



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 2010

No. 58

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR of Arizona).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 22, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ED PASTOR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Lord God, we bless You and thank You for Mother Earth. Earth's beauty calls forth wonder in children and offers daily sustenance to the elderly. Earth is common ground for all human life and invites us to be respectful and grateful for her diverse gifts of land and sea.

Help us to learn from her seasons the wisdom of Your timing. May the variety of her species and the potential of her resources teach us prudence and perseverance. May her fruitfulness give witness to Your ever-faithful love; and her tilt to the Sun model our turn to You to face every need.

Earth is home for us all, but no one's lasting city. With all her laws of nature, Earth is stable yet ever-changing, making all dependent upon You both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WELCH 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 222. Concurrent resolution recognizing the leadership and historical contributions of Dr. Hector Garcia to the Hispanic community and his remarkable efforts to combat racial and ethnic discrimination in the United States of America.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 85-874, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, appoints the following individual to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts:

The Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) vice The Honorable Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94-201, as amended by Public Law 105-275, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the following individuals as members of the Board of Trustees of the American Folklife Center of the Library of Congress:

Patricia Atkinson of Nevada vice Dennis Holub of South Dakota; and

Joanna Hess of New Mexico vice Mickey Hart of California.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 10 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

EXPAND GOLDMAN SACHS INVESTIGATION

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, all America has heard about "too big to fail," and they are still pretty angry about that and the bailout of Wall Street. But now there is a new addition to the lexicon thanks to Goldman Sachs, and that is "designed to fail for profit."

Goldman Sachs worked with a hedge fund manager who put together collateralized debt obligations that he hand-picked because he thought they would fail. Goldman got a fee for putting them together, Goldman sold him insurance, or bets against them, and then Goldman went out and sold to unknowing investors those same securities as great investments.

We are thankful that the Securities and Exchange Commission is back on the beat after a long nap under the Bush administration and Chris Cox. We congratulate Chairwoman Schapiro, but we are asking her to expand the scope of her investigation to look at any credit default swaps that were paid to Goldman Sachs that involved these so-called Abacus instruments and whether or not we could reclaim those as ill-gotten gains for America's taxpayers.

HONORING SERGEANT SEAN DURKIN

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

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H2803

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, there are many heroes from Colorado who have fought and continue to fight in the global war on terror. Today I rise to pay tribute to one hero in particular, Army Sergeant Sean Durkin of Aurora, Colorado.

On March 27, 2010, Sergeant Sean Durkin and his fellow soldiers were on a mission near Forward Operating Base Wilson in Afghanistan when their convoy was struck by an explosive device. Sergeant Sean Durkin and two other brave soldiers exited the vehicle to respond to the blast but were all injured when a second improvised explosive device went off. Sergeant Sean Durkin was gravely wounded and ultimately succumbed to his injuries while at Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

In 2004, Sergeant Sean Durkin graduated from Eaglecrest High School in Colorado. Sergeant Sean Durkin is a shining example of Army service and sacrifice. As a former member of the Army and as a retired Marine officer, my deepest sympathies go out to his family and to all who knew him.

GOLDMAN SACHS AND BAD BETS

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, last week we saw two stories about Goldman Sachs. It made record profits of \$1 billion a month for the past 3 months and it was sued for civil fraud by the Securities and Exchange Commission for the manner in which it made that money misleading its own clients.

Goldman has transformed itself from one of the most respected institutions on Wall Street to one of the most reviled for putting itself ahead of its clients and the American people. The \$1 billion designed-to-fail Abacus deal for the benefit of a hedge fund billionaire who needed to get richer did not create a single new job in America. It did not provide a single American family with a new mortgage. It didn't help a single new business get started. It did more to damage the economy than it could possibly have done to have helped it.

But the only difference with this Texas Hold'em new poker game that Goldman fuels is that when Goldman makes a bad bet the American taxpayer is the loser.

JUDGE REJECTS FIRST AMENDMENT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Federal Judge Barbara Crabb sided with some atheists last week and wrongly ruled the National Day of Prayer is unconstitutional.

The first amendment to the Constitution states, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise

thereof." The judge obviously forgot the "free exercise" part.

Our Founding Fathers jealously guarded the right to free exercise of religious conscience. Thanksgiving was started in 1789 by President George Washington so the Nation could, "Thank and pray to the Almighty for blessing America." We start each day of Congress with a prayer. Heaven knows we need it. We have a long history of honoring the religious foundation of America's liberty.

The National Day of Prayer does not seek to establish a government religion. Quite to the contrary, we specifically recognize one day each year the right of Americans to freely exercise their religion, free from anyone's interference, including atheists and Federal judges.

What's next, Judge Crabb? You going to ban Thanksgiving and Christmas as national holidays?

And that's just the way it is.

EARTH DAY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the last 40 years of Earth Day represent some of my personal highest hopes, fondest dreams, and greatest frustrations about the environment. At times we have watched retreat, denial, and in some cases destruction. But we have also seen people mobilized and government respond with groundbreaking legislation.

Today, Earth Day is not so much an issue of hope or despair as one of determination. The current path we are on is not sustainable. It's, indeed, destructive. More and more people know the devastating facts. But what is exciting is that we know what to do about it. From Girl Scout troops to community colleges to the United States military, people are moving in the right direction with solutions that are cost-effective and that most agree we should implement even if we aren't concerned about destabilizing the Earth's climate.

The Big question is, Where will we be on the 50th anniversary of Earth Day? Will we have risen to the challenge of global pollution, leading by example, making real progress to a low carbon future while we revitalize American industry to compete for business at home and abroad? We can, and I hope that we will.

ENERGY AND THE FARM BILL

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. The Third District of Nebraska is one of the largest agricultural districts in the country and is home to more than 30,000 farmers and ranchers. Yesterday, the House Ag Committee took the first

step on the road leading to a new Farm Bill.

Taking a comprehensive look at the agriculture sector requires us to be direct about the impact of policies coming from Washington to those 30,000 Nebraskans and agriculture producers throughout the country. Measures like the House-passed cap-and-trade bill will have dire consequences for agriculture. As higher energy prices hit other areas of our economy, farmers and ranchers will pay more for seed, fertilizer, equipment, energy, and other supplies.

My goal is to create policies which will strengthen U.S. agriculture and provide long-term stability for our Nation's producers who feed America and the world. We must not continue to saddle producers with onerous regulations which stand in the way of growth and only lead to more uncertainty.

LETTER TO THE SEC RE: GOLDMAN SACHS AND AIG

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the Securities and Exchange Commission to do their job. The letter Mr. DEFAZIO and I wrote to the SEC asks for nothing more and nothing less. The SEC has sued Goldman Sachs for potential fraud. Rather than jumping to the conclusion that there was no fraud or simply convicting Goldman Sachs in the court of public opinion, Mr. DEFAZIO and our 36 cosigners and I call for an expanded investigation by the SEC. Should fraud be found, we ask that any taxpayer money paid by AIG and obtained through fraudulent transactions be recovered.

Finally, we are asking that evidence of criminal wrongdoing be turned over to the Justice Department. The SEC must be serious about reining in companies who ignore our laws. I am committed to this cause, Mr. DEFAZIO is committed to this cause, and our 36 cosponsors are committed to this cause.

I invite all of my colleagues to sign onto the letter and join us.

ELIMINATE SWEETHEART DEALS

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill that would eliminate sweetheart deals. Recently, the current health care bill that got passed, I know in my area, in my town hall meetings, talking to a lot of Americans, people are concerned about the health care bill that just passed, but they are outraged about the sweetheart deals.

What do I mean? The \$300 million that went to the Louisiana purchase, \$100 million that went to a hospital in Connecticut. People are outraged because they feel it is their money, it is their taxpayer money, and they are very concerned about it. They feel it is buying votes.

And that's the reason I think we have such a low approval rating in this country, because they view it as back-room deals, secret deals. This bill will eliminate all the sweetheart deals that are in this bill.

I ask my colleagues to join me in eliminating sweetheart deals in the current health care legislation.

THE AMT ADJUSTMENT ACT

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

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, a critical component of our economic recovery is tax relief for our middle class. I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the AMT Adjustment Act, which eliminates the AMT from the lives of most middle class families and greatly reduces it for the rest.

In places with a high cost of living like New York's Hudson Valley, more and more middle class taxpayers find themselves paying the excessive AMT. We must restore balance to the Tax Code and prevent this millionaire's tax from hitting the middle class for once and for all.

H.R. 5077 increases the amount of income exempt from the AMT and permanently fixes the tax by indexing it to the cost of living. Tax day is bad enough already, and it shouldn't have big surprises to the tune of thousands of dollars our families have to pay.

Congress must stand up for the middle class. I urge support for this bill.

THE ADMINISTRATION AND ISRAEL

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my serious concern about the way the administration is dealing with Israel and how destructive I think their behavior is to our relationship.

I would like to remind the administration that the overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress, Democrat and Republican, but more importantly the overwhelming majority of Americans, fiercely support our friend Israel and expect the administration to reflect that in their behavior.

We have had this President go to Saudi Arabia and to Egypt to reemphasize how important it is to improve relations with the Muslim nations. He didn't visit Israel while he was over there to emphasize how important it was to keep and maintain support for our relationship with that Jewish State.

We have had Vice President BIDEN go there and condemn the construction of apartments in Jerusalem. Secretary Clinton did the same thing. Vice President BIDEN was an hour and a half late for a dinner with the Prime Minister.

How disrespectful. When President Obama met with Netanyahu in the White House and had dinner with him, he walked out on that dinner. How disrespectful.

We expect more from our President when it comes to dealing with Israel than just disrespect. We expect a re-emphasis of our support for Israel.

□ 1015

EQUAL PAY DAY

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, this week we marked Equal Pay Day, a day when we recognize the unequal pay of women in this country. Today, women still only make 77 cents to every dollar earned by men. But this disparity is not a women's issue. It's a family issue.

There are just as many women as there are men in the workforce now, and women are the breadwinner or co-breadwinner in about two-thirds of all American families. That is why all of us, men and women alike, have such a big stake in eliminating this gap.

I was proud that my first speech as a freshman in this body was in support of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act and when that legislation became the first bill that President Obama signed after taking office. I was proud when Maine had Lilly Ledbetter herself to visit our State last month. And I am proud of the fact that Maine has passed a comparable worth law and made great strides towards ending pay discrimination in our own State.

But for all we have to be proud of, we have so much more to do because when women are paid less, everybody suffers.

END BAILOUTS ONCE AND FOR ALL

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. What's the difference between an "orderly liquidation fund" and a taxpayer-funded bailout? There is no difference.

Senate Democrats say they need \$50 billion to create a new fund so the government can "wind down" failing financial firms. House Democrats want \$100 billion more. Both bills increase taxes on consumers at a time when they can least afford it.

Once the bailout fund is in place, government bureaucrats will decide which Wall Street firms are too big to fail, and then they'll use your hard-earned dollars to pay off the firm's creditors. Sound familiar? It's what they did for companies like AIG with the \$700 billion TARP bailout.

Now Democrats are pushing "TARP Two." They want to give the government the power of a permanent bailout fund to get back in the game of decid-

ing which of their Wall Street friends to rescue. And their bill does nothing about Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac—the two enterprises at the heart of the economic meltdown.

Republicans have better solutions. Our measure deals with Fannie and Freddie and places failed firms into bankruptcy. It also provides better and smarter regulatory reform, stops the policy of "too big to fail," and protects taxpayers by ending bailouts once and for all.

EARTH DAY

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the 40th anniversary of Earth Day to support the millions of people around the world who are dedicating their time and service to protecting our environment. I commend all of our citizens for their efforts to clean up our environment, but most of all, I look forward to seeing what we in Congress will do to support them.

I hope this will include passage of legislation I've recently introduced that will restore and protect the largest estuary on the west coast—the San Francisco Bay and its watersheds, which are a national treasure and a resource of worldwide significance.

I also encourage all of us to stand with our constituents this week who are lending their time and service to activities to clean up our environment. One town in my district expects over 5,000 people to dedicate their day to clean up the local shoreline. Earth Day is truly about service, and it's a great opportunity for friends and neighbors to come together on behalf of our planet.

BAILOUT CULTURE

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. With all of this talk about another big bank bailout and protecting companies that are too big to fail, I think we need to bring things back into perspective. The government should not be in the business of picking winners and losers—especially not at the expense of the American taxpayer.

America was built on freedom and free enterprise. Our Founding Fathers never envisioned a Big Brother government so entrenched in the private sector that it would prop up companies like Fannie and Freddie, rescue Wall Street, bail out AIG, and own car companies. What incentive does a corporation have to be responsible to its employees, customers, communities, and shareholders if it knows Uncle Sam is going to be there to pick up the pieces when it falls apart?

With unemployment at 10 percent and companies hesitant to hire new

workers, I think the Democrats should realize it's time to stop playing CEO with taxpayer dollars.

EARTH DAY IS OCEAN DAY

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Earth Day and speak of the important role our oceans play in combating global warming.

As we celebrate the 40th anniversary of Earth Day, we must remember that Earth Day issues are closely linked to ocean health. Think about it. Seventy percent of the earth is covered by water. The ocean plays a key role in climate formation. It is not only the atmosphere that collects CO₂, but also the oceans are trapping CO₂. That is why we have melting ice caps, rising sea levels, hotter-than-average temperatures, and more severe storms and periods of drought.

Ocean acidification has the greatest impact on corals, clams, oysters, and crabs. The seafood that we eat, like salmon, depend on those. Ocean health is directly related to land health. As we learn about our responsibility for the sustainable well-being of our planet, we must become concerned citizens of oceans as well.

Earth Day is ocean day. Think about it. There is more ocean than earth.

EPA'S CONTEST USING TAXPAYER DOLLARS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make Americans aware of a contest being held by the Environmental Protection Agency. In an attempt to explain how the bureaucracy works, the EPA has announced a video contest to encourage citizens to create videos that explain the Federal rulemaking process. The reward for showing how your government operates is a prize of \$2,500.

To some, I realize that might not seem like a lot of money, but as my friend MARSHA BLACKBURN astutely pointed out, \$2,500 is the total tax contribution for a working American making just under \$30,000 a year. Do we really want to ask any American to hand their total tax payment over to someone who made a YouTube video?

Mr. Speaker, we must restore fiscal discipline in the Federal Government, and ending this kind of spending is a good place to start.

HONORING ORENE ELLIS FARESE

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

Mr. CHILDERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Ms. Orene Ellis Farese—a singular woman of great accomplishment, style, and uncommon beauty. Her home was Ashland, Mississippi, where she was a true partner of her husband, famed attorney John B. Farese. They served together in the Mississippi legislature—the first couple to do so in our State and the United States.

The Fareses became the parents of four exceptional children: John Booth, Kay, Steve, and Jeff. The Farese household was a lively and hospitable one, always open to friends and to children's friends.

Mrs. Farese taught by example and placed a high priority on service and excellence. She founded the Ashland PTA and the Arts Festival, served as a Scout and church leader, and was present at every activity involving her children.

In 1938, Mrs. Farese graduated from Blue Mountain College—a momentous accomplishment for a woman at that time. Through her continued leadership, Mrs. Farese was a role model for young women in Ashland affirming that they, too, could accomplish anything with their lives. The Fareses put the tiny town of Ashland on the map and raised the bar for everyone.

Today, their children continue the Farese legacy of giving begun by their parents. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this sterling example of Mississippi womanhood and her beautifully lived life.

IT IS TIME FOR COMMONSENSE REFORM FOR WALL STREET

(Mr. MURPHY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, over the last 10 years, Washington failed to regulate our financial marketplaces, and some people on Wall Street took advantage of that to take ridiculous and dangerous risks with dollars that they couldn't back up. This must never be allowed to happen again. All across America, we know what happened. When Wall Street melted down, Main Street paid the price. It's time for us to put in place commonsense reforms to fix this system.

I was proud to support the financial reform that we passed here in the House last fall, and I look forward to getting a final bill in front of us. We must make sure that taxpayers never again are responsible for bailing out failed financial institutions. We must also protect our consumers from some of the risky and predatory behavior we saw in the marketplace from unregulated organizations pushing mortgages that couldn't be afforded. And we've got to inject transparency and accountability into our financial system. The fresh light of day will disinfect so many of the ills in our financial system.

This is about more than just reform. It's about strengthening the system and strengthening our economy and strengthening all of us in this country.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2194, IRAN REFINED PETROLEUM SANCTIONS ACT OF 2009

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2194) to amend the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 to enhance United States diplomatic efforts with respect to Iran by expanding economic sanctions against Iran, with the Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct conferees at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Ros-Lehtinen moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2194 be instructed—

(1) To insist on the provisions of H.R. 2194, A bill to amend the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 to enhance United States diplomatic efforts with respect to Iran by expanding economic sanctions against Iran, as passed by the House on December 15, 2009; and

(2) To complete their work and present a conference report and joint explanatory statement by no later than May 28, 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this motion comes at a critical point in our efforts to prevent Iran from dealing a devastating blow to the security of our Nation, the security of our closest allies, and to global security and stability. The gravest threat comes from Iran's rapidly advancing nuclear weapons program.

Last week, Lieutenant General Burgess, the director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, and General Cartwright, the vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified that Iran could produce enough weapons-grade fuel for a nuclear weapon within 1 year. But even with this alarming scenario, we may be too optimistic given the Iranian regime's long history of deception.

Last September, yet another secret Iranian nuclear facility was revealed—an underground uranium enrichment plant. Inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency, or

IAEA, reportedly concluded that this facility's capacity is too small to be of use in producing fuel for civilian nuclear power but is well configured to produce material for one or two nuclear weapons a year. The regime has already announced that it intends to build 10 new uranium enrichment plants and will start construction on two in this coming year.

There is mounting evidence that Iran has been working on a nuclear warhead for many years. The IAEA's Iran report from February of this year stated that its inspectors had uncovered extensive evidence of "past or current undisclosed activities" to develop a nuclear warhead.

That same IAEA report, Mr. Speaker, raised concerns "about the possible existence in Iran of undisclosed activities related to the development of a nuclear payload for a missile."

Iran has long been at work on ballistic missiles and already has the ability to strike U.S. forces and our allies in the Middle East, such as Israel and in many other areas.

But Iran is not stopping there. A recent unclassified report by the Department of Defense estimated that Iran may be able to strike the United States with a missile by the year 2015.

□ 1030

The threat posed by the Iranian regime's nuclear ballistic missile and unconventional weapons capabilities is magnified by its continued support for violent extremism. According to this Pentagon report, Iran is "furnishing lethal aid to Iraqi Shia militants and Afghan insurgents. And Iran provides Lebanese Hezbollah and Palestinian terrorist groups with funding, weapons and training to oppose Israel." The same report stated that "Iran, through its longstanding relationship with Lebanese Hezbollah, maintains a capability to strike Israel directly and to threaten Israeli and U.S. interests worldwide."

We know that Iran has a long track record of using these capabilities. The Pentagon report confirms that the Iranian regime has been involved in or has been behind what the report describes as "some of the deadliest terrorist attacks of the past two decades, including: The 1983 and '84 bombings of the U.S. Embassy and annex in Beirut; the 1983 bombing of the Marine barracks in Beirut; the 1994 attack on the AMIA Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina; the 1996 Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia; and many of the insurgent attacks on coalition and Iraqi security forces in Iraq since 2003."

In other words, when the Iranian regime threatens America and Israel with destruction over and over again, they may mean it. Today the Iranian Revolutionary Guard is scheduled to begin a 3-day exercise involving their missiles and other weapons to demonstrate their ability to dominate the Persian Gulf and the Strait of Hormuz,

the choke point for much of the world's oil supply.

Diplomacy and engagement have had no real impact on the regime in Tehran. As Iran sprints towards the nuclear finish line, deadlines set by the Obama administration for compliance have been repeatedly disregarded. Now the strategy appears to be resting on securing a new U.N. Security Council resolution. However, Russia and China see themselves as friends of the regime in Tehran and have publicly stated that they will not support a resolution that puts any significant pressure on Tehran. In fact, The New York Times reported last week that Secretary of Defense Robert Gates "warned in a secret 3-page memorandum to top White House officials that the United States does not have an effective long-range policy for dealing with Iran's steady progress toward nuclear capability."

Mr. Speaker, the Congress must fill this vacuum. We must not sit idly by and wait for Iran to detonate a nuclear device. In February of 2006, the Congress adopted a concurrent resolution, citing the Iranian regime's repeated violations of its international obligations, underscoring that as a result of these violations, Iran no longer has the right to develop any aspect of the nuclear fuel cycle, and urging responsible nations to impose economic sanctions to deny Iran the resources and the ability to develop nuclear weapons. Then we moved to strengthen U.S. sanctions on Iran and to render support to Iranian human rights and pro-democracy advocates through the passage of the Iran Freedom Support Act of 2006.

Yet again, the U.S. has yet to bring to bear the full force of U.S. punitive measures on the Iranian regime. We have failed to act quickly and decisively before. This may be our last chance to apply pressure on Iran before it is too late. So while the motion to instruct we are considering calls on the conferees to conclude their work by May 28, it is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will not wait that long. We must strike at the regime's vulnerabilities and do so quickly and effectively.

As such, the motion to instruct conferees insists on the House-passed version of H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanction Act, also known as IRPSA. Chairman BERMAN and I, along with several other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the House as a whole, have introduced IRPSA to target one of the Iranian regime's key vulnerabilities; namely, its dependence on imported petroleum products, especially gasoline. The House passed it overwhelmingly on December 15 by a vote of 412-12.

The sanctions bill we enact must match the gravity of the growing threat. There are several provisions that the conference report must contain if this legislation is to have any significant impact. Because Iran's energy sector and its dependence on refined petroleum are the regime's Achilles' heel, in the motion to instruct we

must insist on sections 3(a) and 3(b), which strengthen sanctions regarding the development of Iran's petroleum resources and the export of refined petroleum products to Iran. We must not reward countries that allow their businesses and citizens to provide assistance to Iran's nuclear missile or advanced conventional weapons program to be rewarded with a peaceful nuclear cooperation agreement. Therefore, the House must insist on section 3(c), which prohibits such agreements being submitted to Congress or entering into force. We must insist, Mr. Speaker, on those provisions because the executive branch has not once applied sanctions under the Iran Sanctions Act on investment in the Iranian energy sector.

This problem originated more than a decade ago when former Secretary of State Albright exercised a sweeping waiver that turned that act into a paper tiger, and the State Department continues to ignore mandatory sanctions under that act on those who are assisting Iran's proliferation activities. We must also ensure that section 3(d) removes ambiguities regarding the President's waiver authority and, thereby, will ensure the speedy implementation of sanctions. And we must insist on section 3(f), which expands the definition of petroleum resources and products and closes loopholes in the original Iran Sanctions Act that have been repeatedly exploited by others. Because the Iranian threat will continue to grow, the House must insist also on section 3(h), which extends the Iran Sanctions Act by 5 years. And because we must not let those who have already violated our laws off the hook, we must insist on sections 4(a)(1), 4(a)(2), and 4(b)(1).

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion and ask conferees to embrace it and commit to sending the strongest possible bill to the President's desk. The clock is ticking. The centrifuges in Iran are spinning. Our time has almost run out.

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

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

I rise in strong support of the ranking member's motion to instruct. The world faces no security threat greater than the prospect of a nuclear-armed Iran. We must make certain that the prospect never becomes a reality. A nuclear Iran would menace, intimidate, and ultimately dominate its neighbors. It would be virtually impervious to any type of pressure from the West, whether regarding its support of terrorism or its crushing of freedom and human rights at home, and it would touch off a nuclear arms race in the Middle East that would shred the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and almost inevitably lead to catastrophe. And worst of all, Iran might actually use its nuclear arms against those it considers its enemies.

The urgency of this issue is beyond dispute. Iran quite possibly will be capable of developing and delivering a

nuclear weapon in the next 3 to 5 years, and our task of preventing Iran from achieving nuclear weapons capability is made more complicated by the fact that we all know that our best weapon for fighting this battle—economic sanctions—takes time to work. So we need the strongest possible sanctions, and we need them fast.

That's why I support this motion to instruct. The House bill, H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, is a good, strong measure; and I and my fellow conferees will fight for it in conference. We will also work with the Senate on measures to help Iran's brave dissidents circumvent regime efforts to block their communications.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Florida, will speak about an additional provision with respect to State decisions to disinvest that we want to include in this conference report. And I want to send this bill to the President by or before the May 28 deadline proposed in the motion to instruct.

This bill, along with the Senate bill, has already done much good. In recent months, in anticipation of our sanctions becoming law, several major energy companies have ceased selling refined petroleum to Iran. Others have announced they will not make new investments in Iranian energy. They are making the sensible choice that our bill encourages, choosing the U.S. market over the Iranian market. More will make that choice when our bill becomes law.

Meanwhile, our bill is goading other nations to intensify their efforts to achieve a sanctions resolution in the U.N. Security Council, and our own executive branch is getting the message that Congress is able and willing to take the grave matter of sanctions into our own hands.

April 30 will mark 1 year since we first introduced this sanctions legislation. Since then, Iran has increased the number of its working centrifuges and has reached the one-bomb equivalent level in its stock of low-enriched uranium. It has enriched uranium to 20 percent, a big step on its way to mastering the process of producing weapons-grade uranium, and has installed advanced third-generation centrifuges. It has been caught red-handed building a secret reactor near Qom, which research suggests could only have been intended for bomb-making purposes, and it has announced plans to build 10 more reactors.

Iran is in contempt of the international community, and I had hoped that a U.N. Security Council resolution requiring tough sanctions, followed immediately thereafter by additional muscular sanctions imposed by the European Union, would have happened by now. I know the administration is doing everything possible to bring that result about. Unfortunately, we are now nearly 4 months into 2010 with Iran on the verge of nuclear weapons capability and a U.N. Security Council resolution remains an uncertain prospect. We cannot wait any longer.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

You know, I think my colleagues have very eloquently explained the contents of the bill and what we need to do. But the thing I would like to talk about for a minute or two are the ramifications for America and the rest of the world if we don't do something. We get about 30 to 40 percent of our energy from the Middle East, and if I were talking to the American people, I would just say to them that if you look at your lights and you look at the energy you need for your car and for everything else, heating your house, you need to realize that if Iran develops a nuclear capability and that whole area becomes a war zone, the Persian Gulf, where a lot of oil is transported through, we would see a terrible problem as far as our energy is concerned, and that would directly affect our economy.

□ 1045

So it is extremely important that we do something and do something very, very quickly. We have waited too long. We have been talking about negotiating with Iran and putting sanctions on them for the past 4 or 5 years, trying to get our allies to work with us. The fact of the matter is nothing has happened, and Iran continues to thumb their nose at the rest of the world. This is a terrible, terrible threat. A terrorist state, Iran, with nuclear weapons is not only a threat to the Middle East, to Israel, our best ally over there, but it is a threat to every single one of us.

They are also working on intermediate range missiles and possibly intercontinental ballistic missiles. If they get those, nobody is safe. So it is extremely important that we take whatever measures are necessary to stop Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

Now, today we are taking a great first step. I hope when this goes to conference committee we come out with something that is so strong it really will have an impact on what Iran does. But if it doesn't, it is important that everybody in the world realize that we have to stop Iran from developing nuclear weapons because it is a threat to every single person on this planet in one way or another. We have got to stop nuclear proliferation, but the first thing we have to do is stop Iran, a terrorist state, from getting nuclear weapons.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to a distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the chairman very much both for his leadership and for this opportunity, with the ranking member, to really discuss and reinforce some of the principles that many of us support in a bipartisan manner. But I rise today to simply encourage the conference on this legislation and to be able to simply chronicle efforts that I think were not wasteful, but constructive.

I do believe the administration's effort at engagement was constructive and not wasteful. It is always important—for those of us who are lawyers—to create the record, the building blocks for the final decision of the court of law. In this instance, the court of law is the combination of the American people, this Congress, and this administration, and it is, likewise, the world community, the United Nations.

Also, the people of Iran are speaking and they are speaking loudly. No one can forget that fateful picture of a young lady lying in her own blood during the uprising of the people of Iran, not provoked by any world standards or provocation, but for the people of Iran simply saying enough of the despotism of this administration, of their country; enough is enough. They were willing to die in the streets. They took to the buildings to make loud noises at night, and they continue to pounce over and over again.

Iran is a challenge, and it is a terror around the world. Having just come back from Yemen, Bahrain, Qatar, and Pakistan, everywhere you went individuals, leaders in government were willing to indicate what a threat Iran was. Just yesterday, in a hearing on Syria, questions are now rising as to Iran's participation in funding Hezbollah to go into Lebanon. Of course some of those particular points are being denied, but frankly I think if there is any reason to move forward on a conference, it is the concept of the disruption of Iran in the region.

There are those who are in the Middle East who want peace. From Jordan, to Israel, to other places around, they want peace. If we begin to look at Yemen, that is in a distant location, a place where I visited, we know that it is an al Qaeda cesspool. We know that there are young men there that are susceptible to recruitment. All of this provides for a disruptive arena, and we here in this country must provide the moral standing of peace and democracy for those who desire so.

So I rise to support the people of Iran, those who are willing to sacrifice their lives and go into the streets. And it is well known that whatever we have tried to do, the engagement of the Cold War, the standoff, Iran continues to seemingly put forward its nuclear efforts.

I ask for support of this legislation, and I ask my colleagues to vote for this motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act of 2009. This legislation provides another tool for the President to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons by allowing the administration to sanction foreign firms who attempt to supply refined gasoline to Iran or provide them with the materials to enhance their oil refineries. These sanctions would further restrict the government of Iran's ability to procure refined petroleum. Currently, the availability of petroleum products is stagnant in Iran. Private firms have decided that the government of Iran's refusal to cooperate with the multilateral community on nuclear proliferation generates a significant risk to doing business with Iran.

