



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2010

No. 150

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,
November 17, 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 of heaven and Earth, by Your gracious will, You have awakened us to a new day. As we look upon the responsibilities that lay before us, grant us wisdom to make good decisions, the strength to do what is right, compassion for people we meet along the way, and the satisfaction that we may please You by what we do and say, and give You glory, 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 Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. QUIGLEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

LASTING PEACE IN ISRAEL

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the Israeli Security Cabinet is preparing to take a critical vote on a proposal to temporarily halt construction in the West Bank.

Our Israeli friends have offered, once again, to stop construction on the West Bank in order to open the door to a peace deal. However, a peace agreement has no chance of coming to fruition if the Palestinian Authority and President Abbas refuse to come to the negotiating table. Only face-to-face negotiations between the two sides can lead to a peace deal.

Unilateral action by the U.N. will not contribute to peace, and the administration must be strong in signaling that any move by the U.N. toward independent action will be vetoed.

We are at a vital crossroads. We can choose the path of peace, but only if parties do their part and play their role. President Abbas must come to the table and justify the good-faith efforts by the people of Israel to achieve a lasting peace.

NATIONAL GUARD TROOPS SHOULD BE SENT TO THE BORDER

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over 2,200 people have been killed just this year in drug-related border violence in Mexico, and some have been Americans. The violence is flooding into American communities. Bullets are literally flying across the Rio Grande River into El Paso, Texas. The drug cartels shoot their way across the border into America, and people are scared.

The Federal Government has a two-part border security plan: one, put up warning signs not to travel parts of America because of the violent drug cartels; and, two, sue States that try to protect their people from illegal entry. That is no competent security plan.

One real answer is to pass legislation to put 10,000 National Guard troops on the border, to be paid for by the Federal Government and supervised by the State Governors.

How much more violence must occur on the border before the Feds actually do the job the Constitution requires? Protect the Nation.

And that's just the way it is.

LET'S HANG ON TO OUR FREEDOMS

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

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I received a message from one of my constituents, one of my bosses, Mr. and Mrs. Elmo Roach, from northeast Wisconsin, which reads, in part: "Do not waver on beginning to bring our troops out of Afghanistan, saving more of wasteful spending. Redirect all accrued military savings to veterans, to paying our troops and supporting their families.

"Sorry to say, but we may be ready to retreat to the comfort of our well-earned retirement if the President blinks or compromises.

"He promised, we delivered, now we expect him to act like Truman or Roosevelt."

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.

H7501

You see, in northeast Wisconsin we still believe that people are more important than corporate profits. We still believe that one single family on Main Street is more valuable than all of the corporations on Wall Street. We also believe that our freedoms will be ours for only as long as we can hang on to them.

END THE DUAL MANDATE AT THE FED

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, jobs should be job one in this Congress and the next. Full employment must be the objective of policymakers in Washington, D.C.

But after years of runaway spending, borrowing and stimulus, it's clear—and the American people know it—we can't borrow and spend and bail our way back to a growing economy.

Unfortunately, judging from the latest round of quantitative easing, known as QE2, the Federal Reserve hasn't gotten the message. Printing money is no substitute for sound fiscal policy.

This week I introduced legislation to end the dual mandate of the Fed. It is time, once again, to demand that the Federal Reserve focus exclusively on price stability and protecting the dollar; and it's also time to demand that policymakers here in Washington, D.C. embrace the kind of reforms that will promote real growth, tax reform, tax relief, fiscal discipline, regulatory reform and trade. We can't print money as a pathway to prosperity.

I urge my colleagues to join me in ending the dual mandate of the Fed, and let's get back to growing this economy on principles and policies that work.

DEVELOPING CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, one way we can create jobs, the number one concern for many of my constituents, is by developing clean-energy technologies and products made in America.

Hawaii, the most oil-dependent State in the country for our energy needs, is a prime locale for energy initiatives. Thanks to our \$117 million loan guarantee from the Department of Energy, a Hawaii company called First Wind is constructing a wind energy facility in Kahuku on Oahu's north shore. This will be the largest wind power facility on the island of Oahu.

The clean energy generated by this 30-megawatt facility will help Hawaii become more energy independent by powering up to 7,700 homes each year.

In addition to creating about 200 construction jobs, the project also relies on American innovation and know-how by using wind turbines and batteries made by American manufacturers in Iowa and Texas.

I urge my colleagues to support legislation that will help innovative, home-grown companies develop clean, renewable energy technology and strengthen our competitiveness in domestic and overseas markets.

□ 1010

ARMY SPECIALIST BLAKE D. WHIPPLE

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

Mr. LEE of New York. I rise today to honor a great man, Army Specialist Blake D. Whipple of Williamsville, New York. Just 21 years old, Blake's life was taken by a roadside bomb in Afghanistan on November 5. It was his job to clear the roads of these devices, and he did so proudly.

Blake was a 2007 graduate of Williamsville East High School, and signed up to serve his country in 2009.

Blake's parents, Dave and Kim, expressed concern about him joining the Army, as any parent would, but Blake's parents sensed his passion and drive for wanting to be a part of something bigger. Blake was eager to serve his country and was proud of the work he was doing, and I know his family was extremely proud of him.

Blake was fortunate to be home in western New York for 2 weeks this past September. He was able to see his family and friends one last time before his life was cut so drastically short.

Blake proudly served our Nation with courage and bravery, and his life was taken far too soon. He will be missed.

JOBS

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

Mr. BACA. When President Obama took office, he inherited a \$1.2 trillion deficit, two wars, the recession, and mounting job losses that pushed our economy to the brink.

Since then, we have made steady progress by preventing economic catastrophe and laying the groundwork to create new jobs. The Democratic "Make It in America" agenda has closed tax loopholes that allow for outsourcing of jobs overseas. And the recently passed Small Business Jobs Act provides \$12 billion in tax cuts and \$30 billion in new lending for American small businesses. But with the unemployment at 9.6 percent across the Nation, and over 14 percent in California's Inland Empire, we must do more.

I urge my Republican colleagues to come to the table and work with Democrats and the administration. The time for simply saying "no" is over. We

must pass new tax cuts for the American middle class families without the deficit-busting break for the wealthy.

NATIONWIDE REVOLT OVER BODY SCANNERS

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a nationwide revolt is developing over the body scanners at the airports, and it should. Hundreds of thousands of frequent fliers who fly each week are upset about getting these frequent doses of radiation. Parents are upset about being forced to have their children radiated or being touched inappropriately by an unrelated adult.

There is already plenty of security at the airport, but now we are going to spend up to \$300 million to install 1,000 scanners. This is much more about money than it is about security.

The former Secretary of Homeland Security, Michael Chertoff, represents Rapiscan, the company which is selling these scanners to his former Department. Far too many Federal contracts are sweetheart, insider deals. Companies hire former high-ranking Federal officials, and then, magically, those companies get hugely profitable Federal contracts.

The American people should not have to choose between having full-body radiation or a very embarrassing, intrusive pat-down every time they fly as if they were criminals. We need a little more balance and common sense on this.

BUSH TAX CUTS

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, soon we are going to have to decide how to treat the Bush tax cuts. We are going to have to decide whether or not to indebt the American people another \$700 billion to extend benefits, tax benefits, for the richest 1 percent of the country.

Before we go too far in feeling sorry for that 1 percent, consider this:

From 2001 to 2006, 53 percent of all gains, total gains, in income in this country went to that 1 percent. That is right, one out of every two dollars went to the richest 1 percent. That is where the economy has gone.

The growth in this country has benefited primarily the richest people in the country, and we now have the greatest disparity in wealth that we have seen in this country in almost 100 years.

Heed the words of the Roman priest Plutarch, who once wrote: An imbalance between rich and poor is the oldest and most fatal ailment of all republics.

Let's keep that in mind when we consider what to do with those tax cuts for the richest 1 percent of Americans.

CHARTING A NEW COURSE

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, the great patriots living in the original 13 colonies in the early years of this Nation relied on hard work, enduring spirit, and innovative thinking to create America.

We are in the final weeks of the 111th Congress, and during this session, much of the legislation passed challenged the fundamental characteristics of what makes our Nation great: self-reliance, responsibility, taking risks, and making tough decisions.

Instead, we have seen more mandates, burdensome regulations, and overbearing debt and deficits—hardly what those founding patriots intended.

After a few months back in America's First District, the message from Virginians is simple: Stop the spending. Keep freedom intact.

Congress has two choices: Continue on the same path or chart a new, responsible path.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has the responsibility to work together to chart a new course and allow this Nation to prosper for years to come.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, the same challenges that faced this Nation on November 1 still faced us when we woke up on November 3. We still have too many Americans without jobs, and we still have work to do to grow our economy and put our country back on a path of prosperity.

We need initiatives that make America more competitive. We need to tap into the can-do spirit that made this country so great. Folks in my district in southern Minnesota know that a new clean energy economy means jobs and securities right here at home.

I hope my friends across the aisle now understand that Americans expect them to actually do something. They expect them to grow our economy, create jobs here at home and not ship them overseas, and hold Wall Street accountable.

Catchy campaign slogans might be great to win elections, but they won't fix a single problem. They won't create more jobs. They won't put America back to work. Now the hard work really begins, and we must be up to the task.

Winston Churchill once said: Democracy is the worst form of government, except for every other one that has been tried.

Democracy is hard work. It needs to start right here, and we need to put America back on a path to prosperity.

COACH CHARLENE MORETT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to give credit to a coach who has just reached the milestone of a 400th career win.

It was almost 2 months ago when the Penn State field hockey team shut out Temple University 4-0. They were coached by Charlene Morett, the longest tenured coach in the Big Ten and the seventh-longest tenured coach at a single school in Division I field hockey. She is in her 24th season as head coach of the Penn State field hockey program. This makes her only the fourth Division I field hockey coach in NCAA history to hit the 400-victory plateau.

In 2008, Morett led her team to the Big Ten regular season title and was named Big Ten Coach of the Year for the fourth time. Five of her players have been named Big Ten Athlete of the Year.

Morett is a graduate of Penn State and an outstanding field hockey player in her own right. She is a two-time Olympian, winning a bronze medal in the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games, and she was also an All-American lacrosse player.

I congratulate Morett and her team for their accomplishments.

ALLOW BUSH TAX CUTS TO EXPIRE

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a minute to put the Republican Party's current platform into some historical perspective.

It was 30 years ago that Ronald Reagan was elected on the same platform that the government really can't be the solution to any of our problems, that it is the problem. He also suggested that any President who submitted a budget that was not balanced should be impeached. Well, for 8 years he never submitted a balanced budget and tripled our deficit.

George H. W. Bush tried to correct the situation so the Gingrich Republicans contributed to his defeat.

Bill Clinton came in, balanced the budget, allowed tax rates to go up to the level they are set to return to finally in January, saw 23 million new jobs created, while he invested in our fiscal and human infrastructure. He had three successive budget surpluses and left with a \$5.6 trillion projected surplus.

George Bush comes in running against the government, enacts two deep tax cuts, starts two wars, puts in a \$900 billion Medicare part D prescription drug program, and leaves us with the worst fiscal crisis that this country has faced since the Great Depression.

So there is the historical perspective. The fact is those two tax cuts never should have been enacted in 2001 and 2003. They should be allowed to expire, and we ought to reinvest in the human and the fiscal infrastructure of this country if we want to create more and better jobs in this country.

□ 1020

NATIONAL ADOPTION MONTH AND NATIONAL ADOPTION DAY

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, every year an average of 115,000 American children live in foster care just waiting to be adopted. So, today, I am pleased to honor November as National Adoption Month and November 20th as National Adoption Day.

In particular, I would like to recognize Voices for Adoption for its efforts to support adoption. Since 1996, this organization has not only helped recruit adoptive families, but also supported programs that assist families who have already adopted.

For example, Voices for Adoption sponsors a program called Adoptive Family Portrait Project. Through this project, Members of Congress celebrate a family from their district that exemplifies the values of adoption.

This year, I am pleased to recognize the Campbell family from Waldwick, New Jersey. Shea and George have welcomed over 121 children into their home over the last 30 years. In addition, they have adopted several children. Shea also works for Children's Aid and Family Services as a specialist in helping special needs children who have been exposed to drugs. In the past, she has served on the Child Placement Review Board.

The Campbells remain in contact with many of the children who have come into their home as foster children. They also mentor new foster parents and advise those who are considering becoming foster parents for the first time.

During this month, I am proud to highlight the numerous ways the Campbells have contributed to promoting adoption in northern New Jersey. Adoption changes far more than one life; it changes a community.

ACHIEVING THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Ms. CHU. Our country is one of opportunity, where everyone can follow their dreams, but we need to ensure that America's young people get the training they need to succeed. But we have fallen behind.

Today, only 15 percent of American students learn a second language, and it hinders us in today's global economy. That is why I have introduced the

Global Language Early Education Act. My bill funds early education dual language programs across the country, and it provides the skills demanded in board rooms throughout the world.

We know that dual language learners better manage complex situations and problems. That is why the bill also grooms our next generation of executives for success.

Let's be competitive in this world. Let's encourage a second language. Let's promote our workforce and make sure that everybody can achieve the American Dream.

JIM WINNER

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

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life of an entrepreneur, generous philanthropist, and loving husband, father, and grandfather from Sharon, Pennsylvania.

Jim Winner, the developer of The Club anti-theft device, was lost in an accident in September. He was a patriot, serving his country in Korea. He was an inventor who grew his ideas into successful businesses that created good jobs for his neighbors in the Shenango Valley. He was a philanthropist who gave much of his wealth back to his community. And he raised a beautiful family who share his values of hard work, patriotism, commitment to community, and compassion for those less fortunate.

Jim was a Renaissance man, and his dedication to charity reached so many in the Mercer community region.

Jim will be missed by all, and my heart goes out to Donna, his wife; to his family, his friends, and the community that continues to mourn his loss.

SUPPORTING LEBANON AS A FORCE FOR PEACE

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to direct the attention of my colleagues to the fragile but critical status of the country of Lebanon.

Mr. Speaker, we are perhaps days away from an international tribunal's verdict on who killed former prime minister of Lebanon Rafik Hariri. That verdict, many say, could plunge Lebanon into another round of violence and retribution.

Thankfully, this body, through the leadership of people like HOWARD BERMAN and NITA LOWEY, has removed its reservations on U.S. military aid to the Lebanese army. This is a crucial step in terms of securing the Lebanese border with Israel, and it could be a crucial step should the tribunal's decision on who killed Prime Minister Hariri lead to greater instability in that country.

Mr. Speaker, we must support Lebanon as a force for peace and prosperity in this critical region. We need Lebanon as an ally to America and to all the countries in that region who are pushing for peace.

I have thousands of Lebanese American constituents in Connecticut. They constantly remind me of the importance of these points, and I believe they are right.

CALLING ATTENTION TO DIRTY POLITICAL MONEY

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to call attention to the corrosive, pernicious, and corrupting effect of dirty money. What is dirty money? That is money that comes into American politics in the millions, multiples of millions; money that comes in offering to fund campaigns that smear, distort, and deliver untruths to voters; and money that was made much easier to come into our political environment through the Supreme Court case known as Citizens United v. FEC.

We need to take action to make sure that Americans know who is funding these messages that are coming across their airwaves and that the identity of these sponsors is disclosed so that people can make a good choice. Never let the day come that any public servant has to face a torrent of nasty, nasty commercials over the airwaves without the voters even knowing who paid for them, who sponsored them, and who wants them to believe the untruths put in many of these ads.

RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGE ON H.R. 3808

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on passing H.R. 3808, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, be limited to 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTING DAY FOR THE CONVENING OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 112TH CONGRESS

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) appointing the day for the convening of the first session of the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 40

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first regular session of the One Hundred Twelfth Congress shall begin at noon on Wednesday, January 5, 2011.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE PRINTING OF A REVISED EDITION OF THE RULES AND MANUAL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE 112TH CONGRESS

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1720

Resolved, That a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Twelfth Congress be printed as a House document, and that three thousand additional copies shall be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives, of which nine hundred sixty copies shall be bound in leather with thumb index and delivered as may be directed by the Parliamentarian of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 28 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1631

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER) at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

VETO MESSAGE ON H.R. 3808, INTERSTATE RECOGNITION OF NOTARIZATIONS ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of November 15, 2010, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill (H.R. 3808) to require any Federal or State court to recognize any notarization made by a notary public licensed

by a State other than the State where the court is located when such notarization occurs in or affects interstate commerce.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of November 15, 2010, at page H7402.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I will urge the House to vote "no" so as to sustain the President's veto, and I would like to explain why it is important that we are taking this vote.

This bill has passed the House under suspension in each of the last three Congresses. It has been brought forward by our colleague from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) each time. It requires courts to recognize duly performed out-of-State notarizations. As it was passing the Senate, reports began to surface regarding improper and possibly fraudulent documentation in foreclosure actions across the country.

Improperly performed notarizations were reportedly a major factor in circumventing the legal protections afforded to citizens in foreclosure—notarizations in the absence of the person signing the document or without that person's signature or sometimes even forged notary signatures.

So we are taking a fresh look at the notarization bill. There were concerns that it could have the unintended effect of facilitating improprieties in mortgage foreclosures and in other financial transactions as well in that a State could remove important protections from its notarization rules, and then the bill would effectively force other States to go along.

The President took the responsible course in refusing to sign this bill into law so that we could give it a careful and fresh examination in light of these concerns.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, criticism of H.R. 3808 focuses on its potential application to the ongoing crisis in the foreclosure markets. News accounts have detailed stories of fraudulent activity involving affidavits used to rid banks of bad mortgage inventories. I support any effort to combat that activity, but this situation does not involve H.R. 3808.

The bill applies only to "any lawful notarization made by a licensed notary public." There is nothing in its lan-

guage that pertains to fraudulent acts of notarization. The bill advances the legitimate purposes of the Interstate Commerce Clause by ensuring that a lawfully notarized document from one State will be acknowledged by another State in an interstate legal proceeding.

The Courts Subcommittee conducted a hearing on this issue 4 years ago, and it learned of instances in which States rejected otherwise lawfully notarized documents, for petty reasons, from other States. For example, State A requires a notarized document to bear an ink stamp while State B requires a raised, embossed seal. They should be mutually recognized.

The legislative history of the bill and the text, itself, has nothing to do with fraudulent notarizations. We should override the veto and support the legitimate purpose of H.R. 3808.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just respond to my dear friend, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, by saying that what we are trying to do here is to prevent the possibility of sloppy, inaccurate, or fraudulent notarizations from creeping into the foreclosure process.

As we all know, many of the foreclosures have now been found to be legally defective because of many things, including, possibly, improper notarizations. With millions of people losing their homes, it really would be almost negligent for us to assume that notarizations coming from another State, which might be electronic, would not be fraudulent. I think caution is the better choice for the matter that is under discussion.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), who is the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I want to thank the gentleman for the opportunity to address the House on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, today and over the last several weeks, I think there has been a broad misunderstanding of the Interstate Recognition of Notarizations Act, which led to the President's unfortunate veto of this legislation a few weeks ago. There is absolutely no connection whatsoever between the Interstate Recognition of Notarizations Act of 2010 and the recent foreclosure documentation problems.

I first introduced this legislation back in April of 2005, and obviously there was no concern about weakening the foreclosure documentation process at that time. This is a bill that would help people, and I am disappointed that the legislation has been vetoed. This legislation that I introduced would improve interstate commerce by requiring that documents be recognized in any State or Federal court. It would help court reporters; it would help attorneys, businessowners, and consumers in general.

I have heard from many individuals who have been affected by this particular issue. For example, a construction company located in one State submits a contract for a job in another State and is turned down because the second State refuses to recognize the notarized contract.

□ 1640

This is not an isolated problem. This is interfering with interstate commerce, and it should be addressed.

H.R. 3808, this legislation, expressly requires lawful notarizations be recognized in other States and in no way validates improper notarizations. Let me stress that again. It in no way validates improper notarizations. Fraudulent notarizations are illegal. Enforcement of notarizations is a State responsibility, and I fully support each State Attorney General to vigorously prosecute all fraudulent notarizations.

Currently, each State is responsible for regulating its notaries. Typically, someone who wishes to become a notary pays a fee. They will submit an application. They will take an oath of office. Some States require applicants to enroll in an educational course, pass an exam, or obtain a notary bond. This legislation does not change how an individual State regulates notaries in any form or fashion.

This bill had strong bipartisan support in the House of Representatives each of the three times it passed the House of Representatives, and most recently, with unanimous support, as recently as April of this year. I hope the White House will work with the Congress so this legislation can eventually become law.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by expressing my surprise at the author of this bill, who apparently hasn't heard about the fraud and misrepresentations, the swindling of people whose mortgages have led to foreclosure, and then we find out that the instruments that were brought into court didn't even know who the owner was, much less know who notarized it. So I would caution my colleague to let's be a little bit more careful here. A million people are losing their homes, and you're telling me that we're going to accept a notarization from anywhere, coming from any State, because you've introduced this before this problem began?

I say, "no." We can't even find out who the owners were after these instruments get chopped up and resold and moved in the financial scheme of things. We don't want anybody running the risk of accepting an out-of-State notarization because you've introduced the bill before this problem began. And now that it has begun, let's be careful. Let's be certain that we're protecting everybody that's being foreclosed on, and that's my major concern.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

In accord with the Constitution, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 332

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, November 18, 2010, or Friday, November 19, 2010, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, November 29, 2010, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, November 18, 2010, through Sunday, November 21, 2010, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, November 29, 2010, or such other time on that day as may be specified in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. 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 House Concurrent Resolution 332 will be followed by 5-minute votes on passing H.R. 3808, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, and motions to suspend the rules with regard to H.R. 5758 and House Resolution 1715.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 184, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 572]

YEAS—234

Ackerman	Berry	Capuano
Andrews	Bishop (GA)	Cardoza
Arcuri	Blumenauer	Carnahan
Baca	Boccheri	Carney
Baird	Boswell	Carson (IN)
Baldwin	Boucher	Castor (FL)
Barrow	Boyd	Chandler
Bean	Brady (PA)	Chu
Becerra	Brown, Corrine	Clarke
Berkley	Butterfield	Clay
Berman	Capps	Cleaver

Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Perlmutter	Johnson (IL)	Michaud	Ryan (WI)
Cohen	Jackson Lee	Perriello	Johnson, Sam	Miller (FL)	Scalise
Conyers	(TX)	Peterson	Jordan (OH)	Miller (MI)	Schmidt
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Polis (CO)	King (IA)	Miller, Gary	Schock
Costa	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy	King (NY)	Moran (KS)	Sensenbrenner
Costello	Jones	Price (NC)	Kingston	Murphy (NY)	Sessions
Courtney	Kagen	Quigley	Kline (MN)	Murphy, Tim	Sestak
Critz	Kanjorski	Rahall	Kosmas	Myrick	Shadegg
Crowley	Kaptur	Rangel	Kratovil	Neugebauer	Shimkus
Cueellar	Kennedy	Richardson	Lamborn	Nunes	Shuster
Cummings	Kildee	Rodriguez	Lance	Nye	Simpson
Dahlkemper	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rothman (NJ)	Latham	Owens	Smith (NE)
Davis (AL)	Kilroy	Roybal-Allard	LaTourette	Paulsen	Smith (NJ)
Davis (CA)	Kind	Ruppersberger	Latta	Pence	Smith (TX)
Davis (IL)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Rush	Lee (NY)	Peters	Stearns
Davis (TN)	Kissell	Ryan (OH)	Lewis (CA)	Petri	Stutzman
DeFazio	Kucinich	Salazar	Linder	Pitts	Sullivan
DeGette	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda	LoBiondo	Platts	Taylor
DeLahunt	Larsen (WA)	T.	Lucas	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Luetkemeyer	Posey	Thornberry
Deutch	Levin	Sarbanes	Lummis	Price (GA)	Tiahrt
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky	Lungren, Daniel	Putnam	Tiberi
Dingell	Lipinski	Schauer	E.	Rehberg	Turner
Djou	Loeb	Schiff	Mack	Reichert	Upton
Doggett	Lofgren, Zoe	Schrader	Matheson	Roe (TN)	Walden
Doyle	Lowe	Schwartz	McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Wamp
Driehaus	Lujan	Scott (GA)	McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Westmoreland
Edwards (MD)	Lynch	Scott (VA)	McClintock	Rogers (MI)	Whitfield
Edwards (TX)	Maffei	Serrano	McCotter	Rohrabacher	Wilson (SC)
Ehlers	Maloney	Shea-Porter	McHenry	Rooney	Wittman
Ellison	Manullo	Sherman	McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Wolf
Engel	Marchant	Shuler	McMorris	Roskam	Young (FL)
Eshoo	Markey (CO)	Sires	Rodgers	Ross	
Etheridge	Markey (MA)	Skelton	Mica	Royce	
Farr	Marshall	Slaughter			
Fattah	Matsui	Smith (WA)			
Filner	McCarthy (NY)	Snyder	Boozman	Halvorson	Pingree (ME)
Foster	McCollum	Space	Braley (IA)	Kirk	Radanovich
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Speier	Fallin	Klein (FL)	Reyes
Fudge	McGovern	Spratt	Gallagher	Larson (CT)	Tanner
Garamendi	McIntyre	Stark	Gordon (TN)	Meek (FL)	Waxman
Gohmert	McMahon	Stupak			
Gonzalez	McNerney	Sutton			
Goodlatte	Meeks (NY)	Teague			
Grayson	Melancon	Terry			
Green, Al	Miller (NC)	Thompson (CA)			
Green, Gene	Miller, George	Thompson (MS)			
Grijalva	Minnick	Tierney			
Gutierrez	Mitchell	Titus			
Hall (NY)	Mollohan	Tonko			
Hare	Moore (KS)	Towns			
Harman	Moore (WI)	Tsongas			
Hastings (FL)	Moran (VA)	Van Hollen			
Heinrich	Murphy (CT)	Velázquez			
Hershey Sandlin	Murphy, Patrick	Visclosky			
Higgins	Nadler (NY)	Walz			
Hill	Napolitano	Wasserman			
Himes	Neal (MA)	Schultz			
Hinchey	Oberstar	Waters			
Hinojosa	Obey	Watson			
Hirono	Olson	Watt			
Hodes	Oliver	Weiner			
Holden	Ortiz	Welch			
Holt	Pallone	Wilson (OH)			
Honda	Pascrell	Woolsey			
Hoyer	Pastor (AZ)	Wu			
Inslie	Paul	Yarmuth			
Israel	Payne	Young (AK)			

NAYS—184

Aderholt	Buchanan	Ellsworth
Adler (NJ)	Burgess	Emerson
Akin	Burton (IN)	Flake
Alexander	Buyer	Fleming
Altmire	Calvert	Forbes
Austria	Camp	Fortenberry
Bachmann	Campbell	Fox
Bachus	Cantor	Franks (AZ)
Barrett (SC)	Cao	Frelinghuysen
Bartlett	Capito	Garrett (NJ)
Barton (TX)	Carter	Gerlach
Biggart	Cassidy	Giffords
Bilbray	Castle	Gingrey (GA)
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Granger
Bishop (NY)	Childers	Graves (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Coble	Graves (MO)
Blackburn	Coffman (CO)	Griffith
Blunt	Cole	Guthrie
Boehner	Conaway	Hall (TX)
Bonner	Connolly (VA)	Harper
Bono Mack	Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)
Boren	Culberson	Heller
Boustany	Davis (KY)	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Dent	Hergert
Bright	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hoekstra
Broun (GA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hunter
Brown (SC)	Donnelly (IN)	Inglis
Brown-Waite,	Dreier	Issa
Ginny	Duncan	Jenkins

Johnson (IL)	Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)
Johnson, Sam	Miller (MI)	Scalise
Jordan (OH)	Miller, Gary	Schmidt
King (IA)	Moran (KS)	Schock
King (NY)	Murphy (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Kingston	Murphy, Tim	Sessions
Kline (MN)	Myrick	Sestak
Kosmas	Neugebauer	Shadegg
Kratovil	Nunes	Shimkus
Lamborn	Nye	Shuster
Lance	Owens	Simpson
Latham	Paulsen	Smith (NE)
LaTourette	Pence	Smith (NJ)
Latta	Peters	Smith (TX)
Lee (NY)	Petri	Stearns
Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Stutzman
Linder	Platts	Sullivan
LoBiondo	Poe (TX)	Taylor
Lucas	Posey	Thompson (PA)
Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)	Thornberry
Lummis	Putnam	Tiahrt
Lungren, Daniel	Rehberg	Tiberi
E.	Reichert	Turner
Mack	Roe (TN)	Upton
Matheson	Rogers (AL)	Walden
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (KY)	Wamp
McCaul	Rogers (MI)	Westmoreland
McClintock	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
McCotter	Rooney	Wilson (SC)
McHenry	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman
McKeon	Roskam	Wolf
McMorris	Ross	Young (FL)
Rodgers	Royce	
Mica		

NOT VOTING—15

Boozman	Halvorson	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Kirk	Radanovich
Fallin	Klein (FL)	Reyes
Gallagher	Larson (CT)	Tanner
Gordon (TN)	Meek (FL)	Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1715

Messrs. GERLACH, BURTON of Indiana, ALTMIRE, Ms. GIFFORDS, and Mr. BISHOP of New York changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. HASTINGS of Florida, INSLEE, and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETO MESSAGE ON H.R. 3808, INTERSTATE RECOGNITION OF NOTARIZATIONS ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question whether the House, on reconsideration, will pass H.R. 3808, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

In accord with the Constitution, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, nays 235, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 573]

YEAS—185

Aderholt	Bachus	Biggart
Akin	Barrett (SC)	Bilbray
Alexander	Bartlett	Bilirakis
Austria	Barton (TX)	Bishop (UT)
Bachmann	Bean	Blackburn

Blunt	Graves (MO)	Owens	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Nadler (NY)	Schwartz
Boehner	Griffith	Paulsen	Kissell	Napolitano	Scott (GA)
Bonner	Guthrie	Paulsen	Kosmas	Neal (MA)	Scott (VA)
Bono Mack	Hall (TX)	Peterson	Kratovil	Nye	Serrano
Bono	Harper	Petri	Kucinich	Oberstar	Sestak
Boustany	Hastings (WA)	Pitts	Langevin	Obey	Shea-Porter
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Platts	Larsen (WA)	Olver	Sherman
Bralley (IA)	Herger	Poe (TX)	Larson (CT)	Ortiz	Sires
Bright	Hoekstra	Posey	Lee (CA)	Pallone	Skelton
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Price (GA)	Levin	Pascrell	Slaughter
Brown (SC)	Inglis	Putnam	Lewis (GA)	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (WA)
Brown-Waite,	Issa	Rehberg	Lipinski	Paul	Snyder
Ginny	Jenkins	Reichert	Loeb sack	Payne	Speier
Buchanan	Johnson (IL)	Roe (TN)	Lofgren, Zoe	Perlmutter	Spratt
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)	Lowey	Perriello	Stark
Burton (IN)	Jordan (OH)	Rogers (KY)	Lujan	Peters	Stupak
Buyer	King (IA)	Rohrabacher	Lynch	Polis (CO)	Sutton
Calvert	King (NY)	Rooney	Maffei	Pomeroy	Teague
Camp	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen	Maloney	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Campbell	Kline (MN)	Roskam	Markey (CO)	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Cantor	Lamborn	Royce	Markey (MA)	Rahall	Tierney
Cao	Lance	Ryan (WI)	Matheson	Rangel	Titus
Capito	Latham	Scalise	Matsui	Reyes	Tonko
Carnahan	LaTourette	Schmidt	McCarthy (NY)	Richardson	Towns
Carter	Latta	Schock	McCollum	Rodriguez	Tsongas
Cassidy	Lee (NY)	Sensenbrenner	McDermott	Rogers (MI)	Van Hollen
Castle	Lewis (CA)	Sessions	McGovern	Ross	Velázquez
Chaffetz	Linder	Shadegg	McIntyre	Rothman (NJ)	Visclosky
Coble	LoBiondo	Shimkus	McNeerney	Roybal-Allard	Walz
Coffman (CO)	Lucas	Shuler	Meeks (NY)	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
Cole	Luetkemeyer	Shuster	Melancon	Rush	Schultz
Conaway	Lummis	Simpson	Michaud	Ryan (OH)	Waters
Crenshaw	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (NE)	Miller (NC)	Salazar	Watson
Culberson	E.	Smith (NJ)	Miller, George	Sánchez, Linda	Watt
Davis (KY)	Mack	Smith (TX)	Mitchell	T.	Weiner
Dent	Manzullo	Space	Mollohan	Sanchez, Loretta	Welch
Diaz-Balart, L.	Marchant	Stearns	Moore (KS)	Sarbanes	Wilson (OH)
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (CA)	Stutzman	Moore (WI)	Schakowsky	Woolsey
Donnelly (IN)	McCaul	Sullivan	Moran (VA)	Schauer	Yarmuth
Dreier	McClintock	Taylor	Murphy (CT)	Schiff	
Duncan	McCotter	Terry	Murphy, Patrick	Schrader	
Ehlers	McHenry	Thompson (PA)			
Ellison	McKeon	Thornberry			
Emerson	McMahon	Tiaht	Boozman	Kirk	Radanovich
Flake	McMorris	Tiberi	Fallin	Klein (FL)	Tanner
Fleming	Rodgers	Turner	Galleghy	Marshall	Waxman
Forbes	Mica	Upton	Gordon (TN)	Meeke (FL)	
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Walden	Halvorson	Pingree (ME)	
Foxx	Miller (MI)	Wamp			
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland			
Frelinghuysen	Minnick	Whitfield			
Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)	Wilson (SC)			
Gerlach	Murphy (NY)	Wittman			
Gingrey (GA)	Murphy, Tim	Wolf			
Gohmert	Myrick	Wu			
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Young (AK)			
Granger	Nunes	Young (FL)			
Graves (GA)	Olson				

NAYS—235

Ackerman	Cooper	Grayson
Adler (NJ)	Costa	Green, Al
Altmire	Costello	Green, Gene
Andrews	Courtney	Grijalva
Arcuri	Critz	Gutierrez
Baca	Crowley	Hall (NY)
Baird	Cuellar	Hare
Baldwin	Cummings	Harman
Barrow	Dahlkemper	Hastings (FL)
Becerra	Davis (AL)	Heinrich
Berkley	Davis (CA)	Heller
Berman	Davis (IL)	Herseth Sandlin
Berry	Davis (TN)	Higgins
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Hill
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Himes
Blumenauer	Delahunt	Hinchev
Bocchieri	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Boswell	Deutch	Hirono
Boucher	Dicks	Hodes
Boyd	Dingell	Holden
Brady (PA)	Djou	Holt
Brown, Corrine	Doggett	Honda
Butterfield	Doyle	Hoyer
Capps	Driehaus	Inslee
Capuano	Edwards (MD)	Israel
Cardoza	Edwards (TX)	Jackson (IL)
Carney	Ellsworth	Jackson Lee
Carson (IN)	Engel	(TX)
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Chandler	Etheridge	Johnson, E. B.
Childers	Farr	Jones
Chu	Fattah	Kagen
Clarke	Filner	Kanjorski
Clay	Foster	Kaptur
Cleaver	Frank (MA)	Kennedy
Clyburn	Fudge	Kildee
Cohen	Garamendi	Kilpatrick (MI)
Connolly (VA)	Giffords	Kilroy
Conyers	Gonzalez	Kind

Mr. Speaker, Congressman Pickett served in Congress representing the Second District of Virginia for 14 years, from 1987 to 2001, prior to that serving in the Virginia House of Delegates. He passed away on October 27 of this year at the age of 80.

