

would interact, as it was the first time a woman was on a national ticket.

I will miss my friend Gerry. We will all miss her. But we are all better people because of her. Rest in peace, Gerry. We will always remember you. And so will the history books.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a while ago, one of my colleagues was down here talking about ObamaCare and what a problem it was going to cause for this country from a financial standpoint as well as causing rationing of health care and a whole host of other things. But what I want to do right now is bring to the attention of my colleagues and anybody else that's paying attention a decision that was just made by U.S. District Judge Rosemary Collyer that affects everybody on Social Security who wants to have a health care plan besides Medicare.

I'm going to read you an op-ed that just was in the Washington Examiner and also in The Wall Street Journal that I think every single American ought to be aware of because this has wide-ranging impact on everybody in this country. Here's what it says. "A recent court ruling has helped President Obama push ahead with a mandate that all citizens be required to have government health care. This court ruling would mandate that every citizen in this country has government health care." Socialized medicine.

"In a March 16 decision, U.S. District Judge Rosemary Collyer, who previously served as General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, ruled that seniors who elect to opt out of Medicare coverage must forfeit their Social Security benefits as well and repay all past Social Security benefits prior to opting out."

I hope everybody is getting that in their offices. If you don't take Medicare coverage and you're a senior and you opt out of Medicare coverage because you want another form of health care, maybe a better form of health care, then you have got to lose your Social Security payments and pay back all the Social Security payments that you received in the past.

□ 1620

Now, anybody who is paying attention is going to say, "You know, that didn't really happen," but I'm telling you that decision was made on March 16 by Judge Rosemary Collyer, a U.S. district judge here in this area.

The ruling relates to a lawsuit that was filed in 2008 in—and this is the name of the case—Hall v. Sebelius. Several senior citizens challenged a 1993 Clinton administration program rule, and they sued the Federal Gov-

ernment for their right to opt out of Medicare without losing their Social Security benefits. The plaintiffs all paid their Medicare taxes throughout their employment histories and did not request reimbursement of the money.

So they'd paid into Medicare for the entire time that they'd been working. These individuals simply wished to engage other health insurance plans. They wanted to get some other health insurance plans besides Medicare. They'd paid into Medicare and they'd paid into Social Security, but they wanted to get other health insurance besides Medicare.

It goes on to say that they believed it would provide better coverage than that of the government's Medicare program.

In addition, these seniors contributed to Social Security while they were working, and accepted these benefits upon retirement. Now, here is what the seniors' lawsuit argued:

Both the Social Security and Medicare acts state that the application for Social Security benefits and Medicare are voluntary and that applications for each program are not dependent upon each other. Forced participation in Medicare violates an individual's constitutional right to privacy. The Clinton-era rules were promulgated without undergoing the required notice and comment rulemaking requirements, which is a violation of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act.

The judge stated that, in its arguments, the Obama administration "extols the benefits of Medicare and suggests that plaintiffs would agree that they are not truly injured if they were to learn more about Medicare, perhaps through discovery." Note the familiar condescending Obama administration tone: Take the Medicare, and then find out what's in it. You'll like it when you do.

We had that problem before on legislation. You'll remember the previous Speaker of the House. When asked about ObamaCare, she said, Well, we've got to pass the bill. Then we'll find out what's in it.

That really made a lot of sense—but once again, this is pretty much the attitude of the administration.

Here is what the judge went on to say:

"The parties use a lot of ink disputing whether plaintiffs' desire to avoid Medicare part A is sensible."

Translation: If Americans don't want government-run health care, well, they just don't have much sense. After all, the government knows what's best for them, and they don't.

What is most astounding about this case is that, as of late 2009, this same judge, Judge Collyer, supported the plaintiffs' claim and even refused the Obama administration's request to dismiss the suit. Her ruling then was that neither the statute nor the regulation specifies that plaintiffs must withdraw from Social Security and repay retirement benefits in order to withdraw

from Medicare, which means simply that, if they decide not to take Medicare, they can continue to get their Social Security that they paid into, as they should, and they wouldn't have to pay back the Social Security benefits they'd received in the past. That makes sense.