I would like to thank Chairman BERMAN for incorporating 1 my concerns about the human rights situation in Iran into the findings of this legislation. It is important that we acknowledge that, throughout 2009, the government of Iran has persistently violated the rights of its citizens. The government of Iran's most overt display of disregard for human rights happened in the presidential elections on June 12, 2009. As I said on June 19, 2009, "We must condemn Iran for the absence of fair and free Presidential elections and urge Iran to provide its people with the opportunity to engage in a Democratic election process." The repression and murder, arbitrary arrests, and show trials of peaceful dissidents in the wake of the elections were a sad reminder of the government of Iran's long history of human rights violations. The latest violations were the most recent iteration of the government of Iran's wanton suppression of the freedom of expression.

It is important that we are clear that our concerns are with the government of Iran and not its people. The State Department's Human Rights Report on Iran provides a bleak picture of life in Iran. The government of Iran, through its denial of the democratic process and repression of dissent has prevented the people from determining their own future. Moreover, it is the government of Iran that persecutes its ethnic minorities and denies the free expression of religion. As we proceed with consideration of this legislation, we should all remember that the sole target of these sanctions is the Iranian government.

Mr. Speaker, the government of Iran has repeatedly shown its disdain for the international community by disregarding international nonproliferation agreements. Iran's flagrant violation of nonproliferation agreements was evidenced most recently in the discovery of the secret enrichment facility at Qom. The government of Iran's continued threats against Israel, opposition to the Middle East peace process, and support of international terrorist organizations further demonstrate the necessity for action.

Iran's recent actions towards the international community reflect a very small measure of progress. Iran's decision to allow International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA, inspectors to visit this facility was a positive sign, but not a sufficient indication of their willingness to comply with international agreements. The recent announcement that Iran will accept a nuclear fuel deal is also indicative of their willingness to engage in dialogue, though it remains to be seen what amendments they will seek to the deal. While these actions indicate a small degree of improvement in Iran's position, the legislation before us today demonstrates that only continued dialogue and positive actions

will soften the international community's stance towards Iran.

I would also like to emphasize that the legislation before us provides only one tool for achieving Iran's compliance with international nonproliferation agreements. I continue to support the administration's policy of engagement with Iran and use of diplomatic talks. I believe that diplomacy and multilateralism are the most valuable tools we have to create change in Iran. After those tools fail, I believe that the sanctions are an appropriate recourse.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding time.

As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, I strongly support this motion to instruct.

I think it is important for all of us to realize that right now Iran is at its weakest point in terms of its capacity to manufacture enough refined petroleum. It has to, at this point for its gasoline, import that into the nation. Already the impact, the effect of this legislation even coming up on the floor has been effective in backing companies away from doing business with Iran. Imagine what the effect will be if we pass this legislation. Imagine the impact it will have and the pressure that it will bring to bear because the threat of this legislation has already produced a situation in Iran that is very, very difficult for civil society and is making people understand the cost and the consequences for Iran to continue down this road.

Now, this morning the GAO will release a report that shows that foreign commercial activity in Iran's energy sector is going to begin to increase, and that will provide cash for Iran's nuclear program. That is why this bill is so important. A similar report 3 years ago showed half as many companies involved in this sector; now it is on the increase. The usual way of doing business of not standing up to the Russians and the Chinese and to others cannot continue; we have to take action.

Time is not on our side. Enrichment capability, the key aspect of a nuclear weapons program, is being mastered by that government. Not so long ago, I remember talking here on the floor about Iran's 164 centrifuges, and now the progress is measured in thousands and thousands of centrifuges. It is working on a weapon design, my colleagues, and may have a missile to carry that warhead to the United States within 5 years' time.

Today, the world's top terrorist state has its tentacles throughout the region.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue.

As the chairman knows, I have some reservations about the effectiveness of a sanctions regime, but there is no question in my mind but that the worst thing that could happen is military confrontation because that would in fact unite the Iranian people against America and on the wrong side of history.

Now, it is too easy to think of Iran as a monolithic people. The reality is that Iran is the successor to the great Persian civilization, and it is a very diverse civilization. I share the chairman's concern about the current Government of Iran, which I don't think is consistent with Persia's history; and in fact their actions have been inexplicable and inexcusable. And the chairman is right, obviously, to respond. But the reality is that a very substantial portion of the Iranian population, perhaps a majority, in fact embraces American values of democracy and human rights and individual freedoms of expression, collective gathering, and freedom of worship; but they are not able to do that today.

I appreciate the fact that the chairman is determined to allow the technology that would enable the population to communicate their ideas, in fact to mobilize for the best interests of their nation and their future. We ought also to limit the availability of technology that the regime is using for precisely the opposite purposes: to censor and to perform surveillance against those people who would like to empower the Iranian people to take control of their own future.

This bill will be supported, it should be supported, and, again, I appreciate the chairman's leadership.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the gentlelady.

For those of us who have engaged in this region and have watched neighboring countries to Iran, watched their propensity to react as Iran has sped up its development, each of those countries is now looking at going nuclear. I would ask my colleagues to think about those neighbors of Iran that would create a heavily nuclearized Middle East should Iran succeed in this and what the impact would be. We can only imagine the turmoil and the tensions that will come to the Middle East should we not succeed in this effort to prevent Iran from developing these nuclear weapons.

Tomorrow's nuclear Iran would thus have a compounding effect with severe consequences for regional security and, as I pointed out earlier, for U.S. security. So the time for action has long passed. This bill will greatly help because it targets Iran's Achilles' heel at perhaps the only time that we can effectively do that.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the author of Florida legislation with respect to disinvestment from Iran's energy sector, our newest Member, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, the motion before us today is based on the simple fact that a nuclear-armed Iran is an unacceptable threat to our national security, poses an existential threat to our vital ally, Israel, and will ignite a destabilizing arms race throughout the Middle East.

We must take whatever action is necessary to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Iran is the world's leading sponsor of terror; its President denies the Holocaust, and he has openly declared his intention to wipe Israel off the map.

To be included among the powerful sanctions in this legislation is the removal of barriers that State pension boards raise which prevent the divestment of holdings in companies that help to fund Iran's nuclear weapons program.

In 2007, the Florida legislature passed critical legislation that mandated that workers' pension funds could not be used to support Iranian nuclear weapons. In Florida alone, we removed more than \$1 billion from companies that put their profits ahead of this Nation's national security. That is one State. This legislation will permit every State to divest from Iran just as Florida and 20 other States have already done. The divestment effort will become a full-fledged movement.

The threat from Iran is real. This threat is unacceptable, and it demands this aggressive effort on the part of the United States and our allies.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, because that's just the way it is.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Iran is the world threat. They along with North Korea are working together to plot and build nuclear weapons to threaten the rest of the world.

Ahmadinejad, the little fellow from the desert, has already said that when he gets nuclear weapons, his first target is Tel Aviv in Israel. He has made it clear to the world that he wants to destroy Israel and he wants nuclear weapons; he wants missiles from North Korea to do that. But his threat is not just to the Israelis. It is to the entire region, and even to the United States. He continues to rant about how he wants the destruction of the West.

He helps Hezbollah in the north and he helps Hamas in the south both to engage and cause terror in Israel. Our answer has been, Well, let's talk to them; let's tell the Iranians that they're not playing nice, that they are going to cause problems in the world. Mr. Speaker, we cannot adopt the Nev-

ille Chamberlain philosophy and fool ourselves that the Iranians will honestly negotiate with the world. They lie to the world and the United States so they can buy time to build their nuclear weapons. More talking will not bring peace in our time. It will only allow them to build nuclear weapons.

□ 1100

So this sanction must work. It must be enforced. Prevent companies from dealing with our enemy government, the Iranian Government, and do not allow Iran to receive refined gasoline. We must mean it and we must enforce this.

The long-term solution with Iran is that there is a regime change. We hope the good people of Iran change their rogue government, a government that doesn't even represent the people, a government that had fraudulent elections last year and that took over control again.

Our government, our country, our people must be vocal about our support of this resistance movement. Iranians will, hopefully, remove their government by themselves and will peaceably set up a government that represents to the world that it will bring peace to the world.

That is the great hope for Iran. That is the great hope for the world—a peaceable regime change in Iran.

Right now, we need sanctions, and we need to let them know we mean it because we are not going to continue to talk forever and to hope that they will negotiate and play nice.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. I thank my California colleague for yielding to me, and I commend him for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, in the course of my service on virtually all of the security-related committees in this House, I have visited some of the most dangerous and austere places on the planet—rugged, remote areas that provide sanctuary to the most ruthless and cunning terrorists. As a result, I am often asked to name those countries which I think pose the greatest threat to the security of our country and to the world. Iraq? Pakistan? Afghanistan? Yemen?

My answer every time is: Iran, Iran, Iran.

Given the zeal with which it promotes and supports instability in the Middle East, given its myopic obsession with the destruction of Israel, its arming of and financial assistance to Hezbollah and Hamas, and its implacable, duplicitous march towards a nuclear weapons capability, in my view, no other country comes close.

The question that confronts us is how to cause Iran's government to abandon interest in a nuclear weapons program.

Most agree—certainly, I do—that a multilateral approach is most likely to

succeed. Our efforts with the EU, led by the indomitable Stuart Levey, have been effective, but they haven't yet changed Iran's course.

Our country must continue its leadership role. Our efforts at diplomacy and at unilateral sanctions must drive stronger multilateral diplomacy and sanctions. That is why Congress must move to conference on Iran sanctions legislation and why it must enact by an overwhelming bipartisan vote the strongest package. That package should include divestments, and it should expand sanctions on individuals, institutions, as well as on nongovernmental entities, and it must cripple Iran's ability to import refined petroleum products.

Let me be clear, Mr. Speaker. Our problem is not with the Iranian people but with its government's reckless policies. Iran with nuclear weapons not only poses an existential threat to Israel; it poses an existential threat to us and to countries everywhere which espouse Democratic values.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), an esteemed member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, as the Iranians accelerate their nuclear program, indications are that America may be losing its nerve. In its latest report to Congress, the CIA said that Iran has continued to expand its nuclear weapon infrastructure and that it has continued uranium enrichment. This follows reports by the U.N.'s IAEA that Iran has mastered the art of making low-enriched uranium and that it is halfway to its goal of making bomb-grade fissile material.

So what are our options?

We know that Iran's greatest weakness is its dependence on foreign gasoline. The mullahs have so mishandled Iran's economy since 1979 that this leading OPEC, oil-producing nation is dependent on gasoline for 40 percent of its needs.

I wrote the first gasoline sanctions resolution with my colleague ROB ANDREWS in 2005. Over time, my colleagues and I have built a bipartisan coalition with Congressman SHERMAN behind a policy of ending Iran's gasoline sales.

I want to thank Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN for their success in bringing this bill to the floor. In these partisan times now, when have 514 Senators and Congressmen agreed on anything? But they agree on cutting off Iran's gasoline.

Now, without decisive bipartisan action soon, the security of our children and of our allies may depend on the good behavior of a terrorist nation now armed with the most dangerous weapon. So, as Congress has been sleeping, I think we should wake up. We should finally sign this bipartisan bill.

To Congress: Pass this legislation. To the President: Sign it and then seal off Iran's gasoline.

Without unilateral action to cut off Iran's gasoline, no other sanctions policy is serious. With it, we have a chance to remove a great danger to the security of American and Israeli children.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the chair of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. I want to thank the chair for his leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, which mandates tighter sanctions against the Iranian regime. With its continued defiance of the international community and with the clock ticking on their nuclear capabilities, now is the time for action.

This week, Iran announced its testing of various missiles and weapons capabilities. U.S. officials have said Iran could develop a ballistic missile capable of striking the U.S. by 2015, and they have said that Iran's continued existential threat to our strongest ally in the Middle East, Israel, presents dire global security implications.

I urge the conferees to act with haste to address these urgent challenges with tough crippling sanctions. Let the speed with which Congress finalizes this legislation to sanction Iran be a message to the international community that time is of the essence if we are to contain Iran's threat to security, stability and prosperity worldwide.

Again, I thank the gentleman from California and the gentlewoman from Florida for their efforts. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this motion to instruct.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, not long ago, I was briefed by an official on Iran's provocative action, and he gave a challenge in that briefing.

He said, Print out on your computer a red line. Print a big, thick, red bar on a white sheet of paper, and look at it from a distance. You'll think it's a solid red line, but if you'll look at it up close, what you will see is that it is actually a series of tiny, little pink lines all pushed together, but they're individual little lines. He said, What Iran has figured out is a way to break

through one tiny, little line at a time, just one at a time, one at a time, one at a time.

That is why we are here today, because we in the West, we in the United States, are on to what the Iranian leadership is doing. They are being incredibly provocative. There is no legitimate nuclear ambition for Iran. This is a regime that has said that Israel, our greatest ally in the Middle East, has no right to exist. They've said one provocative thing after another.

History is filled, Mr. Speaker, with examples of weakness and ambiguity in foreign affairs. What is the result? Largely, the result is calamity.

Now we have a chance to be united, to all come together to say we are not going to stand for this. We have come up with a remedy, and it is time for the conferees to move forward and to create this very tough and solid sanction against the petroleum products going into Iran. I urge the conferees to move quickly.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I support the Obama administration's historic efforts at nuclear weapon non-proliferation and nuclear security. It is a recognition that our security depends on dialogue and negotiation between nations. It was reflected in a proposal that was made last year to freeze Iran's nuclear programs at existing levels.

Now, in December of last year, I led the effort to oppose H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. I stand here today, almost 5 months later, to reaffirm my objections to the underlying bill, and 5 months later, we have not come any closer to a diplomatic resolution to our objections to Iran's nuclear proliferation program nor have we attempted to amend the language of the Iran sanctions bill to ensure that it does not come at the cost of the well-being of the Iranian people we claim to support.

Iran imports 40 percent of its gasoline. Leaders of Iran aren't going to lack for gasoline, but the people of Iran already suffer. We have to ask ourselves:

Will this cause them to turn against their government or will it cause them to turn against the United States in our efforts to bring about a cessation of Iran's nuclear program? If we cared about the Iranian people, we would not be back on the House floor, considering Iran sanctions.

Congress can better demonstrate its commitment to the Iranian people and to their brave demonstrations for democracy by focusing on efforts to address the egregious human rights, civil liberties and civil rights abuses that they endure. The legislation under consideration will only play into the hands of the Iranian regime by diverting attention away from the significant social and economic problems that must be addressed.

I fear that this legislation will actually strengthen the hard-liners in Iran,

and I am sure that is not what we want to happen. This legislation will undermine any future efforts by the administration to engage diplomatically with Iran by limiting the tools the administration can use. Reports suggest that Iranians have delayed any agreements with the United States for a fuel swap due to internal divisions.

We must stand in support of the courageous battle for human rights and democracy that the Iranian people are engaged in, many at the cost of their lives.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), a member of the Armed Services and Judiciary Committees.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, the ominous intersection of Jihadist terrorism and nuclear proliferation has been inexorably and relentlessly rolling toward America and the free world for decades.

We now find ourselves living in a time when the terrorist state of Iran is on the brink of developing nuclear weapons. If that occurs, all other issues will be wiped from the table because whatever challenges we have in dealing with Iran today will pale in comparison to dealing with an Iran that has nuclear weapons.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration seems to remain asleep at the wheel. We see repeated signals that the Obama administration may already be adopting a policy of containment. It is beyond my ability to express the danger of such a policy. I am afraid that the last window we will ever have to stop Iran from gaining nuclear weapons is rapidly closing.

While it is unlikely that the bill before us will be enough to prevent Iran from gaining nuclear weapons by itself, it is a step in the right direction, and I applaud its sponsors. I only pray that the Obama administration will wake up in time to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear armed nation, from threatening the peace of the human family, and from bringing nuclear terrorism to this and to future generations.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I get the time remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Florida has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BERMAN. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) articulated his reasons for opposing this legislation. We are now, of course, voting on a motion to instruct on the legislation, but I want to just take issue with several of his points.

Firstly, the reason there has not been a diplomatic resolution of the problem is that the regime in Iran has refused to engage in any meaningful and serious way in a resolution which would require them to change their behavior to end their ambition to obtain

a nuclear weapons capability, and that is where the blame lies. It is not because diplomatic alternatives have been ignored. It is because they have been undertaken and rebuffed by the regime in Iran.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Secondly, I disagree very much with the gentleman's contention that our effort to seek to change Iranian behavior and to reverse Iran's decision to pursue nuclear weapons through the imposition of strong, robust, meaningful economic sanctions, both through this legislation and, even more importantly, through tough international sanctions by the community of nations, is going to cause the Iranian people to turn against us on behalf of their regime.

□ 1115

These are people who have risked their lives, their freedom, their liberty. They have been subject to execution, murder, imprisonment, all kinds of repression, efforts to suppress their speech and their political liberties by that regime and have taken great risks, notwithstanding the way that regime has reacted. I would suggest that those people will know more than anyone that the consequences that are befalling the people of Iran are a result of the regime's behavior, not the international community and America's efforts to change Iran's behavior.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so honored to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), our esteemed Republican whip and a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I want to salute, first of all, the gentlewoman's leadership on this issue as well as that of the gentleman from California in bringing this to the floor. I would also like to thank the majority leader for bringing this to the floor as well.

Mr. Speaker, last year the new administration came to power insisting it had a new approach that would head off the looming threat of a nuclear Iran. By talking to and engaging with the regime in Tehran, the administration said we could convince the world's most active state sponsor of terrorism to abandon its nuclear weapons program. And if that didn't work, America ostensibly would gain the "moral authority" to galvanize China, Russia, and the rest of the world to go along with a regime of crippling sanctions against Tehran.

Fifteen months and countless missed deadlines later, the administration's strategy has failed. Our lack of resolve has only enabled Iran to accelerate its illegal activities.

Let us take this opportunity to remember how high the stakes are. The danger of a nuclear Iran is not hypothetical; it is real. It is a direct and serious threat to America. It is a game

changer that would set off a nuclear arms race throughout the Middle East, permanently destabilizing the world's most dangerous region.

Top U.S. military officials recently warned Congress that within 1 year Iran will have the fissile material it needs to make a nuclear weapon. Once Iran gets the bomb, the concept of deterrence that underpins U.S. national security is no longer valid.

The resounding voice of history reminds us that we ignore the threats of dangerous men and dangerous regimes at our own peril. That's why Congress must rise to the occasion and send the message to the world that the United States will not tolerate a nuclear Iran. It is time for a concerted effort to impose sanctions with real teeth, and that begins here today with the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act.

We must block the shipment of all refined petroleum to Iran, and we must cut off all international companies who do business with Iran's Revolutionary Guard from the U.S. financial system. Iran's trading partners must understand that they will no longer conduct business with the regime in Tehran with impunity.

Mr. Speaker, these are times of sharp partisan divide in our Nation's capital, but today we have the chance to come together to take a major step forward in the interests of world peace. The time for decisive action to head off the regime in Iran's nuclear program is now.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the majority leader, I yield myself 30 seconds.

One year and 3 months ago, America was pretty isolated in its goal of trying to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. We absolutely need to move quickly because Iran is moving quickly. But there can be no doubt that the result of the events of the past 15 months have changed the dynamic fundamentally where the international community now recognizes the threat Iran's nuclear weapons pose and it is Iran who is isolated, not America. That is a direct result of the fundamental change of policy.

Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to a great advocate of this legislation and of achieving this goal, the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend of some 45 years, the chairman of the committee, for yielding. And I want to, before I start my remarks, say that I agree with him with respect to his observations regarding the Obama administration's efforts that are bearing positive fruit with respect to our allies around the world. We are not where we need to be and they are not all allies, but they certainly are partners in responding to this threat to the international community.

We know what a grave danger a nuclear Iran would pose to America's security, to our ally Israel's security, and, indeed, to the security of the international community. That is why

Mr. BERMAN and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN reported out a bill. That is why we passed a bill. That's why the Senate has passed a bill. And now it's time to go to conference. It's time to resolve the differences that exist and send a clear and unmistakable message.

The dangerous consequences of inaction range from a fierce regional arms race to a nuclear umbrella for terrorism, to the unthinkable. With American and international security at stake, Iran's nuclearization is a grave proximate threat and cannot stand. That is why the United States must do everything in its power, Mr. Speaker, to stop Iran's nuclear pursuit.

Through years of diplomatic silence, Iran's nuclear program grew. President Obama took a course of patient engagement. And while Iran's unwillingness to negotiate in good faith has been exposed to the world, it has grown even closer to its goal. Today, the International Atomic Energy Agency feels that Iran has enough low-enriched uranium for two nuclear bombs.

So time is of the essence. By proceeding with this motion, Congress moves closer to the imposition of sanctions that will hit the Iranian economy at its weakest points: its banking system, the Revolutionary Guard Corps, and the refined petroleum Iran depends upon.

I support, strongly, this motion, knowing full well that sanctions are never a perfectly precise instrument and that they may mean hardship for ordinary Iranians who already suffer under the repressive regime in Iran. But I support sanctions nonetheless because they can work when the international community recognizes that an outlaw nation poses a common threat to us all, a case that President Obama and Secretary Clinton are making persuasively, as was the point of the chairman of the committee, to our fellow Security Council members and a case that the administration continued to make at this month's nuclear security summit. An extraordinary summit, I might add, of historical precedence, where 47 nations from around the world came here to Washington to meet together, including the President of China, to say that nuclear proliferation poses a danger to all, not just to a single nation, not just to a regional group of nations, but to all.

I support sanctions because Tehran can choose, at any time, to negotiate in good faith and set aside its aggressive nuclear pursuit. And I support sanctions because when properly designed, they can be a source of powerful pressure on the Iranian regime, pressure both external and internal.

As Britain's Telegraph newspaper reported on Monday, "there is now increasing resentment that Iran's once popular nuclear program could be distracting from more urgent needs in the face of economic mismanagement and sanctions. Far from resenting the U.S.-designed sanctions, Iranians blame the slowdown on their own government.

“Nuclear energy is something that I supported, but why go about it in this way?” asked an Iranian citizen Zori Baghi, a pensioner and father of two.” He went on to ask, “If it is legitimate, then why are we suffering for it in this way? If it’s not legitimate, then do it in the right way or give it up. We’re paying too heavy a price,” so said an Iranian citizen about that country’s nuclear ambitions.

It is my belief, my colleagues, that if smart sanctions take effect, more and more Iranians will come to the same conclusion and so, hopefully, will the Iranian regime. Sanctions will show the regime that its embrace of nuclear proliferation carries a cost that is far too high. We cannot expect a change of heart from Tehran, but we can demand a change of behavior.

My colleagues, this action is timely and perhaps past time, but it is always timely to do the right thing, to speak up, to act, and to encourage our allies as well and our partners and our fellow citizens in this globe to act in a way that will protect them and protect our international community.

So I rise in strong support of this motion to go to conference and the motion to instruct, and I thank my chairman for his leadership on this issue. He is working both to have effective action taken by the Congress and to assist the administration in reaching the objective in as positive a way as is possible.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the prospect of an Iranian state armed with nuclear weapons is simply intolerable for the world. It poses an existential threat to our ally Israel. It would pose the threat of terrorism all over the Middle East under a nuclear umbrella, so we wouldn’t be able to oppose what Iran was doing. It poses a threat of a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. It poses the threat that we cannot rule out that this regime would give a nuclear weapon to a terrorist group like al Qaeda to use we can only guess where.

Finally, some people say, you know, we coexisted with a nuclear Soviet Union for 40 years, 50 years. We deterred them, deterrence works. Deterrence cannot work when you have a government that is religious in nature, many of whose elements are millenarian; that is, they believe that the final destruction of Israel even if it causes a nuclear war would bring on the return of the Hidden Imam more quickly. You cannot reason with a suicide bomber. You cannot deter a suicide bomber, which is in essence what parts of the Iranian Government are.

So we must prevent Iran from getting nuclear weapons. We also must

avoid the Hobson’s choice of having a situation where the advisers come in to the President and say, Mr. President, here are your two choices: One, do nothing in Iran, who will have nuclear weapons in a couple of weeks; two, militarily attack Iran. We don’t want that Hobson’s choice. We have to avoid a choice of military action or a nuclear Iran.

The Bush administration was here for 8 years. They pursued a policy of talk tough and carry a toothpick. They talked tough but stopped nothing, and for 8 years the centrifuges increased and increased in number and went round and round and came closer and closer to a nuclear Iran.

Now we have an administration that comes in with a policy of big sticks and big carrots and says first we will engage the Iranians. We will show them the advantages of avoiding a nuclear status, and we will by so doing establish the foundation for unified, not unilateral, sanctions action against Iran if necessary.

□ 1130

Now we’ve reached the stage where we have to start engaging in real sanctions, and we have allies, and we will get those sanctions, and we must take tough sanctions to avoid that Hobson’s choice.

And this resolution before us is part of that, to impose tough sanctions on the Iranians to make them reconsider, or to make it impossible for them to develop nuclear weapons.

So we must establish this now. We must pass this resolution because we do not want a Hobson’s choice of military action or a nuclear Iran, the latter of which is intolerable, and the first of which is something we should not ever want.

So I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution, and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for bringing it to the floor.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I continue to reserve, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), one of the original creators of the concept of refined petroleum sanctions as a sanction.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, there is a justifiable and broad consensus in our country and in this Congress that the regime in Iran cannot have a nuclear weapon. The issue is how to achieve that objective and why to achieve that objective.

We cannot act in isolation to achieve the objective. We must act to isolate Iran. This has been the fruit of the persistent diplomacy engaged in by the administration, assisted very nobly by Chairman BERMAN and our ranking member that has brought us to a point where the world is now isolating Iran.

Iran stands essentially alone in support of the proposition that its behavior has been justifiable.

The sanctions that are proposed by the underlying bill will be effective because they will force the Iranian leadership to choose between the prospect of prosperity if they drop their nuclear chicanery and the certainty of economic stress if they persist in retaining it.

The best evidence that these sanctions are effective is the crash program the Iranians themselves have embarked on to switch from gasoline to natural gas as a means of propelling vehicles.

More important than how to do this, though, is why to do this. In the early 1930s, there were ugly statements and vicious images coming out of Europe. People insisted that people who worried about that were exaggerating the threat. So much of the world, including, sadly, the United States turned away as those ugly signals were sent. The result was a tragedy of unspeakable proportions: 6 million innocent people killed in the Holocaust.

Today, there are ugly signals and words coming out of Tehran.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I am pleased to yield 30 additional seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. There are ugly signals saying that one Holocaust is not enough, that the Jewish state should be wiped off the face of the Earth.

We ignore these ugly signals at our own peril. We should learn the terrible history of the thirties and not repeat it. We should act swiftly, decisively and united with the rest of the world to impose meaningful sanctions on the Iranian Government that will prevent the day of an Iranian nuclear weapon from ever occurring.

I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue, urge a “yes” vote and the swift adoption of the underlying legislation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have one additional speaker requesting time. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, a hemisphere which has already seen Iranian efforts to penetrate.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding to me. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her strong voice.

And, boy, if there was ever anything that’s bipartisan, it’s this resolution. The one good thing that Iran has done is brought us all together because we realize that the Iranian threat to the world is the world’s biggest threat.

Iran remains the leading sponsor of terrorism around the world; and, as was mentioned before, the President of Iran, Ahmadinejad, has threatened to wipe Israel from the face of the Earth.

But the threat is not to Israel alone. It's to Europe, it's to the United States, it's to the entire world; and the entire world must speak with one voice.

I'm a proud cosponsor of H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, and I want to commend Chairman BERMAN for this initiative, and Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN as well.

Only a few short months ago, the world learned of the secret Iranian nuclear enrichment facility near the city of Qom. If there was ever any doubt that Iran was trying to build nuclear weapons, this revelation dispelled any shred of that doubt. The facility was kept secret from the IAEA, the International Atomic Energy Agency. It was built deep in a mountain on a protected military base. This is precisely how a country conceals a nuclear weapons program and defies U.N. Security Council resolutions, not how it develops peaceful energy technologies.

However, although Iran is a leading producer of crude oil, it has limited refining capacity. And this bill will increase leverage against Iran by penalizing companies that export refined petroleum products to Iran or finance Iran's domestic refueling capabilities. It's my hope that the administration will apply these additional sanctions to make absolutely clear to the Iranian regime that the world will not accept its nuclear ambitions.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I'd also like to raise one additional concern which arose at my October hearing on Iran's role in the Western Hemisphere. Venezuelan leader Hugo Chavez recently agreed to provide 20,000 barrels per day of refined gasoline to Iran. It's anyone's guess as to whether this will be implemented, but the deal may be covered by the bill we are considering today. While some question whether Venezuela has the ability to provide gasoline to Iran since it imports some gasoline to meet its own demand, Chavez is clearly approaching a perilous area. I hope Chavez reconsiders this unwise step. And we must consider and keep focusing on Iran in the Western Hemisphere as well.

The U.S., our allies and the U.N. Security Council have recognized that a nuclear-armed Iran would be a danger to our ally, Israel, the Middle East, the nuclear proliferation regime and to the entire world. The Iranian regime is brutal to its own population, murders its own citizens, represses people who want to demonstrate against its stolen election, and it's time for us to stand up.

So I'm glad, in a bipartisan voice this morning, we say "no" to Iran; "no" to nuclear weapons for Iran; "yes" to support the underlying bill.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we are ready to close if the gentleman is ready to.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself my remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, for several years we have watched Iran move ever closer to acquiring a nuclear weapons capability. No rational person can question that that is Iran's goal. And yet, even though Iran has violated its international treaty obligations, defied repeated U.N. Security Council resolutions, had one secret nuclear site after another revealed to the world, and rejected every offer to negotiate, the world has let it happen.

We, in this Chamber, have been elected to defend and promote the interests and security of our country. We must do everything we can to force Iran's leaders to change course and abandon their pursuit of nuclear weapons because the American people and our allies are their intended targets. We know this because they have repeatedly told us.