Owen Pickett will be remembered as a man of resolve who understood that the best way to get things done was to work with people from both sides of the aisle. Congressman Pickett always put his constituents first. He stayed out of the partisan bickering that so many politicians fall prey to and instead focused his energy on how best to serve the people he represented.

A member of the Armed Services Committee during his entire tenure, he distinguished himself as an outspoken advocate for a strong, advanced, and superior military, an improved quality of life for our military personnel and their families, and enduring support of military facilities for the Greater Hampton Roads region.

Congressman Pickett was a friend of mine, a mentor, and a champion for our warfighters, and there are some here today who had the honor of serving in this body with him.

At this time I would like to yield to my colleague from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are saddened about the passing of our former colleague, Representative Owen Pickett, who served the Second Congressional District of Virginia from 1987 to 2001.

Owen was a respected and principled leader. Sometimes we really never get to know each other in this institution, and sometimes it is at the latest, sometimes almost never.

Owen was a good man, a decent man, very honest, very ethical, and very, very committed to the military. He was a tireless representative of the best interests of the Norfolk and Virginia Beach areas.

We extend our deepest sympathies to his wife, Sybil, his three daughters, and his family. I just want to say "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

[From the Virginian-Pilot, Oct. 29, 2010]

OWEN PICKETT: A PRACTICAL MAN

Tributes to Owen Pickett poured forth from members of both political parties after his death Wednesday at the age of 80.

That was testament to the respect that Pickett commanded from Republicans and Democrats across Hampton Roads and Virginia. For decades, he persuaded people of all persuasions to set aside their differences and accomplish important tasks with courage and good humor.

His ecumenical politics and practical bent attracted fans of every stripe and generation. No name comes up as consistently in Editorial Board interviews when candidates are asked which local leader they admire.

"I am deeply saddened to learn of the passing of my good friend Owen Pickett," said Gov. Bob McDonnell. "Owen dedicated his life to public service. He was a patriot. He served the commonwealth in the House of Delegates and our nation in the House of Representatives. That was his passion: service."

NOT VOTING—13

Boozman	Kirk	Radanovich
Fallin	Klein (FL)	Tanner
Galleghy	Marshall	Waxman
Gordon (TN)	Meeke (FL)	
Halvorson	Pingree (ME)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1724

Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, PASTOR, WELCH, AL GREEN of Texas, SCHRADER, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas and Ms. MARKEY of Colorado changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. DONNELLY of Indiana and HOEKSTRA changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The veto message and the bill are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF FORMER MEMBER OWEN PICKETT

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

Mr. NYE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a former colleague today, the late Congressman Owen Pickett, who passed away on October 27 of this year. Congressman Pickett dedicated his life to service to our military, to our veterans, and to his constituents.

A centrist Democrat and fiscal conservative, Pickett spent 14 years representing Virginia Beach in the House of Delegates. In 1986, he won election to Congress as the representative for Virginia's 2nd District, succeeding the similarly moderate G. William Whitehurst, a Republican.

In Washington, as in Richmond, Pickett burnished a reputation for being steady and unassuming, courtly and nonpartisan. Colleagues described him as an effective legislator who toiled behind the scenes as an advocate not just for military service members but for all of Hampton Roads.

Proof isn't limited to the 2nd District. The U.S. Customhouse in downtown Norfolk, for example, wasn't even part of Pickett's territory, but that didn't stop him from securing the federal funds needed to renovate it. Today, the building bears his name.

After leaving Congress in 2001, Pickett devoted himself to the community, spreading around some \$200,000 in leftover campaign funds to local charities and causes.

In Virginia Beach, where he made his home for more than half his life, Pickett helped found the Meals on Wheels program, the Virginia Beach Hospice and the Oceana Lions Club. He was president of the Princess Anne Rotary and Ruritan clubs and in 2003 was honored with the Virginia Beach Jaycees' First Citizen award.

But even outside elected office, Pickett retained influence. He spent his final years offering advice to any who sought it, whether they were Democrats, such as U.S. Sen. Jim Webb and Rep. Glenn Nye, or Republicans, including McDonnell and state Sen. Jeff McWaters.

"When I was trying to decide whether to run for state Senate, I called Congressman Pickett and he encouraged me to do so," McWaters said. "Though we sit on different sides of the political aisle, this never seemed to matter as much to him as getting the job done."

For a practical man like Pickett, there may be no higher praise.

[From the Virginian-Pilot Oct. 29, 2010]

FORMER 2ND DISTRICT CONGRESSMAN OWEN
PICKETT DIES

(By Julian Walker)

The three offices that former U.S. Rep. Owen B. Pickett maintained during his 14 years in Congress—in Norfolk, Virginia Beach and Washington—shared this feature: a sign that read, "This office belongs to the people of the 2nd congressional district of Virginia."

That simple motto, said those who knew him, exemplified Pickett's modest approach to elected office as a full-time post in which addressing constituent concerns was a priority and principle took precedence over partisanship.

"He took his job very seriously," said Jeanne Evans-Cox, who worked for Pickett throughout his congressional career. "I used to call him the 'quiet warrior' because he didn't say an awful lot, but he took everything in. He was a great listener. He would size up the issue, figure out his strategy, give me directions, and we'd move forward."

Pickett, 80, died Wednesday due to complications from congestive heart failure.

The Democrat leaves behind scores of admirers on both sides of the aisle after a lengthy career as a lawyer, an esteemed state and federal legislator, and finally an adviser who provided counsel to plenty of political hopefuls.

A native of rural Hanover County in suburban Richmond, Pickett was raised in humble conditions. His father died when he was a young child, leaving his mother and an older brother to help support the family, according to friends.

It was evident early on that Pickett had a keen intellect, but he never used it to avoid hard work, recalled his lifelong friend George Campbell.

The pair attended Virginia Tech together, beginning in the late 1940s. Their paths separated when Pickett headed to law school at the University of Richmond, but the friendship endured. Campbell, who still lives in Hanover, routinely checked on a tract of land Pickett owned in central Virginia.

Campbell said that when they last spoke by phone about a week ago, Pickett realized the end was near and was at peace with it.

"We maintained a very close relationship, and I'd say he's the best friend I ever really had," Campbell said.

Many who knew Pickett had a similarly strong affection for him.

Ken Geroe, a Virginia Beach lawyer and longtime Pickett ally, called the late congressman a "dear friend and a mentor," adding "there's a hole in my life that won't be filled."

Geroe said he came to Pickett's attention through his work on Gerald Baliles' successful gubernatorial campaign in 1985, a contest in which the former congressman had a leadership role.

"He probably started talking to me because I was the only person at his desk at 6:30 in the morning he could talk to," said Geroe, a former Democratic chairman of the 2nd Congressional District.

Pickett failed in a 1967 run for Beach commonwealth's attorney, but election success didn't elude him for long. He won a House of Delegates race in 1971 and served 15 years in the state legislature before his election to Congress in 1986.

A Blue Dog Democrat with a sharp focus on military issues because of the nature of his district, Pickett often partnered with other House members regardless of party to protect local interests, said Evans-Cox.

Added former Pickett intern Walter Valencia: "He didn't mind crossing party lines if it benefited the district and the state. . . . He just took care of his people."

Pickett retired in 2001, in part because he'd become disenchanted with the growing rancor on Capitol Hill, Evans-Cox said, noting that Pickett mused about a Congress that had evolved from a place where "people did things the right way" to one where officials worked "against each other for partisan purposes, not a common goal."

Pickett was more pithy when he announced in 1999 that he would not seek reelection.

"When Washington, D.C., begins to look better in your rear view mirror than it does in your windshield, you know it is time to consider making a change," he said, according to an account in *The Virginian-Pilot*.

Stepping away from Washington didn't entirely keep Pickett out of politics.

He mentored candidates who sought his guidance, including former state Finance Secretary Jody Wagner, who unsuccessfully sought to succeed him, and more recently, 2009 Democratic gubernatorial candidate Terry McAuliffe.

Another post-retirement pastime was a weekly Saturday lunch with friends at Black Angus Restaurant in the Beach that featured lively discussions about everything except politics, said eatery co-owner Michael Savvides.

When the group met a few weeks ago, Savvides said, Pickett confided that "he had a wonderful life and he didn't mind if he died, believe it or not. It's ironic, but he did say that. . . . I guess he was ready. I guess he had enough."

Mr. NYE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Hampton Roads and the Commonwealth of Virginia lost a dedicated public servant. I had the honor and privilege of serving with Owen both in the Virginia House of Delegates as well as Congress, and I join my colleague Mr. MORAN, in stating that Owen Pickett was a true statesman and effective legislator who enjoyed great respect on both sides of the aisle.

As has already been pointed out, although he retired almost a decade ago, he remained an important, active voice on issues affecting Hampton Roads and the Commonwealth of Virginia. I thank my colleague from Virginia and all of my colleagues from Virginia for the great respect and admiration that they have shown to Owen Pickett.

Mr. NYE. I yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to join particularly with my friend FRANK WOLF, who is my good friend. We work very closely together.

Owen Pickett was the kind of Member that brought real respect to this institution. He worked on both sides of the aisle. He worked very strongly on behalf of our national security. He was a Member who was popular on both sides of the aisle. Owen Pickett and Norm Sisisky served together on this side of the aisle with Frank and me for many years.

Owen Pickett was someone who this institution could have justifiable pride in. We could look to him and say that is the kind of Member, frankly, that we all ought to be, showing respect for one another, working with one another on behalf of the American people and their security.

I rise to extend great sympathy to his family, but much more importantly than that, to give thanks on behalf of this institution and on behalf of our country for his extraordinary service.

Mr. NYE. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the House now observe a moment of silence to remember Congressman Owen Pickett, a former Member who will be dearly missed in southeast Virginia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will all Members please rise.

SERGEANT ROBERT BARRETT
POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5758) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2 Government Center in Fall River, Massachusetts, as the "Sergeant Robert Barrett Post Office Building," on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 574]

YEAS—417

Ackerman	Conyers	Herseth Sandlin
Aderholt	Cooper	Higgins
Adler (NJ)	Costa	Hill
Akin	Costello	Himes
Alexander	Courtney	Hinchey
Altmire	Crenshaw	Hinojosa
Andrews	Critz	Hirono
Arcuri	Crowley	Hodes
Austria	Cuellar	Hoekstra
Baca	Culberson	Holden
Bachmann	Cummings	Holt
Bachus	Dahlkemper	Honda
Baird	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Baldwin	Davis (IL)	Hunter
Barrett (SC)	Davis (KY)	Inglis
Barrow	Davis (TN)	Inslee
Bartlett	DeFazio	Israel
Barton (TX)	DeGette	Issa
Bean	DeLauro	Jackson (IL)
Becerra	Dent	Jackson Lee
Berkley	Deutch	Jenkins
Berman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson (GA)
Berry	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (IL)
Biggart	Dicks	Johnson, E. B.
Billray	Dingell	Johnson, Sam
Bilirakis	Djou	Jones
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Jordan (OH)
Bishop (NY)	Donnelly (IN)	Kagen
Bishop (UT)	Doyle	Kanjorski
Blackburn	Dreier	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Drieheaus	Kildee
Boccheri	Duncan	Kilpatrick (MI)
Boehner	Edwards (MD)	Kilroy
Bonner	Edwards (TX)	Kind
Bono Mack	Ehlers	King (IA)
Boren	Ellison	King (NY)
Boswell	Ellsworth	Kingston
Boucher	Emerson	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Boustany	Engel	Kissell
Boyd	Eshoo	Kline (MN)
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Kosmas
Brady (TX)	Farr	Kratovil
Brale (IA)	Fattah	Kucinich
Bright	Filner	Lamborn
Broun (GA)	Flake	Lance
Brown (SC)	Fleming	Langevin
Brown, Corrine	Forbes	Larsen (WA)
Brown-Waite,	Ginny	Larsen (CT)
Ginny	Fortenberry	Latham
Buchanan	Foster	LaTourette
Burgess	Fox	Latta
Burton (IN)	Frank (MA)	Lee (CA)
Butterfield	Frank (AZ)	Lee (NY)
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Levin
Calvert	Fudge	Lewis (CA)
Camp	Garamendi	Lewis (GA)
Campbell	Garrett (NJ)	Linder
Cantor	Gerlach	Lipinski
Cao	Giffords	LoBiondo
Capito	Gingrey (GA)	Loehsack
Capps	Gohmert	Lofgren, Zoe
Capuano	Gonzalez	Lowe
Cardoza	Goodlatte	Lucas
Carnahan	Granger	Luetkemeyer
Carney	Graves (GA)	Lujan
Carson (IN)	Graves (MO)	Lummis
Carter	Grayson	Lungren, Daniel
Cassidy	Green, Al	E.
Castle	Green, Gene	Lynch
Castor (FL)	Griffith	Mack
Chaffetz	Grijalva	Maffei
Chandler	Guthrie	Maloney
Childers	Gutierrez	Manzullo
Chu	Hall (NY)	Marchant
Clarke	Hall (TX)	Markey (CO)
Clay	Hare	Markey (MA)
Cleaver	Harman	Marshall
Clyburn	Harper	Matheson
Coble	Hastings (FL)	Matsui
Coffman (CO)	Hastings (WA)	McCarthy (CA)
Cohen	Heinrich	McCarthy (NY)
Cole	Heller	McCaul
Conaway	Hensarling	McClintock
Connolly (VA)	Herger	McCollum
		McCotter

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 3, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 575]

YEAS—417

Ackerman	Cooper	Hill
Aderholt	Costa	Himes
Adler (NJ)	Costello	Hinchey
Akin	Courtney	Hinojosa
Alexander	Crenshaw	Hirono
Altmire	Critz	Hodes
Andrews	Crowley	Hoekstra
Arcuri	Cuellar	Holden
Austria	Culberson	Holt
Baca	Cummings	Honda
Bachmann	Dahlkemper	Hoyer
Bachus	Davis (CA)	Hunter
Baird	Davis (IL)	Inglis
Baldwin	Davis (KY)	Inslee
Barrett (SC)	Davis (TN)	Israel
Barrow	DeGette	Issa
Bartlett	DeLauro	Jackson (IL)
Barton (TX)	Dent	Jackson Lee
Bean	Deutch	(TX)
Becerra	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jenkins
Berkley	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (GA)
Berman	Dicks	Johnson (IL)
Berry	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.
Biggart	Djou	Johnson, Sam
Billray	Doggett	Jones
Bilirakis	Donnelly (IN)	Jordan (OH)
Bishop (GA)	Doyle	Kagen
Bishop (NY)	Dreier	Kanjorski
Bishop (UT)	Drieheaus	Kaptur
Blackburn	Duncan	Kildee
Blumenauer	Edwards (MD)	Kilpatrick (MI)
Boccheri	Edwards (TX)	Kilroy
Boehner	Ehlers	Kind
Bonner	Ellison	King (IA)
Bono Mack	Ellsworth	King (NY)
Boren	Emerson	Kingston
Boswell	Engel	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Boucher	Eshoo	Kissell
Boustany	Etheridge	Kline (MN)
Boyd	Farr	Kosmas
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Kratovil
Brady (TX)	Filner	Kucinich
Brale (IA)	Flake	Lamborn
Bright	Fleming	Lance
Broun (GA)	Forbes	Langevin
Brown (SC)	Fortenberry	Larsen (WA)
Brown, Corrine	Foster	Larsen (CT)
Brown-Waite,	Fox	Latham
Ginny	Frank (MA)	LaTourette
Buchanan	Frank (AZ)	Latta
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Lee (CA)
Burton (IN)	Fudge	Lee (NY)
Butterfield	Garamendi	Levin
Buyer	Garrett (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Calvert	Gerlach	Lewis (GA)
Camp	Giffords	Linder
Campbell	Gingrey (GA)	Lipinski
Cantor	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Cao	Gonzalez	Loehsack
Capito	Goodlatte	Lofgren, Zoe
Capps	Granger	Lowe
Capuano	Graves (GA)	Lucas
Cardoza	Graves (MO)	Luetkemeyer
Carnahan	Grayson	Lujan
Carney	Green, Al	Lummis
Carson (IN)	Green, Gene	Lungren, Daniel
Carter	Griffith	E.
Cassidy	Grijalva	Lynch
Castle	Guthrie	Mack
Castor (FL)	Gutierrez	Maffei
Chandler	Hall (NY)	Maloney
Childers	Hall (TX)	Manzullo
Chu	Hare	Marchant
Clarke	Harman	Markey (CO)
Clay	Harper	Markey (MA)
Cleaver	Hastings (FL)	Marshall
Clyburn	Hastings (WA)	Matheson
Coble	Heinrich	Matsui
Coffman (CO)	Heller	McCarthy (CA)
Cohen	Hensarling	McCarthy (NY)
Cole	Herger	McCaul
Conaway	Herseth Sandlin	McClintock
Connolly (VA)	Higgins	McCollum
Conyers		McCotter

NOT VOTING—16

Blunt	Halvorson	Radanovich
Boozman	Kennedy	Simpson
Davis (AL)	Kirk	Tanner
Fallin	Klein (FL)	Velázquez
Galleghy	Minnick	
Gordon (TN)	Pingree (ME)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1738

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING COACH JOE PATERNO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1715) congratulating Joe Paterno on his 400th win as Penn State Nittany Lions football head coach, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

McDermott	Poe (TX)	Sires
McGovern	Polis (CO)	Skelton
McHenry	Pomeroy	Smith (NE)
McIntyre	Posey	Smith (NJ)
McKeon	Price (GA)	Smith (TX)
McMahon	Price (NC)	Smith (WA)
McMorris	Putnam	Snyder
Rodgers	Quigley	Space
McNerney	Rahall	Speier
Meek (FL)	Rangel	Spratt
Meeks (NY)	Rehberg	Stark
Melancon	Reichert	Stearns
Mica	Reyes	Stupak
Michaud	Richardson	Stutzman
Miller (FL)	Rodriguez	Sullivan
Miller (MI)	Roe (TN)	Sutton
Miller (NC)	Rogers (AL)	Taylor
Miller, Gary	Rogers (KY)	Teague
Miller, George	Rogers (MI)	Terry
Minnick	Rohrabacher	Thompson (CA)
Mitchell	Rooney	Thompson (MS)
Mollohan	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (PA)
Moore (KS)	Roskam	Thornberry
Moore (WI)	Ross	Tiahrt
Moran (KS)	Rothman (NJ)	Tiberi
Moran (VA)	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Murphy (CT)	Royce	Titus
Murphy (NY)	Ruppersberger	Tonko
Murphy, Patrick	Rush	Towns
Murphy, Tim	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas
Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Nadler (NY)	Salazar	Upton
Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Neal (MA)	T.	Velázquez
Neugebauer	Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Nunes	Sarbanes	Walden
Nye	Scalise	Walz
Oberstar	Schakowsky	Wamp
Obey	Schauer	Wasserman
Olson	Schiff	Schultz
Olver	Schmidt	Waters
Ortiz	Schock	Watson
Owens	Schrader	Watt
Pallone	Schwartz	Waxman
Pascrell	Scott (GA)	Weiner
Pastor (AZ)	Scott (VA)	Welch
Paul	Sensenbrenner	Westmoreland
Paulsen	Serrano	Whitfield
Payne	Sessions	Wilson (OH)
Pence	Sestak	Wilson (SC)
Perlmutter	Shadegg	Wittman
Perriello	Shea-Porter	Wolf
Peters	Sherman	Woolsey
Peterson	Shimkus	Wu
Petri	Shuler	Yarmuth
Pitts	Shuster	Young (AK)
Platts	Simpson	Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Chaffetz	DeFazio	Slaughter
----------	---------	-----------

NOT VOTING—13

Blunt	Gordon (TN)	Pingree (ME)
Boozman	Halvorson	Radanovich
Davis (AL)	Kennedy	Tanner
Fallin	Kirk	
Gallely	Klein (FL)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

1745

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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

CONDEMNING BURMESE REGIME'S UNDEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1677) condemning the Burmese regime's undemocratic upcoming elections on November 7, 2010, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1677

Whereas the current military regime, officially known as the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC), known previously as the State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC), held multi-party elections in 1990;

Whereas despite the threat and pressure by the military regime to vote for the candidates of the military-backed National Unity Party (NUP), the people of Burma voted 82 percent of parliament seats for the candidates of the National League for Democracy (NLD) party, led by formerly detained leader Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and allied ethnic political parties;

Whereas the military regime refused to honor the election results and arrested and imprisoned both democracy activists and elected members of parliament;

Whereas the SPDC over a period of 14 years held a National Convention to draft a new constitution in which the process was tightly controlled, repressive, and undemocratic;

Whereas the NLD walked out of the convention in 1995 because participants were not allowed to table alternative proposals or voice disagreement with the military regime;

Whereas the people of Burma, led by democracy activists and Buddhist monks in August and September 2007, took to the streets for national reconciliation and the transition to democracy;

Whereas the military regime brutally crushed the peaceful protests, killing at least 31 people, leaving nearly 100 missing, and arresting 700 additional political prisoners bringing the number of Burma's political prisoners to approximately 2,100;

Whereas the SPDC has ignored the repeated requests of the United Nations and the international community to release all political prisoners and end attacks against civilians;

Whereas at the same time, the SPDC assigned a commission to draft a constitution on October 18, 2007, with 54 handpicked participants, in an attempt to ignore past election results, to lock in a process that excludes representatives of ethnic nationalities and the NLD from political participation, and to legitimize continued military rule;

Whereas the latest version of the draft constitution seeks to codify military rule by reserving 25 percent of parliamentary seats for military appointees, permits the head of the military to intervene in national politics, and ensures that key government ministries are held by military officers;

Whereas amidst the crisis in parts of the country caused by Cyclone Nargis, the country's military junta staged a referendum to force through a new constitution, drafted without input from the opposition;

Whereas the vote for the referendum did not follow a free and fair democratic process;

Whereas conditions prior to the referendum consisted of repression, a lack of a

free media, and a lack of an independent referendum commission and courts to supervise the vote;

Whereas the amnesty provision of the constitution removes any rights for civil redress for victims of crimes committed by the military and leaders of the democratic opposition have refused to accept this constitution;

Whereas the amnesty provision is a blatant attempt to legitimize the systematic violence in the country for all junta inflicted crimes;

Whereas the ruling military junta in Burma has one of the worst human rights records in the world and routinely violates the rights of Burmese citizens, including the systematic use of rape as a weapon of war, extrajudicial killings, arbitrary arrests and detention, torture, as well as slave and child labor, including child soldiers;

Whereas the previous detention of Aung San Suu Kyi by the Burmese military regime contravenes Article 9 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and has drawn widespread condemnation from around the world;

Whereas in March 2010, the military regime announced laws governing the elections, including the Union Election Commission Law, giving their handpicked members complete authority to convene the election, along with final decisionmaking power, regarding election postponement, rejection, monitoring, forming sub-commissions, formation of constituencies, compiling list of eligible voters, and forming of tribunals to judge election dispute;

Whereas articles 4 and 10 of the Political Parties Registration Law bans all monks, nuns, and leaders of other religions, government staff, political prisoners and prisoners, foreigners, and members of and those related to unlawful associations and insurgent groups from forming and participating in a political party, further stating that failure to expel such individuals from your political party will result in abolishment of the political party;

Whereas article 6 of the Political Parties Registration Law states that all political parties must pledge to abide and protect the military regime's undemocratic and fraudulent 2008 constitution;

Whereas the NLD refused to re-register under such unjust election laws that would have forced them to expel their leader Aung San Suu Kyi and pledge support for the regime's undemocratic constitution;

Whereas the military regime's election commission released severely restrictive political party campaign rules banning all marches, chanting, and flags and also prohibits any speeches or publications that criticize the military regime;

Whereas the election commission can de-register any political party at their discretion;

Whereas it is impossible under the regime's 2008 constitution and 2010 election laws for the election to be free, fair, inclusive, or democratic; and

Whereas the November 7 election was marked by widespread fraud, voter intimidation, cheating, and irregularities reported throughout the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) denounces the one-sided, undemocratic, and illegitimate actions of the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC) that seek to legitimize military rule through a flawed election process;

(2) denounces the military regime's dissolution of the National League for Democracy and insists that no government in Burma can be considered democratic or legitimate without the participation of Aung

San Suu Kyi, the National League for Democracy, and ethnic nationalities and the full restoration of democracy, freedom of assembly, freedom of movement, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and internationally recognized human rights for all Burmese citizens;

(3) insists that Burma's military regime begin an immediate transition toward national reconciliation, and the full restoration of democracy, freedom of assembly, freedom of movement, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and internationally recognized human rights for all Burmese citizens;

(4) demands the immediate and unconditional release of detained Buddhist monks and all other political prisoners and prisoners of conscience;

(5) calls on the Administration to not support or recognize the military regime's elections as legitimate;

(6) calls on the Burmese junta to change the current flawed constitution by permitting members of the democratic opposition and ethnic minorities to participate in government;

(7) calls for full accountability of those responsible for human rights violations;

(8) urges support for a credible and robust international inquiry to investigate the Burmese regime's war crimes, crimes against humanity, and system of impunity; and

(9) calls for the Administration to fully implement the Tom Lantos Block Burmese JADE Act of 2008 by nominating the Special Representative and Policy Coordinator on Burma and imposing appropriate financial sanctions to facilitate the priorities expressed in paragraphs (1) through (8).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself such time as I may consume.

On November 7, 2010, Burma held its first election in 20 years. This should have been an important milestone for the 55 million people of that impoverished nation, but instead, it was more of the same. The ruling junta fixed the process to ensure its continuing domination, and the vote was marred by widespread fraud and intimidation.

This important resolution condemns the military regime's blatantly undemocratic effort to legitimize its rule through a sham election process.

In 1990, Aung San Suu Kyi's National League for Democracy, referred to as the "NLD party," handily won free and fair elections, but the junta refused to honor the results and, instead, arrested and imprisoned democratically elected members of parliament and democracy activists.

□ 1750

More recently, in 2007, thousands of ordinary Burmese citizens and Buddhist monks led a series of peaceful demonstrations calling for more openness and respect for human rights, only to be brutally crushed by the regime. Today, there are more than 2,200 political prisoners and prisoners of conscience languishing in Burmese prisons in the worst possible conditions.

The junta claims that the Burmese constitution of 2008 is part of a "roadmap to democracy," but in reality, that bogus document maintains power in the hands of military appointees, permits the head of the military to intervene in national policy, and ensures that key government ministries are held by junta officials. Under this framework, true democracy is impossible.

The regime's recent decision to release Aung San Suu Kyi, the iconic leader of Burma's democracy movement, is a transparent attempt to divert attention from its fraudulent election.

The international community must speak with one voice to condemn the results of the November 7 election; press the Burmese junta to respect basic human rights and allow freedom of expression and freedom of association; call for the release of political prisoners; and support national reconciliation between the junta, Aung San Suu Kyi, and ethnic leaders.

We must also continue to press for a robust international inquiry into the regime's crimes against humanity and war crimes, and do everything we can to end the systemic use of rape as a weapon of war, extrajudicial killings, torture, and child labor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Today, I rise in strong opposition to the recent sham election that took place in Burma on November 7. As the sponsor of this important resolution, I want to lend a public voice for many people yearning to see democracy take real root in Burma.

The purpose of the election is crystal clear: to entrench the military junta's rule under a cloak of democracy. Notwithstanding the release of Aung San Suu Kyi, the junta's actions cannot be an excuse to draw the curtain closed on so many people in Burma who yearn for the fresh breath of freedom.

While claiming the pro-junta party won 80 percent of the vote in the sham election, the Burmese regime clearly demonstrated its adherence to Chairman Mao's famous dictum that "political power comes from the barrel of a gun."

To make matters worse, just as rigged election results were being reported, junta troops engaged in shoot-outs with ethnic minority forces in border areas, sending tens of thousands of refugees fleeing into Thailand. Artillery fire even flew over the border, injuring refugees, Thai civilians, and Thai soldiers on the Thai side. Shelling your peaceful neighbor is no way for any government to conduct an election.

And while we all laud the release of the acclaimed Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi, no one should be fooled into thinking that the Burmese junta leopard has changed its spots. The junta has treated Aung San Suu Kyi like its political yo-yo, letting her out and then pulling her back in whenever it has served the regime's political whims. Having gotten her out of the way during the critical runup to the bogus elections, the regime has now decided it is time to place her again in the world spotlight.

But we cannot for one moment forget that there are an estimated 2,500 other political prisoners, including brave monks and ordinary citizens from the Saffron Revolution 3 years ago, who still languish in the Burmese gulag. Until these others are free, Aung San Suu Kyi and Burma are indeed truly not free.

In 2008, I led the effort, along with my friend from New York, Representative JOE CROWLEY, to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Aung San Suu Kyi. We must never forget the strength and hope that she represents. We must never be fooled into believing that this time there really will be change in Burma.

A flawed election process cannot hide the fact that until a sincere, transparent dialogue of political transformation is begun with the opposition, there can be no true democracy and rule of law in Burma. One need only recall that Hitler and Stalin had elections also, and they were just as meaningless.

This raises the whole question of the value of engagement with a regime which hunts down refugees and shells its neighbor in the aftermath of bogus elections. The administration clings to the desperate hope that talking to dictatorial thugs with no preconditions will lead to a world of peace and harmony. The Burmese junta and their bogus elections demonstrate the naive assumption behind this approach to foreign policy.

The release of Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi from house arrest, however, still leaves one Peace Prize laureate behind bars. That is the recent Prize recipient, Chinese dissident Liu Xiaobo. It seems high time for the rulers in Beijing to follow the example of their Burmese buddies and immediately release Mr. Liu. Governments which fear lone voices of conscience like Aung San Suu Kyi and Mr. Liu can never be truly secure, no matter how much voter fraud they conduct to prop up their regimes.

I strongly and enthusiastically urge my colleagues to stand up for democracy and freedom in the proud ancient land of Burma and to wholeheartedly support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, RUSH D. HOLT.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from California.

I rise to express strong support for House Resolution 1677, offered by Mr. MANZULLO, and I rise to denounce the flawed, undemocratic election that took place in Burma earlier this month. For nearly half a century now, the liberties of the Burmese people have been held hostage by successive military rulers. The regime refused to honor the results of open elections held in recent decades and then forced the acceptance of a new, illegitimate constitution in a sham referendum. Last week, the junta once again chose to disregard the will of the Burmese people by staging a fraudulent election.

When I first visited Burma decades ago, I learned what a difference a misguided regime could make. Burma had been a vibrant country known as the "rice bowl of Asia." Burma had had a rich history, fertile land, abundant resources, and a productive population. In the years following the coup in the early 1960s, the authoritarian regime impoverished a nation and brutalized a people. The generals have rejected the choices of the Burmese citizens, imprisoned or killed political dissidents, and failed to address humanitarian suffering caused by their own mismanagement and by tragic natural disasters. The United States has a duty to stand firmly against the military's human rights abuses and to work for justice, reconciliation, and the rule of law in Burma.

I join with those around the world celebrating the recent release from house arrest of Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi, who has led the nonviolent struggle for democratic reforms in Burma, at great personal sacrifice, for over three decades. The outpouring of support and affection for her is a clear signal that the spirit of liberty endures among the Burmese people. Yet we must be mindful of history's lessons. The military junta will not tolerate actions that threaten its iron grip on power. That is why the United States must continue to pressure the regime to end its repressive practices and to accept an immediate transition toward a more democratic government that respects human rights and respects the aspirations of the Burmese people.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

□ 1800

Mr. MANZULLO. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEINRICH). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1677, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. WATSON. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

COMMEMORATING THE PERSIAN GULF WAR

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1672) commemorating the Persian Gulf War and reaffirming the commitment of the United States towards Persian Gulf War veterans, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1672

Whereas, on August 2, 1990, Iraq invaded the State of Kuwait, thereby initiating the Persian Gulf War;

Whereas in the months following Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait, the United Nations Security Council adopted 11 resolutions that, inter alia, demanded that Iraq unconditionally withdraw from Kuwait and imposed economic sanctions and other pressure against Saddam Hussein's dictatorship in Iraq;

Whereas on November 29, 1990, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 678, which authorized United Nations Member States to use all necessary means to uphold Resolution 660 (1990), which demanded that Iraq unconditionally withdraw from Kuwait;

Whereas on January 12, 1991, the United States Congress authorized the United States Armed Forces to help the State of Kuwait defend itself against the Iraqi invasion;

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States, joined by coalition partners, overwhelmed the enemy in a short, decisive military campaign of less than 30 days;

Whereas the hostilities ended in a ceasefire declared by President George H.W. Bush on February 28, 1991, one hundred hours after the ground campaign began;

Whereas during the Persian Gulf War, approximately 694,550 members of the United States Armed Forces served in-theater along with the forces of over 30 other members of the United Nations;

Whereas casualties of the United States during the Persian Gulf War included 383 dead (of whom 148 were battle deaths), and more than 467 wounded;

Whereas approximately 2,225,000 American men and women served worldwide in the Armed Forces during the entire Gulf War era;

Whereas approximately 174,000 veterans suffer from illnesses related to service during the Persian Gulf War, including Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses;

Whereas Congress notes the Institute of Medicine's report, "Gulf War and Health", released on April 9, 2010; encourages the Department of Veterans Affairs task force to identify recommendations from this report to better treat illnesses related to service during the Persian Gulf War, including Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses; and reaffirms the commitment of the United States towards Persian Gulf War veterans;

Whereas since the end of the Persian Gulf War era, an average of more than 2,000 members of the United States Armed Forces have served annually in Kuwait to defend the State of Kuwait against external aggression, and to promote regional peace;

Whereas in addition to their participation in the Gulf War to liberate Kuwait, United States service members have maintained a significant military presence in the Gulf for decades and played a key role in defending United States interests and allies in the Gulf region; and

Whereas beginning in August 2010, various ceremonies are being planned in the United States to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Persian Gulf War and to honor all Persian Gulf War veterans: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the historical importance of the 20th anniversary of the Persian Gulf War, which began on August 2, 1990;

(2) honors the noble service and sacrifice of the United States Armed Forces and the armed forces of allied countries that served in the Persian Gulf since 1990 to the present;

(3) encourages all Americans to participate in commemorative activities to pay solemn tribute to, and to never forget, the veterans of the Persian Gulf War;

(4) calls upon the President to issue a proclamation recognizing the 20th anniversary of the Persian Gulf War; and

(5) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to peace and prosperity in the Persian Gulf region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1672, which commemorates the Persian Gulf War of 1991 and reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the well-being of Persian Gulf War veterans.