She changed her mind. This judge made this ruling in 2009. Now she changes her mind, and she argues in her stunning reversal, "Requiring a mechanism for plaintiffs and others in their situation to 'dis-enroll' would be contrary to congressional intent, which was to provide 'mandatory' benefits under Medicare part A and for those receiving Social Security retirement benefits. Plaintiffs are trapped in a government program intended for their benefit. They disagree and wish to escape," Collyer wrote. "The court can find no loophole or requirement that the Secretary provide such a pathway."

According to Collyer, an "entitlement" is mandatory. You have to take it. Now, here is the government saying you have to take Medicare, and her opinion will undoubtedly be relied upon by the Obama administration as support for claims of mandatory entitlements, such as that which is the crux of ObamaCare, which could be Medicare for everyone. Everyone would have to be covered, not by their own individual health care plans that they have or by their employers' health care plans or a group plan they're on, but everyone would have to be covered by Medicare, which is a government-run, socialized medicine approach, which ultimately would ration health care and cost a great deal more. ObamaCare, when you run it out for 10 years, you'll find it is going to cost literally trillions of dollars at a time when we have a \$14 trillion national debt. This year alone, we're exceeding our revenues by \$1.4 trillion.

The Wall Street Journal reported that Kent Masterson Brown, the lead attorney for the seniors, commented that, if Americans wonder how bureaucrats will write ObamaCare's rules, they need look only to this ruling. "When they do," he said, "they will realize nothing will be optional."

This is an alarming decision that came about in a disturbing manner. Collyer's ruling is a danger to freedom-loving Americans. Let's look to the plaintiffs' appeal—they're appealing—to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals for more favorable results.

That's where we are today. If she is not reversed, that means anybody who gets Social Security, who may have another health care plan and who may not want to be on Medicare, will either have to take Medicare or will have to pay all their Social Security benefits back; plus, they don't get Social Security in the future.

Now think about that. You don't want to take Medicare for whatever reason, and you've been paying into Social Security all of your life. You're

getting Social Security benefits, and because you won't take Medicare, they say, Uh-oh. You've got to pay all your Social Security benefits back to when you received them, and you can't get any more in the future.

That is just absolutely crazy.

I want to read to you some information that I have from the actual wording of the statute, and this is very, very important because it can only be interpreted one way. Yet this judge and the Obama administration are changing it so that it will fit their desired objective. Let me read this to you. Be patient with me while I read this and get all the information before me.

Here is what the Medicare statute says. My colleagues in your offices, see if you get from this that the people have to take Medicare if they're getting Social Security or if they have to pay the payments back and not get any more of their Social Security benefits. Here is what the Medicare statute says:

The Medicare statute provides that only individuals who are entitled—entitled—to Social Security are entitled to Medicare. If you're "entitled" to Social Security. You have to be entitled to Social Security in order to be entitled to Medicare, but it does not say if you're entitled to Social Security that you have to take Medicare. It only says, if you're entitled to Social Security, you're entitled, if you want to, to take Medicare.

This judge is changing the words that are in the statute to mean, if you take Social Security, you have to take Medicare; but the law does not say that. She is making law on the Federal bench, but that's not what our Founders contemplated when they wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Listen to this again: The Medicare statute says that only individuals who are entitled to Social Security are entitled to Medicare.

Therefore, the judge is arguing the only way to avoid entitlement to Medicare part A at age 65 is to forgo the source of that entitlement, i.e., Social Security retirement benefits. So she is standing the law of the country, the Medicare law and the Social Security law, on their heads. This will mean to every single citizen of this country that, if the government says, "Here is something we want you to do. If you don't do it, we're going to take away another benefit you have or another government program," you will have to do it, because that's what this judge's ruling simply means.

□ 1630

If the government is giving you a benefit like Social Security and they decide that there's another benefit that you're entitled to, then say you have to take it, but you don't take it, they will be able to withdraw your Social Security and say you have to pay back all of the benefits of the past. This is absolutely insane. It is government run amuck, government run out of control.

And this judge, if I had the ability, would be fired. I can't remember the exact date, but in 2008 she ruled in favor of the plaintiffs saying if you have got Social Security and you don't want Medicare because you have got another health care plan, you don't have to take it; and now she's reversed herself and said if you get Social Security, you have to take Medicare.

And once again, before I give up the floor, Mr. Speaker—and I see my good friend's here, I'm going to yield to you the balance of my time—this is what the law says: the law says that only individuals who are entitled to Social Security are entitled to Medicare. But that does not say if you're entitled to Social Security you have to take Medicare, and she's saying—and I hope everybody's getting this—she's saying that if you're getting Social Security, you have to take Medicare. You've got another health plan, if your employer has another health plan, doesn't matter; you've got to get rid of those, and you have to join Medicare or you lose your benefits.