We cannot rely on hope for deliverance because that will only guarantee our destruction. So we must act quickly, and we must act decisively.

The bill that the House passed overwhelmingly last December, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, represents the best opportunity we have to do precisely that. If we, and our colleagues in the Senate, can craft a strong measure that can then be sent to the President, we will have met our responsibility to the American people.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that we can defeat the menace that is posed by Iran before it has a chance to strike us, but our time is running out.

Let us support this motion. Let us send a strong bill to the President's desk.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, we meet today to consider a motion to appoint conferees to reconcile the differences between the House and Senate versions of the Iran Sanctions Act. Though both versions would impose sanctions against companies that support Iran's petroleum sector, especially in the area of gasoline and other refined petroleum products, the Senate version includes additional provisions that would direct the president to freeze the assets of Iranian officials and prohibit the U.S. Government from providing contracts to companies that supply Iran with communications monitoring technology. These provisions must be reconciled before the final version can be presented to the President.

Stopping Iran's illegal nuclear enrichment program is an urgent matter, requiring a comprehensive strategy that targets Iran's important energy sector, and its access to the global financial system. These bills can help to achieve these goals.

Last year, Iran admitted the existence of a secret enrichment facility in the holy city of Qom that set in motion a renewed international effort to pursue more aggressive penalties against Iran for its nuclear activities. Using a variety of measures, including the United States led sanctions efforts in the United Nations, penalties currently under consideration by the European Union and the sustained campaign by the U.S. Treasury Department and others to persuade banks and other

businesses to curtail their activities with Iranian businesses, we must significantly increase pressure on Iran to persuade it to end its nuclear program. The United States and the international community must send a very clear signal that Iran faces a stark choice—Iran must end its illegal nuclear enrichment program or it will face increasingly severe consequences. All options for ending that program should remain on the table.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker I rise in opposition to this motion to instruct House conferees on H.R. 2194, the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability and Divestment Act, and I rise in strong opposition again to the underlying bill and to its Senate version as well. I object to this entire push for war on Iran, however it is disguised. Listening to the debate on the floor on this motion and the underlying bill it feels as if we are back in 2002 all over again: the same falsehoods and distortions used to push the United States into a disastrous and unnecessary one trillion dollar war on Iraq are being trotted out again to lead us to what will likely be an even more disastrous and costly war on Iran. The parallels are astonishing.

We hear war advocates today on the Floor scare-mongering about reports that in one year Iran will have missiles that can hit the United States. Where have we heard this bombast before? Anyone remember the claims that Iraqi drones were going to fly over the United States and attack us? These "drones" ended up being pure propaganda—the UN chief weapons inspector concluded in 2004 that there was no evidence that Saddam Hussein had ever developed unpiloted drones for use on enemy targets. Of course by then the propagandists had gotten their war so the truth did not matter much.

We hear war advocates on the floor today arguing that we cannot afford to sit around and wait for Iran to detonate a nuclear weapon. Where have we heard this before? Anyone remember then-Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice's oft-repeated quip about Iraq: that we cannot wait for the smoking gun to appear as a mushroom cloud.

We need to see all this for what it is: Propaganda to speed us to war against Iran for the benefit of special interests.

Let us remember a few important things. Iran, a signatory of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, has never been found in violation of that treaty. Iran is not capable of enriching uranium to the necessary level to manufacture nuclear weapons. According to the entire U.S. Intelligence Community, Iran is not currently working on a nuclear weapons program. These are facts, and to point them out does not make one a supporter or fan of the Iranian regime. Those pushing war on Iran will ignore or distort these facts to serve their agenda, though, so it is important and necessary to point them out.

Some of my well-intentioned colleagues may be tempted to vote for sanctions on Iran because they view this as a way to avoid war on Iran. I will ask them whether the sanctions on Iraq satisfied those pushing for war at that time. Or whether the application of ever-stronger sanctions in fact helped war advocates make their case for war on Iraq: as each round of new sanctions failed to "work"—to change the regime—war became the only remaining regime-change option.

This legislation, whether the House or Senate version, will lead us to war on Iran. The

sanctions in this bill, and the blockade of Iran necessary to fully enforce them, are in themselves acts of war according to international law. A vote for sanctions on Iran is a vote for war against Iran. I urge my colleagues in the strongest terms to turn back from this unnecessary and counterproductive march to war.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the motion to go to conference on the Iran sanctions legislation.

I am grateful to Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN for working with me on a provision included in the House version of this legislation to require companies applying for contracts with the U.S. government to affirmatively certify that they do not conduct business with Iran.

This legislation gives companies a simple choice: do business with the United States, or do business with Iran. We cannot allow the U.S. taxpayer to be last crutch of Iran's dangerous nuclear program. Not on our watch and not on our dime.

The time to act is now, and we must move with fierce urgency.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1287

Whereas, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct initiated an investigation into allegations related to earmarks and campaign contributions in the Spring of 2009.

Whereas, on December 2, 2009, reports and findings in seven separate matters involving the alleged connection between earmarks and campaign contributions were forwarded by the Office of Congressional Ethics to the Standards Committee.

Whereas, on February 26, 2010, the Standards Committee made public its report on the matter wherein the Committee found, though a widespread perception exists among corporations and lobbyists that campaign contributions provide a greater chance of obtaining earmarks, there was no evidence that Members or their staff considered contributions when requesting earmarks.

Whereas, the Committee indicated that, with respect to the matters forwarded by the Office of Congressional Ethics, neither the evidence cited in the OCE's findings nor the evidence in the record before the Standards Committee provided a substantial reason to believe that violations of applicable standards of conduct occurred.

Whereas, the Office of Congressional Ethics is prohibited from reviewing activities taking place prior to March of 2008 and lacks the authority to subpoena witnesses and documents.

Whereas, for example, the Office of Congressional Ethics noted that in some instances documents were redacted or specific information was not provided and that, in at least one instance, they had reason to believe a witness withheld information requested and did not identify what was being withheld.

Whereas, the Office of Congressional Ethics also noted that they were able to interview only six former employees of the PMA Group, with many former employees refusing to consent to interviews and the OCE unable to obtain evidence within PMA's possession.

Whereas, Roll Call noted that "the committee report was five pages long and included no documentation of any evidence collected or any interviews conducted by the committee, beyond a statement that the investigation 'included extensive document reviews and interviews with numerous witnesses.'" (Roll Call, March 8, 2010)

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee included in their investigation any activities that occurred prior to 2008.

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee interviewed any Members in the course of their investigation.

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee, in the course of their investigation, initiated their own subpoenas or followed the Office of Congressional Ethics recommendations to issue subpoenas. Therefore be it:

Resolved, That not later than seven days after the adoption of this resolution, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall report to the House of Representatives, with respect to the activities addressed in its report of February 26, 2010, (1) how many witnesses were interviewed, (2) how many, if any, subpoenas were issued in the course of their investigation, and (3) what documents were reviewed and their availability for public review.

□ 1145

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO REFER THE RESOLUTION

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move the resolution be referred to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Mr. FLAKE. I move the previous question on the resolution itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion for the previous question is preferential.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 218, answered "present" 16, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 217]

YEAS—187

Aderholt Austria
Adler (NJ) Bachmann
Akin Bachus
Alexander Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis

Bishop (UT) Halvorson
Blackburn Heller
Blunt Hensarling
Boehner Herger
Bono Mack Himes
Boozman Hodes
Boustany Hoekstra
Brady (TX) Hunter
Bright Issa
Broun (GA) Jenkins
Brown (SC) Johnson (IL)
Brown-Waite, Johnson, Sam
Ginny Jones
Buchanan Jordan (OH)
Burgess King (IA)
Burton (IN) King (NY)
Calvert Kingston
Camp Kirk
Campbell Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Cantor Kline (MN)
Cao Kosmas
Capito Lamborn
Carter Lance
Cassidy LaTourrette
Castle Latta
Chaffetz Lee (NY)
Childers Lewis (CA)
Coble Linder
Coffman (CO) LoBiondo
Cole Loeb sack
Cooper Lucas
Crenshaw Luetkemeyer
Culberson Lummis
Davis (KY) Lungren, Daniel
Diaz-Balart, M. E.
Donnelly (IN) Mack
Dreier Manzullo
Duncan Marchant
Ehlers Markey (CO)
Emerson McCarthy (CA)
Fallin McClintock
Flake McCotter
Fleming McHenry
Forbes McKeon
Fortenberry McMahon
Foster McMorris
Foxy Rodgers
Franks (AZ) McNerney
Frelinghuysen Mica
Gallegly Miller (FL)
Garrett (NJ) Miller (MI)
Gerlach Miller, Gary
Giffords Minnick
Gingrey (GA) Mitchell
Goodlatte Moran (KS)
Granger Murphy (NY)
Graves Murphy, Tim
Griffith Neugebauer
Guthrie Nunes
Hall (TX) Olson

NAYS—218

Costa Green, Gene
Costello Grijalva
Courtney Gutierrez
Crowley Hall (NY)
Cuellar Hare
Cummings Harman
Dahlkemper Hastings (FL)
Davis (CA) Heinrich
Davis (IL) Hersheth Sandlin
Davis (TN) Higgins
DeFazio Hill
DeGette Hinchey
DeLauro Hinojosa
Deutch Hirono
Dicks Holden
Dingell Holt
Doggett Honda
Doyle Hoyer
Driehaus Insee
Edwards (MD) Israel
Edwards (TX) Jackson (IL)
Ellison Jackson Lee
Ellsworth (TX)
Engel Johnson (GA)
Engel Johnson, E. B.
Eshoo Kagen
Etheridge Kanjorski
Farr Kaptur
Fattah Kennedy
Filner Kildee
Frank (MA) Kilpatrick (MI)
Fudge Kilroy
Garamendi Kind
Gonzalez Kissell
Gordon (TN) Klein (FL)
Grayson Kratovil
Green, Al Kucinich

Langevin	Obey	Sherman
Larsen (WA)	Olver	Shuler
Larson (CT)	Ortiz	Sires
Lee (CA)	Pallone	Skelton
Levin	Pascrell	Slaughter
Lewis (GA)	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (WA)
Lipinski	Payne	Snyder
Lowe	Perlmutter	Space
Luján	Peters	Speier
Lynch	Peterson	Spratt
Maffei	Pingree (ME)	Stark
Markey (MA)	Pomeroy	Stupak
Marshall	Price (NC)	Sutton
Matheson	Rahall	Tanner
Matsui	Rangel	Teague
McCarthy (NY)	Reyes	Thompson (CA)
McCollum	Richardson	Thompson (MS)
McDermott	Rodriguez	Tierney
McGovern	Ross	Titus
McIntyre	Rothman (NJ)	Tonko
Meek (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Towns
Meeks (NY)	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas
Melancon	Salazar	Van Hollen
Michaud	Sánchez, Linda	Velázquez
Miller (NC)	T. Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Miller, George	Sarbanes	Wasserman
Mollohan	Schakowsky	Schultz
Moore (KS)	Schauer	Waters
Moore (WI)	Schiff	Watson
Moran (VA)	Schradler	Watt
Murphy (CT)	Schwartz	Waxman
Murphy, Patrick	Scott (GA)	Weiner
Nadler (NY)	Scott (VA)	Wilson (OH)
Napolitano	Serrano	Woolsey
Neal (MA)	Nye	Wu
Nye	Oberstar	Yarmuth
Oberstar		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—16

Bonner	Dent	McCaul
Butterfield	Diaz-Balart, L.	Myrick
Buyer	Harper	Walden
Castor (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Welch
Chandler	Latham	
Conaway	Lofgren, Zoe	

NOT VOTING—9

Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Polis (CO)
Conyers	Inglis	Ruppersberger
Davis (AL)	Maloney	Rush

□ 1215

Ms. ESHOO, Messrs. NEAL, HARE, HINOJOSA, ALTMIRE, DICKS, MILLER of North Carolina, CARNEY, GEORGE MILLER of California, MARSHALL, TOWNS, GORDON of Tennessee, CLAY, BISHOP of Georgia, GRAYSON, HILL of Indiana, SPRATT, THOMPSON of Mississippi, HOLDEN, KANJORSKI, HOYER, BOUCHER, WATT, ELLISON, Ms. HIRONO, Messrs. LEVIN, STARK, GUTIERREZ, BERMAN, GENE GREEN of Texas, WU, TONKO, DAVIS of Illinois, SCHRADER, PALLONE, Ms. BERKLEY, Messrs. SERRANO, EDWARDS of Texas, LUJÁN, and GONZALEZ changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. COLE, PUTNAM, WAMP, CALVERT, AKIN, RYAN of Wisconsin, ROONEY, LAMBORN, YOUNG of Florida, BOEHNER, BACHUS, GARRETT of New Jersey, SENSENBRENNER, BARTLETT, HENSARLING, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. GOODLATTE, WESTMORELAND, Mrs. HALVORSON, and Mr. ADLER of New Jersey changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. HASTINGS of Washington, LATHAM, and MCCAUL changed their vote from "yea" to "present."

Mr. WELCH changed his vote from "nay" to "present."

So the previous question was not ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that belongs before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to refer.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to refer will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2194 and the motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 1270.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, answered "present" 17, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 218]

YEAS—402

Ackerman	Capps	Eshoo
Aderholt	Capuano	Etheridge
Adler (NJ)	Cardoza	Fallin
Akin	Carnahan	Farr
Alexander	Carney	Fattah
Altmire	Carson (IN)	Filmer
Andrews	Carter	Flake
Arcuri	Cassidy	Fleming
Austria	Castle	Forbes
Baca	Chaffetz	Fortenberry
Bachmann	Childers	Foster
Bachus	Chu	Fox
Baird	Clarke	Frank (MA)
Baldwin	Clay	Franks (AZ)
Barrow	Cleaver	Frelinghuysen
Bartlett	Clyburn	Fudge
Barton (TX)	Coble	Gallegly
Bean	Coffman (CO)	Garamendi
Becerra	Cohen	Garrett (NJ)
Berkley	Cole	Gelbach
Berry	Connolly (VA)	Giffords
Biggert	Cooper	Gonzalez
Bilbray	Costa	Goodlatte
Bilirakis	Costello	Gordon (TN)
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Granger
Bishop (NY)	Crenshaw	Graves
Bishop (UT)	Crowley	Grayson
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Green, Al
Blunt	Culberson	Green, Gene
Bocchieri	Cummings	Griffith
Boehner	Dahlkemper	Grijalva
Bono Mack	Davis (CA)	Guthrie
Boozman	Davis (IL)	Gutierrez
Boren	Davis (KY)	Hall (NY)
Boswell	Davis (TN)	Hall (TX)
Boucher	DeFazio	Halvorson
Boustany	DeGette	Hare
Boyd	Delahunt	Harman
Brady (PA)	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Brady (TX)	Deutch	Heinrich
Bralley (IA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Heller
Bright	Dicks	Hensarling
Broun (GA)	Dingell	Heger
Brown (SC)	Doggett	Herseth Sandlin
Brown, Corrine	Donnelly (IN)	Higgins
Brown-Waite,	Doyle	Hill
Ginny	Dreier	Himes
Buchanan	Driehaus	Hinches
Burton (IN)	Duncan	Hinojosa
Buyer	Edwards (MD)	Hirono
Calvert	Edwards (TX)	Hodes
Camp	Ehlers	Hoekstra
Campbell	Ellison	Holden
Cantor	Ellsworth	Holt
Cao	Emerson	Honda
Capito	Engel	Hoyer

Hunter	McNerney	Sánchez, Linda
Inglis	Meek (FL)	T.
Inslee	Meeks (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta
Israel	Melancon	Sarbanes
Issa	Mica	Scalise
Jackson (IL)	Michaud	Schakowsky
Jackson Lee	Miller (FL)	Schauer
(TX)	Miller (MI)	Schiff
Jenkins	Miller (NC)	Schmidt
Johnson (GA)	Miller, Gary	Schock
Johnson (IL)	Miller, George	Schrader
Johnson, E. B.	Minnick	Schwartz
Johnson, Sam	Mitchell	Scott (GA)
Jones	Mollohan	Scott (VA)
Jordan (OH)	Moore (KS)	Sensenbrenner
Kagen	Moore (WI)	Serrano
Kanjorski	Moran (KS)	Sessions
Kaptur	Moran (VA)	Sestak
Kennedy	Murphy (CT)	Shadegg
Kildee	Murphy (NY)	Shea-Porter
Kilpatrick (MI)	Murphy, Patrick	Sherman
Kilroy	Murphy, Tim	Shimkus
Kind	Nadler (NY)	Shuler
King (IA)	Napolitano	Shuster
King (NY)	Neal (MA)	Sires
Kingston	Neugebauer	Skelton
Kirk	Nunes	Slaughter
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Nye	Smith (NE)
Kissell	Oberstar	Smith (NJ)
Klein (FL)	Obey	Smith (TX)
Kline (MN)	Olson	Smith (WA)
Kosmas	Olver	Snyder
Kratovil	Ortiz	Souder
Kucinich	Owens	Space
Lamborn	Pallone	Speier
Lance	Pascrell	Spratt
Langevin	Pastor (AZ)	Stark
Larsen (WA)	Paul	Stearns
Larson (CT)	Paulsen	Stupak
LaTourette	Payne	Sullivan
Latta	Pence	Sutton
Lee (CA)	Perlmutter	Tanner
Lee (NY)	Perriello	Taylor
Levin	Peters	Teague
Lewis (CA)	Peterson	Terry
Lewis (GA)	Petri	Thompson (CA)
Linder	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (MS)
Lipinski	Pitts	Thompson (PA)
LoBondo	Platts	Thornberry
Loeback	Poe (TX)	Tiahrt
Lowe	Pomeroy	Tiberi
Lucas	Posey	Tiberts
Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)	Tierney
Luján	Price (NC)	Titus
Lummis	Putnam	Tonko
Lungren, Daniel	Quigley	Towns
E.	Radanovich	Tsongas
Lynch	Rahall	Turner
Mack	Rangel	Upton
Maffei	Rehberg	Van Hollen
Manzullo	Reichert	Velázquez
Marchant	Reyes	Visclosky
Markey (CO)	Richardson	Walz
Markey (MA)	Rodriguez	Wamp
Marshall	Roe (TN)	Wasserman
Matheson	Rogers (AL)	Schultz
Matsui	Rogers (KY)	Waters
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (MI)	Watson
McCarthy (NY)	Rohrabacher	Watt
McClintock	Rooney	Waxman
McCollum	Ros-Lehtinen	Weiner
McCotter	Roskam	Westmoreland
McDermott	Ross	Whitfield
McGovern	Rothman (NJ)	Wilson (OH)
McHenry	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (SC)
McIntyre	Royce	Wittman
McKeon	Ryan (OH)	Wolf
McMahon	Ryan (WI)	Woolsey
McMorris	Salazar	Wu
Rodgers		Yarmuth
		Young (AK)
		Young (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—17

Blackburn	Dent	McCaul
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, L.	Myrick
Butterfield	Harper	Simpson
Castor (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Walden
Chandler	Latham	Welch
Conaway	Lofgren, Zoe	

NOT VOTING—11

Barrett (SC)	Davis (AL)	Polis (CO)
Berman	Gingrey (GA)	Ruppersberger
Burgess	Gohmert	Rush
Conyers	Maloney	

□ 1232

So the motion to refer was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2194, IRAN PETROLEUM SANCTIONS ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 2194 offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 11, answered "present" 3, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 219] YEAS—403

- Ackerman, Aderholt, Adler (NJ), Akin, Alexander, Altmire, Andrews, Arcuri, Austria, Baca, Bachmann, Bachus, Barrow, Bartlett, Barton (TX), Bean, Becerra, Berkley, Berman, Berry, Biggert, Bilbray, Bilirakis, Bishop (GA), Bishop (NY), Bishop (UT), Blackburn, Blunt, Bocchieri, Boehner, Bonner, Bono Mack, Boozman, Boren, Boswell, Boucher, Boustany, Boyd, Brady (PA), Brady (TX), Braley (IA), Bright, Broun (GA), Brown (SC), Brown, Corrine, Brown-Waite, Ginny, Buchanan, Burgess, Burton (IN), Butterfield, Buyer, Calvert, Camp, Campbell, Cantor, Cao, Capito, Capps, Capuano, Cardoza, Carnahan, Carney, Carson (IN), Carter, Cassidy, Castle, Castor (FL), Chaffetz, Chandler, Childers, Chu, Clarke, Clay, Cleaver, Clyburn, Coble, Coffman (CO), Cohen, Cole, Conaway, Connolly (VA), Cooper, Costa, Costello, Courtney, Crenshaw, Crowley, Cuellar, Culberson, Cummings, Dahlkemper, Davis (CA), Davis (IL), Davis (KY), Davis (TN), DeFazio, DeGette, Delahunt, DeLauro, Dent, Deutch, Diaz-Balart, L., Diaz-Balart, M., Dicks, Dingell, Doggett, Donnelly (IN), Doyle, Dreier, Driehaus, Edwards (MD), Edwards (TX), Ehlers, Ellsworth, Emerson, Engel, Eshoo, Etheridge, Fallon, Farr, Fattah, Filner, Fleming, Forbes, Fortenberry, Foster, Foxx, Frank (MA), Franks (AZ), Frelinghuysen, Fudge, Gallegly, Garamendi, Garrett (NJ), Gerlach, Giffords, Gingrey (GA), Gonzalez, Goodlatte, Granger, Graves, Grayson, Green, Al, Green, Gene, Griffith, Grijalva, Guthrie, Gutierrez, Hall (NY), Hall (TX), Halvorson, Hare, Harman, Harper, Hastings (FL), Hastings (WA), Heinrich, Heller, Hensarling, Herger, Herseth Sandlin, Hill, Himes, Hinchey, Hinojosa, Hirono, Hodes, Hoekstra, Holden, Holt, Honda, Hoyer, Hunter, Inglis, Inslee, Israel, Issa, Jackson (IL), Jackson Lee, Jenkins, Johnson (GA), Johnson (IL), Johnson, E. B., Johnson, Sam, Jordan (OH), Kagen, Kanjorski, Kaptur, Kennedy, Kildeer, King (MI), Kilroy, Kind, King (IA), King (NY), Kingston, Kirk, Kirkpatrick (AZ), Kissell, Klein (FL), Kline (MN), Kosmas, Kratovil, Lamborn, Lance, Langevin, Larsen (WA), Larson (CT), Latham, LaTourette, Latta, Lee (NY), Levin, Lewis (CA), Lewis (GA), Linder, Lipinski, LoBiondo, Loeb, Lofgren, Zoe, Lowey, Lucas, Luetkemeyer, Lujan, Lummis, Lungren, Daniel E., Lynch, Mack, Maffei, Manzullo, Marchant, Markey (CO), Marshall, Matheson, Matsui, McCarthy (CA), Goodlatte, Granger, Graves, Grayson, Green, Al, Green, Gene, Griffith, Grijalva, Guthrie, Gutierrez, Hall (NY), Hall (TX), Halvorson, Rodgers, McInerney, Meek (FL), Meeks (NY), Melancon, Mica, Michaud, Miller (FL), Miller (MI), Miller (NC), Miller, Gary, Miller, George, Minnick, Mitchell, Mollohan, Moore (KS), Moran (KS), Moran (VA), Murphy (CT), Murphy (NY), Murphy, Patrick, Murphy, Tim, Myrick, Nadler (NY), Napolitano, Neal (MA), Neugebauer, Nunes, Nye, Oberstar, Obey, Olson, Olver, Ortiz, Owens, Pallone, Pascrell, Pastor (AZ), Paulsen, Payne, Pence, Perlmutter, Perriello, Peters, Peterson, Petri, Pingree (ME), Pitts, Platts, Poe (TX), Pomeroy, Posey, Price (GA), Price (NC), Putnam, Quigley, Radanovich, Rahall, Rangel, Rehberg, Reichert, Reyes, Richardson, Rodriguez, Roe (TN), Rogers (AL), Rogers (KY), Rogers (MI), Rohrabacher, Rooney, Ros-Lehtinen, Roskam, Ross, Rothman (NJ), Roybal-Allard, Royce, Ryan (OH), Ryan (WI), Salazar, Sanchez, Loretta T., Sanchez, Loretta, Sarbanes, Scalise, Schakowsky, Schauer, Schiff, Schmidt, Shock, Schrader, Schwartz, Scott (GA), Scott (VA), Sensenbrenner, Serrano, Sessions, Sestak, Shadegg, Shea-Porter, Sherman, Shimkus, Shuler, Shuster, Simpson, Sires, Skelton, Slaughter, Smith (NE), Smith (NJ), Smith (TX), Smith (WA), Snyder, Souder, Space, Speier, Spratt, Stearns, Stupak, Sullivan, Tanner, Taylor, Teague, Terry, Thompson (CA), Thompson (MS), Thompson (PA), Thornberry, Tiahrt, Tiberi, Titus, Tonko, Towns, Tsongas, Turner, Upton, Van Hollen, Velazquez, Visclosky, Walden, Walz, Wamp, Wasserman, Schultz, Watson, Watt, Waxman, Weiner, Welch, Westmoreland, Whitfield, Wilson (OH), Wilson (SC), Wittman, Wolf, Woolsey, Wu, Yarmuth, Young (AK), Young (FL), Frank (MA), Franks (AZ), Frelinghuysen, Fudge, Gallegly, Garamendi, Garrett (NJ), Gerlach, Giffords, Gingrey (GA), Gonzalez, Goodlatte, Gordon (TN), Granger, Graves, Grayson, Green, Al, Green, Gene, Griffith, Guthrie, Gutierrez, Hall (NY), Hall (TX), Halvorson, Harman, Harper, Hastings (FL), Hastings (WA), Heinrich, Heller, Hensarling, Herger, Herseth Sandlin, Higgins, Hill, Johnson (GA), Johnson (IL), Johnson, E. B., Johnson, Sam, Jordan (OH), Kagen, Kanjorski, Kaptur, Kennedy, Kildeer, King (MI), Kilroy, Kind, King (IA), King (NY), Kingston, Kirk, Kirkpatrick (AZ), Kissell, Klein (FL), Kline (MN), Kosmas, Kratovil, Lamborn, Lance, Langevin, Larsen (WA), Larson (CT), Latham, LaTourette, Latta, Lee (NY), Levin, Lewis (CA), Lewis (GA), Linder, Lipinski, LoBiondo, Loeb, Lofgren, Zoe, Lowey, Lucas, Luetkemeyer, Lujan, Lummis, Lungren, Daniel E., Lynch, Mack, Maffei, Manzullo, Marchant, Markey (CO), Marshall, Matheson, Matsui, McCarthy (CA), Goodlatte, Granger, Graves, Grayson, Green, Al, Green, Gene, Griffith, Grijalva, Guthrie, Gutierrez, Hall (NY), Hall (TX), Halvorson, Rodgers, McInerney, Meek (FL), Meeks (NY), Melancon, Mica, Michaud, Miller (FL), Miller (MI), Miller (NC), Miller, Gary, Miller, George, Minnick, Mitchell, Mollohan, Moore (KS), Moran (KS), Moran (VA), Murphy (CT), Murphy (NY), Murphy, Patrick, Murphy, Tim, Myrick, Nadler (NY), Napolitano, Neal (MA), Neugebauer, Nunes, Nye, Oberstar, Obey, Olson, Olver, Ortiz, Owens, Pallone, Pascrell, Pastor (AZ), Paulsen, Payne, Pence, Perlmutter, Perriello, Peters, Peterson, Petri, Pingree (ME), Pitts, Platts, Poe (TX), Pomeroy, Posey, Price (GA), Price (NC), Putnam, Quigley, Radanovich, Rahall, Rangel, Rehberg, Reichert, Reyes, Richardson, Rodriguez, Roe (TN), Rogers (AL), Rogers (KY), Rogers (MI), Rohrabacher, Rooney, Ros-Lehtinen, Roskam, Ross, Rothman (NJ), Roybal-Allard, Royce, Ryan (OH), Ryan (WI), Salazar, Sanchez, Loretta T., Sanchez, Loretta, Sarbanes, Scalise, Schakowsky, Schauer, Schiff, Schmidt, Shock, Schrader, Schwartz, Scott (GA), Scott (VA), Sensenbrenner, Serrano, Sessions, Sestak, Shadegg, Shea-Porter, Sherman, Shimkus, Shuler, Shuster, Simpson, Sires, Skelton, Slaughter, Smith (NE), Smith (NJ), Smith (TX), Smith (WA), Snyder, Souder, Space, Speier, Spratt, Stearns, Stupak, Sullivan, Tanner, Taylor, Teague, Terry, Thompson (CA), Thompson (MS), Thompson (PA), Thornberry, Tiahrt, Tiberi, Titus, Tonko, Towns, Tsongas, Turner, Upton, Van Hollen, Velazquez, Visclosky, Walden, Walz, Wamp, Wasserman, Schultz, Watson, Watt, Waxman, Weiner, Welch, Westmoreland, Whitfield, Wilson (OH), Wilson (SC), Wittman, Wolf, Woolsey, Wu, Yarmuth, Young (AK), Young (FL)

- Kilpatrick (MI), Moore (KS), Schock, Schrader, Schwartz, Scott (GA), Scott (VA), Sensenbrenner, Serrano, Sessions, Sestak, Shadegg, Shea-Porter, Sherman, Shimkus, Shuler, Shuster, Simpson, Sires, Skelton, Slaughter, Smith (NE), Smith (NJ), Smith (TX), Smith (WA), Snyder, Souder, Space, Speier, Spratt, Stearns, Stupak, Sullivan, Tanner, Taylor, Teague, Terry, Thompson (CA), Thompson (MS), Thompson (PA), Thornberry, Tiahrt, Tiberi, Titus, Tonko, Towns, Tsongas, Turner, Upton, Van Hollen, Velazquez, Visclosky, Walden, Walz, Wamp, Wasserman, Schultz, Watson, Watt, Waxman, Weiner, Welch, Westmoreland, Whitfield, Wilson (OH), Wilson (SC), Wittman, Wolf, Woolsey, Wu, Yarmuth, Young (AK), Young (FL), NAYS—11, Baird, Baldwin, Blumenauer, Duncan, Flake, Jones, Kucinich, McDermott, Moore (WI), Paul, Waters, ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3, Ellison, Lee (CA), Stark, NOT VOTING—13, Barrett (SC), Conyers, Davis (AL), Gohmert, Gordon (TN), Higgins, Maloney, Markey (MA), Polis (CO), Ruppertsberger, Rush, Sutton, Tierney