More than 20 years ago, on August 2, 1990, Saddam Hussein ordered his army into Kuwait, starting a crisis that would lead to war. Although some predicted that Iraq's incursion would be limited, within hours Iraqi forces had seized downtown Kuwait City and were headed south toward the Saudi Arabian border, occupying all of Kuwait along the way. What followed was the largest build-up of American forces since the Vietnam War. Within a short period, members of the 82nd Airborne Division, as well as 300 combat aircraft, were headed for Saudi Arabia. By the end of September 1990, there were nearly 200,000 American personnel in Saudi Arabia ready to repel an Iraqi attack.

Realizing the magnitude of Iraq's invasion, the President ordered additional soldiers to the Persian Gulf. During that period, an international coalition was formed, with more than 30 nations joining the effort to repel Iraqi aggression. On November 29, the U.N. Security Council passed a resolution authorizing the use of force if Iraq did not withdraw from Kuwait by January 15; and on the morning of January 16, 1991, allied forces began the first phase of Operation Desert Storm. After a 38-day air campaign, Operation Desert Sabre, a massive ground attack, was launched by American and coalition forces into both Iraq and Kuwait. One hundred hours after the ground campaign began, the President declared a cease-fire.

Mr. Speaker, our men and women in uniform did win that war. Their bravery in battle liberated a country and defended our friends from Saddam Hussein's aggression. We recall with special appreciation the 383 men and women who gave the ultimate sacrifice and the 467 who were wounded, as well as the thousands of veterans who, to this day, suffer from illnesses related to their Gulf War service.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us recognizes the historical importance of the 20th anniversary of the Persian Gulf War. It honors the noble service and sacrifice of the United States Armed Forces that have served in the Persian Gulf during that war and since, and it encourages all Americans to participate in commemorative activities to pay tribute to the veterans of the Persian Gulf War. It also calls upon the President to issue a proclamation recognizing the war's 20th anniversary and reaffirms the commitment of the United States to peace and prosperity in the Persian Gulf region. I strongly support this resolution, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do as well.

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

Mr. MANZULLO. I rise in support of the resolution and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, on August 2, 1990, Saddam Hussein's Iraqi regime invaded and occupied nearby Kuwait. In response, the United States stood firmly against this act of aggression and led a strong coalition of responsible nations in making clear that Saddam's actions would not be tolerated. As a result of U.S. leadership, the U.N. Security Council adopted almost a dozen separate resolutions that, among other things, demanded that Iraq unconditionally withdraw from Kuwait and increased economic sanctions and other pressure against Saddam's dictatorship.

On November 29, 1990, the U.N. Security Council authorized the use of all necessary means to compel Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait. Congress voted on January 12, 1991, to authorize America's Armed Forces to enforce the U.N. Security Council's resolutions with respect to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, when called to action, our men and women in uniform, almost 700,000 of whom served in the theater, fulfilled their mission in an exemplary manner with valor and honor. Joined by our coalition partners, the U.S. military overwhelmed Saddam's forces and drove them out of Kuwait in a decisive campaign that lasted fewer than 30 days. Sadly, during the Gulf War, 383 Americans made the ultimate sacrifice, giving their lives in service to our Nation, and more than 460 others were wounded.

Among those who died was a young flight surgeon from Rochelle, Illinois, by the name of Dr. Koritz, when his jet aircraft was shot down. Further, over 170,000 returning veterans of the Gulf War have suffered from serious health problems.

In 2001, I authored the Persian Gulf War Illness Compensation Act to make sure that our veterans receive compensation from illnesses as a result of Gulf War syndrome. This legislation garnered the support of more than half the House of Representatives, and it was later signed into law by the President of the United States. It was thanks to the loving dedication of Donna Steele, the widow of Gulf War veteran Dan Steele from Freeport, Illinois, that helped me understand the devastating nature of Gulf War syndrome.

Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Gulf War, we must honor the service and sacrifice made by servicemembers and veterans. Further, we must reaffirm our determination to ensure peace and stability in the gulf region which is a key U.S. interest. Accordingly, I am proud to support House Resolution 1672 and thank my friend from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) for introducing this measure.

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine, MICHAEL MICHAUD.

Mr. MICHAUD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 1672, a measure I have introduced to commemorate the Persian Gulf War and reaffirm our Nation's commitment to the veterans who served in it. A cease-fire was declared by President George Bush on February 28, 1991, 100 hours after the ground campaign began.

□ 1810

Yet, this war is far from over for the veterans who served so courageously in the gulf. In fact, an estimated 174,000 still suffer from Gulf War illness, including Gulf War syndrome. These veterans and their families must now wage a campaign of a different sort within the VA system.

This includes my constituent, Michelle Comeau, of Dixfield, Maine, who was exposed to toxic sarin gas as a member of the Army National Guard. This led to unbearable migraines that

have since rendered her 100 percent disabled. In addition, her two daughters were subsequently born with rare birth defects, and have since developed symptoms similar to their mother.

Sadly, Michelle and many other veterans and their families across the country continue to suffer. Not enough is known about these illnesses, including whether or not it can be passed from one generation to the next. Because of this, it is critical that VA continues its research efforts on illnesses of Gulf War veterans.

This resolution we consider today commemorates the Gulf War and honors the noble service and sacrifice of veterans who served there. So it is also fitting that Veterans' Affairs Committee Ranking Member STEVE BUYER is here today to speak on behalf of this resolution.

In addition to being a Persian Gulf veteran himself, Congressman BUYER began his career as a Member of Congress by leading efforts to create a national Persian Gulf War veterans registry. This important program was set up to provide a comprehensive physical exam and to track the special health concerns of veterans who served in the gulf.

I want to thank Congressman BUYER for his service to this great Nation of ours, but also thank him for his service, his time here in Congress, which I enjoyed working with him on the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me today in supporting House Resolution 1672, to encourage all Americans to remember and pay tribute to those veterans, and to let them know that their struggles and sacrifices will never be forgotten.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, it is a real honor and privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER). He is the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs. He and I are classmates. We trained in school together to run as Members of Congress. He is a dear, dear friend. Our offices are on the same hall. Unfortunately, he is going to be leaving Congress this year.

Mr. BUYER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois, and I also thank you for your friendship and your personal counsel over the years. Likewise, I am so pleased that your wife continues to do well.

And to my friend, MIKE MICHAUD, MIKE—if I may have the latitude to address him by his first name, Mr. Speaker.

I don't mean to be nostalgic here for the moment, but I think when Members look back, they really don't remember all the difficult and challenging moments, they remember the things that really bring joy to their life. And one of the joys that I have in life is getting the opportunity to meet some real genuine people. And that's what MIKE MICHAUD of Maine is.

You are a genuine human being and it is your nature, it is your character,

it is your moral compass, the reason I use the word "genuine." You are truly one of the individuals that I will miss when I look back at Congress. I really will, MIKE.

I only wish your conference had made you chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I really do, because you and I could have done a lot of great things together.

In reality, the unwritten history will be the success of the committee occurred not by your current chairman, but because of the work-around solutions that we were able to do, by you and I working together, with STEPHANIE HERSETH and the Sergeant Major and VIC SNYDER. So history may not credit you, Mr. MICHAUD, for all the things you've done, but I'm going to stand on the floor and let everybody know all the great things that you have done for veterans in this country, and I am very proud of you. So as I stand here and I think of not only myself, but I think about my colleagues, I want to make sure that you deserve the full measure.

When I think about over 20 years ago, frankly, Saddam Hussein was pretty stupid. He decided to take seven of his Iraqi divisions and he invaded Kuwait. He committed incredible atrocities upon the people of Kuwait, and raped and pillaged the city of Kuwait City.

And when the President then immediately sent the 101st and the 82nd Airborne divisions as a blocking force to then protect Saudi Arabia, they had to build up the logistics of Saudi Arabia itself and activate reservists. Not since World War II had there been such a deployment, not only of the air, but of the sea and the activation of the Guard and reserve and bringing Seventh Corps out of Europe.

You see, Saddam Hussein decided to pick a fight, and he also then took on the United States at a time when the United States was its strongest. We had completed the Reagan build-up. Reagan built up our forces. A lot of good judgments were made back in the latter part of the 1970s and 1980s. Les Aspin, then the chairman of the committee, even though he made some policy changes with regard to how soldiers were going to be paid, and those pay issues got resolved later, in the latter part of the 1990s, Les Aspin, and then the Democrat control of the Armed Services Committee, though, worked then with Ronald Reagan and built up our force. And that was about standing down the Soviet Union. So as we then stood down the Soviet Union, we had a military that was extraordinarily powerful. And Saddam Hussein took on America at a time when we were the most powerful.

Now, with regard to our combat experience, the combat experience for the Gulf War was truly also of value, in that our senior level leadership, the senior NCOs, the First Sergeants, the Sergeants Major, the Colonels, the General Officer Corps, the Admirals, they were Vietnam veterans. So as we

went into Operations Desert Shield/Desert Storm, the leadership in that war, they said, well, we know what happened during Vietnam, and they always prided themselves that if they ever got themselves in another fight they were going to do things differently. So there was going to be no such thing as rotation. That's what happened in Vietnam.

So when we arrived in theater in the first Gulf War, duration was the theme, not rotation, meaning we will be here so long as it's necessary to throw Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. As it turns out it was 100 days. That was a 100-day ground war. What isn't counted, though, is everything that it took to pull off a 100-day ground war.

Bringing out so many of the guardsmen and reservists was extraordinary. What was amazing about all this is that that type of a call-up of all the guardsmen and reservists to then support the active elements actually was bringing America to the war. When you pull out a teacher, you pull out someone who leads the church choir, you pull out someone who is the butcher and the baker and you then send them to war, you're bringing America to war. And America really at the time was a little shocked.

I mean, some of us, for myself the call-up was in 3 days. I got a notice and I was gone in 3 days. And it was a pretty extraordinary moment, not only in my life but in a lot of people's lives.

When I think back at all of this, I really compliment the extraordinary leadership, not only of then Dick Cheney, but also of Colin Powell and Norman Schwarzkopf. But I also look back with great pride of the men and women in theater. I believe that the active duty, of whom had always sort of looked down and chastised the reserve components, had new respect for the reserve components. And I look back at the Persian Gulf War, it was a defining moment, I think, at the time for our country.

□ 1820

With regard to the veterans, Mr. MICHAUD, you are absolutely correct. With a number in excess of 170,000, when you think of the number of those of us that actually went—I don't know the exact number, probably around 700,000 of us that went—that is a very large percentage that have some form of an illness.

I was pretty startled by all this. I do recall what it took to sort of expose that some bad things had happened; the fact that we had blown up one of the Army depots that contained some mustard and sarin gas, and that plume was so large that it went over tens of thousands of not only our own troops, including myself, but also about 10,000 of the U.K. And to think that the DOD was not forthcoming with that information to our veterans for a long time is very disturbing.

I do recall, when I got home I did not have the physical strength to even run

down to the end of the lane. That is only about 1,000 feet. And here I am, 30 years old, physically fit, come back from war and I don't have the physical capacity. Something had happened to me, and I didn't know what it was. I do recall that my wife wanted me to go down to the VA or to go to the doctor, and I refused to do it. I refused to do it because, I said, Joni, if I go, they're just going to say it's in my head. I made it up. It's not real. Yet something had happened to my body.

When I then came to Congress, I can assure you when I look back at it, and all of us know when you run for Congress it takes about a year and it takes a lot out of you physically, and I was very sick during that 1 year when I first ran for Congress. When I got here, I decided that I had to accept and get out of the denial mode and step forward and provide voice to a lot of my comrades, and that is what I chose to do.

It is very difficult, especially all of us as public figures, to be willing to step forward and put a face, especially your own, on something like that. But I chose to do that. I remember working not only with the gentleman from Illinois but also Joe Kennedy at the time. That is one of the first things I learned about politics, too. When you take someone like Joe Kennedy and you marry him up with STEVE BUYER, when we brought something to the floor, nobody voted against it.

So the things we were able to do by opening the VA to make sure that these veterans got their access to health care, then creating the compensation for undiagnosed illnesses, that was pretty radical. But we knew that something wrong had happened, and we wanted to make sure that our compassion was real, so let's make sure we take care of the families. And that is exactly what we sought to do.

I want to congratulate the gentleman for bringing this resolution. We have moved on to the second Gulf War, and now we are beginning to complete Iraq and we are still in Afghanistan. It is almost as though we have forgotten what happened to the veterans in the first Gulf War, and so many of them continue to suffer from these physical ailments. So when you take a moment like this, you are really saying unto the American people, "Hey, we've still got some concerns. We still have some very real challenges out there." And as I leave, I know that my comrades are in good hands.

So I want to thank all of you for supporting the VA and for supporting my comrades. They were there for us and you remember, and for that I am forever grateful. Thank you and Godspeed.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1672, a resolution recognizing the 20th anniversary of the outbreak of the Persian Gulf War and reaffirming the commitment of the United States towards Gulf War veterans.

This resolution rightly recognizes the suffering and the needs of Persian Gulf War veterans who continue to suffer from Gulf War Veterans' Illness, GWI, without an adequate treatment or a cure. One in four of those who served in the first Gulf War experience multiple concurrent symptoms including memory and concentration problems, chronic headaches, widespread pain and gastrointestinal problems as a result of neurotoxic exposures during their Gulf War deployment. Research also shows that Gulf War veterans suffer from Lou Gehrig's disease at double the rate of their non-deployed peers. There is still no effective treatment for these veterans.

A groundbreaking report issued by the Congressionally commissioned VA Research Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses entitled, "Gulf War Illness and the Health of Gulf War Veterans" identified two definite causes of the disease and a handful of other likely causes: exposure to pesticides and a drug given to troops to protect them from nerve gas.

The National Academy of Sciences' Institute of Medicine, IOM, released a groundbreaking report on Gulf War health in April, acknowledging that over 250,000 Gulf War veterans suffer from a chronic multisymptom illness that it is not due to psychiatric causes. Perhaps most importantly, the report recognizes the need for national research program that is likely to succeed in identifying treatments for GWI that will also benefit other U.S. military forces.

For the past several years, I have led a bipartisan effort to support the Gulf War Veterans' Illness Research Program within the Department of Defense's Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program. The program was awarded \$8 million in fiscal year, FY, 2010 and is critical following the Veteran's Administrations' decision this year to revisit rejected claims for Gulf War Veterans who have attempted to access treatment for the illness linked to their service. The research coming out of this program is among the most promising in the world for these veterans. We can and must do better than to forget the permanent sacrifices they have made. We must not rest until we identify treatments for them and ensure the exposures that caused the illnesses are not duplicated.

I urge my colleagues to continue this bipartisan effort as the FY 2011 Defense Appropriations bill and support funding for the Gulf War Veterans' Illness Research Program. We owe it to Gulf War veterans and all members of our Armed Forces to find a treatment.

Mr. MANZULLO. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1672, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1722, TELEWORK ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2010

Mr. ARCURI, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-657) on the resolution (H. Res. 1721) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1722) to require the head of each executive agency to establish and implement a policy under which employees shall be authorized to telework, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RECOGNIZING 500TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ANDREA PALLADIO

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 259) recognizing the 500th anniversary of the birth of Italian architect Andrea Palladio.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 259

Whereas 2008 was the 500th anniversary of the birth year of the Italian architect Andrea Palladio;

Whereas Andrea Palladio was born Andrea di Pietro in Padua on November 30, 1508;

Whereas Palladio, born of humble origins, apprenticed as a stonemason in his early life;

Whereas under the patronage of Count Giangiorgio Trissino (1478-1550), Palladio studied architecture, engineering, topography, and military science in his mid-twenties;

Whereas in 1540, Count Trissino renamed him "Palladio", a reference to the wisdom of Pallas Athena, as well as the Italian form of the name of the Roman writer of the fourth century, Rutilius Taurus Aemilianus Palladius;

Whereas Palladio's designs for public works, churches, mansions, and villas rank among the most outstanding architectural achievements of the Italian Renaissance;

Whereas Palladio's surviving buildings are collectively included in the UNESCO World Heritage List;

Whereas Palladio's treatise, "The Four Books of Architecture", ranks as the most influential publication on architecture ever produced and has shaped much of the architectural image of Western civilization;

Whereas "The Four Books of Architecture" has served as a primary source for classical design for many architects and builders in the United States from colonial times to the present;

Whereas Thomas Jefferson called Palladio's "The Four Books of Architecture" the "Bible" for architectural practice, and employed Palladio's principles in establishing lasting standards for public architecture in the United States and in constructing his own masterpiece, Monticello;

Whereas our Nation's most iconic buildings, including the United States Capitol Building and the White House, reflect the influence of Palladio's architecture through the Anglo-Palladian movement, which flourished in the 18th century;

Whereas Palladio's pioneering reconstruction and restoration drawings of ancient

Roman temples in "The Four Books of Architecture" provided inspiration for many of the great American classical edifices of the 19th and 20th centuries, in the period known as the American Renaissance;

Whereas the American Renaissance marked the high point of the classical tradition and enriched the United States from coast to coast with countless architectural works of timeless dignity and beauty, including the John A. Wilson Building, the seat of government of the District of Columbia;

Whereas the American architectural monuments inspired both directly and indirectly by the writings, illustrations, and designs of Palladio form a proud and priceless part of our Nation's cultural heritage; and

Whereas organizations, educational institutions, governmental agencies, and many other entities have been celebrating this special 500-year anniversary, including the Italian National Committee for Andrea Palladio 500, the Centro Internazionale di Studi di Architettura Andrea Palladio, the Palladium Musicum, Inc., the Istituto Italiano di Cultura, and the Institute of Classical Architecture and Classical America, as well as other Italian and Italian American cultural organizations, such as the Italian Heritage and Culture Committee of New York, Inc., and the Italian Cultural Society of Washington, DC, Inc., with a wide variety of public programs, publications, symposia, proclamation ceremonies, and salutes to the genius and legacy of Palladio: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes the 500th anniversary of Andrea Palladio's birth year;

(2) recognizes his tremendous influence on architecture in the United States; and

(3) expresses its gratitude for the enhancement his life and career has bestowed upon the Nation's built environment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This resolution marks the 500th anniversary of the birth of noted Italian architect Andrea Palladio.

Born Andrea di Pietro in Padua on November 30, 1508, Palladio was widely acclaimed as the leading architect of the Italian Renaissance.

Best known for his villas, churches, and public buildings, Palladio incorporated many traditional architectural elements of ancient Rome in his work to become the favorite architect of Venetian high society.

Palladio's treatise, "The Four Books of the Architecture," canonized what was to become known as the Palladian

architectural style, which continues to influence Western architecture to this day.

Some of Palladio's surviving villas have been included on the UNESCO World Heritage list.

Not only do his works remain an important part of Italy's rich cultural legacy, but his influence on architecture is evident throughout much of Europe and America as well.

Thomas Jefferson made great use of the Palladian style in constructing his own masterpiece, Monticello, and establishing lasting standards for public architecture in the United States. In fact, one has to look no farther than the building we are presently standing in to see firsthand Palladio's influence on architectural design.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution and to express our gratitude for the impact that Andrea Palladio's life and career has had on architecture in our country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I stand in strong support of this resolution, which recognizes the architectural genius of a man who was born over 500 years ago and continues to inspire the work of architects today.

Andrea Palladio was born into a family of modest means and rose through society as a result of his hard work, commitment to learning, and dedication to his trade.

Palladio is best known for his work, "The Four Books of Architecture," and by 1554 he was named the chief architect of the Republic of Venice.

Palladio's work defined the renaissance style of architecture. Thomas Jefferson utilized his principles in designing his home at Monticello, as well as when he designed the plans for the University of Virginia.

The Palladian style served as inspiration to many architects during the 18th century when they designed the United States Capitol, where we meet today, as well as other government buildings and monuments in and around Washington, D.C.

Indeed, Palladio's influence goes beyond architecture to touch the lives of countless Italian immigrants in this country. Americans of Italian heritage carry on the Palladio work ethic and commitment to excellence.

In this resolution today, we recall the life of Andrea Palladio and recognize the significant contributions he made to Western architecture and to the cultural heritage of the United States.

□ 1830

I urge my colleagues to join in supporting the adoption of this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 259, honoring the life and work of Andrea Palladio.

As cochair of the Italian American Caucus, I have had the privilege of honoring the contributions of explorers like Christopher Columbus, scientists like Galileo, and artists like Constantino Brumidi. Constantino did most of the fresco work in this Capitol. He came to the United States with nothing in his pocket to become an American citizen. He became an American citizen in a very short period of time, and then he set out to perform his great works here, not only in the Capitol, but in many places in New York City.

Or how about veterans, like Sergeant John Basilone, who in the Second World War was the highest decorated member of the Armed Forces. He was wounded at Guadalcanal. He came back to the States and sold war bonds. That wasn't his kick. He asked to go back into the Pacific Theater. He got to Iwo Jima. The third day he was back, he was killed. In 2005, we had a stamp for Sergeant Basilone. Just this year we named a building after him in New Jersey. We named a bridge after him, the highest-decorated person in the history of the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

I bring his name up also because there is a legacy here that is shared with American history, and it changes somewhat the stereotyping of Italian Americans. I hope it does. I am proud to be an Italian American, and I know Mr. MANZULLO is, and we know what that stereotyping is. Stereotyping was not invented in the 20th century. So this is one of the reasons why we have presented this.

It is only right that today we honor this influential architect, Andrea Palladio. He was born Andrea di Pietro in Padua, Italy, on November 30, 1508. He spent his life studying architecture, engineering, topography and military service.

As was mentioned, his very famous masterpiece is "The Four Books of Architecture." Jefferson called these four books the "Bible" for architectural practice, the protocol, and he employed Palladio's principles in establishing the lasting standards up to this date in America and in the constructing of his own masterpiece, Monticello. Our Nation's most iconic buildings and the White House itself reflect the influence of his great architecture.

There is no better way to honor the close ties between Italy and the United States than to look to our shared cultural history, and much of it is shared.

I would like to thank my Italian American Caucus cochair, PAT TIBERI, and Ambassador Giulio Terzi, for all of their work bringing this resolution to the floor. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting such an important figure in the history of both our Nation and Italy.

Mr. MANZULLO. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 259.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO BRING WORLD CUP TO THE UNITED STATES

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 327) to recognize and support the efforts of the USA Bid Committee to bring the 2018 or 2022 Federation Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) World Cup competition to the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 327

Whereas soccer is one of the most popular sports in the world and the FIFA World Cup competition is the single most important event in that sport;

Whereas the United States successfully hosted in 9 cities throughout the Nation the 1994 FIFA World Cup competition, which was broadcast to billions of fans around the world and set an attendance record of nearly 3,600,000, which remains unbroken today;

Whereas the 1994 FIFA World Cup competition served as a catalyst for the increased popularity and development of the game throughout the United States, as well as the introduction of Major League Soccer, the United States national first division professional soccer league;

Whereas the United States Soccer Federation has established the USA Bid Committee to prepare and submit a bid to host the 2022 FIFA World Cup competition in the United States;

Whereas 18 American cities have been named by the USA Bid Committee as candidates to serve as hosts to FIFA World Cup matches in 2022, with each of these cities embodying the diversity and enthusiasm shared by the entire Nation and guaranteeing each participating team and its followers a "home team" atmosphere;

Whereas the United States offers FIFA a valuable and receptive market within which to further develop the sport of soccer, which in turn will have significant impact on and off the field in both the United States and throughout the world;

Whereas the United States possesses all necessary state-of-the-art infrastructure in its stadia and potential host cities to ensure that the competition sets a new standard of quality, comfort, security and safety for players, officials, spectators, media, and sponsors alike;

Whereas hosting the FIFA World Cup in the United States promises record-setting attendance and financial performance, allowing revenues generated by the competition to be used for the further development of soccer and FIFA's objectives of positive social and environmental change;

Whereas hosting the 2022 FIFA World Cup competition in the United States would serve as a tremendous impetus to national and international goodwill, as the competition would bring people from many nations,

along with a diverse American public, together under one banner of peace, friendship, and spirited but fair competition; and

Whereas pursuant to FIFA bidding procedures, the President of the United States and certain Federal agencies have issued guarantees that upon authorization or appropriation, would establish the conditions required to help make the 2022 FIFA World Cup competition the most successful in history: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) recognizes and supports the efforts of the USA Bid Committee to bring the 2022 FIFA World Cup competition to the United States;

(2) encourages the President of the United States and appropriate Federal agencies to support the USA Bid Committee in its efforts to meet all requirements for the United States to host the 2022 FIFA World Cup competition; and

(3) stands prepared to give full consideration to a request by the President to provide support related to the 2022 FIFA World Cup competition, if the United States is selected to host this event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) will each control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Every 4 years during the FIFA World Cup, the world is captivated and obsessed with soccer. We watch young men take to the field representing their respective nations, and we proudly fly our national flags and sing our national anthems. But the World Cup is not just a soccer tournament. As a truly global event, it is a vehicle for bringing the world closer together.

In 1994, the United States hosted what has been hailed as the most successful World Cup in history. Spread across the country in nine host cities, we accommodated more fans than any previous World Cup, reached a record television audience around the world, and in the process fueled the development of the beautiful game in America.

Hosting the World Cup again would be a great honor for our Nation, and I wholeheartedly support H. Con. Res. 327, which supports the USA Bid Committee's efforts to bring the 2022 FIFA World Cup back to the United States.

In May of this year, the USA Bid Committee presented our bid to FIFA, which, in addition to information on logistics, includes a 10-year plan to use soccer as a tool to promote education, health, development, and peace.

In addition to bringing the world's attention to the United States for one month in 2022, hosting the tournament would also generate a tremendous amount of revenue. The USA Bid Committee estimates that ticket sales alone will generate over \$1 billion and visitors are expected to spend an additional \$5 billion on accommodations, transportation, and communications. The licensing and sponsorship of the tournament will likewise bring revenue into the country, and the spotlight on the United States will encourage investment in our economy.

I commend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) for authoring this important resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in expressing strong support for the 2022 World Cup bid.

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and rise in support of H. Con. Res. 327, a bipartisan measure recognizing the efforts of the USA Bid Committee to bring the World Cup to the United States.

On December 2, the Executive Committee of the International Federation of Football Associations, or FIFA, will be voting and announcing the host countries for the 2018 and 2022 FIFA World Cup competitions.

□ 1840

A month ago, the United States decided to focus solely on its bid for 2022. My colleagues will recall that the U.S. hosted a highly successful World Cup 16 years ago, in 1994.

In addition to holding opening ceremonies and the first match in my home State of Illinois, that tournament set World Cup attendance records, drawing nearly 3.6 million live spectators at matches that were broadcast to billions of viewers around the world. It was a great success for the World Cup and a huge boost for the game in the United States. Since that time, soccer has grown significantly in this country, both as a participant and a spectator sport.

I can think of no better venue for the 2022 FIFA World Cup than the United States of America. We boast the second largest number of players in the world, with over 24 million Americans playing. With nearly 4 million young people playing in more than 6,000 clubs and leagues, the United States leads the world in youth players—those who are most committed and important to the future of the game. With our state-of-the-art stadiums and broadcast facilities, we also have the best possible infrastructure to make the 2022 World Cup accessible to the people of the world.

For these and many other reasons, holding the 2022 FIFA World Cup in the United States would be good for FIFA and good for the economy of the United States. Thus, it is fitting that today we join together across party lines to com-

mend and support the efforts of the USA Bid Committee to bring the World Cup competition to the United States in 2022.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, with the excitement of this year's FIFA World Cup competition in South Africa and the achievements of the U.S. Men's National Team still fresh in our minds, I rise to support efforts to bring the world's most popular sporting event—the FIFA World Cup competition—back to our country.

In 1994, our nation hosted the FIFA World Cup tournament. That tournament still holds the record for the highest attendance in history, with an overall attendance of 3.6 million. It also spurred the development and popularity of soccer in this country, leading to the creation of Major League Soccer, the United States' national first division professional soccer league.

Building upon this country's enormous success in hosting the FIFA World Cup in 1994, the US Soccer Federation—through the USA Bid Committee—has submitted a very strong bid to host the 2022 competition.

Bringing the FIFA World Cup tournament back to the United States will both contribute to the further growth of soccer in America and stimulate the economies of dozens of cities and states that hope to serve as hosts to national teams and spectators from around the world. Eighteen communities across the country, including Washington, DC, and Baltimore, MD, are working with the USA Bid Committee to serve as potential hosts for the games during the month-long competition.

I want to thank Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN as well as my fellow co-chairs of the Congressional Soccer Caucus—GEORGE MILLER, DAVE REICHERT, and MARY BONO MACK—for their support of this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the United States faces formidable competition in hosting the 2022 FIFA World Cup tournament from several countries in Asia and Australia, but with Congressional encouragement and support for USA Bid Committee's effort in advance of FIFA's decision on December 2nd, it would send an important message to FIFA at this critical time.

I urge my colleagues to support this timely resolution.

Mr. MANZULLO. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 327, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution recognizing and supporting the efforts of the USA Bid Committee to bring the 2022 Federation Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) World Cup competition to the United States."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL ADOPTION DAY AND MONTH

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1648) supporting the goals and ideals of National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month by promoting national awareness of adoption and the children in foster care awaiting families, celebrating children and families involved in adoption, recognizing current programs and efforts designed to promote adoption, and encouraging people in the United States to seek improved safety, permanency, and well-being for all children.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1648

Whereas there are over 423,000 children in the foster care system in the United States, and more than 114,000 of whom are waiting for families to adopt them;

Whereas 56 percent of the children in foster care are age 10 or younger;

Whereas the average length of time a child spends in foster care is more than 2 years;

Whereas for many foster children, the wait for a permanent, adoptive, “forever” family in which they are loved, nurtured, comforted, and protected seems endless;

Whereas the number of youth who “age out” of the foster care system by reaching adulthood without being placed in a permanent home has increased by more than 55 percent since 1999, as more than 29,000 foster youth “aged out” of foster care during 2009;

Whereas every day loving and nurturing families are strengthened and expanded when committed and dedicated individuals make an important difference in the life of a child through adoption;

Whereas while 3 in 10 people in the United States have considered adoption, a majority of them have misconceptions about the process of adopting children from foster care and the children who are eligible for adoption;

Whereas 71 percent of those who have considered adoption consider adopting children from foster care above other forms of adoption;

Whereas 45 percent of people in the United States believe that children enter the foster care system because of juvenile delinquency, when in reality the vast majority of children in the foster care system were victims of neglect, abandonment, or abuse;

Whereas 46 percent of people in the United States believe that foster care adoption is expensive, when in reality there is no substantial cost for adopting from foster care, and financial support in the form of an adoption assistance subsidy is available to adoptive families of eligible children adopted from foster care and continues after the adoption is finalized until the child is 18, so that income will not be a barrier to becoming a parent to a foster child who needs to belong to a family;

Whereas significant tax credits are available to families who adopt children with special needs;

Whereas the Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, in a partnership with the Ad Council, supports a national recruitment campaign for adoptive parents;

Whereas the Collaboration to AdoptUsKids features a photolisting Web site for waiting foster children and prospective adoptive families at www.adoptuskids.org, and in Spanish at www.adoptel.org;

Whereas National Adoption Day is a collective national effort to find permanent, loving families for children in the foster care system;

Whereas since the first National Adoption Day in 2000, over 30,000 children have joined forever families during National Adoption Day;

Whereas in 2009, adoptions were finalized for nearly 5,000 children through more than 325 National Adoption Day events in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico;

Whereas National Adoption Month celebrates the gift of adoption, recognizing the adoptive and foster families who share their hearts and homes with children in need, and raises awareness of the need for families for the many waiting children, particularly older children and teens, children of color, members of sibling groups, and children with physical and emotional challenges; and

Whereas November 2010 is National Adoption Month, and November 20, 2010, is National Adoption Day, and activities and information about both are available at www.childwelfare.gov/adoption/nam/activities.cfm: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month;

(2) recognizes that every child in foster care deserves a permanent and loving family;

(3) recognizes the significant commitment of taxpayers to support adoption, including the \$1,900,000,000 provided to support adoption through the Title IV-E Adoption Assistance program, as well as the assistance provided through the Title IV-E Foster Care program to 114,000 children waiting for adoptive families, among other important programs; and

(4) encourages the citizens of the United States to consider adoption of children in foster care who are waiting for a permanent, loving family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 1648.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1648, which supports the goals and the ideals of National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month. Children deserve nothing less than to grow up in a safe, stable, and loving home. While the vast majority of children are raised in such settings, there are a number of vulnerable children who are victims of child maltreatment or may have lost their parents in a tragedy and are now in search of a new home to call their own.

Today, there are more than 423,000 children in the foster care system in this country. Many of these children

will be reunited with their biological parents when it is safe for them to do so, while others will find a permanent home with a grandparent or other relative. Meanwhile, more than 114,000 children will be unable to safely return to their biological parents and need to find a new home.

Over the last several years, Congress has worked in a bipartisan manner to provide services that promote foster care outcomes for children in foster care that are positive and to facilitate the timely placement of a child into an adoptive home. In 2008, Congress passed the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act, which provided an array of new services to strengthen the foster care system. The legislation expanded the number of permanency options made available to children who are in search of new homes by allowing States to use Federal assistance to relatives to agree to become the legal guardians of foster children. The bill also extended and improved the Adoption Incentives Program and required States to inform prospective adoptive parents of their potential eligibility for the Federal Adoption Tax Credit.