Now, this case is on appeal, and I hope it goes all the way to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court will reverse it because, if it does not repeal this decision by Judge Collier, then what's going to happen is that everything that government says will have to be done, and you will have almost complete government control over every aspect of our life. If they can say you get Social Security, you've got to take Medicare and if you have got a separate health care plan, to heck with it; and if they can go far enough to say that, they can say anything they want to to make you jump through a hoop. And that is just dead wrong, and it flies in the face of everything that we believe as far as the free people and a free government is concerned.

I just can't believe some of the things that are happening around here; and the thing that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is the American people who are involved in so many things that they can't pay attention to all the things that are going on. They rely upon their elected Representatives because we have a democratic Republic to study these bills and make decisions that are best for the entire country. And that's the reason they do this, because we've got 300 million people here, and they can't read every bill or watch every court decision.

But the fact of the matter is, these courts, a separate part of our government, our Forefathers said we've got a judicial branch, a legislative branch, and an executive branch, and they're supposed to be coequal. But here you have a Federal judge making a law that will transcend laws that we have on the books and change the way of life for every single American.

Remember what this does. The law says if you're getting Social Security, you may take Medicare, and what the judge is saying, if you get Social Secu-

rity, you have to take Medicare, no matter what other health care plan you have; and if you don't do what the government tells you, you have to do it, then you're going to lose your Social Security benefits; and not only that, you have to pay back, probably with interest, every Social Security check you received.

That is horrible. This administration and this judge ought to be taken to task for it; and with that, I'd like to yield to my colleague from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my good friend for yielding.

You know, we hear so often from this administration they're concerned about the little guy, but we know that Wall Street executives gave contributions four times more for the present President than they did for his Republican opponent; and so it kind of tells you where you see where the contributions come from for a particular candidate, who they really care about.

We're told that they really care about the working poor; and yet the very thing we're talking about under the ObamaCare bill is almost inconceivable except that it was pushed through by this President and two Democratic majorities, that there's a provision that if you are just above the poverty line and you can't afford the health insurance that this administration dictates—as I understand, we will be including pregnancy, say you're a young single person, no plans of getting pregnant, no ability to get pregnant, other things that will not affect you at all but have been mandated by the administration—instead of being able to buy a cheaper insurance policy you can afford, this administration will have made it so expensive that people just above the poverty line won't be able to afford it.

And how the bill deals with those working poor just above the poverty line, it requires a 2 percent additional income tax if you cannot afford the insurance that they mandate.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Can I just say one thing. My colleague, a good friend of mine, Representative GOHMERT points out the fallacy and the problems with the ObamaCare bill, and that is bad, very bad and it should not be in law, and that's why we moved H.R. 1 to repeal it.

But this decision that I was talking about, LOUIE, even goes further than that. It says if you're getting Social Security, you have to take Medicare, and what they're doing is they're saying everybody in this country is ultimately going to have to be under a government-run program, Medicare or ObamaCare, which means socialized medicine and an entirely different approach to medicine which will be controlled by government bureaucrats.

Mr. GOHMERT. I understood where my friend was going, and I had not heard about that opinion, and I'm so glad the smart gentleman had brought that to our attention because that is

just incredible except that it is exactly what the Democratic proponents of ObamaCare and the President himself had said before they wanted to get to.

The goal was to use this to get to a complete government-run health care, a single-payer system, where everybody is required to be under it, and so this decision speeds that process up dramatically; but it is ultimately where they said they wanted to get anyway.

Now, having seen socialized medicine firsthand in the Soviet Union as an exchange student back in 1973, and having seen another form of socialized medicine for 4 years in the United States Army, I don't want to go there. I don't want the government in charge of my health care. I saw that in the Army. We have some incredible medics. We have some folks that shouldn't be practicing medicine that were working there; and, in fact, I'm hopeful that I was helpful in getting rid of some of those.

But that's not where we need to be going. People deserve better. But the fact is that in the bill itself there is retribution for the working poor who can't even afford to do what the administration has dictated.