NAYS—11, Baird, Baldwin, Blumenauer, Duncan, Flake, Jones, Kucinich, McDermott, Moore (WI), Paul, Waters, ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3, Ellison, Lee (CA), Stark, NOT VOTING—13, Barrett (SC), Conyers, Davis (AL), Gohmert, Gordon (TN), Higgins, Maloney, Markey (MA), Polis (CO), Ruppertsberger, Rush, Sutton, Tierney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1240

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, 2010, I missed rollcall Vote No. 219. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MATHEMATICS AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1270, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1270.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 2, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 220] YEAS—407

- Adler (NJ), Campbell, Edwards (MD), Akin, Cantor, Edwards (TX), Alexander, Cao, Ehlers, Altmire, Capito, Ellison, Andrews, Capps, Ellsworth, Arcuri, Capuano, Emerson, Austria, Cardoza, Engel, Baca, Carnahan, Eshoo, Bachmann, Carney, Etheridge, Bachus, Carson (IN), Fallon, Baird, Carter, Farr, Baldwin, Cassidy, Fattah, Barrow, Castle, Filner, Bartlett, Castor (FL), Flake, Bishop (TX), Chaffetz, Fleming, Bean, Chandler, Forbes, Becerra, Cullerson, Fortenberry, Berkley, Chu, Foster, Berman, Clarke, Foxx, Berry, Clay, Frank (MA), Biggert, Clyburn, Franks (AZ), Bilbray, Coble, Frelinghuysen, Bilirakis, Coffman (CO), Fudge, Bishop (GA), Cohen, Gallegly, Bishop (NY), Cole, Garamendi, Bishop (UT), Conaway, Garrett (NJ), Blackburn, Connolly (VA), Gerlach, Blumenauer, Cooper, Giffords, Blunt, Costa, Gingrey (GA), Bocchieri, Costello, Gonzalez, Boehner, Courtney, Goodlatte, Bonner, Crenshaw, Gordon (TN), Bono Mack, Crowley, Granger, Boozman, Cuellar, Graves, Boren, Culberson, Grayson, Boswell, Cummings, Green, Al, Boucher, Dahlkemper, Green, Gene, Boustany, Davis (CA), Griffith, Boyd, Davis (IL), Guthrie, Brady (PA), Davis (KY), Gutierrez, Brady (TX), Davis (TN), Hall (NY), Braley (IA), DeFazio, Hall (TX), Bright, DeGette, Halvorson, Broun (GA), Delahunt, Hare, Brown (SC), DeLauro, Harman, Brown, Corrine, Deutch, Harper, Brown-Waite, Diaz-Balart, L., Hastings (FL), Ginny, Diaz-Balart, M., Hastings (WA), Buchanan, Dingell, Heinrich, Burgess, Doggett, Heller, Burton (IN), Donnelly (IN), Hensarling, Butterfield, Doyle, Herger, Buyer, Dreier, Herseth Sandlin, Calvert, Driehaus, Higgins, Camp, Duncan, Hill

Himes	McGovern	Salazar
Hinchey	McHenry	Sánchez, Linda
Hinojosa	McKeon	T.
Hirono	McMahon	Sanchez, Loretta
Hodes	McMorris	Sarbanes
Hoekstra	Rodgers	Scalise
Holden	McNerney	Schakowsky
Holt	Meek (FL)	Schauer
Honda	Meeks (NY)	Schiff
Hoyer	Melancon	Schmidt
Hunter	Mica	Schock
Inglis	Michaud	Schrader
Inlee	Miller (FL)	Schwartz
Israel	Miller (MI)	Scott (GA)
Issa	Miller (NC)	Scott (VA)
Jackson (IL)	Miller, Gary	Sensenbrenner
Jackson Lee	Miller, George	Serrano
(TX)	Minnick	Sessions
Jenkins	Mitchell	Sestak
Johnson (GA)	Mollohan	Shadegg
Johnson (IL)	Moore (KS)	Shea-Porter
Johnson, E. B.	Moore (WI)	Sherman
Johnson, Sam	Moran (KS)	Shimkus
Jones	Moran (VA)	Shuler
Kagen	Murphy (CT)	Shuster
Kanjorski	Murphy (NY)	Simpson
Kennedy	Murphy, Patrick	Sires
Kildee	Murphy, Tim	Skelton
Kilpatrick (MI)	Myrick	Slaughter
Kilroy	Nadler (NY)	Smith (NE)
Kind	Napolitano	Smith (NJ)
King (IA)	Neal (MA)	Smith (TX)
King (NY)	Neugebauer	Smith (WA)
Kingston	Nunes	Snyder
Kirk	Nye	Souder
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Oberstar	Space
Kissell	Obey	Speier
Klein (FL)	Olson	Spratt
Kline (MN)	Olver	Stark
Kosmas	Ortiz	Stearns
Kratovil	Owens	Stupak
Kucinich	Pallone	Sullivan
Lamborn	Pascrell	Sutton
Lance	Pastor (AZ)	Tanner
Langevin	Paulsen	Taylor
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Teague
Larson (CT)	Pence	Terry
Latham	Perlmutter	Thompson (CA)
Latta	Perriello	Thompson (MS)
Lee (CA)	Peters	Thompson (PA)
Lee (NY)	Peterson	Thornberry
Levin	Petri	Tiahrt
Lewis (CA)	Pingree (ME)	Tiberi
Lewis (GA)	Pitts	Tierney
Linder	Platts	Titus
Lipinski	Poe (TX)	Tonko
LoBiondo	Pomeroy	Towns
Loeback	Posey	Tsongas
Lofgren, Zoe	Price (GA)	Turner
Lowe	Price (NC)	Upton
Lucas	Putnam	Van Hollen
Luetkemeyer	Radanovich	Velázquez
Luján	Rahall	Visclosky
Lummis	Rangel	Walden
Lungren, Daniel	Rehberg	Walz
E.	Reichert	Wamp
Lynch	Reyes	Wasserman
Mack	Richardson	Schultz
Maffei	Rodriguez	Waters
Manzullo	Roe (TN)	Watson
Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Watt
Markey (CO)	Rogers (KY)	Waxman
Markey (MA)	Rogers (MI)	Weiner
Marshall	Rohrabacher	Westmoreland
Matheson	Rooney	Wilson (OH)
Matsui	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (SC)
McCarthy (CA)	Roskam	Wittman
McCarthy (NY)	Ross	Wolf
McCaul	Rothman (NJ)	Woolsey
McClintock	Roybal-Allard	Wu
McCollum	Royce	Yarmuth
McCotter	Ryan (OH)	Young (FL)
McDermott	Ryan (WI)	

NAYS—2

Paul Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—21

Ackerman	Dicks	McIntyre
Aderholt	Gohmert	Polis (CO)
Barrett (SC)	Grijalva	Quigley
Cleaver	Jordan (OH)	Ruppersberger
Conyers	Kaptur	Rush
Davis (AL)	LaTourette	Welch
Dent	Maloney	Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1250

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2194, IRAN REFINED PETROLEUM SANCTIONS ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TITUS). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 2194:

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BERMAN, ACKERMAN, SHERMAN, CROWLEY, SCOTT of Georgia, COSTA, KLEIN of Florida, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Messrs. BURTON of Indiana, ROYCE, and PENCE.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of sections 3 and 4 of the House bill, and sections 101–103, 106, 203, and 401 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. FRANK of Massachusetts, MEEKS of New York, and GARRETT of New Jersey.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of sections 3 and 4 of the House bill, and sections 101–103 and 401 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. LEVIN, TANNER, and CAMP.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 1914

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1914, a bill originally introduced by Representative Deal of Georgia, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 4336

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 4336, a bill originally introduced by Representative Deal of Georgia, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4717

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 4717.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the District of Columbia? There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Republican whip for yielding.

Madam Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and at 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and at 12 p.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules, including the very important H.R. 3393, Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2009, introduced by Representative PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, we will consider H.R. 5013, Implementing Management for Performance and Related Reforms to Obtain Value in Every Acquisition Act of 2010, and H.R. 2499, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act of 2009.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, the House will be in session for five more weeks prior to the Memorial Day district work period. I would like to inquire of the gentleman what legislation he expects the House to consider prior to that district work period in addition to the items he just mentioned for next week.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, our number one priority has been and continues to be the progress on the creation of jobs. Last month's report was a positive report. We gained 162,000 jobs, and the economy is showing signs of very substantial improvement as a result of the Recovery Act and of other actions that we've taken to get Americans back to work. So that will continue to be our focus.

Having said that, we also have passed already the HIRE Act, which we think

will have a very substantial, positive effect, which includes payroll tax forgiveness for the hiring of new employees who have been unemployed for some period of time. If they are kept on for 52 weeks, there will be a \$1,000 additional payment, which we hope will encourage employers to hire new people. Additionally in that bill, we gave an extension of the Highway Trust Fund to allow for continued and increased investment in infrastructure and the Build America Bonds legislation, as well as giving a boost to small business growth in terms of expensing.

In addition, the House passed the Small Business and Infrastructure Jobs Act, which is pending in the Senate. We hope that it is coming back to us this work period. We would like to build on our record of job-creating legislation with additional relief to small businesses.

The President has proposed, as the gentleman knows, the Small Business Lending Fund that would take \$30 billion of TARP funds, which was obviously designed to try to get our economy moving again, and provide capital infusion to local banks, and provide assets of \$10 billion or less to incentivize small business lending.

Also, we hope to complete action with the Senate on a long-term extension of unemployment insurance, COBRA benefits and tax extenders for businesses, large and small. Obviously, those pieces of legislation have passed the House.

I expect the House will also take action this work period on the COMPETES Act, which is relatively non-controversial, but invests in growing our economy, particularly in technology innovations, math, and science.

Other items on our agenda for this work period are budget resolution, defense acquisition reform, which I announced we would do next week, defense authorization, the Afghanistan/Pakistan supplemental, the Haiti supplemental, and of course the Iran sanctions conference report, which I hope to have done. As to the resolution that you and I just voted for, the motion to instruct, I urge that that be reported back by the Memorial Day break.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I would say to the gentleman that I am heartened to hear about his continued insistence that this body continue to focus on the number one priority of the American people, which is getting this economy going again and getting Americans back to work.

Madam Speaker, I would say that most Americans agree that what we ought to be doing is containing and limiting government spending. Many of the programs that the gentleman just pointed out indicate that we, perhaps, are going to keep heading down the same road that we have been in order to try and create an environment for jobs.

I would say to the gentleman, although there was some job growth last month, he, himself, I think, would

admit that that is just not enough. In fact, if we were to look back at the times of very high employment in prior years, there is probably a need for over 400,000 jobs to be created each month for us, over a period of several years, in order to accommodate for the growth in population as well as to return us to that kind of low unemployment.

□ 1300

We have got a lot of work to do, in other words, Madam Speaker, and I know the gentleman knows that. And I think it is fair to say that, in fact, we need to create 434,000 jobs per month for 2 years to make up for the job losses that we have experienced. That is going to take some significant commitment on the part of this Congress to stop the government spending and, frankly, to lower taxes on small business.

As the gentleman knows, his constituents just like mine, everyone I talk to knows someone out of work, and it is high time for us to focus on small business, and that is to provide the tax relief for small business and to stop the government programs of spending. And I would hope that the gentleman can commit to trying to change the route that we have taken to finally begin to grow this economy again.

With that, Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman when—

Mr. HOYER. Before the gentleman asks another question, would you yield so I might comment on the comments that the gentleman made?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman indicates that we want to stop spending. Every economist from his side of the aisle to our side of the aisle said that if we did not spend money last year that we wouldn't have grown the economy. In fact, Ben Bernanke, the Republican-appointed Chairman of the Federal Reserve by President Bush; and Secretary Paulson all said you had better invest or you are going to go into a depression, not a recession.

The gentleman talks about job creation, and it is very interesting because, generally speaking, he wants to return to the policies of the Bush administration. And the Bush administration, of course, was the worst job-performing administration since Herbert Hoover. I know the gentleman knows that because those statistics are pretty clear. It created 19,400 jobs per month. You talk about 400 and some odd thousand jobs. I agree with the gentleman. We need to create that level if we are going to get the jobs that your economic program lost, 19,400 jobs, and you need 100,000 to stay even. That was average over 96 months of the policies that were pursued during the Bush administration that my friend supported.

Very frankly, if you will remember, during the Clinton administration, in an economic program that your party didn't support to a person—everyone

voted against it—we created 216,000 jobs per month. Now, there's no secret as to where those jobs were lost. If you create 10 percent of the number of jobs you need to stay even, you're going to go behind and we have a real deficit.

The CBO says that the program that was adopted that, of course, your party opposed, created 2 million new jobs or retained jobs in our economy. Over the last 5 months, we have had a net positive growth in jobs. We grew 162,000 jobs last month. The gentleman is absolutely correct, not nearly enough, but much better than the 779,000 jobs that were lost in the last month of the Bush administration or the average 726,000 jobs that were lost in the last 3 months of the Bush administration.

We are now in the pluses. We are starting to grow. We need to do much, much more. And that's why I responded to the gentleman, when he asked me what we were going to do, we're going to continue to focus on bringing jobs back to America and to our people.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I would say this: Always the gentleman likes to talk about the prior administration, and I would just like to point out that during the prior administration, the last 2 years of that, his party was in control of Congress and, certainly, if we look at the numbers, did contribute to some of the problem that we have got today. And I would say there's plenty of blame to go around. But what we are trying to do is to learn from perhaps mistakes having taken place and go forward in a constructive manner.

It is my sense, Madam Speaker, that this Nation is at a crossroads. We have serious challenges facing this country. Last Thursday was Congress's deadline for passing a budget, and it is my strong belief that we must act, and the gentleman indicates that we are going to act, but because of the critical nature of the challenges that we face, Madam Speaker, I believe that we have got three reasons to act swiftly and properly in passing a budget because it is at the heart of the lack of confidence of what the American people feel towards this body, and if we can rebuild that confidence somehow, we can see a return to growth in this economy so people can get back to work.

First, Madam Speaker, since the 1974 Budget Act passed, the House has never failed to pass a budget resolution. American families and small businesses are not given the luxury of avoiding a budget somehow because maybe it's too difficult, and neither should we. And the gentleman in his own words has said before that it is difficult to pass budgets in election years because the budgets reflect what the fiscal status is. And again, Madam Speaker, I point out never since the passage of the Budget Act in 1974 has this House failed to pass a budget resolution.

Secondly, Madam Speaker, as to the urgency for this body to act in this critical time, CBO Director Doug Elmendorf recently remarked that the

Nation's fiscal path is unsustainable and without a more aggressive approach to spending than the President took in his budget proposal, the debt will rise from currently 53 percent of GDP to 90 percent of GDP at the end of the decade. We all know, Madam Speaker, that is unacceptable.

Finally, I would say to the gentleman, Madam Speaker, the President in his remarks consistently refers to pending tax increases as the expiration of the Bush tax cut. And, Madam Speaker, I would say the American people believe that erasing a tax cut is a tax increase. This Congress has a responsibility to the people that we represent to inform them, the families, the small businesses, of its intention on whether we are going to increase taxes on the small business people and working families of this country.

So I would ask the gentleman if he could give us some sense of when we could expect this body to act on a budget.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I hope that we act on a budget certainly before the end of this work period. I think it's important to pass a budget. I have said that. I am working towards that end.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that and for his commitment to ensure that we right the ship, so to speak, and stop the spending.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman would like to pretend that the Bush administration didn't exist. He doesn't like to look back. He doesn't like history. He doesn't like to learn from our mistakes. I notice he doesn't outline the mistakes that the Bush administration made and that he made in supporting the Bush economic policies, but presumably he believes they existed, which led to such a disastrous performance of our economy. The turning of a \$5.6 trillion surplus that the Bush administration inherited, which allowed it to do some of the things that it did without paying for them because they inherited surpluses, unfortunately, they left a \$5 trillion deficit to this administration. They left a deep, deep, deep hole that we have been trying to dig out, without much help, frankly, from your side of the aisle, I will tell my friend. And we are getting out of that hole. Almost every indicator indicates that, including a growth in jobs. Not nearly to where people are feeling it. So we need to make sure that we continue to create jobs and create an economy that is working much better than it worked during the Bush administration.

The gentleman mentions that we were in charge of Congress in 2007. Yes, in 2006 the American public said we don't like the policies that the Bush administration and the Republicans in Congress are pursuing; we want a change. We did change. But the gentleman well knows that no veto of

President Bush was overridden to change the economic policies you were pursuing, period. We couldn't do that. We couldn't do it until such time as January of 2009 occurred. When it occurred, unfortunately and tragically for the American people and the millions, 8 million-plus, to be exact, lost their jobs, a financial system that was suffering from egregious regulatory neglect and had, as a result, put many, many taxpayers, millions of taxpayers, to the responsibility of trying to stabilize the ship of state. And we have done that.

The good news is that money is being paid back. And the good news is that in terms of the bill that you and I both supported but two-thirds of your party did not, we did stabilize, at the request of the Bush administration, the financial community.

So when the gentleman says that we need to grow jobs, we do. But very frankly, if the gentleman is proposing the same policies that were pursued for 8 years under the Bush administration, then that won't get it and didn't get it. And that's why it is important to learn, not to place blame, but to learn, as I said the other day, from those failures and not repeat them, to invest in the growth of our economy.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Madam Speaker, I would say back if he is so intent on comparing the budgets and the outlook under the Bush administration to this one, I would say this: If we compare the 2011 budgets of President Bush and President Obama, President Bush's outlook and budget for this year was \$2.9 trillion. The 2011 budget of this President is \$3.6 trillion. We could simply cut the deficit by 50 percent if we just lived within President Bush's 2011 budget.

Madam Speaker, I would say to the gentleman if you cut out all of the emergency spending caused by the recession and just look at discretionary spending, since Congress votes on that every year, President Obama will increase discretionary spending by \$319 billion over President Bush's budget for 2011.

So, Madam Speaker, I would say, again, we have got to do better. The American people are waiting for this body to step up in a responsible way to stop the spending, which brings on the need for yet even more debt, which ultimately will lead to higher taxes, despite what the gentleman says, that there's been enough tax relief, and get back to a fiscal path that makes sense so we can see small business grow again.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. First of all, the gentleman does this often. I never said there has been enough tax relief. What you just said I said, I never said that. Nobody heard me say that.

Mr. CANTOR. I thought that the gentleman, Madam Speaker, had said that there has been so much tax relief under the current administration that it seems that all we need to do is keep spending.

Mr. HOYER. If I can, I think you anticipated what the facts are as you know. I didn't say that but you anticipated I might say it.

Mr. CANTOR. I will apologize—

Mr. HOYER. Ninety-five percent of the American public, 95 percent of the American working people, got a tax cut, as you recall, in the legislation that you voted against, \$280 billion in tax relief. That went into the pockets of Americans, helped them get through some very, very tough times which we inherited, did not create, which we inherited, and moving forward.

Now, with respect to the tax increases that you referred to earlier, they are going into effect because of a policy that I voted against but I think you voted for. You were here in 2001 and 2003. And why did you do that? You talk about budgeting. You did it because you couldn't conform to your budget requirements. So what you simply did was you did the artifice, with all due respect, to saying, well, they will expire in 2010. So what is projected to happen in 2010 is a direct result of the budget and the policies that you promoted and voted for, I tell my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I will say to the gentleman again if he is so intent on comparing the two, let's go back to the Bush budget, which would allow us to cut the deficit by 50 percent, if he is so intent on saying how bad things were. Let's stop the spending.

But I would say to the gentleman as far as tax relief is concerned, that tax relief to 95 percent of the public, 25 percent of the tax relief went to entities and individuals that don't even pay taxes. Now, in the minds of most Americans, that is not a tax cut; that's a handout. And that is why we have got to start getting back to basics, Madam Speaker, and insist that the kinds of things that we do here are actually constructive to job creation because that is what we need to be about.

Now, we can go through the litany of things in this President's budget and what the majority has done over its term in office this session to demonstrate taxes have gone up significantly over this period.

It is time to stop taxing, stop spending, and stop borrowing.

So, Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for—

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. When you say taxes have gone up in this period, what period are you referring to?

□ 1315

Mr. CANTOR. Well, I can say this year, this year, Madam Speaker, taxes have increased \$670 billion, \$316 billion of which comes at the expense of the middle class, breaking the President's promise.

Mr. HOYER. And what were those taxes?

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I would say, if you look at the health care bill that was just passed—

Mr. HOYER. The health care bill has not gone into effect. You're saying this year taxes have been increased.

Mr. CANTOR. The health care bill that has just passed, as long as this economy and the players in this economy understand that actions are being taken now to facilitate adopting to a very high tax environment.

Now, if the gentleman wants to join us, if he wants to join us in sending the signal to the public that we're not going to continue business as usual, then let's step up, send the signal we're not going to allow taxes to increase any further, and that starts with differing from the President's budget, which calls for \$2 trillion of tax hikes over the next 10 years.

So I'll say to the gentleman, you can say all day long that you have sat here and provided enough middle class tax relief. It's just not true. The public doesn't understand that. The public sees Washington spending money in unprecedented ways and having to borrow to pay for that. And, ultimately, people understand that it is about raising their taxes, reducing their take-home pay in order to pay for that.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman perhaps believes if he says it enough that I said there's been enough tax relief maybe people will believe it. I have never said that on this floor or any other place. So I wish the gentleman would stop mischaracterizing what I say.

Now, very frankly, what I have said is the policies we pursued were not working demonstrably when we took over the Presidency of the United States, and could change policy, which we did. We changed policy consistent with, frankly, what Senator MCCAIN said ought to be done during the course of the election, not the same way, but that we had to invest in our economy. Mark Zandi, Senator MCCAIN's economic adviser, along with others, said we needed to do what we did.

Now, the gentleman voted against it. But it has, I tell you, worked demonstrably, 2 million new jobs according to the CBO—not new jobs, retained or created. In fact, over 2 million jobs; 162,000 jobs created last month. Not enough. He is correct.

But to ignore the fact that we are making some progress, I don't know whether you saw Larry Kudlow, he said, you know, stop talking down the economy, stop saying that things aren't getting better because the psychology of the economy is very important. And, in fact, whether it's the stock market indication going up, they have confidence, whether it's the growth in our economy from a 6.4 percent decline in the economy that we took over from the Bush administration, to now, a 5.6 percent growth, that figure doesn't mean anything to anybody unless they get jobs. I understand that. We need to get jobs.

What it does mean, however, with the economy growing, that jobs will follow. And that's important.

So please don't put words in my mouth. We need to cut taxes for the American public. In fact, as you know—I want to remark on something that you said. Ronald Reagan was a supporter of the earned income tax credit. Why was he a supporter of the earned income tax credit? Because he thought making sure people had enough money to get by on, buy some food for their family, buy some clothes for their kids to go to school and pay their mortgage payment, was an important thing to happen.

That's the difference, frankly, between our two parties. We don't believe that was a handout. It was a hand up in a very difficult economy. We said—and they don't pay taxes. Why don't they pay taxes, I ask my friend rhetorically. The reason they don't pay taxes is they're not making enough money to pay taxes.

Under your tax program, I would suggest to you, you did that, we supported it. They didn't pay taxes. But what we said is, they've got to live, their kids have to eat, they have to get by. And to the extent that they have some assistance in doing so and spend that money, as every economist will tell you, and you know this to be the case, it will help the economy grow. Yes, we help those people as well.

Maybe you think that was simply a handout and that we shouldn't have done it. But we did it, and it is the difference between our parties in many instances.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I reclaim my time. Madam Speaker, now, see, this is when the politics of attack kick in. For anyone to sit here and say that Republicans don't care about people, that's just not true, and he knows it. It's a definitional question.

If the gentleman differs with my characterization it's not a handout, it's a hand up, okay. But what we're talking about was tax relief. It was not a tax cut. If you don't pay taxes, you can't get a tax cut.

But what I'd say to the gentleman is this: times are different right now, Madam Speaker. The American public understands the crossroads this country is at, that we are on a path to fiscal ruin.

And the gentleman likes to continue to defend the stimulus bill as having been a success. Well, I would say to the Speaker, I'd say, Madam Speaker, to the gentleman, no one, not very many people in America think the stimulus bill was a success at generating jobs, and that's just almost a unanimous fact among most Americans. So if we know that, why would we continue to advocate the same policies?

And instead, Madam Speaker, I would say again I hope the gentleman would join us in advocating tax cuts for small businesses so that we can grow jobs in this economy.

The gentleman did ask what tax cuts, or what tax hikes, occurred over the last, over this session. And during the gentleman's party's majority rule, we know that there was a \$65 billion tax increase on tobacco products. There was an almost \$7 billion tax increase under the stimulus law repealing guidance allowing certain payers to claim losses of an acquired corporation. There was another almost \$23 billion of surtaxes extended for the Federal unemployment program. And there was also, Madam Speaker, as the gentleman knows, a delay of rules reducing double taxation of American foreign nationals to the tune of almost \$6 billion. Those are the tax hikes that have occurred, in addition to the overwhelming billions and billions of dollars inside the health care bill.

So, Madam Speaker, it is not accurate for the gentleman to represent that, number one, this Congress has not raised taxes on the middle class. We know differently. And, number two, to sit here and hide behind the notion that there aren't going to be tax increases at the end of this year, and the fact that that realization is not impacting job growth or the lack thereof, that's not being completely accurate, Madam Speaker.

And I would say to the gentleman, times are different now. It is time for us to own up to the obligations that we face as a country and work together to try and put this country back onto a growth path.

So with that, Madam Speaker—

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield one more time?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. It is a new time. We're paying our bills. Now, we had to borrow a lot of money because we were in a very deep hole. And everybody said if you didn't, all economists, Marty Feldstein, conservative adviser to Ronald Reagan, said you need to put more money back into the economy.

We didn't have any money. You had a \$5.6 trillion surplus that you inherited. We inherited a \$5 trillion deficit. So we had no money. Your administration spent it all.

But you didn't pay for things you bought. You didn't pay for your tax cuts. Very nice to give tax cuts, but if you don't pay for them and they create deficits, then who's going to pay for them? Our children. And that's what happened.

We went to war. One was absolutely essential. We went to another war that some say was of choice, that is, in Iraq. We somewhat abandoned Afghanistan when we went to Iraq, and we didn't succeed in Afghanistan; but we didn't pay for either one of those wars.

Who are we expecting to pay for those wars? Our children.

You adopted a drug prescription program which, very frankly, we made better in the health care bill. We made seniors more secure in getting their prescription drugs. But you didn't pay for it.

Your economy that you left us, very frankly, is responsible for 38 percent of that deficit to which you referred; 90 percent-plus of the deficit that confronts this country are direct results of the policies pursued in the last administration. Just as when Roosevelt inherited from the Hoover administration a very substantial downturn, it took him time to turn that economy around.

So I say to my friend, we are prepared to work together, but we're not prepared to pretend that—when you say times are different, they are different. They are very different. The difference between a \$5.6 trillion surplus and a \$5 trillion deficit, the Bush administration inheritance and our inheritance. And that has made it tough. It's made it tough on us, tough on the American people. And we're trying to get out of this. I think we are.

And again I repeat to my friend, Larry Kudlow gave you some good advice, very conservative guy, on television. You know him; I know him. We appear on his program. And he urged those of you on the conservative side of the ledger, don't deny the facts. That's what Larry Kudlow said. Don't deny the progress that has been made because if you deny it and people believe that denial, they won't think things are getting better and they won't act accordingly. And that's not going to be good for our economy. It won't be good for our country.

So I caution my friend to, when things are positive, have the ability to say, yes, we've made some positive progress from where we were before this administration came into office.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. And in trying to close this colloquy, Madam Speaker, I would say the gentleman knows good and well that when we had a positive job growth report last month, I was the first one to speak out and acknowledge the fact that, yes, growing jobs is a good thing. We've got a long way to go.

The gentleman admits that we are at a different time now, and he points to the deficits; and I point to the fact that the old administration, he alleges, didn't pay its bills, and that perhaps we, in the majority, spent too much. Okay. Fine.

But it doesn't give this majority and this Congress and this administration any better or more license to go and bankrupt this country by continuing on the spending path, and that is my point.

We are at a crossroads, Madam Speaker. I would tell to the gentleman, we have tremendous challenges before us; and as the American people know, if we don't stop the reckless policies of this town, it may very well lead to the fact that our kids and their kids will not enjoy the same freedoms and opportunities that we do.

So I continue to tell the gentleman we stand ready to work with him to try and address this extremely critical time in our Nation.

I yield back.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield, I'll simply say, I agree with the gentleman. And I agree with the gentleman, and certainly want to join together in this effort. And the gentleman will observe, that's why we have adopted, readopted statutory PAYGO. We think that will constrain spending. That's why we've created a commission to look at spending and make recommendations to get a handle on the spending in this country and bring our deficit in line as it was in the nineties.

And that is why the President has submitted a budget that freezes discretionary spending at last year's levels. So we agree with you that we need to move in that direction and, in fact, we are.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. And I'd say, final closing, Madam Speaker. I'd say that in order to get a handle on spending, just stop. And that is why we shouldn't allow for discussion of hiking taxes. It allows this body, this Federal Government, to have yet even more of the taxpayer dollars to decide how to spend.

It's time for us to stop and practice fiscal discipline and get this economy back on track.