So far, we have seen positive results in the area of adoption. Last year, 57,000 children were adopted out of foster care. That's a 3.5 percent increase over the previous year. The increase in the number of children adopted out of care reflects a trend that occurred over the last several years. Since 2006, the number of children adopted out of foster care has increased by 10.5 percent. Remarkably, this increase has occurred as the number of children who are served by the foster care system has steadily declined by 14 percent over the same period.

Earlier this year, as part of the landmark legislation that provided for health care coverage to all Americans, additional incentives and initiatives were taken to promote adoption. The Affordable Care Act included legislation that repealed the sunset date on the adoption tax credit for 1 year—from 2010 to 2011—and increased the maximum amount under the credit. The legislation also made the Adoption Tax Credit refundable for tax years 2010 and 2011.

While Congress has had great success in promoting the adoption of children out of foster care, there are still far too many children in foster care who are waiting far too long to find a permanent home. We need to continue to work together to ensure that States have the resources they need to swiftly move children into adoptive homes when it is appropriate to do so.

I look forward to continuing to work with all my colleagues to achieve that goal. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1648.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1648, which recognizes the goals and ideals of National Adoption Day and Month. As

you know, November 20 will mark this year's annual National Adoption Day celebration. All across our great country, communities will gather together to celebrate the adoptions that have been finalized this year and those that we hope will be finalized next year. In this spirit of community and family, this is what makes the National Adoption Day so very effective and also so very important in the lives of the Nation's more than 423,000 foster children—more than half of whom are under the age of 10.

The issue truly is an urgent one, Mr. Speaker. Each year as children grow older, it becomes harder and harder to place them with "forever" families. In fact, sadly, last year, 29,000 children "aged out" of the foster care system and are now on their own. As someone who adopted an older child, I know what this means to so many families and so many children—in particular, to older children. I call adopting an older child the toughest job I've ever had but also the one that was the most rewarding.

In so many cases, adoption is the key to breaking the cycle of abuse for children who otherwise would languish in dangerous homes. Perhaps it goes without saying how important it is for children to grow up in loving and supporting families. Yet with thousands upon thousands of children still being denied this most fundamental opportunity, Congress must continue to do what it can to support their efforts to find a home.

□ 1850

As such, the Federal Government has rightly stepped in to relieve the financial burden on adoptive families, and in doing so has made adoption more affordable to people of all income levels, but much still remains to be done. The resolution that we are considering today is an important reaffirmation of our commitment to improving the lives of foster children everywhere, and I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their support and attention to this matter.

While we are on the subject of adoption, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention one more thing. It has been brought to my attention that the Democratic leadership has pulled another very important adoption bill from the schedule this week. Actually, I understand that they hope to use it as a vehicle to pass an unrelated measure called the DREAM Act. The adoption bill in question is called the Help HAITI Act. It was introduced by Congressman FORTENBERRY in response to the tragic earthquake in Haiti some months ago. His legislation has passed the House and the Senate, and it was designated to assist children orphaned by one of the greatest natural disasters in recent memory.

A family in my district has adopted one of those children. He is a 3-year-old boy named Samuel. After being abandoned, with no record of who his par-

ents were, Samuel got a second chance at having a family. Sadly, his adoption is stuck in limbo now because of this action. Congressman FORTENBERRY's bill would change that. It has passed the House, and it has passed the Senate. All little Samuel needs is one clean vote and a stroke of the President's pen.

To hold these children hostage in an effort to disguise a vote on a controversial piece of legislation that has no hope of becoming law is completely unacceptable. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the kind of skullduggery that the American people have grown so sick of. If the DREAM Act or any other piece of legislation cannot stand on its own merits, then the sponsors of the bill need to go back to the drawing board and find something that can stand on its own merits.

The Help HAITI Act is one vote away from being sent to the President's desk. I strongly urge the Senate Democrat leaders to allow the House to vote to pass the Haiti adoption bill. If they choose not to, I hope that the current Speaker will at least have the decency to look Samuel and his parents in the eyes and explain the nefarious decision to them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman of the Ways and Means Committee, and I thank the Ways and Means Committee for the very fine leadership that it has exhibited, particularly tonight, by bringing to the floor legislation sponsored by a very good friend, Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. Speaker, I chair the Congressional Children's Caucus, and I really wanted to rise and speak from the heart, for Mr. MCDERMOTT shared with us, as the minority manager as well, some of the pain that goes with children who need to be adopted.

Some years ago, I chaired the Foster Parent Task Force for Harris County, and I had the privilege of chairing it with one of our former colleagues, Congressman Mike Andrews. We chaired that task force to recruit, to restore, to rejuvenate foster parents, and to encourage them in their parenting and in their loving of foster children. In the course of that task, I learned of aging out—children who were in the foster care system and not adopted. Therefore, at the end of the foster care timeframe, they were aged out without any parental jurisdiction, love, affection, or nurturing. I met many of those children on the streets of Houston. I imagine, if I were to travel from the east coast to the west coast, I would meet children like that, children of America who deserve better lives.

So I rise to support this legislation. I applaud Mr. OBERSTAR, the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and of course the staff who saw fit to acknowledge that this is National

Adoption Day and National Adoption Month, because, if there is anything precious in our sights—and for those whose faiths point them to a higher authority—it is that about children. Adoption is an honorable and welcomed next step for a child in foster care, a child who is abused and possibly, if you will, unloved.

I ask my colleagues to support this enthusiastically because we need to end the pain in the eyes of the children and in their hearts by allowing them and hoping for them to be adopted.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentlelady from Florida for the time and also for her good words earlier.

Mr. Speaker, the selfless love inherent in adoption shows the remarkable capacity of the human heart to strengthen a fractured world one child in need at a time, and I am very glad that Congress today is taking the time to honor adoption.

I must add, however, that I am very disheartened that a bill to help Haitian orphans, which has passed this House, as the gentlelady from Florida has said, and which has passed the Senate with amendments, has now been abandoned in secret meetings by this body's leadership.

The Help HAITI Act helps 1,200 Haitian orphans who were in the process of being adopted before the tragic earthquake hit that country. We could have passed this on Monday, and it could be law by now. Yet now, I understand, this bipartisan Help HAITI Act may be used as a vehicle for a controversial immigration measure for which there is no consensus in this body or across America.

While the legal status of these vulnerable Haitian orphans remains in limbo, they have fewer legal protections. They may not be eligible for critical resources, and they may be at risk of being returned to Haiti. Now, surely, we can act to solve this problem free of partisan provocation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say this: These poor children and their heroic American families deserve better than what we are giving them today.

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

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

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

Mr. Speaker, adoption was very near and dear to the heart of a friend of mine who passed away a few years ago. His name was Dave Thomas. Many of you have heard of him because he started a chain of restaurants called Wendy's, which is now known worldwide.

Dave was a child who was adopted. His adoptive mother died, and his father, because he couldn't take care of

him, left him in Fort Wayne, Indiana, at a YMCA when he was about 14 years old, and he was left pretty much to fend for himself. Because of that experience that Dave wrestled with as a boy, he ended up becoming one of the strongest advocates for adoption that I have ever known.

He worked very hard to get a postage stamp adopted—it was adopted—which spelled out the need to adopt children who didn't have homes. On every one of his restaurant maps, he had the ways to adopt a child, and he had pictures of children who should have been adopted. So, from a person who had that personal experience, who was Dave Thomas, I learned that adoption was extremely important for the security and the future of these children.

Now there are these children we are talking about from Haiti. Obviously, the problems there are herculean. Right now, there is a cholera epidemic down in Haiti, and it's probably going to get worse. They're talking about maybe thousands of people becoming infected with this deadly disease. Can you imagine if any of these children had to be sent back there under Haiti's current conditions? Even if they didn't have that kind of an epidemic, you wouldn't want to send them back there.

So I think the legislation this young lady is talking about is extremely important. It sends a message that we really care about those who don't have homes and who need to be adopted.

□ 1900

I sincerely hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will do everything they can to make sure this gets passed and to the President as quickly as possible.

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

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no more Members who wish to speak on this, but I'd just like to close by saying I think that this House Resolution 1648 is a very good one. I urge my colleagues to support it but also to keep up the pressure on the current Speaker to release the Haiti adoption bill.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think in closing it's important to point out that children are children, and while we may talk about some Haitian children who want to be adopted in the United States, we have an immigration policy in this country that is sending children back from my district to their country because we have got an immigration system that does not work. I actually think we ought to think a little bit more about people in this country and how we get the immigration policy rather than trying to say, well, we've got to worry about these people somewhere else. Part of this election was fought over the issue of immigration policy, and this country needs a fair way for people to proceed toward an ability to become a citizen.

Now, you want these Haitian kids to come in here. What about their citizenship? I mean, they just get here; they're going to sit here forever and never get citizenship? I have a boy in my district who was 6 years old when he came here, and no one told him he had to go down and fill out some papers when he got to be 18 and choose his citizenship. So now we're trying to send him back to a country that he never lived in since he was 6 when he came, and so there are real problems with children in this country, and I think we can deal with this one and we'll deal with the other one.

The other body has kept their foot on these issues over and over and over again, and I think we ought to deal with this issue and then we'll deal with the other issue. We'll see whether they're really serious about all children.

I urge my friends and the Members of the Congress to vote for this resolution.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of H. Res. 1648, a resolution that recognizes the importance of federal efforts to encourage adoption, and honors National Adoption Day and Month.

As an avid adoption supporter, I believe that Congress must continue to promote the adoption of children into safe and loving homes. Through our work in 1997 as part of the Adoption and Safe Families Act, and more recently through the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008, Congress made significant advances in providing more options for children in need.

Yet, far too many children, about 114,000, are waiting in foster care programs throughout our country for families to adopt them. These children should be given every opportunity to lead successful lives, and one way to make that happen is to increase the adoption of these children into safe, permanent, loving homes.

That is why National Adoption Day and Month are so important. This year, National Adoption Day will take place on November 20, 2010, and is designed for communities around the country to highlight adoptions. Over the last decade, these events have grown more and more successful. Last year there were events in all 50 states during which the adoptions of 4,800 children were finalized. Since its inception, more than 30,000 adoptions have been finalized on National Adoption Day.

I have been honored to participate in National Adoption Day over the past several years. To be part of such a special occasion reinforces the need for further efforts to move kids into adoptive homes.

I would also like to highlight the efforts of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute (CCAI) to promote adoption through its annual Angels in Adoption Awards Ceremony, held in October. This event also highlights those that have opened their hearts and their homes.

These initiatives are critically important to not only recognizing those who have promoted adoption, but also to highlight the need for greater action on this important topic.

Before I close, I would like to recognize the efforts of Representative JIM OBERSTAR, the sponsor of this resolution, for his work on be-

half of adoption and children in foster care. JIM and I worked closely together on these important issues as co-chairs of Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute. As an adoptive parent himself, he knows firsthand how life-changing adoption is, and with his experiences he has been an effective and tireless leader for children who need loving homes. His expertise will be missed, but his contributions in support of adoption will be lasting.

I would also like to congratulate and publicly thank Representative GINNY BROWN-WAITE for her role in promoting adoption and the wellbeing of all children. As a Member of the Ways and Means Committee, she has been an active supporter of efforts to promote adoption and child wellbeing, continuing her prior work as a member of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute. GINNY is retiring at the end of this Congress, and her deep compassion for and active efforts on behalf of children who have been or are awaiting adoption will continue to inspire those of us she leaves behind. I wish both JIM and GINNY all the best in the years ahead and thank both of them for their distinguished service to our families and country.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1648, which recognizes the goals and ideals of National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month. I would also like to thank Chairman OBERSTAR for introducing this resolution and for his recognition of this important issue.

As a practicing OB/GYN physician for nearly 30 years before being elected to Congress, I have seen first hand the life-changing role of adoption services for families and children all across the Nation. Adoption and foster care are extraordinary means for child survivability. In fact, 45 percent of Americans believe that children are placed in foster care due to some form of juvenile delinquency, but the unfortunate reality is that these children are primarily victims of abuse or neglect. For so many of these youth, the care they receive in foster homes and adoption agencies provides them the only home they ever know. Sadly, year after year, we see thousands of children "age out" of foster care and enter adulthood.

Mr. Speaker, every child in this Nation and around the world deserves a loving family that will take care of them and provide for their basic needs. I applaud the many organizations across the United States that tirelessly strive to provide a home for foster care children and offer them a temporary place to live until they are placed in a permanent home. With local adoption agencies and foster homes doing their part, we must also do ours. I am proud that this body has voted to provide significant tax credits to families adopting children with special needs.

Today there are over 423,000 children in the United States foster care system, and 114,000 of these young individuals are waiting for a loving family to adopt them. The vast majority of these youth are victims of abandonment, abuse, or neglect, and they are in dire need of a family that will provide a home so that they can grow into successful adults.

Mr. Speaker, families that adopt should also be recognized for their commitment to improving the lives of children through the expansion and strengthening of their own families. These families come from all walks of life, but what ties them together is an abounding love for the neglected and the happiness that their new

families enjoy after adoption. Their noble actions in caring for our youth are a public service—but more importantly—an act of service and humility in love for humanity.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution recognizes and honors the foster care and adoption agencies around the Nation that provide our youth with a sense of hope and a future. I support and congratulate all of these agencies and families in their honorable endeavors, and charge them to continue their efforts into the future.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1648, the annual National Adoption Day and National Adoption month resolution. I would like to thank my colleagues on the House Ways and Means Committee for their work to bring this resolution to the Floor, and I want to commend in particular, my friend JIM McDERMOTT, the Chairman of the Income Security and Family Support Subcommittee, for his leadership on adoption, foster care and child welfare issues.

Adoption has been an essential part of my life and legislative service since 1968, when my late wife, Jo, unsuccessful in our hope for biological children, turned enthusiastically to adoption.

Like all prospective adoptive parents, we completed the paperwork and the home study process—which every adoptive parent can remember. We were overjoyed to welcome home our adorable 3-week old son Ted in 1968. Jo and I had no doubt that since we made the decision to accept as our own, one of God's children, that He blessed us with Noelle, Annie and Monica.

For these past 36 years, I have reveled in wearing my legislative hat, as a Member of Congress, as an advocate for effective public policy to eliminate the barriers to adoption and the need to work on behalf of children and families to promote this life-affirming experience.

Adoption has made enormous strides in these 36 years. In the late 1970s, I had the opportunity to bend the ear of President Carter with my radical proposal for an adoption deduction that would be equivalent to the cost of childbirth. In the 1980s, I joined with my former colleague, Tom Bliley, to create the Congressional Coalition on Adoption. In the 1990s, we enacted the \$5,000 tax credit for adoption and in 2001, we were successful in doubling the adoption tax credit to \$10,000. That same year, we created CCAI, the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute, to enhance our adoption advocacy.

As part of that advocacy, CCAI is one of the sponsoring organizations for National Adoption Day that celebrates the adoption finalization for thousands of families. National Adoption Day also raises awareness for the 114,000 children in foster care who are available for adoption and are seeking their “forever family.” I also want to commend the following sponsors for their leadership in promoting National Adoption Day: The Alliance for Children's Rights, Casey Family services, Children's Action Network, the Dave Thomas Foundation for Adoption, and the Freddie Mac Foundation. I also want to express my appreciation for the work of my Legislative Director, Chip Gardiner, who has been a great advocate for the cause of adoption for the past 25 years.

It is fitting and proper for the House of Representatives to approve this resolution in No-

vember which is National Adoption Month and National Adoption Day which will take place this year on Saturday, November 20. As families prepare to celebrate Thanksgiving next week, National Adoption Day is held the Saturday before Thanksgiving as we celebrate this very special day when the dream of family has been realized for so many Americans. This year, more than 350 events will take place across all 50 states and Washington, D.C. to finalize over 4,500 adoptions from foster care.

When I have the opportunity to share my personal experience of adoption, I am reminded of the words of the Nobel Prize-winning Chilean poet, Gabriela Mistral. “We are guilty of many errors and faults, but our worst crime is abandoning children, neglecting the fountain of life. Many things we need can wait; the child cannot. To the child, we cannot answer: ‘Tomorrow’ The child's name is ‘Today!’”

Today, let us reaffirm our support to assist the thousands of children in America in foster care who seek the love, support and stability of a family.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1648.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3774) to extend the deadline for Social Services Block Grant expenditures of supplemental funds appropriated following disasters occurring in 2008.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3774

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF EXPENDITURE DEADLINE OF SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT DISASTER FUNDING.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts made available to the Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, under the heading “Social Services Block Grant” under chapter 7 of division B of Public Law 110-329, shall remain available for expenditure through September 30, 2011.

SEC. 2. BUDGETARY PROVISIONS.

(a) STATUTORY PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.—This Act—

(1) is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-139; 2 U.S.C. 933(g));

(2) in the House of Representatives, is designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles; and

(3) in the Senate, is designated as an emergency requirement and necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 3774.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 3774, which extends the deadline for the use of supplemental social service block grant funds, also known as SSBG, that were made available following the disasters that occurred in 2008.

This extension would provide a 1-year extension for the use of supplemental SSBG grant funds that were appropriated in the Disaster Assistance and Continuing Appropriation Act of 2009 in response to the natural disasters that occurred in 2008. The legislation provided \$600 million for disaster recovery for States affected by hurricane, floods, and other natural disasters that occurred in the year 2008.

Over 60 percent of the money that was appropriated has been spent, leaving a great deal of funding available to address the ongoing needs in States that have been adversely affected by natural disasters. While a number of States have been successful in quickly drawing down the funds that were available to support disaster cleanup, many others need additional time to utilize the resources effectively.

The legislation follows a precedent that was established by the Congress in recent years when we acted to extend the availability of supplemental SSBG funds that were appropriated for the recovery efforts following Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. These funds were extended for a 2-year period to allow additional time for affected States to make use of these resources.

Additionally, the legislation is PAYGO compliant and will not add one dime to the Federal deficit. The funding has already been allocated. The bill simply makes the appropriation available for an additional year.

The legislation, which passed the Senate in late September by unanimous consent, is very similar to a bill

that was introduced in the House by Representative PETE OLSON that has bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 3774.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman on the other side very aptly summarized what this bill does so I will not repeat that.

In my home State of Florida, according to State officials, more time for this appropriation is absolutely vital but we're not alone. The latest HHS data suggests another 15 States had unexpended funds. Just like in Florida, residents of those States affected by the 2008 natural disasters stand to benefit from the additional flexibility resulting from this legislation.

Significantly, the Congressional Budget Office says that the bill will not add to the deficit. It would simply change the timing for the spending already approved of these funds. It is also important to note that this same sort of flexibility had previously been granted for recovery funds in the wake of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. So it makes sense to provide similar treatment for funds provided in the wake of the 2008 natural disasters, and I'm very pleased to support this legislation that will accomplish that.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman, and particularly, I thank the Ways and Means Committee, both the managers on the floor today, Mr. McDERMOTT and Ms. BROWN-WAITE, for their leadership, and I thank the entire Texas delegation and as well my good friend Mr. OLSON, who I know will be appearing on the floor, for his leadership, along with Mr. CORNYN.

We worked together. This is a bipartisan effort and I am glad to be on the floor because we tried to do this on September 29, and I don't think we made our story clear. This is not a Texas issue. In fact, this issue impacts all of the disasters that occurred in 2008, and I would like to, Mr. Speaker, simply call some of the names: The State of Colorado, the State of Florida, Georgia, Illinois, the State of Iowa, the State of Mississippi, the State of Missouri, the States of Nevada, Oklahoma, Texas, and West Virginia, among the many that did not get a chance to help the desperate.

And so I'd like to particularly thank today, in addition to the members of the Texas delegation, Majority Leader HOYER, who continued to work with us and to ensure that we can move this as quickly as possible; and his staff, Terry Lierman and Austin Burnes, who also worked closely with my staff, Yohannes Tsehai and Shashrina Thomas, to bring this to the floor along with my colleagues.

□ 1910

Thousands of families who were victims of Hurricane Ike stopped receiving SSBG funds September 30, 2010, because the legislatively mandated deadline for these funds expired. We made and I made concerted efforts with the Department of Health and Human Services, and I would like to introduce into the RECORD a letter written by my office on September 21, 2010, as well as a letter written back from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, October 1, 2010, from which I read this sentence: "As soon as Congress restores the availability of Hurricane Ike SSBG funding, we will work expeditiously to implement the legislation and make the funds available to those doing the important work of assisting victims rebuild their lives."

There lies the story, Mr. Speaker. Rebuilding lives. For those of us who walked the streets after Hurricane Ike and for the many Members of Congress who walked the streets of their respective disasters, we know what disasters are all about. Not bricks and mortar. Disasters are about the human devastation that faces individuals, lost and lonely, not knowing where to go.

Hurricane Ike was the third-costliest hurricane ever to make landfall in the United States. Ike made its final landfall near Galveston, Texas, a strong Category 2 hurricane with a Category 5 equivalent storm surge. It devastated the island, but it also impacted Houston and my congressional district. It was a huge hurricane, some 500 miles across, making it nearly as big as Texas itself, and its hurricane-force winds extended 120 miles from the center. It was blamed for at least 195 deaths overall, with substantial death and injury in Texas.

The hurricane also resulted in the largest evacuation of Texas in the State's history. An estimated 100,000 homes were flooded in Texas, numerous boats washed away, smashing and flooding homes, knocking out windows, cutting electricity to an estimated 2.8 million to 4.5 million. Most of the people were devastated because the electricity went out for almost 8 weeks. And they were individuals without the ability to go to work and their jobs were cut off. So these dollars will not be misused.

The important point of this legislation is, there is a PAYGO provision in it. It will not spend more money. It will only have the opportunity to use the dollars that are already there. For those of us who have faced disaster, whether it is Hurricane Katrina, Hurricane Rita, the floods in the Midwest, or the various tornadoes that occur throughout our area, or the hurricanes that seem to come every year to the gulf region, I can assure you that these dollars are coming none too soon.

I want to thank the administration's Secretary Sebelius who has indicated that they will move quickly. As this bill passes, we hope that this will move quickly to the President's desk, the

bill is signed, and these moneys will come forward.

Let me acknowledge the groups that we have worked with: Angela Blanchard of the Neighborhood Centers; Harold Fattig of Catholic Charities; Mr. Raimer of the University of Texas Medical Branch; Mark Minick of Lutheran Social Services; Kristi Allen, Bay Area Council; Stephanie Carmona, Sunshine Center; United Way, Anna Babin; Kenna Bush, United Way of Galveston; Carolyn Rose of the Gulf Coast Center; Joe Compian, Gulf Coast Interfaith; Galveston County Food Bank, Mark Davis; Cindy Schulz; and a very strong worker in Ruama Camp, who worked throughout the area with people who could find no way themselves.

So this money will come and help those who are in need of these dollars posthaste. It extends the deadline until September 30, 2011. The bill does not appropriate new funds, as I indicated; and as you well know, they've extended this in years past with Katrina and Rita.

It's a terrible shame to say that people who need help are those who are costing us money. Today, Mr. Speaker, they're not costing us money. We're helping those who are hardworking Americans. I'm delighted to be able to support this legislation. I ask my colleagues to do it. Never forget, we have a role of being a good Samaritan. If you were in need, you would want help. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 21, 2010.

Hon. KATHLEEN SEBELIUS,
Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY SEBELIUS: In early 2009, in the aftermath of Hurricane Ike, the State of Texas received \$219 million in recovery funds under the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) program from the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). As you know under federal law, if these grant funds are not spent by September 30, 2010, these funds will be permanently returned to the federal treasury.

Hurricane Ike has wreaked havoc on Texas, particularly in Galveston and Houston. As we move forward with recovery efforts, it is clear that the impact of this storm has been widespread and many people are still in need of assistance. Unfortunately, Texans are still in need of help, especially the neglected residents of North Galveston. More than 60 Americans and over 26 Texans have died as a result of Hurricane Ike. In addition, the hurricane has caused millions of dollars in damage throughout Houston and Galveston. The local agencies processing the people impacted by Hurricane Ike for which these funds were utilized, received these funds from the state and federal agencies six months late, and therefore have not been able to complete the process of serving the families impacted by Hurricane Ike. Losing these funds on September 30, 2010 will result in the terrible tragedy for the many people that are still suffering from the effect of one of the most costliest hurricanes in our region. Therefore, I am requesting an extension of an additional six months from September 30, 2010, for social services agencies throughout the State of Texas to utilize these grant funds.

Once again, I ask that you strongly consider extending the deadline for the \$219 million in recovery funds under SSBG for an additional six months from September 30, 2010. I have the support of my Congressional colleagues from Texas in my efforts to ensure that Houston and Texas receive the funds we so desperately need on the road to recovery. Thank you for your consideration to this urgent matter.

Very truly yours,

SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH
AND HUMAN SERVICES,
Washington, DC, October 1, 2010.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON LEE: I write in response to your letter of September 21, 2010, concerning the expiration of Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) funds that Texas received to assist in the recovery from Hurricane Ike. I asked our General Counsel to review this issue further to see if there were any possible avenues to extend the availability of these funds. Unfortunately, the original statutory language providing the funds does not give me the authority to extend their availability.

Ike was one of the most devastating storms to ever hit the Gulf Coast. The work of recovery has been arduous, and I thank the individuals and organizations who have been helping those who have suffered because of the hurricane. Their efforts should be commended. We want to support them as much as we can.

I recognize that the Senate has passed legislation making these funds available for another fiscal year and that Majority Leader Hoyer has affirmed plans for the House of Representatives to consider the matter when Congress returns in November. As soon as Congress restores the availability of Hurricane Ike SSBG funding, we will work expeditiously to implement the legislation and make the funds available to those doing the important work of assisting victims rebuild their lives.

I thank you for your leadership in helping these families and organizations.

Sincerely,

KATHLEEN SEBELIUS.

I rise today in strong support of S. 3774, to extend the deadline for Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) expenditures of supplemental funds appropriated following the disasters that occurred in 2008, particularly Hurricane Ike. I would like to thank all the Members and their staffs who worked in a collaborative and bipartisan manner to bring this essential legislation to the House floor today. I would like to especially thank Majority Leader HOYER and Terry Lierman and Austin Burnes of his staff, who worked closely with Yohannes Tsehai and Shashrina Thomas of my staff, to bring this important legislation to the House floor today.

Thousands of families who were victims of Hurricane Ike stopped receiving SSBG funds on September 30, 2010, because the legislatively mandated deadline for these funds expired. I made concerted efforts with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to extend this deadline administratively, but they determined that they needed legislative authority to extend these funds. I would like to thank Secretary Sebelius and the Department of Health and Human Services for responding favorably to my request to expeditiously implement this legislation as soon as it

passes and make the funds available to those organizations assisting victims on the road to recovery. I would also like to thank HHS Regional Director Marge Petty who accepted my invitation to come down to Houston and meet with the organizations in Houston and Galveston who are assisting thousands of families with home repairs and other unmet needs.

Some of the organizations who have been instrumental in these efforts include Neighborhood Centers Inc., Catholic Charities, the United Way, Gulf Coast Interfaith, and the University of Texas Medical Branch, to name a few. Moreover, I think it is crucial that we are providing this legislative authority today before the Thanksgiving holiday so that these families can continue on their road to recovery from the devastation of Hurricane Ike.

Hurricane Ike was the third costliest hurricane ever to make landfall in the United States, behind Hurricane Andrew of 1992 and Hurricane Katrina of 2005. Ike made its final landfall near Galveston, Texas as a strong Category 2 hurricane, with a Category 5 equivalent storm surge. Ike was a huge hurricane—some 500 miles across, making it nearly as big as Texas itself, and its hurricane-force winds extended 120 miles from the center.

Ike was blamed for at least 195 deaths overall, with substantial death and injury in Texas. The hurricane also resulted in the largest evacuation of Texans in this State's history; subsequently it became the largest search and rescue operation in U.S. history. The effects of Hurricane Ike in Texas have been crippling and long-lasting. An estimated 100,000 homes were flooded in Texas, and numerous boats washed ashore, smashing and flooding thousands of homes, knocking out windows in Houston's skyscrapers, uprooting trees, and cutting electricity to an estimated 2.8 million to 4.5 million customers for weeks and months. Galveston was declared uninhabitable, and Houston imposed a week-long nighttime curfew due to limited electric power.

When Hurricane Ike devastated Texas in September 2008, I immediately began to work with the Members of the Texas Congressional delegation to ensure Texas was appropriated recovery funds it so desperately needed. In early 2009, the State of Texas received part of these recovery funds, almost \$219 million under the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) program from the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). Although more than \$174 million of this have been drawn down, there remains over \$44 million to Texas that cannot be utilized without today's extension. Furthermore, of the total \$600 million in SSBG funding appropriated in 2009, there also remains more than \$152 million for 14 States that can be used with the passage of S. 3774.

What has now taken place until today's legislation passes is that SSBG funds which were not utilized by September 30, 2010, were made permanently unavailable for the thousands of Hurricane Ike victims who have been waiting for the completion of social services and their homes to be restored. It would be devastating to Hurricane Ike victims to lose these funds, especially when many of their homes are in the middle of repairs. Furthermore, the numerous local agencies assisting and processing the cases of families impacted by Hurricane Ike, received these funds from the state and federal agencies many months

late due to administrative delays. These delays have caused the agencies to not be able to complete the process of serving everyone impacted by Hurricane Ike since they did not get the benefit of the two years that Congress had intended.

The effects of Hurricane Ike on Texas were drastic and far reaching, affecting hundreds of thousands of people. According to FEMA, within the first week following the disaster, nearly 438,000 individuals or families had registered for individual assistance. By the end of the registration period in February 2009, a total of 734,000 Texans had registered with FEMA for individual assistance. Hurricane Ike destroyed 17,000 homes in Harris County alone.

Due to the lapse in the reimbursement of SSBG funds, many victims are unable to access services critical to their recovery such as unfinished home repairs, unmet needs, mental and physical healthcare, employment services, transportation and legal services. All of these issues are currently being aggravated until these funds to these victims' resumes. Once this extension is granted, not only will these families resume services, this extension will not require any additional funding. According to the Congressional Budget Office who have scored this legislation, this bill will not have a budget authority (BA) effect, but rather only an outlay effect on the timing of payments. Finally, there is also recent precedence for extending these types of disaster funds. Congress routinely extended the deadline for similar funds given to Hurricane Katrina and Rita victims.

Once this legislation passes, I will continue to work with the Department of Health and Human Services to ensure that funding for social services agencies throughout the State of Texas is provided as expeditiously as possible so that the victims of Hurricane Ike receive the assistance they so desperately need on their road to recovery.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this essential legislation.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) who was forward-thinking enough to introduce this legislation to begin with.

Mr. OLSON. I thank my colleague from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate bill 3774. I introduced companion legislation, H.R. 5790, which would do the same thing as this good bill. Two years ago, Hurricane Ike tore through the Gulf of Mexico and made landfall in Galveston, Texas. It was the largest hurricane ever, ever to make landfall in the United States. Ike slammed into Galveston as a Category 2 hurricane but with a storm surge equivalent to that of a Category 4 storm, causing damages estimated at \$18 billion. Over 200 people lost their lives.

Two years later, what Ike destroyed in 12 hours continues to be rebuilt. In response to the storm, an emergency appropriations bill was passed for the purpose of assisting the victims of Ike. The funding came with a deadline that the State of Texas and the local communities now need extended. This is

not without precedent. A similar extension was granted for victims of Hurricane Katrina.

In the process of recovering from Ike, please consider that Catholic Charities reports that there are over 3,500 families in Galveston who are in the process of getting their homes repaired or replaced who still need rent assistance. The Gulf Coast Center in Galveston and Brazoria Counties is working with 19 agencies to provide mental health support and counseling to 3,000 clients each month who are still suffering from the impact of Hurricane Ike on their lives. The University of Texas Medical Branch reports that they are providing food assistance, medical care, and case management to 20,000 households each month. This will end without an extension.

In the words of one leader at the United Way, "We are not asking to access more funding, only to finish what we started." Do I wish this extension was not needed? Of course. We all do. But it is needed, and I ask that this Chamber join me in doing what is right and fair for a community that lost so much 2 years ago. I urge my colleagues to vote for Senate bill 3774, so the people of southeast Texas can finally put Hurricane Ike in their past.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 3774, which would extend the deadline for Social Services Block Grant expenditures of supplemental funds appropriated following disasters occurring in 2008.

The FY2009 Supplemental Appropriation included funding for disasters that occurred in 2008. This included \$600 million in Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) funding eligible to be used for a wide variety of social services to assist in disaster recovery.

In the wake of Hurricane Ike, a total of 734,000 Texans had registered with FEMA for individual assistance and 17,000 homes in Harris County were destroyed.

Due to the magnitude of Ike, the State of Texas received \$219 million in recovery funds under the Social Services Block Grant program from the Department of Health and Human Services.

Under federal law, these SSBG funds must be spent by September 30, 2010. Any money not spent by that time must be returned to the federal Treasury. Texas currently has \$44 million in funding that will revert back to the federal government.

Many entities and local governments in Texas have expressed difficulty in meeting the September 30, 2010 deadline and are requesting a one year extension to September 30, 2011.

Although there have been significant successes through the recovery process, significant needs remain. In the Greater Houston area, more than 2,500 families in case management still cite needs in the area of home repair and/or unmet needs.

It is important to note that Texas is not the only state that would lose access to these funds—16 other states have remaining funds and an extension would assist those states as well.

A similar extension was granted by Congress for Hurricane Katrina SSBG disaster re-

covery funds. It is also important to note that this bill involves no new spending. The SSBG grant funds were released and dispersed to the states over a year ago. This bill will only give those who need it, extra time to expend these needed funds as they continue to recover from Hurricane Ike.

Senator CORNYN's legislation, S. 3774, passed out of the Senate on a unanimous consent. It would extend the deadline for Social Services Block Grant expenditures of supplemental funds appropriated following disasters occurring in 2008 for one year from September 30, 2010 to September 30, 2011.

Before the House recessed on September 29 we tried to bring up this legislation, but it came over from the Senate very late and we were unable to come to an agreement to bring up the legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to allow the states impacted by disasters that occurred in 2008.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. And with that, I would ask for support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3774.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1920

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

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

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

TAX CUTS

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, sometime between now and December 31 we will be discussing tax cuts—specifically, whether to extend the President Obama tax cuts for the middle class or

whether to extend the George W. Bush tax cuts for the rich—and I think it is important for people to understand exactly who this money will be received by.