I yield back.

□ 1330

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 26, 2010

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATE GOLDMAN SACHS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, this week the Securities and Exchange Commission alleges, in a rather unusually constructed civil case, Goldman Sachs committed fraud. But there is growing concern that evidence presented in this case could be excluded from any subsequent criminal case that might be filed by the U.S. Department of Justice.

Thus, I invite my colleagues to join me and several dozen Members in signing onto a letter to Attorney General Holder asking him to investigate Goldman Sachs and other related cases to ferret out and fight fraud in our financial system. Legal maneuvering to thwart justice should not be allowed through those who harmed our Republic so maliciously.

In addition, I urge my colleagues to sign onto H.R. 3995, which enhances the FBI's, SEC's, and Department of Jus-

tice's capabilities to investigate and prosecute fraud and other financial crimes. Our citizens demand justice. Those who committed financial crimes must be brought to justice. Our letter and H.R. 3995 lead exactly in that direction.

RECOGNIZING AUTISM AWARENESS MONTH

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize April as Autism Awareness Month and call for increased research into and treatment for this leading developmental disorder. Autism impacts more of our children every day, and it is becoming exceptionally prevalent in our American society.

The number of American families who must learn to cope with autism is growing every day. An estimated one in 110 children born in the United States are now diagnosed with autism. We must invest in the research that will allow us to better understand and treat this serious disorder.

For individuals already living with autism and those children who will be diagnosed this year, we must make this our priority. Autism's hold on our families, our children, and our country must be broken.

I look forward to the day when children diagnosed with this developmental disorder can live full and healthy lives.

CONGRATULATING ANGEL RAY GUERRERO

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

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, Angel Ray Tudela Guerrero is a teenager in the Northern Mariana Islands who, despite facing health problems in his own life, has found ways to improve the lives of other young people.

At age 12, Angel Ray was diagnosed with a malignant brain tumor. But Angel Ray did not let his disease control his life. Instead, he used his experience to empower himself to help others.

During his year-and-a-half long stay in a Hawaii hospital battling cancer, Angel Ray found that time passed more comfortably because of the playroom there. But Angel Ray knew that kids back home in the Commonwealth Health Center in the Northern Mariana Islands had no playroom. So Angel Ray partnered with Hawaii Representative Glenn Wakai and with Reach Out Pacific, a nonprofit organization. Together, they organized donations of toys and books to create a playroom at the Marianas Hospital.

Angel Ray Guerrero is an inspiration to us all, an individual who took the

adversity of his own life and turned it into a benefit for others.

SUPPORT THE ECONOMIC FREEDOM ACT

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

Mr. ROONEY. Madam Speaker, Florida's unemployment just reached a record 12.3 percent, and in some areas of my district it's as high as 15 percent. My constituents continue to ask me, "Where are the jobs?" Many claim that the layoffs are driving up the unemployment rate. But the real culprit is the lack of jobs being created in the private sector.

Americans who have been jobless for over a year will continue down that road if new jobs simply do not exist. And I am not talking about temporary government jobs. Congress must work to stop spending and create a favorable environment for businesses to save money and invest by cutting taxes and incentivize banks to start lending again.

Increasing the Federal Government's control over the free market and spending money we do not have is not the answer. Americans have made that clear. That is why today I cosponsored the Economic Freedom Act. This bill will lower job-killing taxes on businesses and rein in excessive government spending. This is the type of solution Americans deserve.

CELEBRATING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF RUSSO'S BAR & GRILL

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 90th anniversary of Russo's Bar & Grill in Amsterdam, New York, a city I have proudly called home my entire life.

John Russo opened Russo's in 1920 as the Mohawk Grocery Store. After the repeal of Prohibition in 1933, John turned the grocery store into a tavern and pool hall. He then passed it to his children, Pat, Angelo, Vince, and Lou. Other than Lou's sad passing, the others are still alive and well today. The restaurant eventually was passed along to its current owners, Mike and Barbara Russo.

However, Russo's is much more than a run-of-the-mill restaurant. Russo's is about family, a gathering place, old American ideals, an immigrant's dream, and a successful small business. Perhaps that is why even then-candidate Hillary Clinton recognized the importance of Russo's, making a campaign stop there during her successful 2000 run for a United States Senate seat.

Nearly a century ago, John Russo planted his dream seed, which germinated and grew over generations to

what we see today, a continuing tradition and legacy of fine food, family gathering, a sense of place, and a gathering post after local community meetings and events. Russo's has the recipe for success, tasty success, for 90 years. Congratulations, Russo's.

NATIONAL MEDIA SHOW DOUBLE STANDARD ON GOLDMAN SACHS COVERAGE

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during President George W. Bush's first term, the national media gave extensive coverage to the Bush administration's relationship with Enron. The New York Times wrote, "Their ties are broad and deep and go back many years." Time Magazine reported on "Bush's Enron Problem." A Chicago Tribune headline read, "Bush urged to be open about Enron."

Eight years later, by comparison, national coverage of the Obama administration's connection to Goldman Sachs is scarce. The SEC has filed suit against Goldman Sachs, charging it intentionally misled investors who participated in a mortgage securities deal that was designed to fail. Goldman Sachs employees gave President Obama over \$1 million in campaign contributions, nearly seven times as much as President Bush received from Enron workers, according to numbers on OpenSecrets.org and as reported by the Washington Examiner. The Examiner also reported that several current and former members of the Obama administration have close ties to Goldman Sachs.

The national media should give Americans the facts, not practice double standards.

DO NOT LAY OFF TEACHERS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I agree with my friends on the other side of the aisle, we must create jobs. And we are working intensely to do that. My recollection is that during the Clinton administration, we created some 22 million-plus jobs. In the Obama administration we are increasing our hold on not losing jobs and increasing jobs.

I hope my colleagues will join me in arguing two points: one, we must invest in the private sector, but our banking industry must invest in small businesses to allow them to hire individuals; and two, we must not lose America's teachers. That is the public sector. But who can afford to lose 300,000 teachers? We must call that an emergency and begin to work on the idea of saving the Nation's teachers.

To the Nation's teachers, stand up for your job because you are standing up for the education of our children.

Who can afford to lose the best and the brightest? We lose that when we begin to lay off teachers. We should end any thought about laying off America's teachers.

UNCERTAINTY IMPACTING SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I've spent a number of weeks back in my district, the 19th Congressional District of Texas, talking to small businesses all throughout the district about the economy and about jobs, which is on the minds of the American people, and particularly the people in the 19th Congressional District.

Many of them said, Congressman, we would be spending money, we would be expanding our business, but Congress is creating such an uncertainty that we don't know what to do. They're still trying to figure out how this health care bill is going to impact them. They're still trying to figure out if this Congress is going to pass a cap-and-trade bill that will increase the cost of energy. They hear Congress talking about all kinds of taxes, VAT taxes, gasoline taxes.

And now they see Congress is spending and borrowing money it doesn't have, running up these record deficits. And they said, Congressman, we're just uncertain about what the future is in this country.

In fact, when I go around to clubs and meetings, I ask people in the audience to raise their hand if they are living out a better life than their parents. Everybody's hand raises. But when I ask them how many people think, based upon the course we are on today, that their children and grandchildren will live a better day, the hands are brought down.

Mr. Speaker, we need to get back to the basics here, cut spending, cut taxes, and get the American people back to work.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIMES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

HONORING MILLARD VAUGHN OAKLEY

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

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Upper Cumberland region of Tennessee is known throughout the country for its unparalleled natural beauty. Its rivers and streams, rolling

hills, farms, fields, and forests all come together to create the rich tapestry of the region. But just as the beauty of the land contributes to the character of the place I am proud to call home, so does the remarkable beauty of the people. The teachers and statesmen, the war heroes and artists of the region are the vehicles that have carried our most cherished traditions throughout the ages.

Out of these great men and women, there is one in particular that I am proud to call my friend. Never one to shrink from a challenge, but he has always been ready and willing to dedicate his time and resources to the service of others.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Millard Vaughn Oakley, an accomplished Tennessean who has tirelessly dedicated his life to public and community service. Whether through his law practice, his service in the General Assembly, or his fight to improve education, Millard has always been a staunch advocate for the interests of Tennesseans. Although it would be impossible to qualify and quantify the total impact that Millard's work has had on our communities, countless lives have been enriched because of his faith and his friendship.

A lifelong resident of Overton County in the foothills of the Cumberland Plateau, Millard graduated from Livingston Academy in 1947, attending Tennessee Technological University, and graduated from Cumberland Law School in 1951. Almost immediately after earning his law degree, Millard began his general law practice in Livingston, Tennessee, which he continued until 1971.

During that time, he was elected to four terms in the General Assembly and served one term in the State's constitutional convention. He has had numerous positions in Tennessee government, including county attorney, and served as our State Insurance Commissioner.

Millard has always fought to improve education throughout Tennessee. He serves on the Tennessee Board of Regents, and through his financial support helped create the Science, Technology, Engineering and Math Center at Tennessee Technological University to bring a world-class research center into the heart of Tennessee.

□ 1345

In his hometown of Livingston, he was instrumental in coordinating local officials and private investors to construct the public library that now bears his name. He also established the Oakley First National Bank Foundation which provides scholarships for financially challenged high school seniors in Overton County.

Through his philanthropy, Millard helped build a campus for Volunteer State Community College in Overton County, which now serves students across the Upper Cumberland.

I am proud to be counted as one of Millard's friends, and I join them in

wishing Millard success in all his future endeavors.

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

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AND THE BORDER VIOLENCE CONTINUES

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. Mr. Speaker, there are rules and procedures for coming into the United States legally. You have to sign the guest book at the point of entry so we know who you are. We have a right to know why someone wants to visit our country—and we have the right to tell them when it's time for them to go home.

But right now, America's hard-working taxpayers foot the bill for anyone who sneaks across our borders unabated. American taxpayers are expected to pay for the world's problems. We have enough problems of our own right here.

Let me mention some of our border issues and some of those issues that we have on the Texas-Mexico border.

Criminal aliens are a part of that problem. There is a crime wave taking place in our border regions. There are 14 Texas counties that border Mexico. And recently, I called the 14 county sheriffs and asked them this question, "How many people do you have in your county jail that are foreign nationals charged with crimes other than immigration violations like misdemeanors and felony offenses?" And they told me that 37 percent of the people in the border county jails in Texas are foreign nationals charged with those crimes.

These are not rich counties. These are poor counties. And yet they're expected to take the brunt of the crime problem on the border. They don't have the money to prosecute or even house these individuals. You see, Mexico's problems have become our problems.

Further, the violence in Mexico has escalated. Just yesterday, a Holiday Inn in Monterrey, Mexico, was attacked by narcoterrorists. The assault was done by 50 gunmen who seized cars to block streets to slow down police response. At least three people were kidnapped in the attack by the drug cartels.

Violence at our southern border with Mexico has escalated as well, and it not only affects Mexican nationals on the northern part of Mexico, but Americans on the southern border as well. Murders, kidnappings, Old West shootouts, Mexican military helicopter intrusions into the United States, and reports of criminal cartels cloning border patrol vehicles to smuggle drugs have all occurred.

An Arizona rancher was murdered at the border recently on his ranch. A California border agent was assassinated just a few months ago. In El Paso, Texas, our border patrol agents are reportedly being targeted by the Azteca hit men. These outlaws work and protect drug shipments for the Juarez drug cartel.

Arizona has just passed a new law giving local law enforcement the ability to check immigration status and detain those in the United States illegally. The bill also puts an end to sanctuary cities in Arizona. It requires law enforcement agents to make reasonable efforts to determine a person's legal status if there is a reasonable expectation they're in the United States illegally. Arizona and other States are desperate so they are trying to do the job that Washington will not do.

This bill is waiting for the Governor's signature in Arizona, and most Arizona citizens support this law. Border States have been asking for help for securing the border against the escalating violence for years. States have to protect their citizens because the Federal Government refuses to act to adequately secure the border. It is the primary purpose of the Federal Government to keep American citizens safe. When the Federal Government refuses to act, the border States are left to deal with the problem on their own.

Governor Rick Perry in Texas has been asking for National Guard troops for over a year, but the Department of Homeland Security has ignored these requests.

There seems to be blissful silence in D.C. about the border war. Why do we wait for more tragedy before more boots are put on the ground? Our law enforcement agents need help. Doesn't Washington know the border has become a war zone?

National Guard troops should be deployed to the border immediately to protect us from the narcoterrorists. Border patrol and local sheriffs in Texas and other States are outmanned, outgunned, and outfinanced.

The United States guards the borders of other nations, but yet we refuse to guard our own border. Why do we do that? Mr. Speaker, we fail to act at our own peril.

And that's just the way it is.

AIDS FOUNDATION OF CHICAGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 25th anniversary of an extraordinary organization—the AIDS Foundation of Chicago. The AIDS Foundation is not just an Illinois treasure. It is recognized across the Nation as a leader in HIV/AIDS policy and service.

The AIDS Foundation was founded in 1985 at the height of the HIV/AIDS epidemic when an AIDS diagnosis was a

death sentence. HIV had been identified 2 years earlier, but effective treatment was still not available. Many of us watched helplessly as friends and loved ones passed away.

AFC was founded by friends of mine, Dr. Renslow Sherer, Dr. Ron Sable, Judy Carter, and William Young. Its mission: to lead the fight against HIV/AIDS and improve the lives of people affected by the epidemic.

Thanks to AFC's role as a force for change, lives have been saved and lives have been changed. AFC helped turned the tide of this epidemic in Illinois and across the country by working with community organizations to develop and improve HIV/AIDS services, funding and coordinating prevention, care, and advocacy, and acting as a champion for effective, compassionate HIV/AIDS policy.

In its position as the hub of HIV/AIDS services in Chicago, AFC has worked with its partner agencies to connect people living with or affected by HIV/AIDS with the care, housing, and prevention services that keep HIV infection from being the death sentence it once was.

Through its advocacy efforts, AFC has given a voice to those who would otherwise go unheard, empowering those living with the disease to be their own advocates, holding those of us in power accountable, and keeping the human face of the epidemic fresh in our eyes and close to our hearts.

Many of the life-saving programs established by this body have been implemented on the ground by AFC and its community partners. Again and again, AFC has proven itself to be a dedicated steward of public and private resources. Its innovative approaches to coordinating HIV/AIDS prevention and care services such as case management and support of housing programs have been repeatedly recognized as national models.

From the west side of Chicago to West Africa, AFC has partnered with community organizations to support vital prevention, education, and care programs that would otherwise go unfunded. These activities reflect the true scope of the HIV/AIDS epidemic running the gamut from the local and State level to the national and international stage.

Because of the richness of these links, AFC is uniquely positioned to build coalitions and grassroots advocacy networks to effect change. Its leadership in countless campaigns for more and better HIV/AIDS prevention, care and housing services has empowered those communities impacted by the epidemic to directly engage their elected officials and demand the life-saving services that they need.

As a Member of Congress, I rely on AFC to provide me with policy advice and, as important, to describe the on-the-ground needs and concerns that must be addressed.

And so I would like to congratulate AFC President and CEO Mark Ishaug,

Board Chair Aaron Baker, and their staff and volunteers for their leadership and dedication in the fight against HIV/AIDS. Thanks to your hard work over the last 25 years, we now know that this is a fight in which one day we will be victorious.

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

WHY A "NO" VOTE IS THE RIGHT VOTE ON SANCTIONS FOR IRAN

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

Mr. PAUL. Today, the motion to instruct on the comprehensive Iranian sanction bill was passed overwhelmingly, 400-11. Eleven individuals said that this was not a good idea. I was one of those 11, and I would like to explain why I think the sanction bill against the Iranians is very, very dangerous and not well thought out.

Sanctions are very serious. Sanctions are literally an act of war. When you prevent certain goods and services going into a country, it's like a blockade. There is no advantage to us to do this. The sanction bill literally says that any country that trades or sends oil into Iran, we will no longer trade with them. So if Russia sends in oil or gasoline or refined products or China does, we are theoretically, under this bill, not to trade with them. Can you think of anything more chaotic than having a trade war with China at this particular time?

So often well-intentioned foreign policy procedures backfire. They have unintended consequences and there is too often blowback. Today, unbelievably, we are engaged in so many places in the world and we can't afford it. Our foreign policy costs us a trillion dollars a year to operate. We're in 135 countries. We have over 700 bases throughout the world. We are engaged in military confrontation in Iraq, Afghanistan, in Pakistan. We're bombing in Yemen, as well as having surrogates fighting in Somalia.

We're flat-out broke. The policy is driving our enemies into the hands of the Chinese, and here we are looking for another war. It makes no sense whatsoever.

The conversation today was nothing more than war propaganda on why we have to get ready to bomb the Iranians. There is no proof, according to our CIA, that they're actually working on a nuclear weapon. I'm sure they would like to. Why not. Everybody around them has it so it would be logical that if they're surrounded and threatened and intimidated with all of the people around them, why wouldn't they want

one? Well, of course they do. But others have it.

They have never been found in violation of the nonproliferation treaty. Never. And yet Pakistan, India, and Israel, they don't even belong, and they're our friends and we give them money. Pakistan, they have gotten support from us. They have nuclear weapons and they have been known to send nuclear technology to North Korea.

So the whole process makes so little sense.

The language today was used that, well, we have to go in because of the weapons of mass destruction, they're going to have missiles and they're going to attack us. It's identical to the propaganda promoting in 2002 and 2001 before we attacked Iraq. So this same process is occurring trying to generate all of this excitement about the need to use hostilities.

Now, a lot of individuals vote for sanctions that are basically anti-war and they don't like the military option, and they think this is an alternative. I think that is deeply flawed thinking, because sanctions lead to hostilities. And if you commit to the sanctions, you're really committing to the next step. The sanctions of the 1990s and the year 2000, the sanctions on Iraq, eventually led to the hostilities and the war and the invasion.

So what did that invasion of Iraq do? Did we find any al Qaeda there? No. We found out that Saddam Hussein wouldn't allow the al Qaeda there. No weapons of mass destruction. We've turned the country upside down. Hundreds of thousands of people injured and killed. We have suffered devastating problems from this. And what has happened? We turned the Government of Iraq over to the Shiites, who are allies of the Iranians. So that whole policy has actually backfired.

So now what we're doing to the Iranians is driving them into the pockets of the Chinese. The Chinese are pretty good capitalists these days. They work hard, they produce, they sell us certain goods and services. We pay them, they save their money, and they're starting to invest. So they're investing around the world in natural resources. And what are we doing? All we're doing is trying to take over the world with natural resources so we have control of oil.

This is a mercantilistic idea, it's ancient, and it takes you back to almost colonial times.

□ 1400

So this, I think, shows that our policies are deeply flawed. I sure would have wished this vote would have come out differently. And I warn, this was a very dangerous vote.

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

(Mr. ALTMIRE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

VOTING RIGHTS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this week a historic vote to give the 600,000 residents of the District of Columbia here in the Nation's capital voting representation in the House was due on the floor and had to be pulled down but only for now. I come to thank the majority of Members of Congress, of this House, who have voted for the right of the people of the District to have a vote on this floor, especially the 22 Republicans and the 219 Democrats, who gave the D.C. House Voting Rights Act a straight-up vote in 2007 when it passed 241-177.

I thank Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HOYER for their invaluable and unfailing support until the very end. I thank Majority Leader HARRY REID for bringing a historic first-time vote for the bill where it passed the Senate. I thank Chairman JOHN CONYERS for his unyielding support of D.C. voting rights. I thank former Representative TOM DAVIS whose idea it was to pair Democratic D.C. with Republican Utah, the most perfect example of a bipartisan bill ever to hit this floor where each side benefits equally. I thank Ilir Zherka of D.C. Vote and the coalition he put together and Wade Henderson of the Leadership Conference on Human and Civil Rights, who were steadfast and creative throughout this process.

The Senate for the first time, in fact, enacted the bill, but it had a gun amendment that took down the District's gun safety laws, yet the District's gun safety laws have been held to be constitutional now by the courts. When the bill came here to the House, I sought a clean vote and almost got it. I thank the House for being willing to put the D.C. House voting rights bill on a must-pass bill. The Senate did not agree, so I spent months trying to negotiate a compromise that would have left at least some of D.C.'s gun laws intact.

Finally, and reluctantly, I agreed to the same amendment that passed the Senate to, in fact, alter the District's gun laws, but I had a set of strategies for returning the District's public safety laws.

However, we were hit with a new over the top revised gun amendment that gun forces sprung on us that was worse than anything we could have imagined. Ultimately, people would have been allowed to carry guns in the Nation's capital. The city could not prohibit guns in its own publicly owned buildings. Owners of residential and commercial property could not ban guns in their own property to those who rent or lease.

We expect the gun forces to return. We are ready for them. For the sake of post-9/11 Washington and hometown D.C., they must not succeed in overturning the public safety gun laws of the Nation's capital. I promise you this, we will redouble our efforts to finally give the American citizens who pay taxes at a rate of second per capita in the United States, the citizens who live in our own capital, the vote in Congress they have sought for two centuries and that every American who believes in the founding principles of the Framers and our country know must have. Let's do it, and let's do it this year.

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

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRATULATING JOETEN ENTERPRISES ON ITS 60TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the shareholders, management, and employees of a very special family-owned business in the Northern Mariana Islands as they celebrate their company's 60th anniversary. Joeten Enterprises, Inc., or simply Joeten as it is known to local residents, began with Jose Camacho Tenorio and his wife Soledad Duenas Takai selling beer and soft drinks to soldiers and sailors from Saipan right after World War II. Joeten and Daidai, as everyone called the Tenorios, gradually grew their quintessential mom and pop operation into a diversified, multi-million-dollar corporation. Today Joeten Enterprises encompasses not only retail shopping outlets but also wholesale, shipping and stevedoring, car dealership and auto service, hotel, real estate, construction and material supply, hardware, insurance, bakery and deli businesses. They have hundreds of employees, including many that have been a part of the company for decades.

It is difficult to imagine our principal island of Saipan 60 years ago. The war had destroyed virtually all of the physical and commercial infrastructure. Residents found some work with the U.S. military or lived on government handouts. So for newlyweds Joeten and Daidai to take the great entrepreneurial leap of faith and open a corner grocery store in the village of Chalan Kanoa was a significant step not only in their own lives but in the reconstruction of the island economy.

Joeten and Daidai sacrificed much and worked long hours to build their

small business. Joeten was lucky enough to have a government job, but he was constantly networking, planning, and then carefully executing a variety of adaptations and expansions to grow the business. Daidai supervised the store during the day, balancing the books, while caring for and feeding the couple's growing family. The four daughters and two sons of Joeten and Daidai—Annie, Clarence, Norman, Patricia, Frances, and Priscilla—began their own education in business at an early age right there in the store. Their parents' example and tough but caring attitude taught the children to work hard to get what they wanted from life. They learned that personal discipline was key to success. And as each of the children grew, they took on their own increasingly important roles in the burgeoning Joeten Enterprises.

Joeten passed on in 1993, Daidai in 2008. But their six children continue to run the many businesses their parents began. The children of Joeten and Daidai share their parents' values with their own children, so the lessons Joeten and Daidai imparted continue to be practiced by a third generation of entrepreneurs.

As retold by the Tenorio children and grandchildren, one of the most important of these lessons was that to a large degree the company's success is the result of the teamwork of the company's loyal and dedicated managers and employees.

In that spirit, we salute them all—owners, managers, employees. Hand in hand, may they continue to prosper in the next decade, guided by the vision and spirit of the company's founding couple, Joeten and Daidai.

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

(Mr. POSEY 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 California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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 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.)

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

(Mr. FORBES 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.)

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3244. An act to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the minority leader for allowing me to speak this afternoon during the leadership hour. It is always a significant event to be asked to speak during the leadership hour, and I certainly appreciate the confidence shown in me by the leadership.

This afternoon I thought we'd talk a little bit more about the health care bill that was passed by this House last month because it is an important subject and one that continues to cause problems across the country. Almost anyplace you go, people want to ask you questions about, Why did you do this bill, and what does it mean for me, and what can I expect going forward?

Mr. Speaker, I know I need to confine my comments to the Chair, and I will do so. But if I were to be able to speak to people directly, I would encourage them to look at a health care policy Web site that my office maintains. It's called the Congressional Health Care Caucus, healthcaucus.org. This Web site chronicles many of the debates and discussions that occurred over the last 14 or 15 months, encapsulating the genesis of this health care bill that was passed last month. And really with the passage of the bill, the health care issue does not go away. We simply move into the second part of what is going to be the health care discussion because after all, even as we speak, just down the hill at the Department of Health and Human Services, they are busily working and hiring people, people who are going to be writing rules, writing regulations, and really dic-

tating the policies that will direct health care in this country not just through election day, not just through election day 2012, but literally through the lives of the next three generations of Americans.

So this is an important concept, and people do need to pay attention. As the rules are written over at the Department of Health and Human Services, there will be periods open for comment on that public rulemaking process, and people need to visit Web sites such as healthcaucus.org or the Health and Human Services Web site to familiarize themselves with the rules as they are being written. If you get the mental picture of some central planner moving data points around on a big map or graph, that's probably the right mental image to have right now with where we are with this health care bill.

Let's talk just a little bit about how we got to where we did with the passage of the bill. The recognition after the presidential election of 2008 that health care was going to be a big part of the legislative agenda for the President's first term. There was no question about that. And as we worked our way through the year last year, concepts such as cost and coverage started creeping into almost every story that was written about health care. Because it was after Senator Kennedy's committee over in the Senate, that Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, released a Congressional Budget Office score on the bill that they were working on which showed a cost significantly north of \$1 trillion over 10 years and coverage numbers of about 13 million additional people being covered, that people said, Oh, my goodness, this costs a lot, and we don't get nearly the coverage that we thought we did. So almost every other health care proposal that came forward after that was subject to that same Congressional Budget Office scrutiny and scoring. And as a consequence, it kind of got an idea of the parameters that were being set. Those parameters were that the bill had to be scored and costing under \$1 trillion, and the bill had to score as covering an additional 30 million people. Those were the points on the graph that had to be satisfied at the end of the discussion.

So if it were a question of covering everyone who makes under 150 percent of the Federal poverty level under Medicaid, as was the directive from the bill that was passed in the House, if that made the final number too high, then you do what they did in the Senate and say, Well, we're only going to cover people up to 133 percent of the Federal poverty level with Medicaid, and that money that's not spent on covering people with Medicaid at higher income levels, we'll use that for something else. And there was all sorts of jockeying for position that occurred over the months during the debate last year.

We passed a bill out of committee on July 31 last summer. The bill was actu-

ally supposed to be passed out of committee much earlier and was supposed to come to the floor, and we were supposed to pass the bill on the floor of the House before we went home for the August recess. But because the Speaker of the House decided to take up the climate change bill in June and force the passage of that bill right at the end of June before we went home for the Fourth of July recess, thereby causing many Members to feel some anxiety from their constituents back home over what they had done with this large energy tax that the House just passed, many Members of Congress were reluctant to move with rapidity on the health care bill because they were feeling the push-back from the energy bill that they wondered if maybe we didn't pass this a little too quickly and maybe we should have read the bill and studied and understood what the bill did before we voted on it.

So the month of July was kind of a give-and-take. Really most of the discussion was on the Democratic side of the aisle. It did not involve Republicans. But it was moderate Democrats who were concerned about the passage of this bill too quickly.

□ 1415

Ultimately, the bill did pass in committee. All of the moderate Democrats on my committee voted in favor of it and ultimately it passed, but it didn't pass until the House had already adjourned for the August recess on July 31. As a consequence, the bill did not come back to the House floor until after the August recess.

Most of us know what happened during August. There was a significant amount of anxiety exhibited across the country where people would show up at their Member of Congress or their Senator's town hall meeting during the summer and voice either their support or their rejection of the concept of the health care bills that were being discussed in the House and the Senate, and the feeling was almost uniformly negative against what was being passed at least on the floor of the House.

The situation that occurred after the end of the summer town halls, I thought we would come back and, perhaps with a renewed spirit of bipartisanship, realize that we could not do something this large when it was against the will of the American people. I thought we would come back and hit the pause button or the reset button or maybe even the rewind button and go back to committee and rework this bill; but that was not to be.

The President of course came and spoke to a joint session of Congress here in the middle of September, speaking right from the podium right there behind me, and talked about how they were going to go forward with their vision of health care reform, and it didn't really matter what people said over August. Americans must have been in some sort of fugue state because they didn't really mean what

they were saying when they said they did not like this bill that we, Congress, were going to give them, we, the President, was going to give them.

So as a consequence, in December, after the House passed—the House did come back and pass a bill early in November. The bill had grown from 1,000 pages at the end of July to 2,000 pages by early November. It was interesting that the bill had grown in the number of pages because all of the amendments that were made in order during the committee process were all mysteriously stripped from the bill before it came back to the floor; but the bill was much larger.

The bill came to the floor and passed by a very narrow vote. And again, the polling done the day of that vote showed that only about one-quarter of Americans actually supported the work we were doing, about another 30 to 40 percent felt that we were doing the wrong thing, and another small but significant percentage said you shouldn't even be doing this right now because your focus should be on creating jobs in the American economy. But we passed the bill.

What happened next was really something the likes of which I have never seen before in my short tenure here in Congress. Between Thanksgiving and Christmas, the Senate wrote and produced and passed a health care bill. Now, both Senate committees, the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, had worked on different bills through the course of the year; but then they worked on an entirely different bill between Thanksgiving and Christmas Eve and the ultimate passage of the bill. The bill, interestingly enough, had a House number, it was H.R. 3590. It had a House number because it was a bill the House of Representatives had passed earlier in the year. It wasn't a health care bill when we passed it, but we did pass it on the floor of this House. It was a housing bill, not a health care bill; but that bill was picked up over in the Senate, amended so that all of the housing language was removed and the health care language was inserted.