In the case of the Obama tax cuts, like the child tax credit, it will be received by needy parents who need the money in order to pay the mortgage, pay the rent, pay their car payments, their credit card payments. And in the case of the Bush tax cuts for the rich, it will be received by the rich.

In fact, for the top 1 percent of income in this country, the high and mighty, the people who make an average of \$1.4 million every single year, according to these charts I am about to show, you will see the following:

Mr. Speaker, the Republican plan for tax cuts is to give each millionaire, each person who makes \$1.4 million a year on the average, the top 1 percent of income in this country, the high and mighty, \$83,347 a year in tax cuts. \$83,347 a year, according to econometric modeling by Citizens for Tax Justice.

Let's give some thought as to what the high and mighty might actually do with that money.

Well, here is one possibility. They can buy an \$83,000 Mercedes-Benz E-Class car not just once, but every single year for the next decade. And each year when they get tired of their brand-new Mercedes-Benz E-Class car, they can just give it to somebody because they can afford another one. They can give it to a spouse, a sister, a son, a daughter, anybody. Every single year for the next 10 years, the Republican tax plan is to give millionaires enough money for a Mercedes-Benz.

Here is something else they can do with it. They can buy this gorgeous Hermes bag, a Birkin, for \$64,800, not once, but every single year for the next 10 years, to which they will say to the Republican party, "Thank you very much."

Here is something else they can do with their money. They can buy this bottle of Chateau d'Yquem wine, bottled in 1787, for only \$56,588. That will leave loose change in their pocket of \$25,000. They can buy a bottle of wine from 1787 every year for the next decade. Thank you, Republican Party.

Here is something else they can do. They can buy 20,000 jars of their favorite mustard, Grey Poupon, 20,000 jars. That is certainly enough for them, their family, their friends, even a few poor people. Thank you, Republican party.

Here is something else they can do with the \$80,000 that the Republican Party wants to put in their pocket every year for the next 10 years. They can buy 800 cigars. Think about that. That is one for the morning and one for the evening, 800 luxury cigars. Then they can light each one of those cigars with a \$100 bill. Thank you, Republican Party. You are letting the rich in this country enjoy two cigars each day for the next 10 years and light each one with a \$100 bill.

Now, I have a different idea. I think it is a better idea. These tax cuts for the rich by the Republican Party are going to cost the U.S. taxpayers \$100 billion a year. Do the math. We have 14 million people in this country who are unemployed. We have 13 percent unemployment in my district.

Here is an idea. Let's take that \$100 billion and give 3 million Americans a job. Let's give 3 million Americans a working wage, an honest day's pay for an honest day's work, and that will revive our economy. It will immediately reduce unemployment by two points. And they will take that money and they will spend it on their rent. They will spend it on restaurants in their neighborhood. They will spend it on getting their hair cut. They will spend it on their credit card payments. They will spend it on the things they need to do to stay alive, instead of the alternative, the Republican favorite alternative, which is to have them lose their jobs, keep unemployed, and move into their cars. That is the better idea.

I favor jobs, not tax cuts for the rich.

OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

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. I thank the Speaker for yielding time to me.

About 3 weeks ago, I and four of my colleagues wrote a letter to the President of the United States. Mr. POE of Texas, my good friend, RALPH HALL of Texas, PETE OLSON, and ED ROYCE of California wrote a letter to the President talking to him about the horrible, deteriorating problem that is taking place on our southern border.

We have a border between the United States and Mexico that is 1,980 miles long, and the problems are getting worse every single day. There have been reports on numerous television channels over the past few weeks talking about how really bad it is getting down there, and there is absolutely nothing being done by the administration to really deal with it.

Now, in the letter that we wrote to the President, we said it was extremely important to get on with dealing with this problem very quickly, and we gave the President a few ideas on how this could be accomplished.

First, we said, it became apparent that the Mexican Government and law enforcement authorities in Mexico are either unwilling or unable to address this problem. Therefore, we believe it is imperative that our President meet very quickly and begin a serious dialogue with President Calderon of Mexico on building a comprehensive framework in the spirit of Plan Colombia that will better coordinate a more aggressive and proactive strategy to turn the tide. This needs to be done immediately.

Second, we must complete construction of the border fence. The money

has been appropriated for that and it has been stopped. We need to get that completed. Any responsibility we have to minimize the impact of the fence on the physical landscape or native species in the region pales in comparison when measured against the value of human lives that will be lost if we don't seal the border.

And, finally, we said to the President in this letter, we believe it is critical that we deploy additional National Guard troops to the border. Media reports indicate that 17,000 National Guard troops were deployed to the Gulf region during the recent oil spill, 17,000; yet the administration has pledged only 1,200 to the 1,980-mile border of Mexico. Twelve hundred National Guard troops to protect that border; that is nothing. It will not work.

When you talk to sheriffs and Border Patrol agents who are down on the border, they will tell you that it is a war zone and it is spilling over into the United States, and American citizens are being killed on the Mexican side of the border. But bullets are actually coming across the border and hitting things in the United States in Juarez and elsewhere.

It is extremely important that we address this problem before it gets completely out of control. And some people say we are already there.

We have signs in Arizona 80 miles into the United States, 80 miles into the United States, saying, "Don't go south of here toward Mexico because it is dangerous." Can you imagine?

We are sending troops halfway around the world to fight for people's freedom and to secure our country from terrorist attacks, and yet we have the prospect of terrorists and drug dealers and everybody coming across that border because we are not protecting it, and it is in our front yard, 1,980 miles, and it is unprotected. They are coming across at will.

□ 1930

The President needs to get on with doing what is necessary. I believe he needs to authorize at least 15,000 troops down there and work with the Mexican government to seal both sides of the border and get on with it as quickly as possible. If we don't, the problem is going to get worse and worse and worse.

If you don't believe what I am saying tonight, and if I were talking to the President, I would tell him directly this: "If you don't believe this, Mr. President," I know he watches television once in awhile, and if I were talking to the President I would say, "Watch what is going on and do your job, Mr. President, instead of fighting the Governor of Arizona and the people in Texas, the law enforcement agencies along the border who are staying up day and night trying to defend their constituents in the border area."

People are being threatened. Their houses are being threatened to be

burned to the ground if they even take pictures of the people coming across the border. This is a tragic situation, and if I were talking to the President tonight, I would say, "Mr. President, you are being derelict in your responsibility to the people of the southwest part of the United States by not addressing this problem in a very thorough and comprehensive way."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, October 26, 2010.

Hon. BARACK OBAMA,

President of the United States of America, The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to you today to express our extreme concern regarding the deteriorating security situation along our Nation's southern border. It seems that every day brings a new report of some atrocity; the most recent being the apparent murder of a U.S. citizen at Falcon Lake, Texas; yet little if anything appears to be being done by our government or the Mexican government to stop the bloodshed and bring the perpetrators to justice.

Protecting our borders and our citizens is a paramount responsibility of the Federal government; enshrined in the preamble of the Constitution. It would be an unforgivable breach of our constitutional responsibilities if we do not take stronger measures not only to prevent the upward spiral of violence from further spilling over into the United States and threaten the safety of U.S. citizens on American soil but to reclaim those areas of our border already overrun by smugglers and criminals. We can no longer pretend that this is simply Mexico's problem. The time has come to recognize that the drug violence along the border is a direct threat to the United States and act accordingly.

First, it has become apparent that the Mexican government and law enforcement authorities are either unwilling or unable to address this problem unilaterally. Therefore, we believe it is imperative that you immediately begin serious dialogue with President Calderon on building a comprehensive framework, in the spirit of Plan Colombia, that will better coordinate a more aggressive and proactive strategy to turn the tide of this conflict.

Second, we must complete construction of the border fence. Any responsibility we have to minimize the impact of the fence on the physical landscape or native species in the region pales in comparison when measured against the value of human lives that will be lost if we do not seal the border.

Finally, we believe it is critical that we deploy additional National Guard troops to the border. Media reports indicate that 17,000 National Guard troops were deployed to the Gulf region to respond to the recent oil spill. Yet, you have only pledged 1,200 National Guard troops to protect the border—and according to media reports only a small fraction of those troops have arrived to date. It is unrealistic, if not pure insanity, to believe that a mere 1,200 National Guard troops, even with the support of the Border Patrol, can effectively cover the nearly 2,000 mile long Southwestern border of the United States. We must put additional bodies on the ground and we must give them the weapons and specify rules of engagement that give them the authority to do whatever is necessary to secure the border. A National Guard trooper armed with only a pistol and given no authority to engage the enemy is useless against a criminal armed with military grade weapons and ammunition.

Mr. President, we implore you to view this situation for what it is, a war and to act accordingly.

Sincerely,

DAN BURTON,

RALPH HALL,
ED ROYCE,
TED POE,
PETE OLSON.

[From FoxNews.com]

AMERICA'S THIRD WAR: NATIONAL GUARD'S
NEW MISSION

(By Casey Stegall)

There are many theories on how to effectively secure the nearly 2,000-mile-long border the United States shares with Mexico.

Some believe building a fence to separate us from our southern neighbor is the best route while others think adding additional surveillance equipment and Border Patrol checkpoints will help decrease the number of illegal immigrants and drugs entering America.

One thing virtually everyone close to the border security issue can agree on: America seems to be waging a third war with the Mexican cartels that will stop at nothing to smuggle humans and drugs into our homeland and the national security threat it poses.

One of the more popular ideas on how to secure the region is through the deployment of troops and creation of a strong military presence along the border. In May, President Obama gave the green light for up to 1,200 National Guard troops to be assigned to the four southwest border states. In late September, armed troops started trickling in and working alongside U.S. Border Patrol agents, but the ramp up period is a gradual process since it takes a great deal of time to train the soldiers for their new mission.

According to the National Guard Bureau, nearly 1,200 troops are at work on border issues as of Monday: 263 in California, 561 in Arizona, 80 in New Mexico, 284 in Texas and 10 others assigned to border issues at the National Guard Bureau in Virginia. The deployment is expected to last one year although no official end date has been made public.

Sheriff Paul Babeu, Pinal County Arizona: I'm telling you, as a sheriff, where we're the number one passer county here in Arizona, that it's not secure. That the violence and the concerns we have, are more than just a public safety matter. 520 soldiers are not going to stop it. We have said we need 3000 armed soldiers just here in Arizona.

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.)

HEROES AMONG US RETURN WITH
HONOR

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, it was dusk when he left Thailand and entered Laotian airspace. Soon he was flying into North Vietnam as darkness came over the horizon. It was his 25th mission into North Vietnam flying an F-4 Phantom jet.

The date was April 16, 1966. The pilot was Sam Johnson, United States Air Force colonel, and he was doing his second tour of duty in Vietnam. He was flying with the fighter squadron called Satan's Angels. He was a career pilot

who had already flown 62 combat missions during the Korean War flying an F-86 Sabre jet. Colonel Johnson also flew with the famed Air Force Thunderbirds.

This is a photograph of Colonel Sam Johnson, United States Air Force.

But this day of April 16th, 1966, Colonel Johnson was shot down by ground fire from the North Vietnamese. He was captured, he was put in a prisoner of war camp, and, Mr. Speaker, he was in that POW camp for 7 years.

Because of the way that he would not give in to the torture and to the interrogation, they moved him to the famous "Hanoi Hilton" and a place called "Alcatraz." Alcatraz was where 11 POWs were put because they were the most obstinate POWs, leaders of the other POWs. They were hard-nosed and they had to be segregated, and they called themselves the "Alcatraz gang." They were defiant, and the North Vietnamese called this man right here "Die Hard." They tortured him, but they got no information from him.

During those 7 years he was beaten and tortured, but he never broke down. So then they put him in solitary confinement for 4 years in a cell 3-feet-wide by 9 feet, and he was there for 4 years. During that 4 years, all that was in that cell was a lightbulb that they kept on 24 hours a day. During the nighttime, they put him into leg irons, and during that 4 years, he never saw or talked to another American.

While in the POW camp, he and the other POWs communicated with each other with a code by tapping on the wall, and during that time he memorized the names of 374 other POWs. He kept that memory going so that when he got away or was released or escaped, he would be able to tell their loved ones who they were and where they were.

The torture continued every day. One example was this: One morning the North Vietnamese took him out of his cell and lined him up to shoot him. They told him they were going to kill him in a firing squad. They lined him up. Armed with AK-47s, they pulled the trigger, but there was no ammunition in those AK-47s. They laughed and made fun of Colonel Sam, and all he said was, "Is that the best you can do?"

For food he ate weeds, pig fat and rice. He went down from 200 pounds to 120 pounds. And after 7 years of confinement, he was finally released with other POWs. He suffered torture and broken bones during that time that he still suffers from today.

He continued to serve in the United States Air Force for 29 total years. While he was in that POW camp, his wife back home in Texas, Shirley, had known that he was shot down, but she didn't know for 2 years where Sam was, whether he was alive, dead, or missing in action. They have now been married for 60 years.

After he left the United States Air Force, he served in the statehouse in

Texas, had his own business, and then in 1991 he came and served with distinction here in the United States Congress.

Today, Colonel Sam celebrates his 80th birthday. Down the street, he and a lot of friends, Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle and family, are honoring him on his birthday.

You know, Sam returned home to the United States after his torture and confinement in the POW camps. You notice right here, this patch, Mr. Speaker? You see what this patch says, which is from the 31st Fighter Wing? It says "Return With Honor."

Sam Johnson returned to America with honor. He is a special breed. He is the American breed. Where does America find such men as Sam Johnson? He is one of those. And he is that special warrior during even the time he was a captive warrior that never forsook his duty and never forsook his honor.

So, Colonel Sam, we thank you for your service to the United States of America during war and during peacetime. Thank you for serving this great country. You are truly a hero among us.

Here are the commendations that Colonel Sam Johnson received while serving in the United States Air Force:

COMMENDATIONS

2 Silver Stars
2 Legions of Merit
Distinguished Flying Cross
Bronze Star w/Combat "V" (Valor)
2 Purple Hearts
4 Air Medals
POW Medal
3 USAF Outstanding Unit Citations

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman 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 New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

SAYING ENOUGH IS ENOUGH REGARDING TSA AIRPORT SCREENING

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to announce that I introduced some legislation today dealing with the calamity that we have found at our airports with TSA. Something has to be done. Everybody is fed up. The people are fed up, the pilots are fed up, I am fed up.

I have come to this floor many times over the past many years and complained about the terrible foreign policy we have had, the terrible monetary policy we have had, the excessive spending and the debt, and also the tax policy. But what we are doing and what we are accepting and putting up with at the airports is so symbolic of us just not standing up and saying enough is enough.

I know the American people are starting to wake up, but our government, those in charge, Congress, as well as the executive branch, are doing nothing. Yes, they are talking about maybe backing off and allowing the pilots to go through. But can you think how silly the whole thing is? The pilot has a gun in the cockpit and he is managing this aircraft, which is a missile, and we make him go through this groping X-ray exercise, having people feeling their underwear. It is absurd, and it is time we wake up.

The bill I have introduced will take care of this. But we have to realize that the real problem is that the American people have been too submissive. We have been too submissive. It has been going on for a long time. This was to be expected even from the beginning of the TSA. And it is deeply flawed. Private property should be protected by private individuals, not bureaucrats.

But the bill that I have introduced will take care of it. It is very simple. It is one paragraph long. It removes the immunity from anybody in the Federal government that does anything that you or I can't do.

If you can't grope another person and if you can't X-ray people and endanger them with possible X-rays, you can't take nude photographs of individuals, why do we allow the government to do it? We would go to jail. He would be immediately arrested, if an individual citizen went up and did these things, and yet we just sit there and calmly say, oh, they are making us safe. And besides, the argument from the executive branch is that when you buy a ticket, you have sacrificed your rights and it is the duty of the government to make us safe.

That isn't the case. You never have to sacrifice your rights. The duty of the government is to protect our rights, not to use them and do what they have been doing to us.

□ 1940

The pilots, hopefully, will be exempted from this.

Another suggestion I have that might help us: let's make sure that every Member of Congress goes through this. Get the x-ray and make them look at the pictures and then go through one of those groping pat-downs, and then I think there would be a difference. Have everybody in the executive branch, anybody—a Cabinet member—make them go through it and look at it. Maybe they would pay more attention. But this doesn't work. This

is not what makes us safer. This is preposterous to think that the TSA has made us safer.

When you think about it, if you look at what's happened over the past 10 years, during this last decade, we lost 3,000 on a terrible, terrible day for America. But since that time in this last decade we have also lost 6,000 of our military personnel going over there and trying to rectify this problem. We have lost 400,000 people on our government-run highways. We have lost 150,000 individuals from homicides.

So I think there's reason to be concerned, reason to deal with this problem. We're not dealing with it the right way. We're doing the wrong thing. And groping people at the airport doesn't solve our problems. What has solved our problems, basically, has been that they put a good lock on the door, and they put a gun inside the cockpit. That's been the greatest boon to our safety.

Safety should be the responsibility of the individual and the private property owner. But right now we assume the government's always going to take care of us, and we are supposed to sacrifice our liberties. I say that is wrong. We are not safer. And we also know there are individuals who are making money off this. Michael Chertoff, here's a guy that was the head of the TSA, selling the equipment. And the equipment is questionable. We don't even know if it works, and it may well be dangerous to our health.

The way I see this, if this doesn't change, I see what has happened to the American people is we have accepted the notion that we should be treated like cattle. Make us safe, make us secure, put us in barbed wire, feed us, fatten us up, and then they'll eat us. And we're a bunch of cattle, and we have to wake up and say, We've had it.

I think this whole idea of an opt-out day is just great. We ought to opt out and make the point. Get somebody to watch. And take a camera. It's time for the American people to stand up and shrug off the shackles of our government at TSA at the airports.

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.)

IN MEMORY OF ROSS BEACH

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. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in memory of my friend, Ross Beach. The House rules only allow me 5 minutes to speak, and it's difficult to summarize anyone's life in such a short time, but impossible to do justice to the life of Mr. Beach.

Ross passed away this weekend at his home at the age of 92. Ross was defined by family and friends, business success, and charity.

A lifelong Kansan, Ross received his education in my hometown of Hays. Following a childhood upbringing in the oil and gas fields of western Kansas, Ross enrolled at Kansas State University, where he met and later married the love of his life, Marianna Kistler. They were married in 1941. Ross's service as a naval aviator during World War II sparked an interest in flying that would continue throughout his life.

Ross was a pioneer in our State in banking, radio and television, and in oil and gas. His many professional endeavors created jobs and economic opportunity for many Kansans. He was the president of Kansas Natural Gas Company and chairman of the board of Douglas County Bank. His success in the business world was overshadowed only by his and his wife's generosity. Ross and Marianna are among our State's most prolific supporters of arts and education—the greatest supporters that perhaps we will ever see in our State. On the campus of Fort Hays State University, the Beach family helped fund the Beach-Schmidt Performing Arts Center, and Ross's generosity made possible the construction of the nationally renowned Sternberg Museum of National History.

The Marianna Kistler Beach Museum of Art on the campus of Kansas State University bears the name of Mrs. Beach, which was named for her in commemoration of their 50th wedding anniversary. My wife, Robba, and I have been honored to serve on the board of visitors at the art museum that bears the Beach name, and we're able to witness firsthand the passion and commitment Ross and Marianna had for culture and the arts in Kansas. On the campus of the University of Kansas, Ross assisted in the formation of the Beach Center on Disability, where Kansans with disabilities and their families are helped to lead healthier and more productive lives.

Kansans from all walks of life have benefited from Ross's compassion to others and his service to community. He was recognized on many, many occasions, including his designation as Kansan of the Year in 2002; the President's Award from Kansas State University in 1989; and, along with his wife, the Citations for Distinguished Service from both the University of Kansas and Fort Hays State University.

Despite his stature in our community and State, Mr. Beach always treated every person he encountered with respect and dignity. Anyone who met Ross easily became a lifelong friend. As a young newlywed couple starting out our new life in Hays, the first invitation Robba and I received was to come to Ross and Marianna's home for dinner. There was never a more gracious couple than the Beaches.

For a large portion of my life, I joined Ross and other businessmen and professionals for lunch at The Roundtable. While there was a lot of talk of sports and politics, I learned a lot more about life by listening to Mr. Beach. From our earliest meeting to just last month, he was my friend and adviser. I hate the thought that no longer do I have the ability to pick up the phone and see what Mr. Beach thought of one of my ideas or to discuss what was going on in our small-town neighborhood or what was happening on the world stage.

My friendship with Mr. Beach certainly opened doors in business and politics; but, more importantly, he gave me the confidence to realize that this small-town Kansas kid could one day be able to serve his State and the Congress of the United States of America.

While my family and I are saddened by the death of Ross Beach, we take comfort in knowing the legacy of Mr. Beach will endure far beyond our own generation. While Ross Beach may have donated his talents and treasure, it is his caring nature and generous soul that I and many others will miss most. To Marianna and daughters Mary McDowell and husband Gary; Terry Edwards and husband R.A.; and Jane Hipp and husband Steve, I offer my deepest sympathies. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of a man dedicated to service and committed to making Kansas and America a better place to live and work.

We are told to whom much is given much is expected. Ross Beach more than fulfilled this expectation, and I'm honored this evening to pay tribute to an amazing, larger-than-life man that I had the fortune to know for nearly 35 years. The man who loved to fly soared throughout his life and landed safely on heaven's shore.

PRINCIPLES OF HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Next week will mark the 8-month anniversary of the new health care law. When we started this debate almost 2 years ago, I relied on my longtime experience in the medical field to come up with four principles that I strongly believe should be in any health care reform. The first was that health care reform should lower costs. That has yet to happen under this law. Instead, the Federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services projected that overall national health spending would increase an average of 6.3 percent a year over the next decade under the new law. In addition, the law imposes more than half a trillion dollars in tax increases. It imposes more than \$210 billion in new payroll taxes that could hit small business owners.

The Medicare actuary has reported that health care costs would actually increase over the next decade by a total of \$310.8 billion. The Congressional Budget Office, or the CBO, wrote that most of the major saving proposals in the health care law are "widely expected" to be scaled back or would be difficult to sustain for a long period. That means higher deficits.

The second principal for health care reform is that it should increase access to care. That has yet to happen under the new law. Instead, major health insurance companies in California and other States simply have decided to stop selling policies for children rather than complying with the new Federal law that bars them from rejecting youngsters with preexisting conditions. While these insurance companies are not distinguishing themselves, the reality is that they will always look out for their bottom line.

The Medicare actuary found that provisions in the law will cause as many as 40 percent of Medicare providers to become unprofitable over time, thus "providers would have to withdraw from providing services to Medicare beneficiaries." This will mean problems with access to care. An example is, in Texas, over the last 2 years, more than 300 primary care physicians have stopped seeing seniors.

□ 1950

My third principle is that we should preserve the innovations and improvements that have allowed this country to pioneer new treatments, medications, and equipment. Yet, under this law, there will be \$107 billion in taxes on drug and device manufacturers and insurers. That is more money for taxes and less money for innovation.

The bill requires small businesses to file 1099 forms to any vendor with which they spend more than \$600 in a given year. That will affect 40 million businesses that will be involved in increased paperwork at a huge cost, detracting from their ability to invest in research and development.

Finally, I believe that any reform of our health care system should preserve the decisionmaking process between the patient and the patient's physician, not the government, not a bureaucrat, and certainly not anyone from a health insurance company, but the new health care law does just the opposite.

In one estimate, the law creates 159 various bureaucracies and commissions, Mr. Speaker. In fact, the Congressional Research Service essentially threw its hands up in the air and concluded "the precise number of entities that will be created is currently unknowable." The administration has released 4,103 pages of regulations and is still going strong. Soon the government will be in control of every aspect of health care, but I assume that was the ultimate goal.

This 2,700-page law is, as the CRS says, "currently unknowable." Our Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, had it right

when she said the House would "have to pass the bill so you can find out what is in it." Yet what we do know about it violates all four of the principles on which any health care reform should be based.

I supported the Republican alternative 6 months ago, H.R. 3400, the Empowering Patients First Act. It includes my principles and it deserves support.

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

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida 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 North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES 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 New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity.

Coming off the elections, everyone wants to know what the voters had on their minds. I'll share with you a few things that I heard from my voters in my district and throughout California—perhaps experiences similar from around America.

They want jobs. They want to work.

I think all of us in one way or another understands and feels within us the need to work. It's part of our lives. There are a few, undoubtedly, around who don't ever want to work—and okay for them—but for most Americans, they want a job. They want the opportunity to bring home a paycheck, to support their families—to provide for their food, their shelter, their opportunities for education, and to go on a vacation every now and then. That basic instinct—that basic desire to care for your family, to help build a community—I think is part of America. Americans want jobs. If there were ever a message from this year's elections, it's that.

Now, this isn't new to those of us who are here in the Chamber. It's not

new to the Democrats, and I'm sure it's not new to my Republican colleagues also; but who actually over the last 2 years amongst all of us in this Chamber and in government have actually been working to create those jobs? I think it's the Democrats. We are going to make that point here today, not only about the past actions that have been taken over the last 2 years, but about what's coming in the future.

Early in 2010, many of us on the Democratic side began to formalize and to formulate a strategy, and we call that "Make It In America." If America is going to make it, then we must, once again, make it in America. We must rebuild our manufacturing industry, which is where we make things.

As a child, I remember looking at the pictures of America, of the great poetry of America's birth of industry, when the robust strength of this Nation was seen in the manufacturing sector. It was heavy industry at the time. It was the steel industry and the auto industry. That enormous strength of America carried us through World War II when we literally built the armaments to take on Nazi Germany and Japan. It was done here in the industries of America. The manufacturing base of this Nation needs to be rebuilt, and it is the Democratic Party and the programs that my colleagues and I will be talking about today which will cause that to happen. America will make it when we make it in America.

Joining me tonight are two of my fellow colleagues—PAUL TONKO, from the once and future great industrial part of New York, and Mr. ELLISON, from the great Midwest.

So I would like to turn to them for a few moments for introductory comments, and then we'll turn back, and we'll begin to hit not only what was done over the last 2 years but, also, where we are going in the future.

Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, and thank you for bringing us together on a very important topic. "Make it in America" manufacturing matters, absolutely. I think what has been promoted also as a subtheme here has been the investment in basic research, R&D, and in scientific research, making certain that we can move forward with cutting-edge, ahead-of-the-curve sort of technology that enables us to create jobs on the radar screen that simply are not there today, and it allows us to advance, I think, an energy agenda and an environmental agenda that allow for us to grow jobs.

Now, as you were making your introductory comments, I was thinking about America COMPETES, which is the legislation we did on this House floor several months ago. I think 98 percent of our Republican colleagues voted against the measure. We got just about no support. Yet it was supported by the United States Chamber of Commerce. They understood the wisdom of investing in R&D and basic research

and in providing for the modernization of our manufacturing sector.

I am convinced, like you, Representative ELLISON and others, that we can make it smarter in America, which will allow us to be very sharp, competitively speaking, on the global market scene. I think that we can do it in a way that allows us to advance jobs in this country simply by embracing the intellectual capacity of this great country.

In my home district of the 21st Congressional District in New York—the upstate region, the capital region—we are home to GE Corporate. I just witnessed their moving forward with plans to do advanced battery manufacturing, which will be the linchpin to all sorts of energy innovation. As we do that, we can grow jobs here in America by investing in R&D, by coming up with new product lines, and by making certain we're ahead of the curve on science and technology opportunities that are available to this Nation.

In the construct of the 21st Congressional District, I represent the old passageway—the Erie Canal, the route of freight-hauling—that really built America and inspired the westward movement. In so doing, in building that canal, we also gave birth to a necklace of communities called "mill towns," and they became the epicenter of invention and innovation. So it is within our DNA, that pioneer spirit, here in America to continue to do that, and I think we need those incentives that we talked about.

This leadership and this House during the 111th Congress gave birth to a number of ideas, including America COMPETES, closing tax loopholes for investments taking jobs offshore, taking them into other locations. We want to close those loopholes and absolutely promote the Small Business Jobs Act. Those were great cornerstones of development that will allow us to grow jobs, and as we know, we've had 10 consecutive months of private sector job growth.

□ 2000

We've now surpassed the million mark for private-sector jobs, and that's a great accomplishment in light of the 8.2 million that were lost during the Bush recession. And speaking of President Bush's track record, they were losing jobs. They were losing a net—we had a net zero gain of private-sector jobs during that administration. This 1 million is a great mark as we move forward in this calendar year to turn this country around, and we need to just continue along that road of progress.

So it's great that you have brought us together, and I'm happy to join you during this hour.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. TONKO, and I know that you are going to have to leave us in a few moments, but you just reminded me of one of those little charts that I often have here, and this one really does show what you just talked about. It

displays that the gold here are the Bush years. You can see the enormous number of losses of jobs, and right down here, right here at the bottom, that's the start of the Obama administration in January of 2009, and each month thereafter, each quarter, we saw an improvement. We didn't see the jobs really coming back in the private sector until the last several months, but clearly, in the last several months, those jobs are there. Interestingly, the unemployment rate has not dropped because it is the government jobs that are now being lost but, nonetheless, a net gain in the jobs in the private sector.

Mr. TONKO. That's absolutely the progress we wanted to witness, and was it fast enough? It's never fast enough for us after we've lost 8.2 million jobs, after the American households in the last 18 months of the Bush presidency lost \$18.5 trillion. That was pain that was very deep, deep and dark, and it's never fast enough, but it is certainly a rise in the right direction and a movement that needs to continue along that road of progress.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You also raised the very, very important part is that the industrial strength of America has almost always occurred as a result of the research and innovation that has been the hallmark of America. You mentioned the COMPETES Act which deals with energy research in the United States. It deals with scientific research. It's an extremely important one, and unfortunately, our Republican colleagues refused to support that bill when it was here on the House floor. We had enough Democrats at that time to move the bill out.

Also, as I recall, I wasn't here and my two colleagues were here at the time—it was the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, otherwise known as the stimulus bill, that created the largest increase in scientific research ever in America's history. Now, the public may not appreciate that, but that research is finding its way into every part of our industrial future, and from that, the billions of additional dollars that were spent, two things happened: scientists, technicians, lab techs, engineers were employed. They had jobs, and they were developing the future industries of America.

Enough from me. Let me turn to my compatriot from the Midwest. Mr. ELLISON, you have a very, very important part of the country. It wasn't particularly friendly to us Democrats but friendly to you because of your outstanding leadership. So please share with us your experience there in the upper Midwest.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, Congressman, let me just thank you for holding down this Special Order and congratulations to you and Congressman TONKO. In California, you-all conveyed the message, and I want to congratulate your whole State for your success from our side of the aisle.

But unfortunately I'm going to have to be here for a short while tonight,

but I just wanted to come down and share a few moments with you and the Speaker and the American people, talk about the importance of maintaining and holding on to that vision of making it in America because we did it before, we can do it again, but it will not happen by magic. It's going to take some things.

It's going to take, first of all, some investment in education. It's going to take some investment in our Nation's infrastructure. It's going to take some real investment in our small businesses so that they can get it moving, and it's going to take some real investment in our belief in ourselves to reclaim this mantle of manufacturer for the world.

This can happen. We've done it before. America still is the leading manufacturing Nation in the world, but we've seen other nations creeping up on us. We can do it but these investments are going to have to happen.

In this Congress, we made tremendous investments in, as you already pointed out, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Important. We call it the stimulus for shorthand, but the fact is it was reinvestment. Reinvestment is one of the R's in that American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, and Mr. Speaker, I want the American people to bear in mind that investment is what we need at this time so that we can continue our upward trajectory for jobs.

I hope that our friends on the other side of the aisle who are going to get the gavels after they assume leadership continue this effort to try to reinvest in America for the sake of manufacturing. We will see. They will have the chance. But the fact is that this Democratic Congress put this country on a platform and a foundation for future growth in jobs and manufacturing.

There was mention a moment ago of the investment act. Not only did we invest in scientific research, we invested in infrastructure. We not only invested in infrastructure, but in our health care bill we invested in making sure that we have the educational wherewithal to take care of our people into the future. Tremendous investments in education, for medical education, so that we can take care of our people. That, again, will fuel manufacturing because part of manufacturing is medical device manufacturing so that we have the educational talent to make those instruments that are life saving in this world.

So you put the health care bill, together with the Recovery Act, what you're talking about is a recipe for making things that will help life-saving research take place through American innovation and manufacturing.

So I just want to commend you for being down here week after week. Whether you have a bunch of people helping you or whether you're by yourself, you have an enduring commitment to making sure the American people know that manufacturing is not declining—well, it has been but it

doesn't have to be declining—in America. It can be ascending in America if we make the investments in education and research and the things that we talked about earlier.

I want to say that being from the Midwest, and I'm so proud to be from the State of Minnesota, wonderful State. We already had a little bit of snow there. I know you all don't know what that is in California. It's white, fluffy stuff. The fact is we even in the State of Minnesota are investing in wind. We are investing in biofuels. We are investing in all sorts of green energy producing methods that also require that we're going to be manufacturing new technology but also transmission lines to transfer the energy that we make based on our innovation.

In the course of the time between August and now, we've been home a lot, working hard but back in our districts, and I had the opportunity to go to a number of manufacturing companies in my district. 10K Solar, they know who they are. They're in Minnesota. They are a cutting-edge solar innovation manufacturing company. Other companies are making new fascinating things with wind technology. And this is the kind of thing we want to stimulate. This is what is going to continue to make America the great economic power that it has been, and I just hope that we can get some real bipartisan cooperation to continue this drive so that we can continue to make America that country that is the envy of the world.

And so unfortunately, Congressman, I'm going to have to leave you to carry the weight tonight, but again, I just want to thank you for your commitment and just say that I draw inspiration from the pictures that you're about to explain right now.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, Mr. ELLISON, thank you so very, very much, and it's a busy night for all of us. We've just come back to reorganize ourselves and to go forward.

Earlier today we selected a minority leader for the next year. It is our current Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, and as she left the caucus today she very clearly laid out an agenda for the Democratic Party. That agenda was Make It in America: Manufacturing Matters, and Take Care of the Middle Class. These two things go together. If we are going to have a robust economy, if we are going to be able to move up the employment and reduce the unemployment in America, then we must make it in America. As we do that, we will recreate those very, very important, critical, middle class jobs. There's a whole strategy that's underway here.

□ 2010

I used to play football when I was back at the University of California a few years back and did fairly well at it. But there is an analogy that I think we need to keep in mind here to the current economic situation in America.

Let's envision for a moment that the first quarter was the 8 years of the

Bush administration. What happened? Well, I had a little chart up here a few moments ago, and maybe I ought to put it back up. The first 8 years of the Bush administration—be with me for a moment here—were the years of the first quarter. What happened? It was a wipe-out. It was horrible. The American team was decimated. We were on our backs. We were losing 800,000 jobs a month in the last year of the Bush administration. It was 8 million jobs lost.

The second quarter, we brought in the Obama team. It didn't start off too good. The first few minutes of that quarter were rough, but it was an improvement. Each minute that went by, each quarter that went by, we saw an improvement; and by the end of that second quarter, we were building jobs. We were building jobs in the private sector.

Now, we're into the second half of the Obama administration. What's going to happen? The Obama team is still on the field. The President's in place. We have a strong minority position going forward in the Democratic Caucus. Our Republican colleagues will take over the management of the House, and we'll see how that goes. On the Senate side, the Democrats are still there. So let's continue the second half as the Democratic half.

Here's our plan: we are going to develop strategies—many of them are already in place—to make it in America so that America can make it, and it is based on this: manufacturing matters. That was the Speaker's message. The minority message going forward in this House next year will be "make it in America so that Americans can make it." It's important to be able to take that paycheck home.

My oldest daughter, now a little bit older—well, I should say more than a little. I'll never forget the day she came back from her first summer job. She came back, and she showed us her check. She held it up like that; and she said, Dad, I've got my first paycheck. She was proud. She was so proud that she was a working American.

And I know for those millions of Americans out there today that can't find a job, they want to be able to come back to their home with that check in hand and tell their children, I'm back at work. I'm working again. I can take care of you. I can provide for your education. I can put the food on the table. That's what they want. And we have a strategy in mind on the Democratic side that will do that.

This first quarter that I was talking about, the strategy was basically to increase the wealth of the wealthy, to start two wars and never pay for them, and to take the referees off the playing field and just let it rip. And we were ripped to a fare thee well. Wall Street just went crazy with ultimate greed. And the result—we should have expected it—you take the referees off the field, take the rule book, throw it off into the shower; and what do you think's going to happen in an NFL

football game? Well, that's what happened when Wall Street was allowed to run amok during the George W. Bush years.

It was the Democrats in this House, in the Senate that laid out a structure to stabilize the financial industry. We got most of that money back, and we'll probably get it all back in the years ahead. It was stabilized, not as good as we would want; but it was stabilized.

And then the next piece was brought forward, which was the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. By all accounts, by learned economists, 3 million jobs were created or saved as a result of that. And that wasn't the only piece of legislation. There was in that piece of legislation reinvestment in science and technology and research, reinvestment in our roads and streets and bridges, building the foundation for the future of America.

Followed up later in this session by Democrats with legislation called the HIRE Act, to put people back to work, to give businesses the financial incentive to hire people, to bring people back onto the payroll, subsidizing those rehires so that people can take that paycheck home and say, Dear, I'm back at work. I've got a job again. That's what Americans want. And the Democrats were delivering that.

The last piece of legislation before we went into the election was a piece of legislation to help the governments of America, the cities, the counties, the States, keep people employed in the essential jobs that are the public sector jobs: police, fire, teachers. In California alone, 16,000 teachers are in the classroom this year as a result of that piece of legislation. We want people to work. We put those bills on the floor. Some were actually passed by the Senate, much to our delight; but many, many were not. There were many pieces of legislation that passed here without Republican support, but nonetheless were an effort on our part to put people back to work. We're going to take this thing further in the year ahead and up through the next session of Congress.

Let me put this up here for you to see. My colleague, Mr. ELLISON, was talking about wind turbines and photovoltaic. Interesting, but not many of these are made in America nowadays. Most of these are imported: wind turbines from Europe and China; photovoltaic cells now mostly from China; buses from Europe and other places. We can make these things in America. We can make these things in America because we once made them in America. In my own district, in the Fairfield/Solano Counties area of California, we used to make a lot of solar panels. And in the Bay Area, there still is a bus manufacturer, one of the few left in America that actually produces buses, the GILLIG Corporation.

I will never forget the day that I went out to visit the wind farm in Solano County and talked to the companies that were putting those wind tur-

bins up. I asked them, Boy, that's quite a tower. It's 400 feet high, a lot of steel. Oh, yeah, yeah. We bring that in from Korea. That's interesting. And those blades stretching out the length of a football field, 300 feet? Oh, yeah, those are brought in from Europe right now, but maybe we can begin to manufacture those once again in Colorado. And all the gear boxes and all of the electronics, all of it is imported.

And I told them, I said, You want me to continue to support American tax money, subsidizing your wind turbines and your business, and you want those things made overseas? Well, they don't make it in America anymore. And I said, Well, let me put it to you this way: if you want my help, if you want American taxpayer money for subsidies, then you damn well better make it in America; otherwise, our tax money ought not be used to support industries overseas. If it's private money, do what you want to do. If you want to buy a turbine from Europe, fine. If you want to buy a turbine from Japan or China, fine. But use your own money. Don't you use American taxpayer money. But unfortunately, far too much of that has gone on in the years of the past.

I have introduced legislation and others are following along so that our tax money is going no longer overseas for buses, for bridge steel, for photovoltaic systems, for wind turbines. Our tax money, when these Democratic bills pass this House and the Senate and signed by President Obama, our tax money will be used to support American industry.

□ 2020

Think of what that means. We spend \$4 billion a year buying buses with our tax money, our gas tax money. Where is it going now? A lot of it is going overseas for foreign-made buses and trains and equipment. We don't want that anymore.

In the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, some \$12 billion was set aside for a high-speed rail, and a sentence was added to that particular piece of the bill that said that when high-speed rail is built in America, it will be built in America by American manufacturers.

There are some companies overseas that build these high-speed rail systems. Some of them whined, and others of them—Siemens, in particular—said, Well, if that is where the money is and that is the requirement, then we will build the Siemens high-speed rail system in America.

It makes a difference in how you write laws, and the laws that we should write that use our gasoline and our diesel tax money to buy buses, trains, other kinds of rolling stock, and to build bridges and to build highways, that is our gas tax money, that is our diesel tax money, then spend that money on American-made equipment, whether it is a bus, a high-speed rail, a train, or whatever. Again, if you want

to use your private money, if you want to buy a Mercedes-Benz, go for it, but not with our tax money.

It also applies in the area of energy policy, the same thing. In the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, there were substantial subsidies for wind and solar and green technologies of all kinds, nuclear and the rest. Good. We need to change our energy policy. We have to move away from our dependence on coal and oil into new, renewable technologies that do not contaminate our atmosphere with carbon dioxide.

Are we going to do that successfully? If we allow our tax money, our subsidies to be spent on equipment made overseas, I don't think so. I don't think so at all. That is our money. We should spend it in the future on American-made equipment of all kinds. That should be our policy. That is legislation that I have introduced. That is legislation that is strongly supported. And, I dare say, it is legislation that will be a major part of Make It In America, the Democratic agenda to rebuild the manufacturing sector of this Nation.

There is another piece of this puzzle that we need to keep in mind, and that is tax policy. There was a lot of discussion during the campaigns, and a lot of Democrats lost their jobs on this issue. It is the big "D." It is the deficit. A lot of our Republican colleagues, rightfully, said the deficit is a problem.

Well, you can go into economics. You can talk about Keynesian countercyclical economic policy and all the rest. And I happen to believe that when the economy is going in the tank, countercyclical measures, Keynesian, using the government purchasing to encourage the growth of the economy, to stabilize the economy, unemployment insurance and other benefits that provide a foundation are extremely important. And, we will soon, on this floor and over in the Senate, take up the extension of the unemployment insurance.

I know our Republican colleagues are opposed to this. They think that by ending the unemployment insurance, people will go out and find a job. I think not. And even a few Republicans lost their jobs in this election, and we will see if they get unemployment insurance. They may very well apply for it, and maybe some of my Democratic colleagues will also. But that unemployment insurance keeps food on the table, keeps families together, and provides the shelter that is necessary, because the jobs are not yet there, because these policies are just now going into legislation and eventually into the law and into place.

The deficit, what are we going to do about the deficit? We are going to have to get the economy going. That, all economists say, is the most critical part of dealing with the deficit. If the economy doesn't grow, the deficit cannot be dealt with. So we grow the economy. Policies such as we have talked about here are a way of doing it.

There is another thing about the deficit that needs to be taken into account, and that is: Where did it come from? Here is a fact. The day that George W. Bush took office in January of 2001, he was handed a \$230 billion surplus. The day that President Barack Obama took office, he was handed a \$1.3 trillion deficit. Why did it occur? Collapse of the economy, clearly a big piece of it. And the policies of the government just letting Wall Street run amuck, the housing industry run amuck without any rules, all of that was part of it. But there was more to it.

The Bush tax cuts in 2001 and 2003 added billions and, over time, trillions to the deficit. And the Iraq war and the Afghanistan war, two wars that were financed by borrowing money from China, added to the deficit.

Those are the realities. The deficit is part of the economy now; it is part of our fiscal situation. It started, grew, and manifested itself during the George W. Bush years, and now we need to work our way out of it.

So how are we going to do that? How do we work our way out of this deficit? Well, with policies like Make It In America, clearly important. The countercyclical measures, providing unemployment insurance, using the power of government to bring jobs into reality, all of those are important. Tax policy, also.

A big debate will occur in this Chamber in the days ahead. Before December 31, a debate will occur as to what will be the tax policy of the United States. The George W. Bush tax cuts, which I talked about a moment ago that created a large part of that deficit, are up for debate because they expire on December 31, 2010. The expiration of those tax cuts, most of which went to the wealthy, are going to be up for debate.

Our Republican colleagues want to extend all of the tax breaks. The Democrats, President Obama and the rest of us, have a different idea. We think the deficit is really important. We believe that we have to address the deficit. The extension of all of the Bush tax cuts will significantly increase the deficit.

Now, on the Democratic side, we believe that the tax cuts to the middle class are extremely important, because they give the middle class the opportunity to have a larger paycheck, less taxes taken out, so that homeowners can pay the mortgage, put food on the table, provide for their families, give kids the books, the backpack, the things they need to go to school. That is our view. The tax cuts should be extended for the middle class.

Let's look at what happens in a very, very important policy discussion between the Democrats and the Republicans about taxes. There are a lot of bubbles on this page, but these bubbles represent real money. The George W. Bush tax cuts, if extended, have this effect:

For those people that are earning \$10,000 or more, they will get \$52 in re-

duced taxes. And so it goes. Let's say a person is earning \$75,000 a year. They will get \$1,800 of tax cuts. And then it continues to grow. The more income you have, the more wealth you have, the greater the break, the greater the tax cut for you, so that by the time you are a millionaire, your average tax reduction is \$17,000.

Under the George W. Bush, that is average. That is between \$500,000 and \$1 million. But if you are a millionaire and you have \$1 million adjustable tax, you will receive an enormous benefit. And then, if you get up to the gazillionaires, here is where you are.

□ 2030

The Democrats have a different idea. Our idea is that every taxpayer, every taxpayer, the very wealthy and those who are making just \$10,000 a year, should receive a tax break on the first \$200,000 that an individual makes and \$250,000 for a couple filing joint tax returns. Let me make that clear: Every taxpayer gets a tax break, up to \$200,000 for an individual and \$250,000 for a couple filing a joint tax return.

What is wrong with that? Millionaires get a tax reduction, billionaires get a tax reduction, every taxpayer gets a tax reduction. And this is our plan. But for those who are very, very wealthy, those who are making over \$250,000, \$500,000, \$1 million, \$1 billion a year, we think they have an obligation to America, and they should not receive a continuation of the tax break that they have had for the last several years, this kind of a tax break.

So we would suggest that their tax break go back to what it was before 2001. In the case of those earning up to \$1 million, it would go from 33 percent to 36 percent. Oh, my goodness, a 3 percent increase. How horrible.

I think not. What does that amount to for somebody making \$1 million a year? Three percent, \$30,000. That is not going to bust their checking account. But it is certainly going to be important if you are concerned about the deficit. If you care one iota about the deficit, you better be caring about this, because here is where the real money is, right here.

For the tax breaks to continue, for those above \$250,000 we are talking about over \$700 billion of increased deficit. You can't have it both ways here. You cannot have it both ways. If you are concerned about the deficit, then why in the world would you want those people who are not hungry, who are not homeless, who are not working in our manufacturing plants, why would you want them to be responsible for increasing the deficit? Well, perhaps because that is your constituency.

That is not our constituency. The Democratic constituency is the hard-working middle class that will get a tax break, a continuation of what they have had for the last 7 years.

This is important. This is about the deficit. Remember, every taxpayer in America gets a tax break up to \$200,000

or \$250,000. They get a break. But you get more money above that, and your adjusted gross income is greater than \$250,000, then for that amount, up to \$1 million, you are going to pay 3 percent more. For a millionaire, \$30,000. For a billionaire, okay, it will be more dollars, but the increase is only going to be 4-plus percent. This is not going to bust their bank, and it is not going to hurt small business.

Let's be clear about this: Small business is not impacted, except for just 3 percent of the small businesses in America, meaning this proposal that the Democrats are going to put forward will provide a tax break for 97 percent of small businesses. It will not increase their taxes for 97 percent of small businesses.

For 3 percent, and here is the definition of small businesses, the world's largest construction company, Bechtel, in California, is by the definition that the Republicans use a small business. Billions of dollars of annual income. It is a small business. I think not, but that is the Republican definition.

Now, one of my colleagues earlier tonight did a little thing that I just have to do again, because it is very illuminating, so let me do that. I will take down our principal message for the two years ahead: Make it in America. Manufacturing matters. If America is going to make it, we must make it in America.

I was talking a moment ago about the Bush tax cut. Here is what it means. The Republican plan, if the Bush tax cuts are extended, will cut taxes for the rich an average of \$83,347 a year. \$83,347 a year is the average tax reduction for the 1 percent wealthiest Americans, the 1 percent wealthiest Americans.

Well, what does that mean? Well, it means that for the next decade, they will be able to buy an \$83,000 Mercedes Benz E-class every year for the next decade. Or maybe they want to buy their wife, girlfriend, whatever, a modest purse, a Hermes, just a handbag, \$64,000, every year. That is a lot of purses for the next 10 years.

Now, if that is not sufficient, we like to characterize some of these fat cats with their cigar. Well, they won't have trouble buying cigars. These are top-line cigars. They can buy 800 cigars every year. And that is not all. They can light those cigars with a \$100 bill. Every single cigar, that is 800 a year, and 800 \$100 bills used to light them.

I could go on and on, but I see my colleague PAUL TONKO has returned.

Here is the alternative, Americans. Here is the alternative to the Republican plan. Instead of giving \$83,000 a year to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, you can take that same amount of money and give a \$30,000-a-year job to 3 million Americans.

Our work is about choices, our work is about values, and, frankly, our work is about morality. Tell me what is the morality of allowing the richest 1 percent of Americans to buy 800 cigars a

year and light those cigars with \$100 bills, \$83,347 in tax reductions, versus 3 million Americans, 3 million unemployed Americans who have a family, who are losing their home, who cannot provide food if the Republicans are able to block the extension of the unemployment insurance.

This is a moral question. This is a question of what is right and wrong in America. This tax cut shows the dividing line about where you stand in America.

Where do you stand? Are you with the richest 1 percent, so they can go out and buy a Mercedes E class \$80,000 vehicle every year for the next decade, or do you stand with families and want to put a paycheck on the table? I think it is pretty clear.

Mr. TONKO, thank you for rejoining us.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for an enlightening discussion on job creation, making it in America, and tax policy that can empower our middle class. The strengthening of the middle class, enabling them to have more purchasing power, has got to be the guiding force as we continue to do work in the closing stages of the 111th Congress and move into the next session of Congress. It is absolutely essential. I think it is what everyone heard out on the campaign field this past fall and summer. People were concerned about the economy.

Again, we have surpassed that 1 million count for new jobs in the private-sector realm, but after 8.2 million jobs lost, it simply isn't getting us there quickly enough.

□ 2040

I understand the impatience. I understand the fear. Obviously, people need to have a job. The dignity of work enables them to dream the American Dream of house ownership and allowing them to encourage their children and help their children pursue their careers through perhaps higher education. So it's important that we respond to that dynamic of empowering the middle class.

I think there's some telling statistics that are really highlighting the concern that people are expressing these days. Some 83 percent of all United States stocks are in the hands of 1 percent of the public. Now that is a very lopsided statistic. We're also told that some 61 percent of Americans always or usually live paycheck to paycheck. That is up from 49 percent just a year ago and then 43 percent just 2 years ago. So that climb from 43 to 49 to 61 percent of those who usually or always live paycheck to paycheck is a concern or at least ought to be a concern to the Members of this body.

And so it is important for us to make certain that we break some of those barriers and we allow for some of the benefit to flow to the middle class. Sixty-six percent of the income growth, for instance, between 2001 and

2007 went to the top 1 percent of all Americans. And when we look at the difference between the Obama tax cut and the Bush tax cut, the Bush tax cut borrowed money from China to enable us to give as a government the top percent of wealth—top 1 or 2 percent of wealth of America—to receive their tax cut. We borrowed. It was off-budget, as you indicated earlier. So we borrowed to pay for a tax cut; to spend for a tax cut for the wealthiest of Americans. Now when we look at the Obama tax cut, it was the largest historic tax cut for middle-income America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That was in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, wasn't it?

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely—and oftentimes a fact missed on many out there. It was the largest such tax cut for middle-income America, a historic statement. You compare that Obama tax cut to the Bush tax cut that borrowed to spend for the tax cut for the wealthiest of Americans. And so now we shouldn't be surprised when we see these stats that show more purchasing power there for the wealthiest, who are now usurping all of the purchasing of stocks out there. One percent reflecting the 83 percent of all United States stock, for instance.

So we need to do better than that. And I would suggest that all income strata fare better when we have a strong middle class. You need someone to purchase your products. You need someone to build your products, to manufacture your products. We need a strong middle class. We need to invest in that opportunity. And I think all of that recovery that we're hoping for becomes all the more expedited.

It was shown to us in the Clinton years. By creating economic recovery, by producing jobs, you solve the Nation's deficit. President Clinton inherited a deficit from the first Bush administration, and he handed over a \$5.6 billion surplus to the next administration. And then what did we inherit but a record deficit that was then passed on to the Obama administration at their beginnings in 2009 with, again, a recession that was more painful than any economic consequences in the past 70 years.

So the track record is such that you have seen Democrats working with the Democratic administration to build us out of deficit situations, create a surplus, and then have it spent down again and giving priority to those engines—economic engines that simply don't work. When the Obama tax cut—again, historically large for the middle class—was implemented, we saw that what the economists, from far-right thinking to far-left thinking, as a team had suggested would happen. We actually saw that happen. And these economists were right on. As soon as the middle class was given its tax cut, that tax cut was brought back. It was spent back in the regional economies. And we saw the beginning of the end of that bleeding of the recession. It ended the bleed-

ing simply by creating that recovery, having those dollars recirculate in regional and State economies across the country, the telltale indicators then proved that the bleeding of that recession had stopped. And it was that empowerment of the middle class that enabled, I think, the economics of it all to work.

So we should take lessons from history, and we can take that Obama tax cut and contrast it with the Bush tax cut and see what really happened. And your whole statement about those thresholds, those households of \$250,000 or less, with that as a threshold we can see the empowerment that comes when we concentrate on that portion of the tax cut that I believe will have a trickle-down value. The \$700 billion price tag on the upper income strata in terms of spending on a tax cut for that strata is a hefty one and we need to understand, analytically understand, what the payback would be. What is the dividend; is there a lucrative dividend by spending such money on that given strata of tax cut.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. TONKO. If you or anyone really cares about the deficit, you need to really pay very close attention to this debate that is going to happen here in this chamber and here in Washington, D.C., in the days and weeks ahead. And that is, do we give an enormous tax break to the wealthiest of America, and in doing so increase the deficit by over \$700 billion, or do we limit that tax break to all taxpayers up to \$200,000 or \$250,000? An extremely important debate that will take place.

For me, it is time to think about the deficit. It's time to get real about the deficit. And if you really care about the deficit, if you really care about growing the economy, the point that you just made, then limit the tax reduction so that all Americans receive a tax deduction up to \$200,000 or \$250,000 of adjusted gross income. And keep in mind it's adjusted gross income, not gross income. Adjusted gross income. That's after all the deductions.

Mr. TONKO. And I would suggest to you also that we need to accompany that sort of analytical thinking and that sort of dividend associated with the spending that would be done on a tax cut so that we maximize the benefit for the economy. But we also have to think of the stewardship, the sound management that was part and parcel to the Clinton years when we contrast that with the management post-Clinton or pre-Clinton. It is absolutely essential to incorporate concepts like PAYGO so that you pay as you go. You are forced then to come up with the ideas that will produce the revenues in order to initiate the new spending.

Mr. GARAMENDI. By PAYGO, you mean that the Congress and the Senate in enacting tax cuts balance those tax cuts off against reductions of program or vice versa. If you have a new program, the way you get the revenue to pay for it.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The PAYGO, meaning as applied to us in the Congress.

Mr. TONKO. Exactly. And it creates that sort of stewardship over the budget that doesn't find us in situations where we paid for two wars, we initiated a part D Medicare doughnut hole which impacted our senior population with their pharmaceutical needs and gave a tax cut to the wealthiest of Americans and did it all off-budget. And so that when this President assumed office, one of the first tasks assigned the administration or embraced by the administration so as to truth in budgeting and honesty in budgeting is to bring it online, which grew the deficit, but it was a truthful budget. You can't continue to have an off-budget, borrow from China or whatever, in order to pay for programs and say, Okay, we'll pay for it into the future. The PAYGO concept requiring us to find the revenue sources in order to do these orders of programing or tax cuts will be accompanied by the mindset, the logic of just how do you pay for it. And PAYGO means being fiscally responsible.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Excuse me for interrupting. That was the policy during the Clinton period, and it led to the surplus because it put fiscal discipline into this building and over on the other side in the Senate. Similarly, it has now been reinstated by the Democrats a year and a half ago.

□ 2050

I want to just wrap up here. I want to go back to "Make It In America" and wrap with this. Our time has almost expired here.

Mr. TONKO. Sure.

Mr. GARAMENDI. With this "Make It In America" agenda, as Speaker PELOSI and soon to be Minority Leader Pelosi said as she exited the Organizational Caucus of the Democratic Party today, there are two principles that the Democratic Caucus will follow: One, we will make it in America so that America can make it. Two, we will do this on behalf of the middle class so that those jobs are there.

Interestingly, while the President hasn't used this term very often of "make it in America," President Obama has nonetheless proposed policies that are directly in line with this—specifically, that every business in America be given the opportunity to immediately write off any capital investments they make. Now, it's already in the law. In the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, there is in the law an automatic write-off of a capital investment made by a small business. That was increased in a subsequent bill that we voted out, without any Republican support, that allows small businesses to write off immediately.

The President would go further. I've introduced a bill that would do that—other members of the Democratic Cau-

cus have also—so that businesses would be incentivized to invest now in the capital equipment that will provide the foundation for future jobs. Invest now.

This is part of our strategy. It is an overarching Democratic strategy, one that we have been working on for some time, beginning with, among the first bills passed by Congress and signed by the President way back in 2009, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Would you like to wrap this up here?

Mr. TONKO. Let me just state this, that the landmark Small Business Act, which is intended to create jobs—we're anticipating 500,000 jobs—allows for investment in exporting, which I believe is critically important; it allows for investment in our modernization of manufacturing and small businesses, and it allows for the unleashing of some \$300 billion worth of loan opportunities to our small businesses.

We profess small business to be the economic engine, to be the springboard to the economic recovery. To the credit of Speaker PELOSI, whose leadership has led this House through the 111th Congress, we have made that our focus. We came out of a deep, deep recession, and, unfortunately, there wasn't enough time for us to feel the effects of the progress made by such legislation. I just think we need to pursue that path to progress.

Thank you very much, Representative GARAMENDI.

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

THE ECONOMY, UNEMPLOYMENT, AND THE ADVENT OF THANKSGIVING

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

Mr. AKIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good evening.

I would like to talk about several different topics today. One, I think, is on the hearts and minds of Americans everywhere. I want to talk a little bit about unemployment. I want to talk about the economy and what the solutions are to this problem. This isn't very complicated, but people try to make it more complicated than it needs to be.

When we get done with that subject, I'm going to change gears and do something that's a little bit more topical for the Thanksgiving season. I'd like to tell you the actual story, a great adventure story, about the Pilgrims, about the Thanksgiving that they celebrated and about the many other ways that they have blessed our country.

First things first, let's talk a little bit, though, about something that's on everybody's minds—the problem of unemployment and the problem of the continuous and rapid growth of the Federal Government, which stifles our

freedoms and liberties, which buries us in red tape and bureaucracy, which raises our cost of living, and which makes life more and more miserable for Americans as they lose their freedoms, and the Federal Government's out-of-control spending that accompanies that.

These are problems we've talked about, and these are problems that the voters have voted on. The voters seem to think that this is a problem in spite of the fact that we're going to try and shove socialized medicine down the throats of Americans and in spite of the fact they don't want it. We're not dealing with unemployment. We're not dealing with the causes for unemployment, but I think we need to talk about it a little bit because it isn't as complicated as some of my colleagues seem to make it out to be. It's not a matter of class warfare. It has nothing to do with that. It's just simple economics.

Now, if you want to talk to anybody who is a small business man and ask him what are the things that kill jobs and ask him what are the job killers, I would bet you he's going to be talking about things on this list right here.

The first thing is excessive taxation. The second is insufficient liquidity. What does that mean? It means it's hard for businessmen to get money from banks.

Economic uncertainty. People don't want to take risks when they don't know what's going to happen next. Then, of course, there is a whole lot of red tape and government mandates. All of those things are enemies to jobs and job creation.

Now let's go into this just a little bit because this isn't so difficult. It's not a matter of class warfare. It's not a matter of rich people not paying enough. In fact, there is an interesting statistic or two. What percent of the overall tax burden do you think the top 1 percent of Americans carry? What percent do you think the top 10 percent of Americans carry? Well, the top 10 percent of Americans carry about 70 percent of the tax burden in this country. How about the bottom 50 percent of Americans? What percentage do they carry? Less than 10 percent. So I guess we've got a pretty graduated income tax. If that were the solution, we'd already be in great shape, but let's get back to the basics about jobs.

First of all, why is it that excessive taxation kills jobs? Well, the reason is that the people who own small businesses create most of those jobs. Small businesses—maybe we should say medium and small businesses, which have 500 or fewer employees, are the businesses that hire 80 percent of Americans.

Now, my Democrat friends can't seem to make this connection. If you kill the business, you're not going to have the jobs. If you tax the businessman's hide off, he's not going to hire people because he's not going to have the money to buy new equipment, to

put up new buildings, to invent new technologies, and to expand his business. So the connection is pretty straightforward. If you want to kill jobs, you tax the guys who own those businesses. A lot of those business owners don't really think of themselves as wealthy, because they've started some little businesses that have grown and grown and grown, and as they grow, they keep putting more and more money back in the businesses. They haven't stopped to consider the fact that they may be multimillionaires, but they keep putting the money into the businesses and the businesses grow and they hire more people.

If you're just so hung up on the fact that somebody is filthy rich and if you're so hung up on the fact that they may be having more fun than you are and that you've got to tax them into the dirt, well, then you're not going to have any jobs. You just can't have it both ways. If you want jobs, you have to have healthy businesses, and you can't have healthy businesses if you tax them out of existence. So excessive taxation is just going to be a job killer.

Insufficient liquidity. That is, if you run your banks and if you have bank regulators all over the banks so they can't make any loans, it's hard for the businessman to get money to invest in new things.

Obviously, economic uncertainty. Let's say you own a business, and you've got lots of money tied up in it. Are you going to take a great big gamble when you don't have any idea what next goofy policy the administration is going to come up with or what kind of additional taxes and red tape and bureaucracy you're going to face? No. You're going to hunker down. You're going to say, Wait a minute. I'm not going to take any risks in this environment. Business is off.

A lot of people are boarding up their businesses. A lot of businesses are shutting down. A lot of jobs are being shipped overseas. We create such a hostile environment for business that the big businesses say, Okay. You show us the rules. If you don't want to have your jobs in this country, we'll take the jobs somewhere else. The small businesses just close their doors, and the jobs are gone forever. So the economic uncertainty is a job killer.

Of course there is red tape and government mandates. There is one that should be on this list, and that is excessive government spending. That is also something that has always, historically, been a problem.

Now, on top of the unemployment problem, on top of the runaway Federal Government that is no longer a servant but has taken on the effect of master and is bossing Americans around and taxing them out of house and home and ruining the economy—if that's not bad enough, we've got another problem that's coming, and it's something that we need to deal with in the near future.

□ 2100

That's the problem of a huge tax increase that's just around the corner at the beginning of the year.

So, if we're already in trouble with close to 10 percent unemployment and we know that excessive taxation is one of the things that is a job killer, do we want to then apply a whole bunch more, another huge tax increase to the economy? Most people would say you have to be crazy to do something like that. Most people, when they look at history, say that's the dumbest thing in the world to have a huge tax increase right when the economy is having a hard time, and yet, that's precisely what is going to happen next year if the Congress doesn't take action.

What's happening is, because of some rules in the Senate, the Bush tax cuts, a series of Bush tax cuts are going to expire, and when they do, you can see some of the jumps here from 2010 to 2011. This ordinary income tax, a bracket of 35 percent, is going to jump to 39.6 percent; capital gains going from 15 to 20. You know, the capital gains, that's an important one because that's a place where people who invest in businesses have money. If this tax is low enough, they can plow it back into business. As you raise it up, there's less money going back into businesses. And these are different kinds of dividends, going from 15 to almost 40 percent.

And the death tax, wow, is that ever taking a jump. Everybody who needs to die, you need to die this year, that's for sure, because death tax is zero. It's jumping to 55 percent. So when you get beyond the first million or two that are protected from the death tax, what's happening is, your dad owns a farm and he has a lot of fields and he's got a lot of pieces of equipment, and your plan is to follow in your dad's footsteps and be a farmer, and your dad dies and you find out you're going to have to sell 55 percent of your farm to pay the taxes that your dad owes on his death. Isn't good enough to tax him when he's alive. You tax him when he's dead. So we have a death tax. Well, by the time you get rid of selling half the fields and half the pieces of equipment you say, well, I can't run the farm. Well, that's really smart tax policy, isn't it, that we shut down a small business by jumping the death tax from 0 to 55 percent.

We have child tax credits here that are going up, marriage penalty, lowest tax brackets going from 10 to 15 percent. So, these taxes are coming. Most people would say, that studied economics a little bit, would say this is not what you should be doing during a recession. In fact, regardless if you're a Republican or Democrat, history says this is not what we should be doing.

You could learn—and I'm kind of surprised that the Democrats haven't taken a lesson from Kennedy because he had a recession when he was President. He cut taxes and the economy sprung right back, and of course Ron-

ald Reagan did it. I don't expect the Democrats to learn from Ronald Reagan, even though he used to be a Democrat, but JFK, you think they could learn from him.

You think maybe they could have learned from FDR even. FDR had a guy who was Secretary of the Treasury who was Henry Morgenthau. Henry Morgenthau came up with the same idea that Obama and company came up with a couple years ago, said we're going to stimulate the economy by spending tons of money. It's a little bit like grabbing your bootstraps and pulling and hoping to fly around the room. You know, they're going to spend a lot of money, spend enough money that will get the economy going. That's the idea.

Now, no normal rational person that's not been smoking those funny cigarettes can come up with such an idea. If you came home and your husband or wife said to you, hey, we've got too much credit card debt here, or I'm not making enough money, you know, things aren't going right economically, what do you think we should do? Oh, let's spend money like mad. You would think somebody was crazy. That's what people have tried. Henry Morgenthau tried it. He tried it for 8 years. He came and appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee. His words were, We have tried spending money. We're spending money, more than we have ever spent before and it does not work, I say, after 8 years of the administration. We have just as much unemployment as when we started and enormous debt to boot.

Now, I would hope that we could learn something from history. This is FDR. This is World War II vintage-type stuff. We should have learned from this. We could have learned from JFK. No. Could have learned from Bush. We could have learned from Reagan. When you're in trouble like this, what you want to do is you want to back off on the taxes and back off on the Federal spending. We're going the exact opposite direction. It doesn't make any sense to be raising taxes. We know that taxing small business is a job killer, and yet, we're forging ahead, trying to get everybody paying attention to the fact that, oh, the rich's guy got too many cigars or too many cars or something like that.

But the trouble is the rich guy, who owns that company, is the one who's hiring people. He's the one making the decision to add a wing on the building, put a new machine tool under the wing, to invest money in new processes, to come up with a better way to do things, to be more competitive than a foreign competitor and put Americans back to work. Those are the kinds of people that you need to have taking your money and plowing it back into the economy.

Now, there's some people think through this idea of Federal Government spending money that you can put people to work by the Federal Government hiring them. That seems on the

surface like a bright enough idea. Certainly if you take some tax money and you go out and hire some people, those people have a job. Doesn't that put people back to work? Well, yes and no. The people you hire do get a job. The trouble is for everyone you hire, there are two people in the private sector that lose their job because the government's sucking that money for those salaries out of the private sector. The private sector then becomes less efficient, and economists will say that you lose about two jobs out of the private sector for everybody you put on the government payroll. I mean, if putting people on the government payroll worked, we'd all work for the government. They tried that in the Soviet Union. It wasn't such a hot idea.

So, what's the danger? Why am I talking about this stuff? It should be a day when politics is over, the elections are over, we could get back to work and do the right thing. Well, the right thing here is paying attention to the fact that America is in trouble with a 10 percent unemployment rate. It's actually more than that because I don't know if you know it or not, but anybody who's been unemployed for a certain period of time, they don't count them anymore. So they're not unemployed, even though they don't have a job. That's sort of an interesting way to count, isn't it?

But anyway, here's what happened a number of years ago. I actually was here in Congress when this happened, and these charts go back a few years, but I think it's kind of interesting. This is the gross domestic product. So these vertical lines are America's GDP, and this is before and after a tax relief which occurred in 2003 about the first or second quarter of 2003.