But it wasn't a question of let's get the best possible health care policy and put it in this bill. It was more a question of what will it take to get your vote and we will put that in the bill. That process was so unseemly. The last part of December people were engaged even though they were concerned about the goings-on in their lives for the holidays and the end of the year activities, but they were also concerned about the appearance of votes being bought and sold and people actually coming to a conclusion to vote "yes" for the bill because they had gotten some special deal contained within the bill. That process was so flawed that even though the Senate achieved that 60-vote margin on Christmas Eve, the bill will be exhibited by the American people continued for weeks after that.

Now the bill did pass on Christmas Eve; it was passed early in the day to get Senators out of town ahead of a snowstorm. As a consequence, the bill itself was not ready for prime time. No one, I really believe this, no one in the Senate ever thought that would be the final product. This was, again, simply a placeholder to get the Senators out of town before Christmas and be able to say that they had passed a health care reform bill before the end of the year. Everyone thought we will come back to a conference committee or we will come back to some type of arrangement where we meld the House and Senate products together; maybe it won't be a formal conference committee because we really don't want to include Republicans, but we will still work on trying to get some of the rough edges of this thing knocked off and include some of the House-passed principles as well.

Unfortunately for America that never happened because what did happen is the second Tuesday of November an election held way, way up in the State of Massachusetts, where a Republican was elected Senator in a seat that had been held by a Democrat for literally generations, and that happened because the appearance of passing this bill before Christmas Eve appeared so awkward, appeared so unseemly that it looked as if people were buying votes for the bill. The American people pushed back, and even in Massachusetts that was too much to take and Senator SCOTT BROWN was elected.

As a consequence of that, it was apparently felt by leadership in the House and the Senate that a conference committee was not a good idea and there would not be the support for this bill on either the floor of the House or the Senate if they were to bring it back requiring the 60-vote margin in the Senate and of course a simple majority in the House.

The Speaker of the House at one point was asked could they just pick up and pass the Senate bill in the House and get it down to the President for his signature. The statement then, right after the Massachusetts election, was that the Speaker did not believe she had 100 votes on the floor of the House for the Senate bill.

It was significant that the Senate bill had a House bill number. It was significant that the Senate bill, although now it was a health care bill, had passed the House previously because under the rules of Congress if that bill would come back to the House of Representatives with the question asked, Will the House now agree to the amendment made in the Senate on H.R. 3590, and if that answer was "yes" by a simple majority, then the bill is passed and it goes down to the White House for signature. Well, ultimately that is exactly what happened.

During the remainder of the month of January, all of the month of February, and much of the month of March, the same process occurred over

here where Members of Congress on the Democratic side of the aisle were encouraged, cajoled, threatened—whatever—to change their vote or to change their mind and vote for this health care bill.

Well, it passed. It passed and was signed into law. It required a significantly sized fix-it bill to be passed within a week because the bill was so flawed it really could not stand on its own. Indeed, there have been multiple things that have been brought to people's attention since that time about problems that existed with the bill, and I rather suspect we are going to continue to find those problems occurring over and over and over again in the next several months.

My opinion: this bill should be repealed, and we should actually go back and do what the American people really were asking us to do when they showed up at those town halls in large numbers in the month of August. They did not want us to turn the entire system on its head in order to help the people that legitimately needed to be helped. Yes, we needed to provide some assistance to people with preexisting conditions. Yes, some tort reform would be nice. Is there anything you can do about the cost of health care in this country? But don't take away what is working for 60 to 65 to 68 percent of the American people. That was a message delivered loud and clear in the month of August and has been delivered loud and clear in every poll that has been taken on the subject since that time.

The system needed reform; the system did not need to be changed from top to bottom. And yet over the next 8 years that is exactly what we will see, a system that none of us will recognize by the end of 2010, 2014, 2016, 2018—pick your point on the timeline.

Currently in my State, the State of Texas, Attorney General Greg Abbott is pursuing a court case—and joined with several other States to do so—to argue before the Supreme Court that the bill we passed is unconstitutional. Proponents of the bill, people who think the bill was proper and is constitutional, argue that under the commerce clause of the Constitution this bill will be held to be constitutional by the Supreme Court even though the concept of universal health care is discussed nowhere in the Constitution.

The problem with the commerce clause is that we are now, for the first time, requiring a citizen of the United States, merely as a condition of being a citizen of the United States, to buy a good, service or product that they may not want, need, or feel they are able to afford. This is the first time the commerce clause has been invoked to protect the commerce that was essentially coerced by the Congress. So the attorneys general of several States are now pushing that case and are going to argue that before the Supreme Court.

One of the shortcomings of the Senate bill, one of the things that wasn't

properly thought through, was the provision of what is called a severability clause in the bill. We actually had a severability clause in the House bill that was passed in November, but no such severability clause was included in the Senate bill. Perhaps in their haste, just to get something done before that snowstorm on Christmas Eve, they simply forgot about it.

What a severability clause would do is, Congress recognizes that from time to time we will overstep our bounds in the eyes of the courts and the court might strike down a provision in the bill, but the severability clause allows the rest of the bill to stay and be enforced. Without a severability clause, this is now up to the discretion of the court. The court could, if it agreed that the commerce clause could not be invoked to pass this bill, strike down the entire bill, or they might use the discretion of the court to only strike down a portion of the bill that they deemed unconstitutional. That drama has yet to play out, and likely it will during the summer months or fall and we will have to see what occurs with that. But I do support Attorney General Greg Abbott in Texas and many of the other attorneys general across the country who are actively pursuing this course against this bill.

What would repeal look like? Could Congress in fact repeal a bill that had passed and been signed into law by the President? The answer is yes, and there is actually precedent for that. In 1989, some people will remember the name Dan Rostenkowski. He was the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—a Democratic chairman from the State of Illinois, coincidentally—and passed the Catastrophic Health Care Act. This was the Catastrophic Health Care Act for senior citizens. The bill was actually passed in a bipartisan fashion in both the House and the Senate. It was thought that people wanted this, but in fact it's one of the problems that you have when you get out in front of the American people and give them things that they don't necessarily want that actually cost them money.

What happened with the Catastrophic Care Act was the pushback was so intense and so immediate that when Congress came back into session, they quickly decided that perhaps the world could live without the Catastrophic Care Act and they repealed it. Now, this bill was passed in the final months of the Ronald Reagan administration; it was signed by President Reagan. The repeal was signed by President George Herbert Walker Bush. But the concept of repeal of a bad health care entitlement law is one that certainly has been exercised within the lifetimes of many of us who are serving in this body today.

Since the passage of this bill in March, support across the country has diminished, opposition has increased; and, again, that is likely to continue as the bill will become more and more un-

popular as people dig into it and look into the provisions of the bill.

One of the other things that is working against the concept of this bill was the absolutely poisonous process that led to its passage and its signing. Back in May or June of last year, six stakeholders met down at the White House to talk about health care reform. Now, there is nothing wrong with that. That is perfectly proper that perhaps the people who represent the doctors, the hospitals, the drug manufacturers, the device manufacturers, America's health insurance, and representatives from the Service Employees International Union met down at the White House to talk about health care reform.

In a very well publicized photo op that occurred after those meetings, the President came out before the cameras and said that he had agreement from the six parties that were in those meetings that they would save \$2 trillion over the next 10 years in the delivery of health care. Well, I simply asked for the notes of those meetings, the agreements that were agreed to in those meetings so that we, as the legislative body, could evaluate that as we were working on the legislation, the actual law or the bill that would become law here in the House of Representatives.

I sent letters to the White House in September. I was rebuffed without any sort of information. Ultimately, in December, I filed what's called a resolution of inquiry with my committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce. This resolution of inquiry was brought up before the committee on, interestingly, the same day that the President delivered the State of the Union Address in January.

□ 1430

The resolution of inquiry was not going to pass because, obviously, on a party line, the Democrats are in charge, and they can strike down almost anything they want. Yet the chairman of my committee consented to allow me to request of the White House six of the 11 things that we had asked for in the resolution. He said some of the information is right and proper and should go to the gentleman from Texas should he request that information. So we re-requested the information.

Essentially, all we have received from the White House are copies of press releases and copies of Web pages that were reproduced for us, but there has been nothing regarding anything that was written down, nothing regarding any arrangements that were made or any deals that were made; there has been nothing regarding any email exchanges that occurred resulting in the savings of \$2 trillion.

Now, I will admit to sometimes being relatively naive, but it seems to me that, if you're going to agree to a \$2 trillion deal, someone, at least on the back of an envelope somewhere, is going to kind of keep a tally of what

those numbers are—someone is going to write something down—but the White House would have us believe that, no, there has been nothing written down.

Is it significant? I submit that it is. There were several points that came up during the debate of the bill, both in the House and in the Senate, where an amendment would be offered and where the discussion then would suddenly end with, Well, that wasn't part of the deal.

In December, Senator McCAIN had an amendment over in the Senate about drug reimportation. I don't agree with drug reimportation. I actually think that is a bad idea, but I do think Senator McCAIN should have had the ability to submit his amendment, to debate his amendment and to have it pass or fail on the merits of the amendment. In no way should he have not been allowed to offer that amendment because of a secret deal that was made down at the White House with the drug manufacturers, but that is exactly what happened. He was stopped from offering the amendment by his committee chairman, who said, That's not part of the deal that we have.

Another area is where the hospitals were going to be taxed as part of the pay-for within the bill. They said, Wait. That wasn't part of our deal.

Well, the deal may be fine, the deal may be proper, but we as legislators should at least be privy to those decisions that were made down at the White House. We should at least have the information about what was agreed to and on whose behalf those agreements were made. We never got that information, and to this day, I still await some response from the White House.

Significantly, during the Presidential campaign, when he was a candidate, President Obama said, and I'm quoting here: "And that's what I'll do, bringing all parties together, not negotiating behind closed doors but bringing all parties together and broadcasting those negotiations on C-SPAN so that the American people can see what the choices are, because part of what we have to do is enlist the American people in this process."

I couldn't agree more. Yes, you've got to enlist the American people when you're doing something this broad and this sweeping, but they never bothered to do that. Yes, you do need to open those meetings up. C-SPAN can sometimes be a trifle boring when you watch us for too long at a time, but it's important. It's a window to the world that people have on the legislative process.

So, when the President made that pledge no less than eight times during the campaign, it struck a chord with people; it resonated with people. If my Representative is involved in those meetings, I'd like to see where he stands. The President would make this point: Does the Representative stand on the side of the drug companies or does he stand on the side of the people?

Does the Senator stand with the insurance companies or does he stand with America's patients?

They are important concepts to know. Unfortunately, we have not yet had the ability to know what those deals were.

I've got to believe that this is such an important point that people got this when it was offered to them: Look, we'll make it an open and transparent process. You can watch it on television if you don't get too bored, but it will be your choice. You can watch it on television. I think people picked up on that notion. Honestly, this is one of those where, yeah, people can say things during a campaign that they actually can't deliver on after the election is over. That happens all the time. I understand that. But this is a "read my lips" moment. This is a "read my lips: no new taxes" moment. The President promised that all of these negotiations would be up for purview, covered on C-SPAN, that you would be able to watch, and that you would be able to make the decision as to whether this process was a good one or a bad one. Again, unfortunately, to date, that has not happened. I do hope that the White House does at some point get us that information.

Now, one of the things that I heard over and over again during the summer, during the town halls, is that, really and truly, if you're going to hold prices down in the delivery of medical care, you're going to have to do something in the realm of liability reform.

I understand this because, in my home State of Texas, we, in fact, passed significant liability reform back in 2003, and that has made Texas now one of the more favored places to practice medicine. There have been doctors who have fled other parts of the country and who have moved to Texas. In fact, one of the bigger criticisms in Texas right now is that it takes the Texas State Board of Medical Examiners too long to process an application because their backlog is so significant, but it is a far cry from where we were in 2002 when we were, in fact, labeled as one of the States in crisis in the medical liability crisis.

Now, during the 8 years since that bill passed as a State bill, Texas has licensed over 15,000 new physicians. It is important. Texas is a big State, and there are lots of open areas in Texas. Since the passage of that law back in 2003, 125 Texas counties have added at least one high-risk specialist. That's like half of the counties in Texas, and there are 224 counties in Texas. That's over half of the counties in Texas that have added one high-risk specialist. My home county of Denton County is one of those. Tarrant County, another county I represent, also is one of those.

We heard stories in 2002–2003, all over the State, of people who were closing their medical practices—radiologists, perinatologists, doctors who take care of the sickest of the sick pregnant moms with the sickest of the sick new-

born babies. They simply could not get liability insurance because their risk was too great. Their risk was too high. They were leaving the State. The State paid for their education in State-supported schools, the State supported them during their residency training, but the State could not offer them a place to practice because they could not afford liability premiums in the State. So, since that bill has passed, 125 Texas counties have added at least one high-risk specialist.

Again, Texas is a big State. It's not hard to believe, especially in some of the less populated areas out in West Texas, that a person might live many, many miles from a physician, but since the passage of this law, now 99.7 percent of Texans live within 20 miles of a physician. That is a staggering success story with the number of doctors who have moved into the State and who are practicing. Yes, some are practicing in urban areas, but many are practicing in rural areas, in rural areas that previously did not have emergency room doctors and that previously did not have obstetricians but that now do, and that is critical for access to care in the State of Texas.

We've talked about this health care bill, and we've talked about access to insurance, but really, when you need health care, you're not so much interested in an insurance policy; you're more interested in do you have a doctor there to see you when you're sick.

There are 82 Texas counties that have seen a net gain in emergency medicine physicians, including 43 medically underserved counties and 29 counties that are partially medically underserved. There are 33 rural counties that have seen a net gain in ER doctors, including 26 counties that previously had none. There are 26 counties that previously did not have emergency room doctors which now have emergency room doctors in the State of Texas. Such has been the effect of medical liability reform.

In my field of obstetrics, Texas saw a net loss of 14 obstetricians in the 2 years preceding reform. And you might say, Texas is a big State, and 14 is not that many; so, hey, you can deal with that sort of loss. But since the State passed the law, they've experienced a net gain of 192 obstetricians, and 26 rural counties have added OB docs, including in 10 counties that previously had none. I mean that's a big deal. When you have a family member in labor who is looking for a place to have her baby, it is important to have the care there when you need it.

There are 12 rural Texas counties that have added an orthopedic surgeon, including in seven counties that previously had none. Again, that's a significant fact, particularly in areas of rural Texas where the drive might be quite long if you're dealing with an injured loved one and are trying to find orthopedic care.

Charity care rendered by Texas hospitals has increased by 24 percent, re-

sulting in almost \$600 million in free care to Texas patients since the passage of that liability reform law in 2003. Texas physicians have saved almost \$600 million in liability insurance premiums, which is a significant savings that has allowed more doctors to stay in practice.

The Texas law has been so successful that I introduced legislation into Congress that was modeled after the Texas law. It is H.R. 1468, the Medical Justice Act. I offered this in the form of an amendment when we marked up our health care bill in the House Energy and Commerce Committee last summer. It was rejected first on a technicality and then along a party-line vote.

If we're going to ask our doctors to be our partners in this brave new world of health care we've constructed, the very least we can do is give them some stability in their practices. That stability would be in the form of some relief from the problems that they face with medical liability.

Another problem that is faced by our Nation's doctors, which is one of the reasons we are very likely to face a significant doctor shortage—and again, in spite of the fact that we passed a health insurance bill, if we do not have doctors to see those patients, then it is not going to do much good that we passed that bill. When passing this sweeping health care reform bill, it would have been the ideal time to talk about things like physician workforce and how we train doctors and how we pay for that training, but we chose to omit most of that thinking from this bill.

Another problem that we face on almost a recurring basis here in Congress is the fact that Medicare, by formula, ratchets down reimbursements to physicians year over year over year. In fact, this year, the number was to go down over 20 percent. Last week, we passed a very small bill that extended that deadline to the end of May, so doctors got a little bit of a reprieve, and patients got a little bit of continued access to their physicians.

I will have to tell you, as a practicing physician, that is a significant event when a major payor like Medicare comes in and says, We're going to be paying you 20 percent less next month for the work that you do for us. It is a difficult problem to fix, it is an expensive problem to fix, but it is one that just simply must be done, not just because it's the right thing for doctors, but because, if we do not have doctors who commit to staying in practice and taking care of our Medicare patients, then patient access is going to be a critical problem. We will all stand up here and talk about how we want our patients, our Medicare patients, to have only the best and quality care, but it's very, very difficult to guarantee them quality care when we can't even assure them of a doctor at the other end of the phone line when they need one.

Now, in the health care bill that we passed, primary care physicians do get

a little bit of a boost in payments for Medicaid, but that is short-lived, and there are still going to be significant disparities between payments of primary care and specialty care. Medicare and Medicaid rates for primary care services will increase for primary care but only for a very short period of time. We are very famous in Congress for doing this. We'll say, We're going to take care of you. We're going to actually pay you what you think you're worth for the next 18, 20 or 24 months. These things are called funding cliffs. Sure enough, there is a big funding cliff in the health care bill that was passed, and doctors will face falling off that funding cliff now in a little less than 2 years' time.

Fixing the Medicare payment formula, fixing the so-called SGR formula, is going to be a tough lift. The House did pass a bill last fall. Unfortunately, it was a bill that had already been rejected by the Senate, so I'm not quite sure why we brought it up and voted on it on the House side, but we did. It was a bad bill. It didn't really fix the problem, but it was the only opportunity to pass a Medicare fix, or an SGR fix, or a doc fix, during the calendar year 2009. So I voted in favor of it even though the bill, itself, was a dreadful product. Surely, we can do a much better job.

Now, I have an SGR reform bill, H.R. 3693, Ensuring the Future Physician Workforce Act, and I would encourage Members of Congress to look at that. This is going to come back again and again and again. We passed a short-term extension. We now have solidified physician payment through the month of May, but beginning June 1 or 6 or some date early in June, that 20 percent funding cliff will still be out there, and we are going to have to take care of that.

I rather suspect, this being an election year, we're not going to do anything large to fix this problem. We should, but I do rather suspect that we will do something that punts it down the road until after the next election. It's a shame. It's a shame, because when we're doing something as big as this fundamental health care reform that we did, it seems like this is exactly the type of problem that you would like to take care of.

Again, what do we hear from our folks when we go home and talk to them about health care?

Well, I'll tell you what, Congressman. One of my biggest problems is trying to find a doctor who will take Medicare.

If seniors change locations, if they move from one town to the next, if they leave their towns when they retire and move to be closer to their grandchildren, they are very likely going to experience difficulty and delays in finding doctors who are taking new Medicare patients.

□ 1445

Because of what we in the United States Congress do to physicians year

in and year out, it has become so cumbersome to find physicians who will take new Medicare patients that it has become a critical access issue for our seniors.

Let me just talk briefly, because it is important, one of the mistakes that was made in the bill, one of the problems that emerged after the bill was passed and signed, and most people in the country are not going to shed too many tears about this, but Members of Congress actually lost their health insurance after the passage of this bill. Or actually the way it's written, Members of Congress will now be required to buy their insurance through the insurance exchange just as every other American will be required to do beginning in the year 2014. The exchanges are not going to be set up until 2014, but Members of Congress, as of the signing of this bill, are required to buy their health insurance through the exchange.

So we are now asked to buy insurance in a nonexistent exchange, and that is going to make it difficult. Our staff do fall into the same category; so I am getting many questions from staff saying, Well, they're still taking a health insurance premium out of my paycheck, but am I really insured or not? And there is some confusion and it needs to be cleaned up. Again, most Americans are not going to shed too many tears about Members of Congress being confused about their health insurance coverage. They're going to say, Welcome to my world. But interestingly enough, the people who wrote this bill, and that would be committee staff, administration, staff from the White House, leadership staff, the people who actually wrote this bill—and make no mistake about it. Certainly no Republican was involved in writing this bill. Most Democrats were not involved in writing this bill. In fact, I will submit to you House Democrats especially were excluded from this process. So who writes a bill like this? Well, it is tenured and long-term committee staff, leadership staff. Yes, the White House was out here big time while the bill was being hammered out during the latter part of December and the first part of January. All of those people who actually wrote the bill are exempt from that.

So there is one little simple fix-it bill, H.R. 4951, that would also require committee staff, leadership staff, members of the administration, political appointees at the Federal agencies to also be covered under the exchange the same as Members of Congress. Now, again, the problem is that we're required to be covered under the exchange. The exchange is not up and running until 2014; so it remains to be seen how that will work out. But the irony of Congress voting itself out of health insurance because they didn't understand the bill that came over from the Senate on Christmas Eve is just simply too important to ignore.

One of the last things that I do want to cover this afternoon is yesterday my

committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce's Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, was going to have a hearing on America's business that had released information that they were going to change their earnings projections because of issues that occurred after the passage of the health care bill.

So you see here, and this actually should be a minus sign in front of all these numbers, a company like AT&T was going to have to write down a billion dollars in charges because of changes to their accounting that was now going to occur as a result of our passing the health care bill. Well, when these companies released the press releases that they were restating projected earnings because of what the health care bill had done, John Deere was going to have write down \$150 million; 3M Company had to write down, again, that should be a negative \$90 million.

When that occurred, the chairman of my committee, Mr. WAXMAN, said, This is not right. These companies are simply doing this to embarrass the Congress and embarrass the President. They need to come before our committee and be held accountable for why they would release this type of information on a day that was otherwise a day of great national joy when the President was signing the health care bill.

Well, the companies responded that they were simply performing under requirements like the Securities and Exchange Commission. Their earnings were going to be affected by the passage of this bill, and they were required to restate earnings based upon that information. And maybe they didn't need to release it on that particular day, but certainly that information needed to be made public. And, indeed, many of these same companies had contacted members of the committee staff and let them know this in advance of actually releasing the information.

Now, interestingly enough, when it came to light that the heads of these companies stated, Well, we're just simply doing what you told us we had to do under the rules provided us by the Securities and Exchange Commission, the committee decided to postpone indefinitely that hearing.

But it was troubling. It was troubling because here we have a rather significant subcommittee in the United States House of Representatives, a rather significant subcommittee that can issue subpoenas if it wants. It does take testimony under oath. This is generally not an exercise that a company CEO will look forward with great relish to come before our committee and have to answer questions. And some of us saw that as actually an intimidation tactic: Don't you dare complain about what we have done with this health care bill or we can make your life miserable if you do.

Health care costs are going to take a toll on United States profits, corporate

profits, according to estimates by a benefits consulting firm, Towers Watson. Medtronic, a medical device maker, warned that new taxes on its products could result in about a thousand workers being laid off. Their accounting also estimated that there will be thousands of layoffs and consumer-related costs.

If you came out against this bill, if you dared to speak out against this bill, the message was loud and clear to corporate America: We're going to call you in. We're going to question you under oath. We are likely to embarrass you in a public forum. So don't you dare complain.

But one of the things that I have heard over and over from both large and small business back home is this health care bill is going to have a profound, a significant, and a deleterious effect on just simply conducting a business. More than one small business in my community has come back to me and said, As I run the numbers, as I look at what happens to me through the year 2014 and the requirements that will be upon me, it is very likely that my bottom line will go negative and stay negative as far as I can see unless I don't expand or I don't hire. In fact, the succinct message that the United States Congress has sent to small and medium-sized business across the country in every State of the Union is don't hire right now. Don't hire right now until you know what is going to be required of you, Mr. or Mrs. Employer. We are likely going to change the way your business works, again, in a very profound and significant way.

Now, I also sit on the Joint Economic Committee, which is a House and Senate committee. The first Friday morning of every month, whether we're voting on the floor of the House or not, we need to be in town to receive a report from the Department of Labor. And that report is the employment report for the preceding month. It comes out the first Friday of every month. Usually those numbers are released at about 8:30 in the morning, and our committee convenes at 9:00 or 9:30 to hear from the head of the Department of Labor as to what the employment statistics look like.

I joined that committee in January of 2009. We have never had, never had in the 15 months that I have been in the committee, a good news report. In fact, one of my constituents back home said I'm bringing such bad luck to the committee, maybe I ought to consider some other assignment. But the fact remains if we keep doing things in Congress, in the House and the Senate, in the legislative branch, if we keep doing things that send a loud and clear message to small business, medium-sized business don't hire right now, we're not going to see the type of employment recovery that we all feel that the economy is capable of.

Look, whether you believe in bailouts or stimulus or not, everyone

knows that the United States economy is too vibrant not to recover. There is almost no way that the United States Congress or the White House, regardless of who occupies these chairs or who is down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue—there is almost no way that the Congress or the White House can keep the American economy indefinitely suppressed. But we can really lengthen the pain, and that is one of the things that we're doing right now.

The uncertainty we have created with health care costs, the uncertainty we have created with energy costs, the uncertainty that we are creating with this financial services bill that is now being argued over in the Senate, small business, medium-sized business is looking at what is going on in Washington right now and saying, I may need help but I don't think so. I will either pay a little overtime or just ratchet back some of the expansion I was doing. Yet every person who runs for office, and you can take this to the bank, is at some point going to stand up on a stump or a chair and give a speech to a chamber or rotary club back home and say small business is the engine that drives our economy. And that's exactly true.

If I have one small business at home that might be looking at picking up one or two additional people but says, Right now is not the time and I am not going to do that, okay, that's only one or two jobs. Could that have a profound effect on the larger economy? You bet. You bet. When you take that one or two job growth that's not occurring in that business and extrapolate it across the broader economy for businesses of that size, that has a significant, a significant deleterious effect on the growth of jobs and the economy. And yet it is the unemployment numbers that are really the depressive part of what is happening in the economy right now. Yes, Wall Street might look a great deal better than it did last year. Maybe some other numbers, the gross domestic output, may look better than it did last year. But the numbers of unemployed, the numbers of long-term unemployed, the numbers of young people unemployed, the numbers of minorities unemployed, those numbers are what people are having to deal with every day. That's either them or their friends and neighbors, and that's what they see every day. And until we address the problems with employment, no one in this country is going to believe that we really have the appropriate handle on the economy or the economic direction of the country.

Again, I believe the economy will recover in spite of the United States Congress, in spite of the White House. It almost always does. But we can certainly make that recovery much more difficult and much more painful and perhaps suppress it longer than it would be otherwise suppressed by our activities here in the House of Representatives.

Suffice it to say, as we wrap this up, I believe this health care bill to be a fiscal disaster. It is going to increase the deficit. I don't care what anyone else says. It's \$582 billion over the first 10 years, and likely as not, over the second 10 years those numbers even become more startling. You look at how the bill is constructed. You've got 10 years of taxes paying for 6 years of benefits. Is it any great surprise that the next decade, which is 10 years of taxes and 10 years of benefits, that that deficit is not likely to increase?

We also have a problem that the bill double counts Social Security payroll tax revenues, a budgetary gimmick that made the bottom-line number look great. Again, remember the parameters that we were working with? You have got to have the top number less than \$1 trillion. You have got to have the coverage number over 30 million people. Move those points around on a chessboard however you want, but those are the parameters with which you have to work. So if you double count income from Social Security payroll taxes, if you double count the money from the Medicare cuts, of course your bottom line is going to look better.

We also did something in this bill that's called the CLASS Act. Most people are not aware of it. It's thought of as a long-term care supplemental insurance, but the reality is it's a Three-card Monte. For a \$50-a-month cost, a beneficiary may receive \$50 a day in additional long-term care costs for a long-term care hospital. Well, most of us know that \$50 a day is not going to cover your stay in a long-term care hospital. Most of us know that the numbers on that equation really don't work out. But what happens is since you have so many people just joining the program at the front end, during the first years you actually run a surplus, but then you get to the outyears and you run a significant deficit.

The CLASS Act was literally a financial manipulation that was introduced at the last minute, not to provide people long-term care insurance. If we really wanted to do something with long-term care insurance, we'd make it tax deductible. We'd make it a tax credit. We would make it so you could pay for it out of your health savings account. If we really wanted to help people get long-term care insurance, there are ways to do it. The CLASS Act wasn't it. What the CLASS Act was, was some fancy bookkeeping, some manipulation of the books. Collect a lot of premiums up front. You don't start paying benefits for several years. So that will score as a savings, score as a revenue raiser during the first 10 years of this budgetary cycle, but in the outyears it does nothing but explode the budget.

Again, in my home State of Texas, it's estimated that this bill is going to cost the State of Texas almost \$25 billion in additional funding for Medicaid, and additionally there are going to be

cuts to the safety net hospitals, so-called disproportionate share cuts.

□ 1500

Other dates of significance in 2011, the drug makers face an annual fee of \$2.5 billion. Now, many people say, wait a minute, the drug companies make too much money anyway so, yeah, hit them with a \$2.5 billion charge beginning in 2011. Maybe they should be paying a little bit more.

But think about it for a minute. That \$2.5 billion, where is that going to come from in the pharmaceutical manufacturing world? Is it going to come from the CEOs' salary? Is it going to come from the lobbyists' salary? I think you know the answer to that. Those dollars are going to come from increased costs to the end user, the patient, you and me.

In 2011 medical device manufacturers are going to be charged an additional fee. It goes up to \$2 billion per year. Again, that's not going to be paid by the CEO of one of these Boston companies that is a medical device manufacturer. That money is going to be paid by the patient who receives that defibrillator or that artificial hip, that vein filter for preventing blood clots. Those are the people who are going to actually be paying that fee, not the companies themselves.

There's a health insurance provider fee, \$2 billion in 2011, and it goes up from then. Again, that money is not going to be taken from the CEOs' salary, from the private insurance companies in this country. Whether they are for profit or not for profit, that money is not coming out of the CEOs' salary or the lobbyist money. That money is coming out of the ratepayers' hide.

There's going to be a tax on wages that will increase to 2.35 percent. In 2013 there will be a new tax on unearned income on dividends and interest, almost 4 percent.

In 2013 the excise tax of 2.9 percent is imposed on the sale of medical devices. Now, these are class two and class three medical devices in your doctor's office or hospital. So class one devices like Band-Aids, tongue depressors, those won't be taxed. But class two devices, and what are some examples of class two devices, syringe and needle, those are going to be taxed in your doctor's office.