And so the tax decrease we're talking about here is the very tax that's going to expire. So when we cut this tax in 2003, what happened to GDP? Well, here's GDP going along like this before. We do the tax cut and take a look at what happens to GDP afterwards. Now, that suggests that if there's any causal relationship at all that the tax cuts gave us a better GDP.

Let's take a look at the same tax cut not applied to gross domestic product, but let's take a look at it applied to jobs. These lines are job creation. The ones that go down mean that we are losing jobs. The ones that go up mean that we're creating jobs. This is what the economy is doing. Now, this, again, is this May 2003 when these tax relief measures went into effect. Look at all the jobs we're losing here, and look at the snappy turnaround right here when you let the small businessman keep some of what he earns. My goodness, what a turnaround.

Now, here's a very unpleasant thought. If these tax cuts had this positive effect when the tax cuts went into effect on jobs and on gross domestic product, if these tax cuts had that positive an effect, what happens when we reverse that same thing? What happens

when we turn it upside down? What happens when the tax cuts expire? Are they not likely to exert the exact opposite force on our gross domestic product on our already high unemployment? Now, we're not in this situation.

□ 2110

Right now we're having trouble with unemployment, but why do we want to put a force on it that's going to make it even worse. If these things did some good when they went into effect, why do we want to let them expire? It's bad enough the way it is. If we extend the tax cuts, it may not fix the 10 percent, but it may not go to 15 percent anyway. So this is what happened when the tax cuts went into effect to job creation, and that's why the economy took off.

Now, one of the things, it seems to me, that my dear socialist friends don't quite understand is that if you are a happy socialist, what you want is, you want the government to be doing well, you want to have lots of money that you can slop around and spend on different programs. And of course we've been doing too much of that, spending more than we have. But you would think you would want a strong economy because what a lot of people don't realize is, if that economy isn't strong, not only are individuals hurting, not only are States that have to balance their budgets hurting economically, the Federal Government revenues are also way down.

I was surprised during this time period when people wanted to say that the tax cuts had cost us a whole lot of money, that when you took the money they claimed the tax cuts cost in lost taxes and added it to the war in Iraq and Afghanistan that the amount of money total was less than what it cost us to have the economy in the tank in these first couple of years. So when the economy is bad in your home, it's bad in your State. It also is lousy in the Federal Government. So you put all of these tax cuts in place. You think, Oh, that's fiscally irresponsible because then the government is going to go into debt more and more. Oh, is that really so? The fact is not so.

Let's take a look at what happened. Here are Federal revenues. This is the year. That is the tax cut. So Federal revenues are coming down here. We cut taxes, and the Federal revenues actually go up. Now that seems like making water run uphill. Why is it possible that the Federal Government would get more money when we reduce taxes? It is known to some people as a Laffer Curve. But what this is, it's the effect that when the economy gets going, we collect more tax revenues.

Let's look at it this way: let's say that you are made king for the year, and your job is to collect as much revenue as you can collect in the selling of loaves of bread. So you start to think. You say to yourself, Well, I could put a one-penny tax on a loaf of bread and people would eat a whole lot of bread

because we're not taxing it very much, and we'd raise a certain amount of money. And then you think, Wow, but if I could do that with a penny, I could move that decimal over and charge a dollar a loaf of bread. Then I would get much more money. How about \$10 a loaf? You say, Well, wait a minute. So \$10 a loaf, I could get \$10 every time. But people wouldn't buy bread anymore. It would be too expensive. It would go on the black market, or they would buy cake or something else.

So common sense would tell you that if you are king for the year and you are taxing bread, that there is some point between a penny and \$10 perhaps, there is some point where there is an optimum amount of tax where people will still pay it and still buy bread. And if you raise the tax, what, in fact, happens is the revenue that the government collects goes down rather than up. In other words, it's not possible to just keep taxing too much because if you do, it basically drives the amount of money you collect down. So there's an optimum point.

And my point here is that if you are a happy socialist, you want the economy strong, and the way to do it is to let the people that run the businesses have enough money to make those investments so that the economy is strong, and we have more Federal revenue coming in. This is what happened '04, '05, '06, '07. The Federal revenues start going up even though we did these tax cuts. Now what we want to do is to reverse this. We're going to get rid of the tax cuts which is then going to have more effect to drive the economy down. It's going to create more job loss, and it's going to make the GDP worse.

We are having trouble learning some very basic lessons from history where we are at a point where we are overtaxing the economy. And if we want to get this economy going, we have to learn from JFK, we have to learn from Ronald Reagan, we have to learn from Bush II that the way to deal with this thing is to cut government spending and to cut taxes. It's a very straightforward answer. But we also have to realize that if we don't deal with the tax increase that's coming up, we are going to add significantly to the already existing economic problems of our country.

So what's the solution? It's not complicated. Make the Bush tax cuts permanent. Now we, Republicans, have proposed that for years. The Senate Democrats have opposed it. The Democrats in the House have opposed it. They say all of these tax cuts are for rich people, and they talk about the classes of society in America. And the one thing they can't seem to remember is the fact that if you don't have a strong business, you're not going to have jobs, and you're just going to have to get used to it.

In America, some people get stinking rich; and it's okay; and it's all right for them to have their money because a lot

of times, if they get enough money, they start spending it on other people anyway. And so what you've got to do is let those businesses have some money to work with because the government is not going to create the jobs. And by letting these tax cuts expire, you are just going to further damage the economy and increase the suffering of Americans all across our country.

So the solution is straightforward, at least to what we should be doing with these tax cuts. What we should be doing is keeping the tax cuts and voting to make them permanent and not letting them all expire. That's the commonsense way to approach the thing. It's not going to necessarily get us out of all the problems we're in right now, but it's going to prevent them from getting a lot worse.

And what we have to do then obviously is to get back into the business of cutting back on Federal spending, and we're going to have to cut back on government red tape, and we're going to have to dismantle some of the complicated and redundant different Departments that we don't need to be paying for. We have to start looking at the Federal Government and say, What does the Federal Government have to do and all of the stuff that it would be nice if the Federal Government did that cost money, we're going to have to just stop doing that. We're not going to get it out of waste, fraud, and abuse because there isn't a budget line item that says that. What we're going to have to do is we're going to have to reform the system.

The one thing I believe the Republicans are looking at very closely—I'm certainly very interested in it and am trying to sell it to my Republican colleagues—is the idea that we have an opportunity, though we can't pass legislation through the Senate and even if we did, it's unlikely that President Obama would sign it. But what we can do is we can send bills to the Senate, and the public can watch and see that we've heard the message. We understand. We want less taxes. We want more affordable government. We want to shrink and reduce the Federal Government in places where it doesn't really need to be putting money, and we can do that.

But there is one thing we can do and that is in the House here, we can change the rules. We can change the system. The House, with Democrat and Republican leadership through many, many years, is really a series of fiefdoms, as different committees gain lots of power.

And if we take a look at that system and we design a system which is not so much designed to spend money but to make it hard to spend money, then we can start making some progress to develop the tools here in the House to try to reduce a government that is literally a runaway government that is no longer the servant of the people but is increasingly becoming a fearful master.

That is our task; and we will be evaluated by the American public, I have no doubt, on our ability to perform the task. And to the degree we have a majority in the House, we can at least start in the House by saying, Let's change the whole committee structure. Let's take a look at how we do the budgeting process. Let's take a look at how these earmarks fit into who spends the money, who makes money, and how do we hold the committees accountable for reducing the size of the Federal Government.

All of these things are ahead of us, but we need to stop this train wreck coming, and we need to make these tax cuts permanent. That's the quick answer to something that we need to be doing.

Now I'm going to turn to perhaps a little bit lighter topic, a completely different topic, and that is the advent of Thanksgiving coming along next week. The Thanksgiving story is one that, as I have gotten older, I get to love the story more and more. It's a fantastic adventure story. It's a story of people of tremendous courage, tremendous vision who took very great risks and gambles and blessed you and I and all true Americans, blessed in ways that we've forgotten and in ways that we need to remember. I'm going to grab a picture, if you will excuse me a second.

□ 2120

Last year, I had this picture on a larger format. Unfortunately, I just had this framed copy. The picture that is by my side, some of you may recognize, is a small version of the picture that is in the Rotunda here not so far from where I am standing.

The picture is called "The Pilgrims at Prayer," and I would like to talk to you about this little group of Pilgrims that came over and gave us our Thanksgiving, the particularly famous Thanksgiving that took place in Plymouth, Massachusetts. There was an earlier Thanksgiving in Virginia, but this particular group of Pilgrims, though, gave us a lot, lot more than Thanksgiving. So while it is the Thanksgiving season, I think it is appropriate to think a little bit about their great example to us, because it is the principles and ideas of people like this that we need to reproduce and we need to follow their example as we move America forward in the days ahead.

So let me start by saying, first of all, who were these Pilgrims that we talk about that were at Plymouth and that gave us Thanksgiving? Who were the Pilgrims? They were really a couple of groups of people, but about half of them, and some of the very influential ones, were called Separatists. They were what you might call in their day sort of the evangelical Christian types of England, except that they were a little bit of a weird subset in this regard.

They had listened to the writing of a Scottish theologian that followed Knox in about the 1580s or so, and he started

finding in his Bible this interesting idea that the Bible, particularly the Old Testament, or, for Jewish people, the Torah, there seemed to be a distinction between civil government and church government.

Now, that may seem very obvious to us today, but in those days, if you recall, there was a king half the time running the church and a church half the time running the kingdoms, and the two were very much interconnected and very much intermixed dating back to the time of Charlemagne.

But they came up with this idea that the Bible seemed to indicate that there was a difference between church government and civil government, and they got that from looking at the story about Moses. Moses was like the civil authority, but he had a brother who was running the worship service, Aaron. And so he saw that example, but then there were other examples that were less known.

There was a guy, Uzziah, who was a king, and he went into the temple and started burning incense because he thought he was able to do anything he wanted. A couple of courageous priests stood up to confront him, and he started to stick his finger at them and give them a lecture and say, Off with their heads, and he looked and his hand was covered with leprosy.

So there were these stories, particularly the story of Saul, the first king, where he offered the sacrifice and Samuel read him the riot act and said, You've really have blown it now, buddy.

So you have these examples in the Old Testament where civil and church government were separate. So these guys, the Separatists, had learned from their Scripture and had decided in their day that they didn't want their church to be run by the King of England. This was following old Henry VIII, who had separated the English church from the church in Rome, and so the church was being run by the King of England. These guys decided what they were going to do in Scrooby, England. They decided that they would get this manor house. They would all get together and worship and start their own little church, and the church wasn't under the King and it wasn't under the King's thumb. Well, as you can imagine, that did not meet with the approval of the King, and he said, I am going to harry them out of England.

And so these Separatists were given all kinds of very tough treatment—fines and taxes. Their wives were put in the stocks and made fun of and all kinds of difficult things so that these Separatists couldn't really live in England and they couldn't have their little church that they had started or their series of churches. And so, as you know the story, they moved to Holland where they could have freedom to start their own church.

So they lived in Holland for some time. It was a difficult existence. They

had to work 7 days a week and many, many hours a day; very, very difficult economically for them. But they didn't complain, and they were able to have their church worship service the way they wanted. That lasted for some period of time as these Separatists were in Holland, but a couple things happened that convinced them to look around at something else, and the main thing was that their children were picking up some bad habits from the Dutch kids and they didn't like that. They had come there because they had some very strong theological beliefs about what was right and wrong. They were worried about their children and the culture in which they were living, and so they cast about for what God would have them do.

So the picture that is printed, it is a wonderful painting. It is about 10-by-20 feet in the Rotunda. This picture depicts the key turning point for a bunch of these Separatists, and this is in the town of Delfthshaven. And if you take a look closely at the picture, certainly you can't see it here in the camera, but it says "Speedwell." That is the name of the ship. And these are the Separatists gathering together at Delfthshaven in a farewell to their pastor, John Robinson, who they loved dearly.

John Robinson was a very even-tempered, peace-loving man. He had risked his life a number of times trying to separate groups of different Christians that were fighting each other, and his parishioners said he had the wisdom to see trouble coming and to steer his little flock away from the trouble. So they loved John Robinson.

He is now preaching his last sermon, because he will not go with the Pilgrims to America but, instead, will stay behind with the members of his church that were still going to be back in Holland.

And so, as you can imagine, if this is your last time and you have all of these friends who are going on this absolutely incredible expedition to plant a plantation in the middle of the wilderness all the way across the ocean, you are going to give them your best shot. You are going to talk to them about the things that you think are most important.

So we have a recording of what he was preaching about. And he, first of all, bewailed the state of the Calvinists and the Lutherans. And he said, "For though Luther and Calvin were bright lights in their own day, yet were they living today they would readily embrace the additional truth that God is breaking forth from his word."

What he was saying, in effect, was that our understanding that we get from the Bible is not static; it is something that moves over time. And as people learn lessons from history, we should learn from them, and we should continue to learn the additional things that God is going to teach us in practical sense from his Bible.

In a sense, his idea of the Bible was it was a gold mine. It was full of truth.

And as men over time read it and understood it, they could improve the lot of civilizations. It turns out that this was a pretty good theory in all practical sense. Whether you happen to have any interest in theology or not, it turned out to be a pretty good theory, and you will see why in just a few minutes as we follow this little group of people on this incredible adventure story.

You have to think about this. When people came to America in Jamestown and other places, it was men. They came here, to some degree, to say they were going to spread the light of Christ to the heathen, but mostly they were looking for gold. That is what the history books show us.

But this little group of people were different. They were going to take their wives and their children on a one-way trip across the North Atlantic to try to plant a civilization. And they were doing it not as a bunch of dogs that had their tails tucked between their legs because they had been chased out of one place and chased out of another place, but with a vibrant vision of a challenge to build a new civilization based on new principles and new ideas. They wanted a change from the European civilization because, Robinson goes on and says: Now, when you go to this new land, be very careful what you adopt as truth, sayeth he, for it is unlikely essentially that a Christian civilization can spring so rapidly out of such thick anti-Christian darkness.

He was talking about Europe, and how Europe was very resistant to ideas that the Bible would suggest were a good way to do things. So he was saying: Now, when you go over on this great expedition, be really careful what you do, because how you set things up is going to be very, very important. And you don't want to set it up just the way they did in Europe, but continue to use the Bible as the blueprint.

So this group of people are going to leave Delfthshaven here and they are going to go across and rendezvous in England with the ship *Mayflower*.

Now, it turns out this old *Speedwell* was a leaky bucket. They tried to take a couple of attempts to start from England to go over to America, and the seams on the *Speedwell* opened up and it started to leak so badly they had to turn around and come back, and then they had to take some of the different passengers off and some of their supplies off. They had to leave the *Speedwell* behind. It got to be kind of complicated and expensive.

Eventually, like a family getting off on a vacation late, they eventually get in the *Mayflower* everybody they could fit in there with what supplies they could and started across the North Atlantic. Well, that delay put them in the North Atlantic in the fall, which is a rough time to be crossing the North Atlantic.

Well, the old *Mayflower* started getting beaten by storms. In the begin-

ning, the Pilgrims—and let me maybe clarify this point now. The people in the *Mayflower* at this point are really two groups. About half of them are these Separatists, which you see here, and the other half were just jolly old blokes off the streets of England that were part of the merchant adventurers financing this trip to plant a colony over in the New World.

□ 2130

The idea of the colony, of course, was it was going to make money for the people that were financing this undertaking, and they were hoping they would get rich from it. So you have really a little over 100 people, about 50–50 between these Separatists that have a vision for a new civilization and other people that are just there mostly hoping to make a good living and to turn a page in their lives.

So they come across the North Atlantic, and in the beginning the sailors all start making fun of them because they are all seasick. It is pretty miserable to be seasick. You almost feel it would be better to die when you turn green. So the sailors would call them "puke socks." That was what one of the boatswains called them, "you puke socks," because everybody was sick and feeling pretty bad.

But the storms intensified as they crossed, and after awhile the poor old Pilgrims noticed that the sailors weren't joking so much about it. They looked a little bit upset too, because the storms got really severe. And in spite of their prayers and everything else, the *Mayflower* was just beaten by storms.

One time in the middle of the night they heard a groaning and a crack as though they had run into a rock or something, and it turned out one of those great big huge oak beams that was supporting the main mast had started to sag and break under the weight of the mast and the tremendous pressure of the wind and the rigging and the sails.

So they were almost thinking they had to turn the *Mayflower* around and go back to England, when one of these passengers, one of the Separatists, remembered there was a big printing press screw jack in the hold, which they fought out of the hold and managed to get it in position and cranked it up to support the oak beam so it would not be sagging.

They continued the trip across the ocean, and because of the storms were blown significantly off course and landed the first time out in Massachusetts, which, of course, is not Virginia. Virginia in those days went as far north as New York, but they were headed much further south. They weren't surprised. They knew they had been blown north by the storms.

So there they are after a couple of attempts to try to come south down the outside of Cape Cod. The winds were very unfavorable, it is late in the season, the storms are rough. These old

square riggers, the Mayflower, they were not great technological wonders at being able to sail into the wind, so consequently they didn't want to get with a hard wind to be driven on to the sandy beach, because the ship would break up and that would be the end of the deal.

So they are anchored out at Provincetown, and it is getting I guess into about the November timeframe, getting pretty chilly up in Massachusetts. They realized that they are not in Virginia and so their charter didn't apply. So now we get the first real lesson in civil government from the Pilgrims, and, boy, what a great lesson for all of us it is today.

Because the charter didn't apply, the two groups that were in the Pilgrims were known as the saints and the strangers. The saints were the Separatists, that is the saints here at prayer, and the strangers were the ones that were strangers to God. And the strangers are saying, hey, it is like Australia, you know. No rules, mate. Everybody for himself. We get to shore, we can do whatever we want to do.

It had quite a smell of anarchy about it, and it was then that the saints said, no, we kind of need to pull things together. So they exercised some leadership, took a piece of paper and wrote a document. It is called the Mayflower Compact, one of the greatest American documents produced. We don't have a copy of it. We have copies, but we don't have the original. It was viewed by the Pilgrims as not really an astounding thing, but subsequently we have considered it of great import.

So it starts "In the name of God, amen." It goes on to say, "We do covenant and combine ourselves together in a civil body politic for the glory of God, the advancement of the Christian faith, and to frame such just and equal laws as may seem good."

And so what is it that is so special about this Mayflower Compact? Well, as far as I know, it is the first time in human history where you have a group of free people under God creating a civil government to be their servant. Does that sound like a familiar pattern? Of course. It is very similar to what our Declaration of Independence is saying.

You have to understand in the context of history how innovative what they had done really was, because in Europe, the model for civil government was the divine right of kings. If you are a politician, it was a great deal. You say "God put me here as king. When I say jump, you are supposed to say 'how high?'"

So Europe had been dominated by the divine right of kings, and each king felt like they weren't a servant, they were the boss. God put them there, and they tell you what to do. That is how Europe did things.

But these Separatists when they came across the ocean had the concept that we are trying to infuse in the Republican Party as we deliberate very

soberly about changing the system, that we are going to change the system from Europe and the divine right of kings to the system that the government would be the servant of the people and that individual citizens had God-given rights and it was the responsibility of the government to protect your God-given rights.

That is what the Mayflower Compact was all about, and that is why this very first moment, as they are at the great big oak table in the great room of the Mayflower, why this moment is so significant to all of us, because the Pilgrims gave us the model of American civil government.

Now, to them it was sort of a straightforward idea, because they had already struggled with this question in the context of their church government. In Scrooby, England, they had decided to separate themselves from little old King James. He was a little bit of a weird fellow. He had some very strange social habits. They didn't want him running their church.

So a group of free people under God had covenanted together to create a New Testament church, and they took that model of the New Testament church and simply picked it up and applied it to civil government. A group of free people under God created a civil government, not a church government, to be their servant.

Now, they believed those two were separate, so they didn't tangle up the church with their civil government, but they used the same pattern. So the Mayflower Compact is really to our knowledge the first written constitution pulling these elements together; that under God, free people are creating a civil government to be their servant. That is the basic pattern. It is called the covenantal view of civil government. It is the first written Constitution in America that is on that same pattern. That was 1620.

Now, I will continue with the story of the Pilgrims, but just to jump forward, it is not so long after that, 1620 to 1634, you have a more advanced constitution for Boston, and then a very highly advanced constitution called the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut, only 18 years later. So that is 1638, very early.

The Fundamental Orders of Connecticut has basically the whole model for the whole U.S. Constitution. It has federalism, separate branches of government, a lot of the technical sophistication of the U.S. Constitution just 18 years after these Pilgrims had started with the Mayflower Compact. So you have a tremendous period of the development of the concept of American civil government very early.

Well, I told you this group of Pilgrims here had blessed us in a lot of ways. It should be obvious, two of the ways they blessed us—these are ideas that just completely undergird America. The first is separating civil government from church government. That is something they took from the Bible. It is amusing, isn't it?

The second thing they did was give us our model of civil government, which is the fact that the government is to be the servant, not a fearful master. So those were pretty good ideas.

They also came, and I think this is a pretty important concept, they came with the belief that they could learn things from the Bible and should use the Bible as a blueprint to guide how they did things. And that same concept was picked up later by the people who would follow after the Pilgrims.

So let's finish the story a little bit and get to Thanksgiving. The Pilgrims, they are on Provincetown at the tip of Cape Cod, and they do the Mayflower Compact. Then they take pieces of a prefabricated boat called a shallop that was stored in their holds and they put that together. It had been damaged some by the storms coming across. It took them a number of weeks to build it up. But a shallop is a pretty good size rowboat. It would carry more than a dozen people, it had a sail and a rudder.

They took the shallop up in the shallow water around the inside of Cape Cod, and they had their first encounter at Eastham beach, there just about sunrise. A whole bunch of Indians screaming and yelling shot arrows at them. It wasn't exactly a warm welcome. They shot some of their muzzle loaders off and nobody got hurt. And they continued around the inside of Cape Cod.

They were looking for a place, and Cape Cod, I have a chance to go there in the summer times, it is known as Barnstable Harbor. Translated, that means Barnstable Harbor.

They were out in the surf, the sand is shallow there, they are out in the shallop and it got to be dark, and they are trying to figure out, the wind is coming up, it is starting to snow, they are getting ice all over their clothes. They try to make a run in to where they thought the entrance to Barnstable Harbor was, and they were mistaken. It was not. It was just a sandy beach, and the surf was starting to pile in on the beach. And right when they are in the waves, the guy by the name of Clark says—grabs the steering oar, and he swings the shallop around in a desperate maneuver. He says, "If ye be men, pull for your lives."

□ 2140

And they laid into the oars and were able to snatch the shallop out of the waves and out into the deep water. Again, the snow. It's dark and the snow is coming down. Ice is freezing on their clothes. And eventually, eventually they manage to find something where they can pull into the lee of this piece of land where they got out of the heavy blowing wind and were able to pull their boat up on the shore where there weren't any waves, and they spent a waterlogged Sunday on this island. It turned out when they got up in the morning, it was an island in the middle of a beautiful harbor, which we now

know as Plymouth, Massachusetts. The island was named after the seaman Clarke, who said, If ye be men, pull for your lives.

And so they start making rapid discoveries. They find that there's an area of land that's clear where they can plant crops. There's beautiful fresh water coming down from a hillside and a high area that they can fortify to try to protect themselves, defend themselves from whatever problems there might be. Particularly, they were concerned about the Indians that were in those parts. They didn't see any Indians, but they were worried that there might be some because the other Indians over in Eastham had not been too friendly. Of course, there's a reason they hadn't been too friendly. It's because there had been some ships that had come by and stolen some of them and sold them off into slavery. It put the Indians in a bad mood, you might say.

And so you have the Pilgrims now late in the season, in fact, about Christmas Day, starting to build their first shelters in Plymouth. As you can imagine, the trip had been tough. Their supplies were limited. And the people that were getting in and out of the wet boats and trying to work on building shelters there started to get sick. And over a period of the next couple of months, more and more of them died, to the point that in some days as many as four Pilgrims at a time would die. There was a time, a day or two, when everybody was so sick there were only two or three that were able to get up and feed everybody else and sort of show themselves on the palisades of the little fortification they'd made just in case the Indians made some sort of attack.

But they were in rough shape. In the middle of the night sometimes a man would take his dead wife, would drag her out across the frozen ground and bury her under leaves and rocks. And it was very tough. There were children, wives, and adults. By the time that March came around, half of the Pilgrims—almost half the Pilgrims had died.

Now you might ask yourself, these are people that came with a vision. They had a vision that God was calling them to found a new Nation based on new principles, new ideas, ideas that they took from the Bible. And you'd say, Well, where was their God? He blew them off course by the storm and now half of them died. You'd think they might get discouraged. It's easy to be discouraged, as you can imagine, in those conditions. Very few families didn't have someone who died in that first couple of months.

And so the captain of the Mayflower, who had anchored the Mayflower there in Plymouth Harbor for the winter to try to give them some protection, in the spring decided he had lost half his crew, decided he had to sail back to England. And so he prevailed on the Pilgrims. He said, Now, you need to go

back with me to England because this little adventure hasn't worked too well. Half of you are dead; half my crew is dead.

And so you can picture standing on the shore, Plymouth, and the wind is blowing through the pine trees behind you and you're looking across to the harbor. There's the Mayflower and the boatswain is giving the call. Sails are being squared to the wind. The sail is being raised. Men are walking or actually turning a big crank. It wasn't quite a capstan. It was a different type of arrangement to lift the old seaweed-covered line that held the anchor to the bottom of the harbor. And first large, then small, the Mayflower disappears over the horizon and there's just the sound of the wind in the trees. And every one of the Pilgrims stayed there on that beach because they believed that God had called them to a mission, to the beginning of something that was going to be great that He would bless, in spite of the fact that half of them had died.

It wasn't too long after that that they had their first Indian sighting. The lookout said, Indian coming. You mean Indians? No. Indian. They look out and here's this tall brave dressed in a loincloth walking boldly down the street. He looks at them and in perfect English says, Do you have any beer? Quite a reception from their first Indian guest.

It turned out he was an Indian that was a chief of a tribe up in Maine. He liked hitchhiking down the coast. And he could speak English. He'd actually gotten to know English pretty well and developed a taste for smoked duck and for beer and things. Until he had eaten a good supply of the Pilgrim's food, he wouldn't tell them too much. After he had a good meal, he told them about the Indians in the parts. He told them about the fact that the land where they were living had been considered cursed by the Indians because the Patuxets that had lived there had died of a plague. And so God in his providence took the Pilgrims to probably one of the only places on the eastern seaboard where they could stay where there weren't hostile Indians.

It turned out they made a good alliance with Massasoit, who was a good Indian chief and had become a friend of the Pilgrims. Massasoit talked to them about the last of the Patuxets that was living by himself, alone and lonely. And when Tisquantum understood the plight of the English settlers in Plymouth, he decided to join them because he knew something about it. He had been shanghaied, sold into slavery, bought out of slavery by some monks, traveled to England, learned to speak English, and gotten a trip back in a ship to go back to the Patuxets. He got there and the Patuxet tribe was wiped out, I assume by small pox or something. And so he's living by himself.

Now he joins the Pilgrims and helps them and teaches them all kind of useful lessons. He told them that in a

short period of time that the streams would be full of little fish and they could use that to plant corn. He taught them important things like taking your moccasins off and wiggling your toes in the mud so you can catch eels, which they could fry up for food. All sorts of useful things Tisquantum taught them. Of course, we know him as Squanto, friend of the white man.

Squanto lived with them some time and helped the settlers there. They were living under the conditions of the contract that the merchant adventurers had set up. And one of the things that they had set up was it was going to be a socialistic society. Everybody was going to pitch into the common store. They had common land. They're going to grow food on the land. Everybody had to work the field. Everybody had to wash everybody else's laundry. And that wasn't working too well. In fact, Governor Bradford—he was elected Governor soon after Governor Carver had died, probably of cerebral hemorrhage—Governor Bradford said in his diary of Plymouth Plantation, as though men were wiser than God, he said this idea of socialism—he didn't use the word socialism—taking everything in common may have been a good idea to Plato and other ancients as though they were wiser than God.

But he basically pitched out socialism and said every man can have his own field, could grow his own corn, and his diary said that it made hands very industrious. People who would feign to be sick or too weak to work now were out busy in the cornfield growing corn for their family and the women didn't complain about washing other people's clothes.

Anyway, they got rid of socialism. Eventually, after about a year or so, decided to celebrate a day of thanksgiving. And so they invited a couple of Indian chiefs to join them for thanksgiving. The trouble is the Indian chiefs, Massasoit, brought along about 90 braves. So when the Pilgrims saw this massive number of Indians they were going to feed for a meal, they're thinking, Oh my goodness, this isn't going to work very well.

Fortunately, the Indians did some hunting. They brought deer and turkey and a number of other things, berries that they had collected. And they had a wonderful Thanksgiving. The Indians didn't know they had just been invited for one Thanksgiving dinner. They stayed 3 days and enjoyed Thanksgiving over and over again. In the meantime, they had footraces and contests and shooting with bows and arrows and all kinds of other things that they did that was a lot of fun. It was a great couple-day celebration of thanksgiving in Plymouth Plantation.

Thanksgiving became a very popular holiday in the colonies up and down the eastern seaboard. And the first national day of thanksgiving was called by George Washington to celebrate the adoption of the U.S. Constitution. It was later set at a particular time in

November—I think it was the third Thursday in November as I recall—and it has stayed there to this time.

□ 2150

So we have the story now of the Pilgrims. As you celebrate your Thanksgiving this year, it might be helpful to think back and say there is more than Thanksgiving with the Pilgrims. They were a group of people who were willing to change the system, to think of different ideas. They came here and separated civil and church governments. They came here and created the model of a written constitution, the idea that the government is to be the servant of the people, that people have God-given rights and that it is the job of government to protect those rights, as we stated another 150 years later in our Declaration of Independence. They came here with the idea that, after trying socialism, it wasn't going to work. They realized that it was not biblical, that it was a form of theft, so they kicked socialism out. They learned that in the early 1620s.

So we can thank these people because of the fact that they were innovative and had that spirit and desire. Even when half of them died and the Mayflower was going back, they clung to their vision. They had the courage to create a new civilization. In the words of Bradford Prince, as written in his diary, they felt that perhaps they'd lit a candle on a dark shore. They felt that perhaps they could be stepping-stones for people who would come after them to found a great Nation. So the dream that they had of coming here to do something new, unlike what Europe had done, was very much in their hearts. It was very much a part of their thinking as they scratched that existence on that lonely, rock-strewn Massachusetts shoreline. To this day, as we celebrate Thanksgiving, we can remember their first Thanksgiving when they put a few kernels of corn on a plate to remind them of how close to starving to death they had been at one time.

It's a beautiful story. There's a lot more to it, a lot more adventure to it. There were knife fights in cabins. I haven't had time to cover all of that with you, but the basics are there. This is a great bunch of Americans, a wonderful adventure story and a time for us to give consideration to the fact that we also have been given a challenge, a challenge of a beautiful land that was established on a firm foundation. It's our job to keep it that way and to pass it on to our children—a government that is the servant of the people and not the master.

God bless you all. Have a wonderful Thanksgiving.

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

OUR POLITICAL HERITAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 2009, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, I had the great privilege and honor to deliver my first speech as a Representative of the people of the 10th District of Illinois. As I end my time in the House of Representatives and begin with the honor of serving the great State of Illinois, I want to thank those that I have served with and reflect on my time in this great body.

Our Jefferson's Manual of House Rules traces its heritage back to the Palace of Westminster, in London, England. Early in the 1980s, I worked under a member of the House of Commons during the time of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, and in Parliament, great weight is put on a member's maiden speech.

In the speech that I gave in the House of Representatives, a new Member outlines the principles for which he stands, and as I began my service to the people of northern Illinois, I highlighted the political tradition of the men and women who represented us in this House. A look at their accomplishments and service mirrors who we are and the gifts that we can provide to this great Nation.

Our community has a 180-year-long tradition of electing leaders who are very independent and ahead of their times. Ours is a rich tradition, and I can only hope that history will find my contributions to be consistent with the predecessors', whose roots trace back to 1818 when a new State of Illinois stood on the frontier of a growing Nation.

My predecessors were committed to the people of Illinois and to the good of this Union. At the same time, they understood the important role of the United States and of the world as a beacon of freedom, and while they fought for similarities here at home, they also fought for human rights abroad and condemned those who would spread intolerance and hate wherever it occurred.

Within its current boundaries, our congressional district encompasses a diverse community, including northern Cook and eastern Lake Counties, and it stretches from Wilmette, north along Lake Michigan's shore, to Waukegan. To tour our district is to see firsthand both the promise of the American Dream and those who have not yet realized it.

Our residents enjoy both great benefits and serious challenges. We are home to some of the wealthiest communities in the Nation, and yet we also have some of the most economically challenged communities in Illinois. We have pristine wetlands and forests, as well as one of the worst polluted harbors in the Great Lakes, and we have more than 1,000 tons of highly radioactive spent nuclear fuel stored just 120 yards from Lake Michigan. We are also home to the only training center for new recruits in the United States

Navy. Each day, thousands of my constituents commute to Chicago, fighting some of the worst traffic congestion in the Nation each morning into the city and repeating the process every evening.

In serving the people of the 10th District, I have been honored to follow a long list of role models who have represented us in the Congress:

Our first Representative, John McLean, was one of the State's pioneer political leaders. He took his seat in the Old House Chamber on December 3, 1818, serving just 1 year. He was later elected to the United States Senate to fill a vacancy caused by the death of Senator Ninian Edwards in 1824 and served through March of the following year. While our pathfinder's service was very brief in both Chambers of this Congress, he was honored by the State, which named McLean County after him.

It was about this time that the first European family settled on the North Shore in what is now Evanston, residing in a place that was described as "a rude habitation of posts, poles and blankets." More notable, though, was the construction of the first permanent structure on the North Shore, a roadside grocery, serving cold beer and liquor to travelers. This grocery was described as "the headquarters of counterfeiters, fugitives from justice and, generally speaking, a vile resort." Ironically, 100 years later, Evanston would become the international headquarters of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and it is from these Spartan but colorful beginnings that we trace our suburban history.

Numerous shifts in population have brought many changes to the boundary lines of today's 10th Congressional District, and redistricting has changed its landscape no fewer than 10 times in the last 190 years. We face another change soon as Illinois prepares to lose a congressional seat before the next election. By 1902, Lake and northern Cook Counties were part of the 10th District, and the first outlines of the current district were formed as a new phenomenon in American living emerged, the suburbs.