Now, in your doctor's office they can't charge you that 2.9 percent tax that they have to pay on the tax on that syringe because that's a contractual amount between the insurance company, the patient, and the doctor. That's very difficult for a doctor's office to pass that charge along, so actually doctors are going to bear the brunt of that. Hospitals too are likely to bear the brunt of that. Since their arrangements are contractual with insurance companies, they're unlikely to be able to pass that cost along.

Other types of medical devices, type two devices—interestingly enough, I'd like to say everything from lasers to

leeches will be taxed in your doctor's office.

Employers with more than 50 employees must pay a fine of up to \$3,000 if employees receive tax credits to purchase insurance. So that's where a lot of the small and medium-sized business is really concerned and the arbitrary placement of those numbers, why is it 50 employees, why not 55? Why not 45? Simply because they had to pick a number and start somewhere.

So if there's a small business back home that has 48 employees, but they've got so much work, as the economy recovers, that maybe they'd be fixing to add five jobs, they're not going to do it. Let's stay under 50 employees. Our life will be a lot easier under this health care bill. At least let's wait. At least let's wait until we see what's going to happen.

What's up next? Well, let me say it again: I favor repeal of this bill. Rip it out, root and branch, and get it gone, and then come back and fix the things that people told us they wanted fix.

But what we are going to see next is just down the street at the Department of Health and Human Services; another Federal agency called the Office of Personnel Management, OPM; the Internal Revenue Service. They're writing the rules and regulations that are going to dictate how this legislation, how it now turns into the rules and regulations that govern what happens in your doctor's office or hospital and essentially dictates what happens in your life when you intersect with the American health care system.

This will take some time. This is not something that is going to occur overnight. Right now the hiring is in process, so, yeah, maybe the administration can say we're adding a bunch of new jobs over at the Department of Health and Human Services and IRS. But most of us would just as soon that those IRS agents weren't hired because they generally are not there to make our lives go smoother and easier.

Office of Personnel Management, that's an interesting phenomenon. Many people will recall that when the Senate passed their health care bill, Senator LIEBERMAN said, I won't vote for a health care bill that has a public option within it. And yet we have a bill that, in fact, does have a public option. And it's not called a public option, straight up, but it is a public option, sure enough.

States are required to set up State exchanges. People will be required to buy their insurance in the exchange. Some people will have those costs subsidized; some will not.

Well, what if a State does not set up an exchange? Can the Federal Government force it to set up an exchange? And the answer is no. The Federal Government will set up a national exchange for those States where no State exchange exists. Within that national exchange, under the law, it is required that there be one insurance company that is a for-profit company and one

that is a not-for-profit. These insurance companies, if no company signs up to do this duty, that exercise is then taken over by the Office of Personnel Management.

So a nonprofit insurance company administered by the Office of Personnel Management begins to look a lot like what was discussed last July and August as the public option. It, in fact, will be a de facto public option within a very short period of time. So those who opposed the bill and said I couldn't support a bill that had a public option, but now that the public option is out of it, I'm okay, I can support the bill, guess what? They got a public option.

Let me just conclude by saying this was not a bipartisan bill. The opposition to this bill was bipartisan. You had almost 40 Democrats and every Republican who said, we don't want this bill.

Interestingly enough, part of the story that is yet to be told is the effect of this bill on what happens early in November, later this year. In USA Today, the little newspaper that comes out nationally, earlier this week there was an article about the number of physicians who have filed and are running races for Congress. It will be unprecedented numbers. I think the actual number of doctors, Republican doctors who have filed for congressional races, is just a little over 30, 32. There are many more waiting in the wings. Some States have much later primaries. That number will likely go higher.

Not every doctor will win their primary, unfortunately. Not every doctor will win their congressional race. But I think it's safe to say that the next Congress, the 112th Congress, when it convenes next January, is likely to have more physicians within that Congress than anytime in the previous hundred years.

This bill has had a profound effect on how Americans think about their health care and how they think about their relationship with their government. Is a government that is bigger better for the individual or worse?

Many people are now having that internal discussion or that discussion around the dinner table that never would have thought about that in years past. But now it has become an important issue.

This next November will be a seminal time in American politics and American governance going forward. It will dictate whether this bill continues to exist and exert control over the people's lives, continues to take money out of the lives of productive citizens, or whether this bill is turned back, and then the Congress gets down to the serious work of correcting the problems that people told us they wanted us to correct and we ignored them consistently through the fall and through the winter.

I think it says something that the opinion of Congress right now are in the low double digits. Any doctor who's

willing to run for Congress, and I can tell you this from some personal experience, doctors actually enjoy a fairly high approval rating. It's in the high seventies. You come to Congress, it goes into the low teens.

It is a significant step to run for Congress for physicians. And yet doctors across the country are willing to give up their peace of mind and their livelihood to come to the aid of their country in its hour of need.

BIG GOVERNMENT AND THE WILL OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DRIEHAUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized to address you here on the floor of the House. And I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that these deliberations here represent the most deliberative body in the world. And that's the argument that we've made for years. And even though it's not as deliberative as it was before Speaker PELOSI took the gavel, we still have some discussion time down here. We still have Special Orders. We still have 60 minutes and alternating hours between Democrats and Republicans when both sides do show up for those alternating hours.

But tonight that's not the case. This is the wrap-up and the finish of the week, Mr. Speaker. And many have gone to the airport and caught a plane and gone home to their district or wherever they might go.

But I don't think enough has been said yet this week. It's been a relatively short week, and not a particularly trying or testing week with anything that stands out here as significant accomplishment.

But I'm watching still as policy moves in America. And the policy that has been shoehorned through this House of Representatives and become the law of the land has caused the American people to fill up my town hall meetings.

We were not here on Monday. We didn't gavel in until, well, we gavelled in on Tuesday, and the first votes were sometime about 6:30 on Tuesday evening, so the work week is Tuesday evening for two or three votes. We call it naming post offices. That was the level of the significant suspension calendar. And then we had some debate on Wednesday and some committee activity. And today is Thursday. It's been low key. Last votes took place maybe 2 hours ago, something like that. So our work week is all day Wednesday, finishing the night on Tuesday and the early part of the day on Thursday and then going, a lot of people going home, Mr. Speaker.

That's okay with me because I don't support the agenda that's being driven here out of the Speaker's Office. I don't support the process that has been developed.

I do support the Constitution, liberty, freedom, fiscal responsibility, limited government, and I support the people that have been coming here to petition the government for redress of grievances. That's a constitutional right that we all have. And I've seen tens of thousands come here to say, don't take away my freedom, don't take away my liberty. Let me have the right to manage the health care of my own body, for example.

And the people across this country that have said over and over again that the fiscal irresponsibility with the profligate spending that's been going on for the last 3 years-plus in this Congress is more than they can abide.

And my town hall meetings on Tuesday, or excuse me, on Monday of this week, one in Council Bluffs and one in Sioux City, we're not jam-packed to the walls with people standing outside looking in the doorway, as they were during August of last year, when people believed that they had a chance to put the brakes on what we now know and the President refers himself to as ObamaCare. That packed our town hall meetings in my district, all over my district, all over the State of Iowa, all over the United States of America, hundreds and hundreds of town hall meetings with hundreds of thousands of Americans that came in to express that they did not want the government to take over the management of our health care.

And I have never seen an issue that brought this much intensity and this many people out. And still the leadership in this Congress was determined to shoehorn a bill through here. And that happened maybe 3 weeks ago or a little more, early in the wee hours of a Monday morning, just a little after midnight, as I recall. The final vote was on a Sunday night.

The Speaker could not have allowed the Members of Congress to go home, let alone for an Easter break period of time, because she knew that if the Democrats in this Congress went home to listen to their constituents, that their congressional offices would be jammed full of people that said they were there to petition their Members of Congress for redress of the grievance of a government takeover of health care. And they would have filled the streets by the tens and hundreds of thousands. They would have demonstrated at congressional offices. They would have filled any town hall meetings. There would have been an outpouring of rejection of that policy like this country has never seen.

And so the Speaker kept her own Democrat Members here on the Hill and insulated from their own constituents, even to the extent that, as the phone lines either jammed or they were shut down, I don't know which, but the last 3 days I couldn't call my own office. And I know that there weren't that many people calling my office. They were busy calling the offices of Democrats who were determined to vote for ObamaCare.

But I couldn't get through because the switchboard was jammed, at least the last 3 days here in the House. While you had Members that couldn't even be heard, their constituents could not call them. They couldn't get through to send them a fax. Yes, they could send an email, presumably. And we don't know whether those emails went on an automatic dump or whether there was an answer. Only their constituents can know that.

We know that there was a difficulty verifying if the Senate, during their period of time that this was an important issue, up till Christmas Eve, if in the Senate actually Members were answering their telephones.

□ 1515

But here they couldn't get through to call my office. I couldn't call my own office from my cell phone. And my own staff that I had to communicate with around the Hill, we had to call on our own cell lines to each other's cell phones.

That's not such a particularly great handicap, but on top of that, Mr. Speaker, the cell phones were jammed. The signal was so jammed with so many calls that we couldn't connect either by cell phone sometimes for hours.

Now, that's an awful lot of rejection focusing itself on an issue here that America had had the opportunity to debate since last July all the way into nearly—well, nearly into April. That's what's happened with ObamaCare.

And now, after the bill has passed—and I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that if we would have had the bill go to the Senate for a vote and then to the House for a vote in order to qualify it to go to the President's desk for signature that turns it into the law of the land, ObamaCare could not have passed this Congress on the day that it was messaged to the President because the votes didn't exist in the United States Senate to support the bill. That was voted by other people.

And the ones that the folks voted to represent themselves, Massachusetts in particular, SCOTT BROWN was elected by generally the liberal people in Massachusetts to block ObamaCare. And there he was following through on his word to do that, except it was circumvented. And they used a rescissions policy that had never been used in a piece of policy like this before to enable that to happen. And on top of that, a promise from the President of the United States that he would sign an executive order that he would have liked to have had the pro-life people in America believe that the President of the United States can sign an executive order that would amend a bill that the Congress had just passed. That's the executive order that deals with the Stupak amendment, which was designed to shut off Federal funding for abortion that might be enabled by ObamaCare.

Now, think about what this means. Here we have a Constitution that sets

up the structure. Article I, section 1 says all legislative powers will be vested in a Congress of the United States comprised of a House of Representatives and a United States Senate. It even prescribes that all spending will start in the House, not in the Senate. But this is an authorization bill, not an appropriations bill. So ObamaCare could have started in the Senate or in the House.

Well, we got a Senate version that was taken up by the House. But the Constitution establishes that all legislative powers are vested here in the House or in the Senate, but House and Senate collectively. We are the legislative branch of government. And the President of the United States, who wrote the book "The Audacity of Hope" had the audacity to offer to BART STUPAK that he would sign an executive order that would effectively amend BART STUPAK's pro-life language into the legislation that was here on the floor of the House at the time messaged from the Senate.

Now imagine, a man that taught constitutional law as an adjunct professor at the University of Chicago would believe as President of the United States that his executive order can effectively amend legislation that is presumably the majority opinion of the elected Members of the United States Congress.

If the President can amend legislation by executive order, then can't the President also just write the legislation by executive order and do what he will without having to consult Congress? That would be a two branches of government instead of a three branches of government. Maybe the President would argue that there is something that Congress can do that he can't, like appropriate money, for example. Well, that would be a very narrow role, and that would be turning his back on the constitutional responsibility that is vested in the United States Congress. And we should always reject the idea that a President can sign an executive order that has an effect on changing the legislation that the Congress has passed.

In fact, I may be the number one most authoritative voice in the United States Congress on this subject matter because, I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that on a State level when I was in the State legislature as a State senator, we had then our Governor, Tom Vilsack, filed an executive order. He was a fresh governor of maybe a little bit fresher than the President has been during this period of time. I think it was in the first couple, 3 months of his office, Governor Vilsack signed an executive order known as executive order number seven. I looked at it and concluded that he had violated the separation of powers and legislated by executive order. And when I raised an objection, of course it was refused and denied. The executive office didn't want to respond to a legislative office.

And so I went to court, and we filed the case of King v. Vilsack. Now, this

is now our Secretary of Agriculture, Tom Vilsack, whom we had a good exchange in the Ag Committee. I think it was just yesterday. But in this issue we disagreed. He believed that he could amend the code of Iowa by executive order and sought to do so with that executive order. I believed that the legislative powers are vested within the legislative branch of government. And most of our State Constitutions, including Iowa's, are modeled off of our United States Constitution.

And so our State legislators across the land will take an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of, fill-in-the-blank. For me it's Iowa. That oath is an oath that you can only take to uphold the Constitution as it reads, as you understand it, as it was understood to mean at the time of the ratification of the Constitution itself, or the subsequent amendments. There isn't any other alternative.

None of us can take an oath to uphold a Constitution as it might be amended by, what, the President's executive order? Or even a decision of the United States Supreme Court? Now, I put that list at 10 now, as the 10 last people that should be allowed to amend the Constitution of the United States. That should be the nine Supreme Court Justices and the President of the United States. Those 10 are the last people on the planet that should be engaged in seeking to amend the Constitution.

The Constitution sets up a framework for us to amend it when we don't like the results. We are required to adhere to it and live by it. And for a President of the United States to sign an executive order that's got companies that deal, that supposedly buys a dozen votes to support ObamaCare here and the President would exchange an executive order that was designed to assure those Stupak dozen that there wouldn't be Federal funding of abortion because his executive order would alter the language and the meaning of the bill. The smallest and tiniest of fig leaves was offered to Congressman STUPAK. That executive order no one takes seriously today. It was simply a tool of utility to put the votes together to force this ObamaCare off the floor of the House and send it to the President for his signature, which he did. And now ObamaCare is the law of the land.

I was, I believe, Mr. Speaker, the last Member of Congress to leave the House of Representatives and leave the Capitol that night. It took me perhaps an hour to wind myself down and come to a point where I thought I could leave this place where such a cataclysmic offense to our Constitution, our budget, our freedom, and our liberty had taken place in such a shameful fashion. The shameful fashion includes the antics in the United States Senate, where they cut deal after deal after deal, including the Cornhusker kickback. Yes, and I know there was a successful effort made to peel the Cornhusker kickback

out of there. It leaves in the Louisiana purchase, it leaves in the Florida gator aid, it leaves in seven or eight other special deals that were cooked up in the Senate so that they could produce enough votes temporarily to push that bill through on Christmas Eve. And then of course we had the Massachusetts election, which changed the dynamics over there.

Here deal after deal was made. And one day I hope to hold hearings in the United States Congress to find out what actually went on behind those closed doors. And I believe the American people have a right to learn what went on behind those closed doors. I want to hold hearings and investigations and bring people under oath and stand them up and let them take that oath and then testify before a congressional hearing. What were you offered by Rahm Emanuel? What were you offered by the President of the United States?

If you're AARP and your job is to represent the senior citizens that are your members, I want those representatives of AARP to come in and tell us, was the offer that you can sell insurance to the AARP members so good and so high that you decided to sell out your own members? What was it that the SEIU got? What was it that Big Pharma got? What happened to the \$165 million that they promised that they would commit in an ad campaign in order to sell ObamaCare to America so that Big Pharma could have a larger market that was mandated by the Federal Government? What were the deals that were made? We need to know that.

If we can drag CEOs of private American corporations before the United States Congress, and if HENRY WAXMAN can threaten to—actually, yesterday was the day he was going to do that and he cancelled it. I think he thought better of it. But if HENRY WAXMAN, the chair of Energy and Commerce, can bring CEOs before the United States Congress and allege that they're making too much money, or he wants to see into their books and their records, or if ED MARKEY, the subcommittee chairman, can hand a letter to David Sokol that is an intimidating letter because the president of Mid-American Energy, who testified against cap-and-tax, can be intimidated with the threat of the chairman of an important Energy and Commerce subcommittee at the request of that chairman to investigate the company that he represents. Witness intimidation, plain and simple, straight up front. It's documented. It's in public documents now. Along with the other activities that have to do with the President of the United States now nearly a year ago firing the CEO of General Motors.

Just simply summarily fired the CEO of General Motors. Didn't try to take his fingerprints off. Didn't imply that it was a decision that came about some other way. Didn't try to hide it. He proudly accepted, some will call it credit, I will call it blame for reaching

across the line between the public and the private sector and firing the CEO of General Motors and deciding who would be the new CEO of General Motors. He sent his car czar to make some of those deals. The President of the United States replaced and named all but two of the board members of General Motors. And he wasn't quite as engaged in Chrysler, but those same activities took place.

And the White House, and when it's the White House it's the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, dictated to the bankruptcy court exactly the terms that emerged from the bankruptcy court, General Motors and Chrysler. That situation is appalling and breathtaking when you think of the nationalization that has taken place.

And Mr. Speaker, when you look at the beginning of this is at the end of the Bush administration, Henry Paulson, Secretary of the Treasury, came here to the Capitol, September 19, 2008, and asked for \$700 billion in bailout money that he would deal out the way he saw fit in an attempt to stop what he believed was a potential or maybe even an impending meltdown of the world's credit. He thought it could have all come crashing down. He couldn't guarantee there would be a fix, but he said if you try to give me any new ideas they won't be as good as his own.

So he ended up with \$350 billion in the beginning of this, in about October of 2008, and then another \$350 billion that was approved by a Congress that was elected later and by a President who was elected later. And that was President Barack Obama, who supported and approved all of the TARP funding, all of the nationalization beginnings. And he followed through on the balance of that and the takeovers of three large investment banks: AIG, the large insurance company to the tune of around \$180 billion, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, culminated by executive order right before Christmas of last year that hardly made the news.

You know, if we just went in and looked what happened on late Friday night after the news cycle and the press goes off to their golf game or home to their family, we would find all kinds of, I mentioned earlier, cataclysmic things that have happened in the United States on late Friday night.

I would like to go back and just amend something here to the power in Congress. Give me the right to veto and put back in place anything that happened after, say, 2 o'clock on a Friday before the press comes to work at around 9 o'clock on a Monday morning. Let me go back and fix those things that happened. We would have a lot better country today that wouldn't have reverted. But Friday night, this is when the President pulls those moves because that is when there is the lowest news cycle. So that's what happens.

Three large investment banks taken over by the Federal Government with

the approval or the active involvement of President Barack Obama. AIG the insurance company taken over and bailed out, \$180 billion. President Obama approved or enacted that. The takeover of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac that the chairman of the Financial Services Committee pledged he would never vote to support or bail out. And I remember the date that I heard that the first time and the most clearly was October 26, 2005, right over there from that microphone, when BARNEY FRANK said, "I won't vote to bail out Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. And if you think so and you're investing in them, don't count on me doing that."

Well, we might not have had the starkest and clearest and cleanest of votes, but we have had a persistent and a relentless defense of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac's irresponsible financial practices going through many years prior to 2005. But I stood here on this floor and engaged in that process. And the amendments that came to put capital requirements and regulatory requirements on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were shot down and voted down and fought against. The most aggressive opposition came directly from the Democrats, who were in the minority at the time. But Fannie and Freddie had worked the lobby and had a broader bipartisan support than they might have otherwise had.

So three large investment banks nationalized, AIG nationalized, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac nationalized. And now, Mr. Speaker, I say you and the American people share the liability of \$5.5 trillion in contingent liability of Fannie and Freddie. And before I go to the car companies' nationalization, I would remind you and all who may be overhearing this dialogue that of all of the financial reform that has Wall Street under the focus and under the spotlight and under the magnifying glass, of all of the tactics that have been used, and the President going back up to Wall Street to give his speech today, of all of that, the President didn't mention Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac. There is nothing in the financial reform bill that reforms Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac.

□ 1530

What's in the financial reform bill is a \$50 billion slush fund to let the administration decide which businesses are too big to be allowed to fail and to go in and implement a government takeover of the private sector. And what are the criteria? The judgment of the executive branch. Yes, there are some guidelines, but not many constraints. And it gives the Federal Government the power and the authority to look over every credit transaction in America. Every credit transaction in America.

And so presumably that means that if you're in a small, little rural area, it used to work this way: you go in and maybe pick up some grocery items or

buy some gas, they'd put it on your tab. You'd come around and pay the bill at a later date. They'd want to look that one over.

If you go in—and someone mentioned this, and I thought it was a pretty descriptive way. If you go into a furniture store and they have a special on mattresses and so you can buy the mattress and come pay for it 30 days later, nothing down, that's a credit transaction the Federal Government would look in on and have to approve.

It would give them the ability to look in on your credit card, Mr. Speaker. Not necessarily take it out of your pocket, but electronically look in on those credit records. And that would give the Federal Government the authority to examine everybody's transactions. All of your credit card transactions, all of your debit card transactions. Presumably, if you have credit involved with your bank accounts, to look at those loans in the bank accounts. Maybe technically not your checking account because that's not a credit account.

But a Federal Government going that far and that deep and having that kind of authority, let alone looking into all of the Wall Street transactions that take place—the investment banking transactions, the derivatives, the credit default swaps—all of the components that come along that have to do with higher finance, the mortgage transactions that take place and to track them all the way through. And some of this is good. Looking at high finance and being able to track that and being able to identify is primarily a good thing as long as that oppressive thumb of the Federal Government doesn't go in the middle of our back down to individuals in this fashion, and as long as we don't leave it to the discretionary judgment of the Federal Government on which businesses are too big to be allowed to fail.

If the Federal Government can come in and take over three large investment banks and AIG and Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and if we have a President of the United States who seems to be following through on the playbook that is on the Web site of the Democratic Socialists of America—DSAUSA.org, Mr. Speaker. I hope everybody is paying attention to it, or you can Google "Democratic Socialists of America" and hit the button and there will be a Web site. And that Web site changes a little bit each time that I speak about the DSAUSA.org.

But on the Web site—I saved all of those pages so you can run but you can't hide. Things never die in cyberspace, Mr. Speaker. But on their Web site is now or has been the language that starts out with this. It says, We are socialists. We are not communists—which doesn't give me a lot of comfort. There's a marginal difference, and they tell you what the difference is.

Communists want to nationalize everything. They want to own all real

property. They want to take over everybody's house, all real estate, and they want to tell everybody where they have to work, what they will pay for goods, and what they'll be paid for the work that they are told to do. That is more the pure form of communism. From each according to his ability, to each according to his need.

Well, that also seems to fit the socialists, doesn't it, because they want to do the wealth transfer. They want to share the wealth. That's what the President told Joe the Plumber. Funny. That's what is also the mission statement of ACORN: Share the wealth. The exact language comes right out of the mission statement of ACORN. And the SEIU linked in so closely to ACORN that it's just the funding streams are a little bit different but they are commingled, and often they are trading shirts with each other. Whether it's a purple SEIU shirt or a red ACORN shirt, there are a few more wearing the purple SEIU shirts today than there are ACORN.

By the way, at the risk of digressing, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that even though ACORN announced that on April Fools' Day they would be shutting down ACORN National, I carry this acorn around in my pocket every day to remind me that they have not gone away. It actually may have been an April Fools joke on us that ACORN was going to shut down ACORN National. They could have done that.

But now it's the same people, the same faces, the same boards of directors, a little mixing and matching, changing the names, changing the titles. Funding streams have been shrunk significantly, thanks to Hannah and James and the work that went on behind that. But the same structure is in place. It's the same people, the same problems.

In fact, it reminds me of what happened after the wall went down on November 9 of 1989, and it appeared to be the end of the cold war. The Soviet Union thereafter imploded. A little more than a year after that, the Soviet Union was wound down, and there were those who got together to celebrate the end of the cold war. It was worthy of celebration. A 45-year cold war had looked like it had come to an end, but it didn't convince the communists that they had lost it philosophically.

They didn't believe that our free enterprise capitalism and the vigor that comes from being an American was what had defeated them. They thought they just maybe needed better managers that were more pure in their ideology. And so even though they had to scatter from the light, they went back and reformed new alliances and new allegiances, and they come back at us again and again and again, even more insidious and even harder to find and harder to identify. But philosophical enemies of the liberty and freedom of the United States and western civilization, they remained.

ACORN remains an entity out there that has spent millions of dollars un-

dermining the integrity of the legitimate ballot system here in the United States of America. They produced and admitted to over 400,000 false or fraudulent voter registration forms, and they argue that it didn't result in a single fraudulent vote—which is completely, I think, a specious argument. Why would you spend millions to produce false or fraudulent voter registrations if you didn't think that was going to result in some kind of favorable result for you in the ballot box?

And I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that even though there were major problems with ACORN in Ohio, if that election would have been closer and we would have scrutinized it more closely, we would have found out more about what could have been happening in the ballot box in places like Ohio and Minnesota. When we go to court, who wins in the end in the close elections?

And what if all of those false or fraudulent voter registrations had been kicked out at the beginning and no one had walked in? And that doesn't mean that the ones that were discovered were all of those that actually happened. I have to believe that the voter registration list was significantly corrupted in all of the States where ACORN was carrying out this practice and has significantly corrupted voter registration lists, and opens things up for more and more corruption.

And this United States of America, built upon the foundation of our Constitution itself, that Constitution, one might think, is the framework for law, and it's what we have to preserve if we're going to be a healthy and a viable country. And I agree.

But the very foundation underneath the Constitution itself is legitimate elections. And when elections are delegitimized by organizations like ACORN, and if the American people lose the confidence that we have legitimate elections, there the Constitution falls because the foundation for the Constitution itself is legitimate elections and the people's confidence in those legitimate elections as well.

So ACORN went right at the very component of America that is essential. And that is not that we just have clean, legitimate elections. We must do that if we're going to uphold our Constitution; but we also have to have the American people that believe that we've conducted ourselves in a legitimate fashion, that their vote was not undermined by an illegitimate vote.

That's the ACORN side of this.

ACORN, by the way, another place that I want to do investigations—the other side of the great election divide—and hold hearings in this Congress and subpoena witnesses and go in and drill down and investigate them completely. And I believe that many of those investigative lines, when we follow the money, will lead to the White House itself, Mr. Speaker.

So we have financial reform that's up in front of us. We have ACORN that has dispersed itself to some degree but are

reforming under the same managers, same faces, and some of the same funding streams.

I have raised the issue of how ObamaCare was pushed through this Congress and how it takes over another chunk of our private sector. I will summarize and add up: The three large investment banks that were taken over by the Federal Government; AIG, the insurance company, taken over by the Federal Government; Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, taken over by the Federal Government; and now we have General Motors and Chrysler taken over by the Federal Government; \$700 billion in TARP spending at the beginning of that; \$787 billion in the stimulus package at the tail end of that. And we have all of 6 percent of the American population that believes that the stimulus package actually worked and stimulated jobs.

Well, the data shows the exact opposite. Unemployment went up, not down, while that was going on. The promise was we wouldn't see unemployment go over 8 percent under the stimulus package, but what really happened is unemployment went to 10 percent. And it's hanging in that zone, 9.7 percent in unemployment.

The vision of borrowing money from the Chinese and the Saudis and pouring it in to projects here in America, extending jobs for the public sector, creating government jobs—and calling creation of government jobs economic development, I don't think we've ever had a President that believed that in the history of America until we get to here, this point in our history.

I don't even believe Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the great Keynesian economist that he was, and he embraced John Maynard Keynes' philosophy—not quite to the extent that Keynes would have liked to have had him do, but in a substantial way—didn't believe that government jobs were a replacement for private sector jobs even though he created a lot of them. And we did a lot of make-work projects across the country, and the evidence of that is still out there.

But our President has said to us a little more than a year ago that he believed that Franklin Delano Roosevelt lost his nerve and that he should have spent a lot more money in the thirties, and if he had done so, that would have brought about a recovery instead of waiting for World War II to come along to become and I quote—well, I better not quote that—but the general language is that World War II came along; it was the greatest economic stimulus plan ever. That's close to a quote. I know I've got the philosophy exactly right. And I don't actually disagree with that statement about the stimulus plan with what the Second World War happened to be.

But I would argue that we didn't recover from the Great Depression in the Second World War even. When the stock market crashed in October of 1929, and as it spiraled downwards and

it hiccuped its way up and down and we went through that vast spending era of the Great Depression, and we saw unemployment go up and then come back down and go up again, and when we got to World War II, December 7, 1941, we were still in the Depression. And unemployment was a number that was approaching 20 percent for part of that time, and we had 25 percent unemployment, I think, at the peak.

And we got into the Second World War and we began to manufacture everything as fast as we could. A lot of the women that had not worked before went to work. Rosy the Riveters. And my mother among them who tied parachute knots in Omaha is what she did every day. Tied knots in parachutes. That was part of her war efforts. And, God bless her, she turned 90 years old yesterday. And I honor my mother with all of the love that I have. She did her part of the war effort, as my father did his 2½ years in the South Pacific.

But the economy didn't recover in the Second World War back to where it was. It wasn't the Second World War that was the complete recovery package that one would think the President, according to his words, would be the recovery.

I would just look at what are the indexes. Some of the indexes would be what did the stock market look like and when did it get back to where it was in October of 1929. One might think that Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal and his Keynesian spending was what brought us out of that. That's what my history people taught me. My teachers taught me that.

□ 1545

I went back and looked at the records and found out that wasn't the case. We still had high unemployment, and we still had low and stagnant growth and some reduction of growth in the thirties.

What we saw during World War II was that unemployment rates went way down because we needed everybody to do the work. We saw unemployment rates go to the lowest they've been in history, 1.2 percent. Now that's almost unheard of today, but unemployment was 1.2 percent. It was 25 percent as a high ratcheted down to 15, 10, on down to 1.2 percent near the end of World War II. Still, still we did not recover from the Great Depression from the 1929 stock market crash. It wasn't World War II. It wasn't even the Korean War. In fact, Franklin Delano Roosevelt had been dead for 9 years before the stock market, the Dow Jones Industrial Average, came back to where it was in October of 1929. That happened in 1954, Mr. Speaker.