In 1913, the election of a Progressive candidate, Charles M. Thompson, was indicative of the new independent spirit of the 10th District voters and of our willingness to elect whomever will best represent our interests, regardless of incumbency or party affiliation. Independent, thoughtful leadership are common themes among the men and women who represented our 10th District. Our leaders include:

John Stuart, a law partner of President Lincoln's; James Woodworth; Isaac Arnold; Charles Farwell; Lorenzo Brentano; George Foss; Abner Mikva; George Adams, a Civil War veteran who fought in the First Regiment of the Illinois Volunteer Artillery; and Robert McClory, who served for nearly 20 years and was a House manager for the Equal Rights Amendment in 1972.

Yet there are five men and women who represented the 10th District who stand out among this impressive crowd and deserve star treatment. These five heroes fought against slavery, advocated equal pay for women, civil rights initiatives, and served a number of Presidents as they battled human rights abuses abroad while funding biomedical research here at home.

□ 2200

These five exemplify the high standard of leadership demanded by our constituents and expected by our Nation.

Elected in the 33rd Congress as a Whig, Representative Elihu B. Washburne served his final seven terms as a Republican. During his tenure in Congress, he served as chairman of the Committee on Commerce and, in the 40th Congress, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. In 1862, President Lincoln personally lobbied to have him elected Speaker, although he eventually fell short.

Representative Washburne's legacy is legendary. He was a strong opponent of slavery and became known as one of the leaders of the Radical Republicans, along with Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner. This group was outspoken in its opposition to slavery that went well beyond calling for simple abolition. They called for complete equality under the law for freed slaves.

The Radical Republicans were critical of the reconstruction policies of both President Lincoln and President Andrew Johnson. Representative Washburne argued that Southern plantations should be subdivided and redistributed among former slaves, and when President Johnson attempted to veto the extension of the Freedman's Bureau, the Civil Rights Act, and the Reconstruction Act, Representative Washburne and his colleagues took action and were successful in their efforts to pass the Reconstruction Act.

The Radical Republicans and Washburne became leaders in the impeachment of President Johnson, and when his close friend Ulysses S. Grant became President, Representative Washburne was appointed as our country's Secretary of State. He resigned just 11 days later, ending what remains the shortest term for any U.S. Secretary of State.

Congressman Washburne left that high office because the President offered him the opportunity to assume the leadership of the American diplomatic mission in Paris. Congressman Washburne served as our ambassador to France through the Franco-Prussian War and there demonstrated true independence and initiative.

Ambassador Washburne offered refuge to diplomats from various German States and other foreigners who were abandoned by their diplomatic missions. In grave danger on the street, those diplomats found safety under the American flag with Ambassador Washburne, and when the German Army surrounded Paris in late 1870,

Washburne remained at his post and was the only foreign diplomat still in residence in Paris during the days of the Commune. These were tough times for besieged Parisians, who were reduced to eating rats.

Washburne honored our Revolutionary War debts to France by continuing his humanitarian service. His international service and his commitment to humanitarian relief presaged our own time when America has become a foundation for freedom and the international system of humanitarian relief missions around the world. Congressman Washburne remained in Paris until 1877, when he returned to Chicago.

Sixty years later, we come to the beginning of a career of another star in our story, Congressman Ralph Church, who won election to Congress in the 74th, 75th and 76th Congresses and again in the 78th Congress through his death in the 80th Congress. Many people living in our community still remember Congressman Church and his wife, Marguerite.

The second luminary in our story is a Representative far ahead of her time, Representative Church's widow, Marguerite Church. Mrs. Church succeeded her late husband in the Congress, and during her first term, Illinois redistricted its congressional seats for the first time since 1901. It placed northern Cook and Lake Counties in what was then called the 13th District.

Mrs. Church brought a commonsense approach to Federal spending. She spoke against what she called extravagant and reckless spending, earning respect from both her colleagues and her constituents. Her seat on the Government Operations Committee gave her an ideal platform to urge restraint in spending, and her assignment on the Committee on Foreign Affairs allowed her to encourage the growth of democracy across the globe.

Many of Mrs. Church's policies proposals were forward-thinking. Early in her career, she advocated equal pay for women and civil rights initiatives. The progress of the early 1960s finds its roots 10 years prior, partially in the service of Marguerite Church. She was the only female Member of the Illinois delegation, and her voting record was impeccable, answering more than 11,000 rollcalls during her tenure in the House, missing only four.

In 1959 as a ranking member of the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee, she traveled more than 40,000 miles and visited 17 countries. In 1960, at the invitation of President Eisenhower, she participated in the White House Conference on Children and Youth and, in 1961, served as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations 15th Assembly.

While participating, she jumped far ahead of her time, especially in her outspoken public criticism of South Africa and their policy of apartheid. Mrs. Church then retired in 1962.

The 88th Congress saw the beginning of another legendary career. Donald

Rumsfeld was elected Representative for this district, having previously served on the staff of Congressman David Dennison and Robert Griffin. While in the House, Rumsfeld sat on the Committee on Science and Astronautics and Government Operations. It was during this heyday of President Kennedy's space program, which heralded Lake Forest's own Jim Lovell, who went on to command Apollo 13.

Rumsfeld also had a seat on the Joint Economic Committee in both the 90th and 91st Congresses. His campaigns were indicative of what politics used to be and what they were to become. He accepted only small donations and limited expenditures for his campaign while relying on an army of volunteers to canvass neighborhoods and perform day-to-day tasks which served as the lifeblood, then and today, for any strong congressional campaign.

In 1969, he resigned to accept a place in President Nixon's administration as the head of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Not knowing much about the Office's mission at the time, he turned to his chief of staff, Bruce Ladd, who had an intern friend who had written a college paper on the Office of Economic Opportunity. That intern came to brief Congressman Rumsfeld on the Office's opportunities and walked out with a job. The intern's name was Richard Cheney.

In 1971, President Nixon appointed Rumsfeld as the director of the Cost of Living Council, a position he held until 1973 when he became the United States ambassador to NATO for 2 years.

When President Ford took office in 1974, he recalled Rumsfeld to Washington to coordinate a four-man transition team. His performance earned him appointment as the White House chief of staff, although he personally did not like the title and preferred to be called staff coordinator. He brought Secretary Cheney with him.

In 1975, Rumsfeld was appointed our Secretary of Defense, a position which he held through the end of the Ford administration in 1977. He was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom that same year, and during the Reagan administration, Rumsfeld's expertise led him to accept membership on the President's General Advisory Committee on Arms Control, and he became an adviser on government and national security affairs in 1983 and 1984. He was named Special Presidential Envoy to the Middle East in 1984.

Rumsfeld's experience in the private sector as CEO of G.D. Searle & Company and as a senior adviser to William Blair & Company complemented his government service. I'm proud to call him a friend.

Building on the records of Washburne, Church, and Rumsfeld, among others, we touch on other stars of our story. Congressman Robert McClory represented Lake County and serves as a true symbol of independence in service to the Nation. Congressman McClory was a conservative and a

loyal Republican who was a defender of President Nixon until the evidence convinced him otherwise. It was Congressman McClory's votes for two impeachment articles that set the standard for political independence, judgment, and the rule of law in this House.

For us, we now come to the final predecessor of mine in this seat, Congressman John Edward Porter, who won a special election in 1980 to follow Abner Mikva. To briefly touch on Congressman Mikva's service, it was brilliant in many ways and set another standard for independence in this Chamber and on the Federal bench.

□ 2210

Following him, Congressman Porter gained a seat on the Committee on Appropriations in 1980 where he served until his retirement after the 106th Congress.

Following a trip to the Soviet Union in 1983, Congressman Porter founded the Congressional Human Rights Caucus. He witnessed numerous human rights abuses while in the Soviet Union and decided to enlist the support of his colleagues to bring pressure on nations and groups that mistreat the innocent or prisoners of conscience. In his role as cochairman of the Human Rights Caucus, he helped free refuseniks, fought for the rights of North Korean refugees and religious freedom in China, spoke out against the use of child soldiers in Africa, and condemned the brutal regime of Sani Abacha in Nigeria.

The Congressional Human Rights Caucus was the first U.S. Government entity to host the Dalai Lama in Washington. Congressman Porter also sponsored legislation authorizing the creation of Radio Free Asia and then secured appropriations to fund this ground-breaking program, helping move the agenda of freedom in China.

Porter's record of accomplishments in foreign policy is impressive, but his record of constituent service was unmatched. He led efforts to improve the safety of Waukegan Regional Airport by updating the radio and control tower. He brought back the Coast Guard rescue unit to help the people of southern Lake Michigan, the same Coast Guard folks that saved my life as a teenager.

He worked with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to control flooding along the north branch of the Chicago River, and his commitment to the environment led him to be a strong supporter of the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act. He orchestrated the effort to designate 290 acres of land at Fort Sheridan as open space and was one of only six House Members named as taxpayer superhero by the Grace Commission's Citizens Against Government Waste in 1992. He was named to the Concord Coalition's honor role in '97 and '98 for his commitment to eliminating deficits and balancing the budget.

John Porter was always willing to take chances when he truly believed in

an issue. And 15 years ago, long before it was safe to do so, he proposed reforms to the third rail of American politics, Social Security. His proposal, in fact, can be considered revolutionary because it was one of the first and was remarkably similar to many proposals that followed.

What Congressman Porter may be most remembered for was his improvement of the health care for all Americans. In his role as chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education on the Committee on Appropriations, Congressman Porter launched the effort to double funding for the National Institutes of Health within 5 years. This additional funding helped researchers develop better and new treatments and helped fund the cracking of the human genome. He also had a commitment to biomedical research and investment in the future that will undoubtedly result in better health care for all people around the world.

John Porter served us all in the highest tradition of public service and commitment to a greater good. Having served as his administrative assistant, I could not have had a stronger role model in public service. I had some very large shoes to fill and can only hope to be remembered by my constituents as someone who fulfilled his tradition.

The record clearly demonstrates northeastern Illinois' political character, strongly independent, generally ahead of our time. Ideas like emancipation, equal pay for women, and an end to apartheid were all part of our representatives' leadership in decades ahead of the body politic. Our opinions do not necessarily adhere to strict party lines; and, therefore, anyone who represents our area must demonstrate independence and break from the party on occasion to make sure that they are adhering to our values. My predecessors did this. And while I'm a firm believer in my party's vision, it's that tradition of independence that I sought to serve in the House of Representatives.

Elihu Washburne, Marguerite Stitt Church, Don Rumsfeld, Robert McClory, John Porter. They are not household names, but their service helped shape the history of our Nation because of their commitment to do what was right and the decision to take action to protect those most in need. It is an example of what I strove to live up to in the service of this House and the people of the 10th Congressional District.

Drawing on this tradition, I focused my service on independence modeled by Congressman McClory, on spending restraint modeled after Mrs. Church, on constituent service and biomedical research in the example of John Porter, on national defense modeled after Don Rumsfeld, and America's role in the world modeled after Elihu B. Washburne. In light of this history, the people of the 10th District demand

their Representative in Congress should be a thoughtful, independent leader at all times. And I believe such independence is a way to represent the people of Illinois, and I take that very seriously.

Early in my service, I had the opportunity to prove that I would follow that tradition for the 10th District. I cosponsored and voted in favor of the Shays-Meehan campaign finance reform law, a bill opposed by most Members of my party. Although my support did not make me popular in leadership circles, I made a promise to my constituents, and I was not going to break it. This was not the time to follow party loyalty because I thought the Nation's interests were in supporting that legislation.

I have consistently cosponsored and supported bipartisan legislation to end hate crimes and employment discrimination, bolster access to women's health services, and ensure equal rights for all Americans. I've also been a staunch supporter of Federal stem cell research. This cutting-edge research has the potential to eliminate pain and suffering for millions of people who are living with cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's, and more. Such independence is reflected in Congressional Quarterly's analysis, which identified my record, for example, as "the center of the House" in 2009.

My predecessor, John Porter, set our country on a course to double funding for the National Institutes of Health over his first 5 years; and I maintained that commitment to his legacy through 10 years in this House. On my view, it is essential that we continue this promise and ensure that we remain committed to the future advancement of medical technology and research.

I'm also very proud to be one of the only few Republicans who worked actively to craft stem cell legislation and was an original sponsor of H.R. 3, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, which the House passed but unfortunately was vetoed by the President. The future of stem cell research is unknown, but I'm hopeful that we will continue to lead on this issue and ensure that we find a permanent solution and set funding from the Federal Government.

Following the inauguration of President Obama, I worked with my fellow moderates in the Tuesday Group, the House Centrist Caucus, to create a health care reform agenda. As a result of hundreds of meetings and roundtable discussions with providers and doctors and patient groups, we authored the Medical Rights and Reform Act, which guarantees the doctor-patient relationship, allows individuals to buy insurance across State lines, and would end frivolous lawsuits.

Following Congresswoman Church's footsteps, I also took measures to reduce wasteful Federal spending. I bucked my party in leading the charge to deny hundreds of millions of dollars

in Federal funding for the infamous Bridge to Nowhere in Alaska. I was also the first member of the Appropriations Committee to swear off pork-barrel spending in our broken earmark system. I consistently voted to support the taxpayer and ease the burden of Federal taxes on American families.

I voted in a way that reflects a pragmatic problem-solving nature for the people of northeastern Illinois. I tried to make sure that the Federal Government was making daily life easier for suburban families. The most common complaint among families in Chicago suburbs is traffic congestion. Our highway system is outdated and in need of repair, and mass transit can be more readily available if we work policy correctly. To address this, I joined with my colleague to the west, Congresswoman MELISSA BEAN, to create the Suburban Transportation Commission. Our goal was to bring together local leaders with their State and Federal representatives to find solutions to local and regional transportation problems.

I have been a staunch supporter of commuter rail; and I am pleased to say that since we've been in office, Metra has expanded service on its North Central line and is working now to build the Star line, which I hope will provide a commuter rail link between western suburbs. I also introduced the COMMUTER Act to incentivize the use of public transportation among suburbanites who would otherwise be stuck in traffic.

Recognizing the growth of suburban communities, I joined with dozens of my colleagues to devise the Suburban Agenda, a package of legislation designed to address the needs and concerns of suburban families. We focused on keeping kids safe in school, making college more affordable, preserving open space, and improving our health care delivery system. And to keep employment up in the suburbs in the teeth of the Great Recession, I introduced the Small Business Bill of Rights, a bill to protect the number one engine of our economy, small businesses.

□ 2220

From preserving the right to a secret ballot in a union election to eliminating unnecessary paperwork, the Small Business Bill of Rights is a prime example of suburban pragmatism at work.

Suburban families also expect world-class schools, and in the 10th District we are privileged to have some of the best public schools in the country. I think it is fitting that the first bill I introduced in the House was the GRADE-A Act to ensure full funding for Federal impact aid schools. I established an education advisory board to help guide me in formulating education policy, and this board helped draft legislation making technical corrections to the No Child Left Behind Act that I believed would enhance local control of schools and empower teachers.

I worked on many facets of improving our education system, including creating healthier learning environments. I introduced the Green Schools Act to provide matching grants for green school construction projects in our classrooms and the School Conservation Corps Act to support conservation clubs and teach kids about the importance of environmental protection.

As a staunch supporter of alternative energy and transportation, we supported and authored many other bills to provide permanent tax incentives for renewable energy and clean transportation. I also joined with Congressmen Boehlert and PLATTS to help lead the Republican effort to raise the Nation's fuel economy standards.

Following in the tradition of Congressmen Washburne and Porter, we promoted human rights in remote corners of the world through my tenure of this House. I took up the case of a journalist imprisoned in Bangladesh simply on the, quote, crime of promoting interfaith dialogue between Bangladesh and Israel.

Shoaib Choudhury was charged with sedition, a crime punishable by death under Bangladeshi law, and spent 18 months in prison before congressional attention convinced authorities to release him. In 2007, the House passed a resolution I authored calling on the Government of Bangladesh to immediately drop all charges against Shoaib. It carried by a vote of 409-1.

Some of our work also helped secure the release of Dr. Taye Wolde-Semayat, a political prisoner in Ethiopia. We condemned the persecution of Baha'is in Iran and sought to bring peace to Darfur, worked to secure the release of the first Egyptian blogger to be jailed for his online writings, and established the Congressional Commission on Divided Families to reunite Korean Americans with their North Korean relatives.

We fought to protect Iraq's Christian community from increasing violence and led efforts to combat the rise of global anti-Semitism. We fought for women's rights around the world, basic education, health services, and access to family planning.

We stood up for our allies—Poland, Armenia, Greece, Ukraine, and Georgia—and increased oversight of the United Nation's Relief and Works Agency, and demanded accountability in U.S. assistance to the West Bank and Gaza.

We successfully changed policy on proposed arms sales to Saudi Arabia, protecting U.S. forces in the region, and preserving Israel's qualitative military advantage.

We delivered Eyes in the Sky, and the X-Band radar system to defend the State of Israel, and our bipartisan legislation moved forward to prohibit gasoline sales to Iran which is now the law of the land.

In my time representing the people of the 10th District, there is one defining

moment that shaped my work in the Congress and forever changed our country. I started the day on September 11, 2001, in the Pentagon having breakfast with Secretary Rumsfeld. The meeting broke up early when the Secretary was notified that a second plane hit the World Trade Center. Shortly thereafter, we were evacuated from the Capitol complex after the Pentagon was hit. Being forced from our offices that day was a profoundly sad moment.

As a veteran and a Naval Reserve intelligence officer, I knew we were at war and there was much work to be done in the Congress to protect the American people and provide our military with the resources they needed to fight terrorism.

The House began debating legislation to establish a Department of Homeland Security while most congressional offices were closed as a result of an anthrax attack. Working out of temporary space at the General Accounting Office, I authored language providing for effective 911 emergency call capabilities from telephones on passenger aircraft and trains. At the same time, I also began working on improving the effectiveness of the State Department's Rewards for Justice program to help provide investigators with more information that could lead to the capture of wanted terrorists. Remembering how a tip from this program led to the capture of Mir Aimal Kasi, the terrorist who murdered CIA employees outside headquarters on January 25, 1993, I wanted to increase the maximum reward for information that would lead us to terrorists responsible for 9/11.

In the years that followed, we continued to work to make this program more effective, authorizing special payments, expanding the number of informants eligible for rewards, and allowing payments other than cash to be made in certain circumstances.

The war in Afghanistan requires contributions from all elements of the U.S. Government, and sometimes the best support comes from unexpected places. On one trip to Afghanistan, I was pleasantly surprised to find that some of the best intelligence against al Qaeda and the Taliban were coming from agents of the Drug Enforcement Administration. I was also surprised to learn that the DEA was not officially part of the U.S. intelligence community. I returned to Washington and worked with Congressman FRANK WOLF to make sure that the DEA became an official member of the intelligence community again.

I also worked to provide DEA with specialized intelligence aircraft to use in Afghanistan. The intelligence collected from this plane not only helps warfighters on the ground, but the information is also admissible in court, meaning narcoterrorists in Afghanistan could more likely face criminal charges in the United States.

I am very proud of my work in Congress to help our men and women in

uniform fight overseas, and more proud to have served alongside them. In December 2008, I became the first Member of the House to serve in an imminent danger area when I deployed to Kandahar, Afghanistan to serve as a special adviser to General Nicholson for Regional Command South focused on counternarcotics. A year later, I returned to Afghanistan to serve again. Each time, I have become more committed to the men and women serving over there and their mission.

Today, 9 years after the first American boots hit the ground in Afghanistan, the mission remains vital to our security. We must leave Afghanistan only after victory is secured and terrorists no longer find sanctuary in its rugged mountains capable of hurting Americans and the United States.

As a veteran, one of my highest priorities in the Congress is to take care of our men and women in uniform, consistently work to improve the quality of life for active duty servicemen and -women, their families, and retirees.

I am proud to have joined with Congressman DENNIS MOORE to pass the American Veterans Disabled for Life Memorial Coin Act. This memorial will honor the sacrifices made by America's more than 3 million disabled veterans by building a memorial for them here in Washington, D.C., within eyesight of the Capitol. I was also inspired to see this bill passed by an extraordinary young man, Sergeant Bryan Anderson of Rolling Meadows, Illinois. Bryan lost both legs and an arm due to a roadside bomb in Iraq.

Washington has legions of professional advocates who make a living out of convincing people to see issues from their point of view, but none can compare to Bryan. With Bryan, what you see is what you get—a veteran with an inspirational story who wants to see the memorial built, not for himself, not just for disabled veterans, but so that everyone will remember the sacrifice of all of our veterans.

One project in particular follows the arc of my career in this House. In 1999, a Washington-based consultant wrote a study recommending the closure of the North Chicago VA Hospital. The study said that Lake County veterans could get help downtown in Chicago or Maywood, or even the Milwaukee area, with only a 30-minute drive.

□ 2230

The study overlooked the fact that North Chicago VA was recently renovated and housed modern in-patient wards with the latest equipment still in bubble wrap. It also overlooked the fact that the Navy was operating an outdated, oversized hospital no more than a mile away and had plans to invest more than \$100 million to replace it. I thought it made more sense to combine these two institutions, rather than close one and rebuild the other.

Over the last 10 years, we battled the bureaucracy and gradually integrated the services of the Navy and VA. We

started by combining in-patient mental health, leading to a jointly operated operations suite and emergency room, and on October 1st of this year, we officially opened the first truly joint Navy-VA hospital in the country. This new facility will care for more than 100,000 veterans, retirees, sailors, and their families. It is my hope that this model will improve veterans' health care throughout our Nation.

What better way to honor our veterans than by naming the facility after one of our Nation's heroes, 10th District resident and Apollo XIII Commander Captain James A. Lovell, Jr.

In 2007, I wrote to Deputy Secretary of Defense Gordon England and requested that the new facility have the name that reflected the mission of this pioneering hero. In response, the Deputy Secretary wrote, "It is fitting to name the facility after Captain Lovell, not only for the reasons cited in your letter, but also for his role in the history-making Gemini 7 mission, which included the first rendezvous of two manned maneuverable spacecraft. The joint DoD-VA health care facility in North Chicago can be described as the first rendezvous of two separate medical treatment facilities, joining them into one cohesive, comprehensive federal facility. It, too, is a history-making event."

As I leave this House, we face key challenges; challenges of solving increasing gridlock in our communities; challenges on the environmental front of cleaning up nuclear waste and PCBs; challenges of maintaining the tradition of the 10th District in education excellence; challenges like keeping the U.S. health care system on the cutting edge so that each American lives a full and healthy life; and providing tax fairness for married people, ending the death tax, and stopping government waste.

I look forward to continuing our work and confronting these challenges head-on in the Senate. In the meantime, I want to extend my best wishes and heartfelt congratulations to our congressman-elect, Robert Dold, who I know will continue our tradition of thoughtful, independent leadership. Congressman-elect Dold shares my passion for our district, our State, our country, and our democratic allies. I am confident that the 10th District is now in good hands and look forward to working with him to advancing these goals.

Mr. Speaker, I first arrived in this House as a staff member in 1984, 26 years ago. On and off, I served during the speakerships of Tip O'Neill, Jim Wright, Tom Foley, Newt Gingrich, Dennis Hastert, and NANCY PELOSI. This institution is the real arena of American politics. It is here that the raw emotions of the American people are translated nearly instantaneously into draft policies to address our Nation's needs. It is here where democracy is strongest, youngest, and most vibrant.

As an intern, staffer, and Member I have had the honor to serve in the

House of Commons in London, in the House of Representatives here in Washington, and soon in the Senate. But most of my professional life, in one form or another, has been here in the People's House. I have loved every minute of it, and would say to young Americans that one of the best ways to make a real difference in life is to join the roughly 12,000 Americans who have had the unique privilege of serving their district here in the center of the democratic world.

I want to especially thank my district chiefs of staff, Dodie McCracken, Lenore Macdonald, and Eric Elk; my Washington chiefs of staff, Doug O'Brien, Liesl Hickey, and Les Munson; and the man who drafted my first speech in the House, Patrick Magnuson, and the man who drafted my last speech in the House, Patrick Magnuson.

I move on now to the Senate to serve the people of Illinois. I am honored to have the privilege to work for everyone from Rockford to Cairo. But part of my heart will always remain here in the House with the spirits of Washburne, Church, Rumsfeld, Mikva, and Porter, the men and women who represented the northern suburbs here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the floor for the last time, and thank you.

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. GRAYSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today and November 18.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 18, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

10327. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the

Department's final rule — Hass Avocado Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Section 610 Review [Document Number AMS-FV-10-0007] received October 32, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10328. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Mexican Hass Avocados; Additional Shipping Options [Docket No.: APHIS-2008-0016] (RIN: 0579-AD15) received November 1, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10329. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Balance of Payments Program Exemption for Commercial Information Technology-Construction Material (DFARS Case 2009-D041) (RIN: 0750-AG60) received October 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

10330. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Treatment by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as Conservator or Receiver of Financial Assets Transferred by an Insured Depository Institution in Connection With a Securitization or Participation After September 30, 2010 (RIN: 3064-AD55) received October 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

10331. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — The Low-Income Definition (RIN: 3133-AD75) received November 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

10332. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Microbiology Devices; Reclassification of Herpes Simplex Virus Types 1 and 2 Serological Assays; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2009-N-0344] received October 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10333. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Volatile Organic Compound Site-Specific State Implementation Plan for Abbott Laboratories [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0665; FRL-9212-8] received November 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10334. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County, New Mexico; Interstate Transport of Pollution [EPA-R06-OAR-2007-1119; FRL-9221-4] received November 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10335. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Change of Addresses for Submission of Certain Reports; Technical Correction [FRL-9221-7] received November 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10336. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Delegation of National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories; State of Nevada; Clark County Department of Air Quality and Environmental Management [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0814; FRL-9219-5] received November 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10337. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determinations of Attainment by the Applicable Attainment Date for the Hayden, Nogales, Paul Spur/Douglas PM10 Nonattainment Areas, Arizona [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0718; FRL-9219-7] received November 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10338. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to In-Use Testing for Heavy-Duty Diesel Engines and Vehicles; Emissions Measurement and Instrumentation; Not-to-Exceed Emission Standards; and Technical Amendments for Off-Highway Engines [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0142; FRL-9220-6] (RIN: 2060-A-069) received November 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10339. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-47, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10340. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-48, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10341. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-51, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10342. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-44, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10343. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-43, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10344. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-45, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10345. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-46, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10346. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-58, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10347. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-52, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10348. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-57, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10349. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-104, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10350. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-096, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10351. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-111, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10352. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-102, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10353. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 09-103, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10354. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-100, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10355. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-058, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10356. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-082 (CORRECTED), pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10357. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-076, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10358. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-048, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10359. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-085, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export

Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10360. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-091, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10361. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-036, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10362. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-084, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10363. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-081, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10364. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-099, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10365. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-086 (CORRECTED), Certification of proposed issuance of an export license, pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10366. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-074, Certification of proposed issuance of an export license, pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10367. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-093, Certification of proposed issuance of an export license, pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10368. A letter from the Associate Director for PP&I, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — North Korea Sanctions Regulations received November 1, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10369. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report related to Afghanistan and Pakistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10370. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — General Schedule Locality Pay Areas (RIN: 3206-AM25) received November 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

10371. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act; Regional Fishery Management Councils; Operations [Docket No.: 080102007-0337-03] (RIN: 0648-AW18) received October 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

10372. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; closure [Docket No.: 0912281446-0111-02] (RIN: 0648-XY79) received October 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

10373. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Re-Opening of the 2010 Gulf of Mexico Recreational Red Snapper Season [Docket No.: 970730185-7206-02] (RIN: 0648-XY73) received October 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

10374. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Emergency Rule to Authorize Re-Opening the Recreational Red Snapper Season [Docket No.: 100713296-0452-02] (RIN: 0648-BA06) received October 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

10375. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Closure [Docket No.: 0912281446-0111-02] (RIN: 0648-XY79) received October 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

10376. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 0910131363-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XZ27) received October 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

10377. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Group-er Fishery of the South Atlantic; Closure of the 2010-2011 Commercial Sector for Black Sea Bass in the South Atlantic [Docket No.: 040205043-4043-01] (RIN: 0648-XY48) received October 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

10378. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Group-er Fishery of the South Atlantic; Closure of the July-December 2010 Commercial Sector for Vermilion Snapper in the South Atlantic [Docket No.: 040205043-4043-01] (RIN: 0648-XY47) received October 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

10379. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone

Off Alaska; Chinook Salmon Bycatch Management in the Bering Sea Pollock Fishery; Correction [Docket No.: 090511911-0307-02] (RIN: 0648-AX89) received October 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

10380. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Amendments 20 and 21; Trawl Rationalization Program [Docket No.: 100212086-0354-04] (RIN: 0648-AY68) received October 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

10381. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, Department of State, transmitting report on the Secretary of State's decision to designate an entity and its aliases as a "foreign terrorist organization", pursuant to Section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended (8 U.S.C. 1189); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10382. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, Department of State, transmitting report on the Secretary of State's decision to designate an entity and its aliases as a "foreign terrorist organization", pursuant to Section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended (8 U.S.C. 1189); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10383. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, Department of State, transmitting report on the Secretary of State's decision to designate an entity and its aliases as a "foreign terrorist organization", pursuant to Section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended (8 U.S.C. 1189); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10384. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Revolution 3 Triathlon, Lake Erie & Sandusky Bay, Cedar Point, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0791] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10385. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Illinois River, Mile 000.5 to 001.5 [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0786] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10386. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Direct Final Rule Staying Numeric Limitation for the Construction and Development Point Source Category [EPA-HQ-OW-2010-0884; FRL-9222-2] received November 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10387. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Credit for Carbon Dioxide Sequestration 2010 Section 45Q Inflation Adjustment Factor [Notice 2010-75] received November 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10388. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Tribal economic development bonds — Extension of deadline to issue bonds [Announcement 2010-88] received November 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10389. A letter from the Associate Legal Counsel, Equal Employment Opportunity

Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Regulations under the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008 (RIN: 3046-AA84) received November 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ARCURI: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1721. Resolution providing for the consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1722) to require the head of each executive agency to establish and implement a policy under which employees shall be authorized to telework, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules. (Rept. 111-657). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PENCE:

H.R. 6415. A bill to permanently extend the 2001 and 2003 tax relief provisions, and to permanently repeal the estate tax, and to provide permanent AMT relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 6416. A bill to ensure that certain Federal employees cannot hide behind immunity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 6417. A bill to prohibit Federal funding of certain public radio programming, to provide for the transfer of certain public radio funds to reduce the public debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOSWELL (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. LATHAM):

H.R. 6418. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to extend the suspension of the limitation on the period for which certain borrowers are eligible for guaranteed assistance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. NORTON, Mr. STARK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. OLVER):

H.R. 6419. A bill to amend the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 to provide for the further extension of emergency unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADLER of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 6420. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act with respect to the applicability of identity theft guidelines to creditors; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 6421. A bill to eliminate the learned intermediary defense to tort claims based on

product liability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 6422. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 with respect to current connection; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Ms. CLARKE, and Ms. HARMAN):

H.R. 6423. A bill to enhance homeland security, including domestic preparedness and collective response to terrorism, by amending the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Cybersecurity Compliance Division and provide authorities to the Department of Homeland Security to enhance the security and resiliency of the Nation's cyber and physical infrastructure against terrorism and other cyber attacks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and 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.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. Con. Res. 332. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H. Res. 1720. A resolution providing for the printing of a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Twelfth Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. FALCOMA, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Res. 1722. A resolution supporting international tiger conservation efforts and the upcoming Global Tiger Summit in St. Petersburg, Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. FATTAH:

H. Res. 1723. A resolution disavowing the partisan impeachment of William Jefferson Clinton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SPACE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BARROW, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HODES, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. HILL, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. LINDER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. FILNER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WELCH, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BOYD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. WU, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Ms. DELAURO):

H. Res. 1724. A resolution commending the City of Jacksonville, Arkansas, for its outstanding support in creating a unique and lasting partnership with Little Rock Air Force Base, members of the Armed Forces stationed there and their families, and the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. FILNER introduced a bill (H.R. 6424) for the relief of Lauli'i Matu'u; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 39: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 235: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 678: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
 H.R. 1193: Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 1310: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 1410: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 1521: Mr. CRITZ.
 H.R. 1625: Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 1693: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 1751: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 1884: Ms. BEAN.
 H.R. 1927: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 1948: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 2103: Mr. HARE.
 H.R. 2625: Mr. WALZ, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 2870: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 3464: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HARE, and Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 3577: Mr. MAFFEL.
 H.R. 3697: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
 H.R. 3790: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
 H.R. 4371: Mrs. EMERSON.
 H.R. 4469: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BONNER, and Ms. GIFFORDS.
 H.R. 4671: Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 4722: Mr. FARR and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 4802: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 4806: Mr. BERMAN.
 H.R. 4844: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 4958: Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 5001: Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 5058: Mr. BONNER and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 5111: Mr. STEARNS.
 H.R. 5470: Ms. SUTTON.
 H.R. 5504: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 5510: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 5527: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 5533: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 5791: Mr. HEINRICH.
 H.R. 5803: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 5859: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 5967: Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 6072: Mr. NADLER of New York.
 H.R. 6113: Mr. CASSIDY.
 H.R. 6199: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H.R. 6238: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.
 H.R. 6258: Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 6283: Ms. NORTON.
 H.J. Res. 97: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
 H. Con. Res. 296: Mr. COHEN.

H. Con. Res. 323: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. GRAYSON.

H. Con. Res. 327: Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H. Res. 763: Mr. MCCAUL, and Ms. FOXX.

H. Res. 767: Mr. COSTELLO.

H. Res. 840: Mr. WAMP.

H. Res. 1431: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. PETRI, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 1444: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. STARK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. MATSUI.

H. Res. 1476: Mr. WEINER, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 1524: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H. Res. 1531: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr.

CONAWAY, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H. Res. 1576: Ms. TSONGAS.

H. Res. 1585: Mr. DJOU, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. PITTS.

H. Res. 1690: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. CHU, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARROW, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California,

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FALCOMA, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. SIREN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. WATSON, Mr. BACA, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BOREN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. SABLON, Mrs.

MALONEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WU, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. REYES.

H. Res. 1704: Ms. TITUS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SIREN, Mr. FARR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. MANZULLO.