So one can't, I don't think, legitimately argue that the World War II stimulus plan even brought us out of it. We increased our production and stabilized our economy and put people to work. The unemployment component of this got a lot better, but the growth and equities that had to do at

least at a minimum with the Dow Jones Industrial Average didn't get back to where it was until 1954, from October of 1929. Franklin Delano Roosevelt had been dead for 9 years before the stock market got back to where it was when it crashed in 1929. This was a long, long, long painful recovery that America went through, and we went through not just the Great Depression of the thirties looking for a recovery, but we went through the Second World War looking for a recovery, we went through the Korean War looking for a recovery, and finally limped our way back.

I will submit, Mr. Speaker, that a big reason for that is, when you over leverage a country or a company, you have to pay and service the debt. That means that you have to pay the interest on the borrowed money. And by the way, that borrowed money came from Americans back then instead of the Chinese and the Saudis now. But you have to service the interest on the debt. The war bonds had to be paid off as well. So that has to come out of the tax revenue that's coming in. The tax revenue that comes in comes from—not government—it comes from the private sector. The private sector has to be viable. It has to be vigorous. There has to be profitability there in order to attract more capital investment. Capital investment necessarily increases—wise capital investment necessarily increases our productivity. Increased productivity increases our gross domestic product, which allows us to buy, sell, trade, make, gain, produce more goods, sell more goods, cash in at the cash register more, whether it's the factory or the retail. And when that happens, this private sector economic growth then pays its share of taxes. And in the end, it's the people in America that pay the taxes, not the corporations, not the businesses, and it certainly isn't the government.

So what we have going on here now is, the government is swallowed up with those eight huge entities that I talked about. Three large investment banks, AIG, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, General Motors and Chrysler, those eight entities that are swallowed up by the Federal Government represent, according to an economics professor at the University of Arizona as far back as last August, one-third of the private sector activity in the United States swallowed up by those eight huge entities nationalized and taken over by the Federal Government. And behind that came what? ObamaCare swallowing up another 18 percent of our economy.

Now if you want to add 18 percent to—one-third is 33 percent, correct, Mr. Speaker? Yes, I know. You're nodding, and I appreciate your math is correct—that's 51 percent. So 33 percent and 18 percent adds up to 51 percent of our private sector economy. This now taken over and managed or dictated the terms of its business contracts, every bit of health care in America will be, according to this term of

ObamaCare, signed into law a couple weeks ago or three, will be directed by the Federal Government.

And some people—let me say some people without the largest of minds—are arguing that because we still have a surviving private sector health insurance industry, that the health care in America hasn't been nationalized. I would challenge them, Mr. Speaker, point to me—point for me to a sector or a component or an activity within health care in America that is not slated to be changed, altered or directed by ObamaCare. There isn't a single health insurance policy in America that the President can tell anyone, You get to keep that policy, that it isn't going to increase the premiums dramatically or perhaps reduce them marginally. That's going to happen. The premiums change for everybody in America unless there's somebody who happens to sit exactly on the dividing line. Young people will pay a lot more in premiums because they're a lower risk. We went from a 7-1 community rating that's out there now, which means that the most extreme cases—the lowest premium compared to the highest premium—are 7-1, which means that if we have a young healthy person paying \$100 a month on a similar policy, an older person that may not be completely healthy could be paying \$700 a month on a similar policy or even an identical policy. Now this has been pulled back to a 3-1 community rating which means that now that—just say we've got two people. They're both insured. The youth at \$100 a month. The older person, say my age, who is a greater risk, at \$700 a month. That's \$800 between the two of us. Now when you go to a 3-1 community rating, that means that there can't be that much disparity. So you dial that thing back down. And you charge the young person then \$200 a month and the older person \$600 a month. Now we're dealing with \$800 again. But the \$800 comes \$200 from the young person at doubling their premium and a reduction in the older person at \$700 down to \$600. Now you've got the \$800 that comes together for that monthly premium of the two insured. That's how that works.

So health insurance premiums change because they changed the rules for everybody, and they'll have to be approved by the Health Choices Administration czar or whomever that happens to be who has that title, and what was the Senate version of the bill. That part I didn't commit to memory, Mr. Speaker. Everybody's health insurance changes in America, and this government effectively cancels every policy subject to the approval of the new rules that will be written that aren't written yet. Nobody knows where they are. The health insurance underwriters are pulling their hair out, trying to figure out what happens and how do they do business. The Federal Government's dictating completely every health insurance policy in America. Can we find a health care provider that doesn't have

their way of doing business altered by this bill? Certainly the funding stream that comes in is altered. There's \$500 billion cut in Medicare for our senior citizens, \$523.5 billion—over \$500 billion cut out of Medicare reimbursement rates.

I represent the most senior congressional district in America. Iowa has the highest percentage of its population over the age of 85 of any of the States. We're the oldest two or three over the age of 65. There is good longevity there, I like that, and healthy practices, presumably. But the district I represent, out of the 99 counties in Iowa, 10 of the 12 most senior counties in Iowa. And I hear the President say there's waste, fraud and abuse in Medicare so we're going to slash \$500 billion out of there to pay for ObamaCare. And has the President pointed his finger to a single bit of waste, fraud and abuse that is in Medicare that he would fix? The promise is that's what he will do. But if he can't identify it or won't identify it, or if he's holding the access to that information hostage to the passage of his ObamaCare bill—he's got the bill. He signed it. It's now the law of the land.

Now it's time for the President of the United States to turn over all of those magic cards to show us, where is the waste, fraud and abuse in Medicare? I don't say it doesn't happen. I hear those cases, too. But what's the solution to fix it? And do we really have to pass a bill in order to have legitimate clean government? If there's corruption, let's go find it. Let's go root it out, root and branch, pull it out, and let's legitimize all of Medicare in the country. But we don't need to be going in there and arguing that—if there's \$500 billion worth of waste, fraud and abuse, how do you arrive at that number if you haven't found the waste, fraud and abuse yet?

So now I'm going to tell you, seniors will be penalized or they won't keep their word, and we'll be borrowing more from the Chinese to fund ObamaCare because—I'm going on record here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this day, April 22, 2010, to say that we will not see \$500 billion in cuts in Medicare. They were never sincere about that. That's only a number that they needed to reach so they could argue that ObamaCare doesn't cost over \$1 trillion over 10 years. Remember the argument now became, CBO scored this at \$132 billion in savings over 10 years. That's \$13.2 billion per year, the 10-year budget window that we're talking about. That is not loose change to American taxpayers. But to the overall budget, it's very marginal as to whether it's a savings or whether it's an increase in spending. But that includes and is predicated upon the cut to the spending which is a punishment to our seniors of \$523.5 billion. It's also predicated upon a tax increase of \$569.2 billion, and it was predicated upon the avoidance of the doctors' fix which is in the change of \$360 billion. All of that

distorts this to the tune of about \$1.4 trillion that with an honest accounting would get added back into this ObamaCare bill.

So you take \$1.4 trillion in costs that are distorted, and you would subtract \$132 billion from that, and you're down in the neighborhood of—let me get that number here right—subtract \$132 billion from the \$1.4 trillion. Now you are down about \$1.27 trillion in increased costs. Now remember what the President said. I have to refresh you, Mr. Speaker, because I'm wondering if any Democrats would actually be able to pass this test.

A couple little questions about history: Why did we go into ObamaCare in the first place? What was the argument from the beginning? What happened during the campaign that presumably gave the President of the United States a mandate to impose ObamaCare on America? And I remember this discussion, but I suspect that Madam Speaker PELOSI does not choose to remember this. Barack Obama—then Senator and candidate Obama said, We are spending too much money on health care. We've got to solve the problem of spending too much money on health care. And so he argued that the solution for that apparently is to spend a lot more on health care.

Now that doesn't pass the first little bit of third grade logic test. I could go to my little granddaughter, who is now 5, had her first little loose tooth here over the weekend, and say to her, If we're spending too much money, does it solve the problem if we spend more money? And she would give me that quizzical look like, How could you say something so irrational, Grampa? It's not rational to argue that spending too much money is solved by spending more money. But that's the argument that came. It's a matter of fact in public record. We're spending too much money. We have to solve that problem. And lo and behold, ObamaCare spends a lot more money, and somehow they still argue that they're solving the problem of spending too much money.

The second thing is that we have not enough competition in the insurance companies, not enough choices. We have 1,300 health insurance companies in America—or we did until a month ago when ObamaCare was signed into the law of the land. We have 1,300 health insurance companies, 100,000 possible policy varieties, and the President wants another one to compete with. Now he didn't get that. But he got the exchange, and the exchange will decide who are the winners and who are the losers, and they will write the mandates for every single policy in America. And let's just say, if you don't cover contraception, then there is going to be a requirement to cover contraception; if you don't cover Viagra, there's going to be a requirement to cover Viagra; if your policy doesn't cover mental health, there will be requirements to cover mental health.

Mandate after mandate after mandate, when we only have a couple—three of those in law prior to ObamaCare—will come raining down out of the Federal Government. And whenever there is a mandate, it makes an argument for four or five or six more health care mandates, and every mandate increases the costs over the premium and takes away our liberty and takes away our freedom.

□ 1600

All of these things that I have talked about pale in comparison to the part that knots up my innards more than any other, and that is this: since 1973, the people generally on the left side of the aisle in America have made the argument with regard to Roe v. Wade, Doe v. Bolton, and abortion in America, the people on the other side of the aisle have argued long and hard that the Federal Government has no business telling a person what they can or can't do with their body. That's the argument. So they argue that the Federal Government can't regulate nor diminish nor make it more restrictive for a woman who seeks an abortion to get that abortion because it's not our business what a woman does with her body. That is their argument. Men and women made that argument.

Over here on this side of the aisle, over and over and over again they made that argument. Now the same people, Mr. Speaker, are making the argument—and have made the argument and the President has signed it into the law of the land—that the Federal Government has no business telling a woman what she can or can't do with her body, but instead, now the same people are arguing that the Federal Government has every right to tell everybody in America what they can or can't do with their body.

The President of the United States, with the iron fist of the leadership within the House and the Senate and the complicity of a bare majority of the Members of the House, has imposed and nationalized our very bodies. The most sovereign thing that we have is our own personal self, our skin and what is inside our skin; the management of same has been taken over by the Federal Government. Now they tell all of us, you shall buy a health insurance policy; and if you can't afford it, we're going to tax somebody else and send you a refundable tax credit and you, by golly, are going to pay for that policy.

And if you are working and making enough money and you don't have a policy, if you happen to be working for a business that has less than 50 employees, then we are going to fine you a percentage of your income. The IRS is going to come in and do the audits, first electronically and then personally, to impose that health insurance policy on you. And it won't be the one that you could buy last month. It will be the one that you can buy next year or the year after, after they write the

new rules. The Federal Government's nationalization of our bodies.

So they have nationalized eight huge entities, a third of the private sector activity, and another 18 percent of our economy, health care, and nationalized and taken over the most sovereign thing we have, our skin and what is inside our skin, and taken away our ability, as individual free people that exercise the rights that come from God, clearly identified by the Founding Fathers and delineated in the Declaration of Independence, which is the foundation for the Constitution, the sovereignty of man, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that you and everyone in this Congress and those who aspire to come to this Congress should know that the Founding Fathers understood that those rights are prioritized rights—life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness—not just a grab bag of rights that they pulled out of the sky or randomly put into a package, but set there in an order of priority, a priority that the thing most paramount is our lives, the management of our lives as well; and that liberty, as a secondary right, is subordinate to the right to life.

The pursuit of happiness was not the pursuit of happiness as it is envisioned in the minds of a lot of people today. Pursuit of happiness, by the way, is subordinated to liberty and to life so that no one in their pursuit of happiness—and by the way, pursuit of happiness meant to our Founding Fathers more the Greek understanding, the word “*eudaimonia*,” which means pursuit of truth, pursuit of knowledge, pursuit of perfection in both body and mind. That is what pursuit of happiness was understood to mean when the Declaration of Independence was signed and they pledged their lives, their fortune, and their sacred honor.

The pursuit of happiness was the pursuit of truth and purity. That pursuit of happiness, though, is still subordinate and cannot—in anyone's pursuit of happiness can they infringe upon the liberty of another because our liberties are established in the Bill of Rights, for example, now—we understand them more clearly.

And they are also enshrined in title VII of the Civil Rights Act: You shall not discriminate against people based upon race, creed, color, ethnicity, now and a lot of times it's age and disability. Those are real rights. They are the rights that are protected. And the rights to freedom of speech, religion, the press, the right to keep and bear arms, the rights to property that come in the Fifth Amendment, the right to be protected against double jeopardy, to be judged by a jury of our peers, all of them, those are all rights. These rights are our liberties.

Our liberties that are guaranteed to us cannot be taken over by someone else in their pursuit of their happiness. They have to honor and respect that as our liberties are always subordinated

to the right to life being the most paramount right. These things are all taken away by ObamaCare: right to life itself, because it puts people in line to take the health care that the Federal Government prescribes and it's unconstitutional in a lot of ways, at least four ways.

First, there is nothing there in the enumerated powers that grants this Congress or the President of the United States to join together and impose a product on us that is neither produced nor approved by the Federal Government. Never in the history of this country has that ever happened. That is a constitutional violation. There is nothing in the commerce clause that allows such a broad definition that people that would not engage in commerce whatsoever would have to buy a product produced or approved by the Federal Government. It is a violation of the equal protection clause for the reasons that I have said, the Louisiana Purchase, Florida Gator Aid, and the list goes on.

Some Americans are treated different than others in the bill. It is a violation of the Ninth and 10th Amendments, the States' rights component of this as well. I encourage the 20 States attorneys general to go forward with their lawsuits. I am working for a repeal of 100 percent of ObamaCare. Pull it out root and branch; I don't want one DNA vestige left behind. Let's get it out. Let's pull it out all the way, Mr. Speaker, so there is none of it left. And then we can start putting components in place as individual stand-alone bills so the American people can clearly see that their voice is being heard in this United States Congress. And we can do it, we must do it, and we can do it in a reasonable time frame. We can put a discharge petition down here on the floor now for signatures of these Members of Congress.

The second thing we can do is seek to get that vote on the floor. The Senate is doing the same thing. And when we have the other side of the election, we can shut off funding for the implementation of ObamaCare. We can do that. In 2011 and 2012 we can elect a new President who will sign the repeal on his first order of business January 20, 2013. And then we start the reform process.

That is where we need to go, Mr. Speaker. And for those who think that it can't be done, it can't be accomplished, I have a survey on my Web site that asks the question: Do you believe that it's more likely that ObamaCare will be repealed than the Cubs will win the World Series this year? And the last number I saw, 58 percent believed it is more likely we will repeal ObamaCare and 42 percent thought it was more likely the Cubs would win the World Series. They went to spring training; they're playing ball. We are going to play ball all the way to 2013 and beyond. We are going to get this job done, Mr. Speaker. One hundred percent repeal of ObamaCare it must be

to preserve the liberty that Americans had last month that they deserve every month in the lives of our children and grandchildren.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would express my gratitude for your indulgence and your attention, and especially that little nod of the head, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MCCOLLUM (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today until noon on account of official business.

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 Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALTMIRE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SABLAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, April 29.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, April 29.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, April 29.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, April 26, 27, 28, and 29.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3244. An act to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on House Administration; in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 26, 2010, at 12:30 p.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:

7142. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Acquisition, Logistics and Technology, Department of the Army, transmitting report of intent to enter into a contract for technical engineering, logistical services and supplies, and component/airframe materials in support of depot maintenance programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7143. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's determination and certification under Section 490(b)(1)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 relating to the top five exporting and importing countries of pseudoephedrine and ephedrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7144. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the Authority's fiscal year 2009 annual report prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7145. A letter from the Secretary to the Board, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's annual report for FY 2009 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7146. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report on the Paul Coverdell National Forensic Science Improvement Grants Program, managed by the Office of Justice Programs' National Institute of Justice, pursuant to Public Law 90-351, section 2806(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7147. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Georgetown, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0934; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASW-29] received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7148. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Jet Routes and VOR Federal Airways in the Vicinity of Gage, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0004; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASW-32] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7149. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airway V-422 in the Vicinity of Wolf Lake, IN [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0006; Airspace Docket No. 09-AGL-30] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7150. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Koyukuk, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0692; Airspace Docket No. 09-AAL-13] received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Com-

mittee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7151. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Shaktoolik, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0142; Airspace Docket No. 09-AAL-2] received, March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7152. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Scammon Bay, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1038; Airspace Docket No. 09-AAL-19] received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7153. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Dillingham, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1055; Airspace Docket No. 09-AAL-16] received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7154. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30714; Amdt. No. 3364] received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7155. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 737-100, -200, -200C, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0452; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-326-AD; Amendment 39-16223; AD 2010-05-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7156. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines (IAE) V2500-A1, V2522-A5, V2524-A5, V2525-D5, V2527-A5, V2527E-A5, V2527M-A5, V2528-D5, V2530-A5, and V2533-A5 Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2007-29060; Directorate Identifier 2007-NE-34-AD; Amendment 39-16243; AD 2010-06-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7157. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30715; Amdt. No. 3365] received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7158. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 767 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0642; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-001-AD; Amendment 39-16241; AD 2010-06-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7159. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, Inc. Model MD-900 Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-

2009-0953; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-45-AD; Amendment 39-16230; AD 2010-06-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7160. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Thielert Aircraft Engines GmbH (TAE) Models TAE 125-02-99 and TAE 125-01 Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0948; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-30-AD; Amendment 39-16236; AD 2010-06-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7161. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS355E, AS355F, AS355F1, AS355F2, and AS355N Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1090; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-31-AD; Amendment 39-16227; AD 2010-06-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7162. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Using Agency for restricted Areas R-3005A, R-3305B, R-3005C, R-3005D and R-3005E; Fort Stewart, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0201; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-19] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7163. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extended Operations (ETOPS) of Multi-Engine Airplanes; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FAA-2002-6717; Amendment No. 121-348] (RIN: 2120-AI03) received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7164. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Issuance of Opinion and Advisory Letters and Opening of the EGTRRA Determination Letter Program for Pre-Approved Defined Benefit Plans (Announcement 2010-20) received March 30, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7165. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Distressed Asset Trust (DAT) Tax Shelters (LMSB-0210-008) (UIL: 9300.50-00) received April 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7166. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Taxation of fringe benefits (Rev. Rul. 2010-10) received April 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7167. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Industry Director Directive #3 Tier II Issue Enhanced Oil Recovery Credit Status Changed to Monitoring [LMSB-04-0210-007] received April 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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 Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 5107. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to require persons to keep records of non-employees who perform labor or services for remuneration and to provide a special penalty for persons who misclassify employees as non-employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCOTTER:

H.R. 5108. A bill to require certain Internet websites that contain personal information of individuals to remove such information at the request of such individuals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. DENT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H.R. 5109. A bill to establish a tax, regulatory, and legal structure in the United States that encourages small businesses to expand and innovate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, Financial Services, Rules, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, and Appropriations, 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 Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona:

H.R. 5110. A bill to modify the boundary of the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 5111. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to modify special rules relating to coverage of abortion services under such Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARNAHAN (for himself, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5112. A bill to provide for the training of Federal building personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. DAHLKEMPER:

H.R. 5113. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to establish the Healthy Hab-

its School Challenge Program to reduce childhood obesity by recognizing schools that are creating healthier school environments for children by promoting good nutrition and physical activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. HARE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 5114. A bill to extend the authorization for the national flood insurance program, to identify priorities essential to reform and ongoing stable functioning of the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHAUER (for himself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 5115. A bill to recognize the key contributions of flight support specialists to our Nation's aviation safety by restoring the retirement treatment of flight support specialists whose functions were outsourced by the Federal Government in 2005; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GORDON of Tennessee:

H.R. 5116. A bill to invest in innovation through research and development, to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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 Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. OLVER):

H.R. 5117. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance for developing countries to promote quality basic education and to establish the achievement of universal basic education in all developing countries as an objective of United States foreign assistance policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

H.R. 5118. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require the exclusion of data of an exceedance or violation of a national ambient air quality standard caused by a prescribed fire in the Flint Hills Region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. TEAGUE):

H.R. 5119. A bill to amend the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act to improve compensation for workers involved in uranium mining, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. NYE, and Mr. TEAGUE):

H.R. 5120. A bill to improve employment, training, and placement services furnished to veterans, especially those serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Education and

Labor, Small Business, Energy and Commerce, and Armed 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 Ms. CLARKE (for herself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. STARK, Ms. CHU, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. WATSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 5121. A bill to promote the sexual and reproductive health of individuals and couples in developing countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WATERS, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 5122. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Housing Assistance Council; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5123. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain high-intensity sweetener; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 5124. A bill to prohibit the use, production, sale, importation, or exportation of any pesticide containing atrazine; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 5125. A bill to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to establish a fund to be used to make local governments whole for losses incurred from the Lehman Brothers Holding, Inc., bankruptcy; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 5126. A bill to repeal provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act relating to health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Ms. GIFFORDS (for herself and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 5127. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish a reporting requirement for any stored value device carried out of, into, or through the United States, to establish registration requirements for stored value programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona):

H.R. 5128. A bill to designate the Department of the Interior Building in Washington, District of Columbia, as the "Stewart Lee Udall Department of the Interior Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HODES (for himself and Mr. CARNAHAN):

H.R. 5129. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat carsharing and ridesharing reimbursement arrangements as

qualified transportation fringe benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 5130. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Beaver, Chipuxet, Queen, Wood, and Pawcatuck Rivers in the States of Connecticut and Rhode Island for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5131. A bill to establish Coltsville National Historical Park in the State of Connecticut, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 5132. A bill to require the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to establish a research initiative to support the development of technical standards and conformance architecture to improve emergency communication and tracking technologies for use in locating trapped individuals in confined spaces and other shielded environments where conventional radio communication is limited, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SRES, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PASCARELL, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 5133. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 331 1st Street in Carlstadt, New Jersey, as the "Staff Sergeant Frank T. Carvill and Lance Corporal Michael A. Schwarz Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SRES, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CAO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5134. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Groundwork USA national office, to provide grants to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, 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. WALDEN:

H.R. 5135. A bill to provide for congressional approval of national monuments in Oregon, restrictions on the use of national monuments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H. Res. 1287. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. PITTS):

H. Res. 1288. A resolution urging the issuance of a certificate of loss of nationality for Anwar al-Awlaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS,

Mr. AKIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BONNER, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. DENT, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGEN of California, Mr. MACK, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MICA, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. THORNBERY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TURNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. SIMPSON):

H. Res. 1289. A resolution expressing the sense of the House that Democratic Members of the House should join Republican Members of the House in a total ban on earmarks for one year, that total discretionary spending should be reduced by the amount saved by earmark moratoriums, and that a bipartisan, bicameral committee should be created to review and overhaul the budgetary, spending, and earmark processes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. MURPHY of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H. Res. 1290. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a National Day to Prevent Teen Pregnancy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ARCURI:

H. Res. 1291. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week beginning May 9, 2010, as National Nursing Home Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

H. Res. 1292. A resolution congratulating the Emporia State University Lady Hornets women's basketball team for winning the 2010 NCAA Division II National Championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself and Mr. WALDEN):

H. Res. 1293. A resolution expressing support for the goals and ideals of National Child Abuse Prevention Month; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself and Mr. BOREN):

H. Res. 1294. A resolution expressing support for designation of the first Saturday in May as National Explosive Ordnance Disposal Day to honor those who are serving and have served in the noble and self-sacrificing profession of Explosive Ordnance Disposal in the United States Armed Forces; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H. Res. 1295. A resolution celebrating the role of mothers in the United States and supporting the goals and ideals of Mother's Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. BILBRAY):

H. Res. 1296. A resolution congratulating the American Society for Cell Biology on its 50 years of service to the basic biomedical research community in the United States and around the world, as well as the public; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MARKEY of Colorado (for herself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. WU, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. LANCE):

H. Res. 1297. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of American Craft Beer Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FARR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BOYD, Mrs. CAPP, Ms. HARMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHAUER, Ms. WATSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H. Res. 1298. A resolution encouraging efforts to reduce the use of paper and plastic bags; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

262. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State

of New Mexico, relative to House Memorial 39 urging the Republic of Turkey to hold and safeguard religious and human rights without compromise; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

263. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, relative to House Memorial 34 urging the Congress of the United States to expedite the passage of legislation to enact the necessary amendments to the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

264. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, relative to House Memorial 54 urging the Congress of the United States to consider legislation that promotes clean energy development and use; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, Education and Labor, Science and Technology, Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 24: Mr. MURPHY of New York, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 208: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 213: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 219: Mr. AUSTRIA.

H.R. 413: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 483: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 678: Mr. PITTS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. SPACE.

H.R. 734: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 761: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 775: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 836: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 847: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. BACA.

H.R. 878: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 932: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 949: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 950: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1024: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1074: Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1077: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1079: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1083: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1087: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1165: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1169: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1177: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. HERGER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1205: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1283: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1308: Mr. CUMMINGS and Ms. KILROY.

H.R. 1361: Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. CHU, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1408: Ms. RICHARDSON and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1430: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 1458: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1526: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1529: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1558: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1616: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 1625: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MELANCON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr.

ARCURI, Mr. WELCH, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1670: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1826: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 1844: Mr. KAGEN.

H.R. 1855: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 1874: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. SHULER.

H.R. 1964: Mr. CAO.

H.R. 2000: Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. JENKINS, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 2054: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 2057: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 2142: Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 2220: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 2275: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 2328: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2408: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 2478: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 2542: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H.R. 2547: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 2625: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of New York, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2639: Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 2999: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3017: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SCHAUER, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 3024: Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 3039: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 3048: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3077: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 3108: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3181: Ms. RICHARDSON and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 3286: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Ms. KOSMAS.

H.R. 3310: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 3335: Mr. WATT and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 3393: Ms. HARMAN and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 3402: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 3408: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. WEINER, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 3418: Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 3421: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 3560: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3564: Ms. TITUS and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 3567: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 3652: Mr. TERRY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 3666: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 3668: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HODES, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LEE of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 3764: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 3781: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 3790: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 3799: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 3924: Mr. PITTS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mrs. BONO MACK.

H.R. 3936: Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 3995: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 4109: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 4115: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 4128: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4148: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 4163: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4175: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 4195: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 4278: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 4296: Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4333: Mr. DRIEHAUS.

H.R. 4343: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 4427: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. MACK.

H.R. 4443: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 4489: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 4502: Mr. HODES.

H.R. 4525: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.

H.R. 4530: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 4533: Ms. RICHARDSON and Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 4544: Mr. MELANCON and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 4568: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 4572: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 4594: Mr. PETERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HODES, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4599: Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 4645: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4647: Mr. COSTA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 4649: Mr. HIMES, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 4684: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 4689: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 4745: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 4759: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. SPACE.

H.R. 4785: Mr. WALZ, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 4796: Mr. LEE of New York and Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 4803: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 4812: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 4850: Ms. KILROY.

H.R. 4859: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 4869: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 4879: Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Ms. KILROY.

H.R. 4886: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 4888: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WALDEN, and Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 4889: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 4903: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 4904: Mr. AUSTRIA.

H.R. 4918: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 4919: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 4923: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HARE, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. WALZ, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NYE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. HODES, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 4927: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4929: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 4933: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4940: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 4943: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 4951: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 4959: Mr. NADLER of New York and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 4960: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 4971: Mrs. BONO MACK and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 4972: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 4993: Mr. WELCH, Mr. HODES, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
 H.R. 4995: Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 4999: Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 5000: Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 5008: Mr. ARCURI, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. CUELLAR.
 H.R. 5015: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
 H.R. 5017: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 5019: Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. LOEBSSACK, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. WEINER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 5034: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HARE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SCHAUER, and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 5038: Mr. LAMBORN.
 H.R. 5042: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 5044: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
 H.R. 5049: Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 5059: Mr. ROONEY.
 H.R. 5064: Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 5065: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GALLEGLEY, and Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 5081: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. KRATOVIL.
 H.R. 5082: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 5083: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 5091: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 5092: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 5095: Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 5102: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.J. Res. 59: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.J. Res. 78: Mr. ALTMIRE.
 H. Con. Res. 226: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CAO, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H. Con. Res. 260: Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. HERGER, Mr. COLE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. CAO, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LEE of New York, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H. Con. Res. 262: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WATT, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 265: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. POSEY.
 H. Res. 173: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H. Res. 191: Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H. Res. 252: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H. Res. 278: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. PAYNE.
 H. Res. 375: Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. ARCURI.
 H. Res. 397: Mr. CALVERT.
 H. Res. 407: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. EHLERS.
 H. Res. 857: Mr. TERRY.
 H. Res. 873: Mr. WALZ and Mr. GALLEGLEY.
 H. Res. 929: Mr. KUCINICH.
 H. Res. 1033: Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. CAMP, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H. Res. 1056: Ms. NORTON.
 H. Res. 1110: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. PITTS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. LATTI, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H. Res. 1161: Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. WATERS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. WATSON, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mrs. LUMMIS, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. TITUS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Res. 1196: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.
 H. Res. 1207: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H. Res. 1209: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. LAMBORN.
 H. Res. 1226: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. TERRY.
 H. Res. 1229: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. CALVERT.
 H. Res. 1240: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HARE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H. Res. 1245: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H. Res. 1247: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HODES, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. REYES, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. NORTON.
 H. Res. 1250: Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 1251: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PERRIELLO, and Mr. BARTLETT.
 H. Res. 1254: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H. Res. 1259: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Res. 1261: Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H. Res. 1273: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. FOX, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BONNER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LATTI, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. UPTON, Mr. AUSTRIA, and Mr. LATHAM.
 H. Res. 1277: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
 H. Res. 1279: Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 4717: Ms. NORTON.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 10 by Mr. JONES on H.R. 775: Tim Murphy, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Gus M. Bilirakis, Cliff Stearns, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Dan Burton.