So between a judge saying if you've got Social Security, you're going to be crammed into this policy, and this administration and former Speaker PELOSI and HARRY REID saying that we're going to penalize you because you're working poor and can't afford the luxuries of the policy we're mandating, the working guy just doesn't have much of a chance unless we are able to turn some of those things around.

And the working poor is what I often saw at Ft. Benning when people were not getting paid what they should have under President Carter; but now the military is paid better, and yet I wanted to bring up the situation that exists. There is an attempt to use the military as pawns even while they're out there fighting to protect us in foreign areas, combat theaters. The last thing those people should have to worry about is whether or not their money arrives in their account so their family can be taken care of. Yet we're hearing from military people, they understand if there's a shutdown, sure, they will get their pay eventually when the shutdown is over and maybe they will be lucky and HARRY REID and the Democrats in the Senate won't force a shutdown for very long.

□ 1640

We know they want to force it because they keep saying they do. And of course we heard from Senator SCHUMER himself that this is a political game to them. They are going to force a shutdown and basically blame the tea party. The military are the ones who are going to get hurt there. This from the Democratic Party that says all they care about is those working to protect us; and yet when you see what

they are really doing behind the scenes, it is no such thing.

We have a report from CRS here that says: "Even though uniformed personnel have been excepted from furloughs during a lapse in funding, no special provision allows the Defense Department to provide pay when appropriated funds are not available to do so. In this regard, uniformed personnel are treated no differently than excepted civilian Federal employees who are similarly expected to continue working during a shutdown but whose pay will be delayed until appropriations are enacted."

Well, I know my friend from Indiana feels, as I do—and we've got, I don't know, around 50 other people just in a matter of an hour or so that have signed on to this bill, H.R. 1297, that says—and I will get over right to the meat of this thing—it says, During a funding gap impacting the Armed Forces, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in the case of the Coast Guard, out of any amounts in the general fund of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in the case of the Coast Guard, determines to be necessary to continue to provide pay and allowances without interruption to members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including Reserve components thereof who perform active service during the funding gap."

So we hope that the majority leader in the Senate, HARRY REID, and Senator SCHUMER and those who have been saying privately, which got exposed—like the Bible says, What's done in the dark will be exposed, and it has been. They are out to shut down the government, try to blame the tea party.

And they have expected that one of the things they will, I'm sure, be able to do is have the "lamestream media" that run out and try to do anything they can to support that party go try to find spouses of military in harm's way who are scared to death because now the government has been shut down and there is no check coming for the next pay period. This will address that, and we can take our military off the table as pawns and let them be about concentrating on protecting us and saving their own lives.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I'm sorry to interrupt you, LOUIE, but one thing I think that my colleagues and anybody that is paying attention ought to know is, first of all, I have heard that the Republicans don't have an alternative health care plan. We've had one for 2 years, and the media keeps saying that we haven't provided an alternative. We do, one that will work and won't cost the taxpayers and the future generations almost everything that they will ever expect to earn. That's number one.

The other thing that concerns me is that the administration and now their

complicit persons in the court and the media are trying to do everything they can to move this country in a direction that nobody has ever anticipated and that is complete government control over our lives. And I know that you and all of our colleagues from this side of the aisle are very committed to making sure that doesn't happen.

The last thing I would like to say is, we need to cut government spending. You know this. And we're sending legislation over there to try to cut \$100 billion or \$61 billion out of this year's spending, \$61 billion. The projected deficit this year is \$1.4 trillion, so \$61 billion is a drop in the ocean. It's nothing. Yet they don't want to cut anything or any programs. And if we don't cut spending, this country will not only be bankrupt, but we'll be giving a legacy to our kids and grandkids that they will never forgive us for.

So I just hope my colleagues are really aware of that. We don't want to shut the government down. We are committed to cutting spending. They are the ones that, when we send a spending cut over there, won't let the bill pass; and we're cutting in a responsible way. So they're the ones that are causing the problem. We do not want the government shut down.

Mr. GOHMERT. One of the things that is being said is, But what about the children? I welcome that question, because those of us who are standing so firmly in trying to cut this runaway spending are the ones who are standing for the children and the children's grandchildren because what has been done—and in truth, I remember getting beat up in '05, '06 for \$160 billion in deficit spending. It was wrong. We shouldn't have been there. But now for the last 3 years, 2½, to be over a trillion dollars each year is just reprehensible. It is wrapping such a heavy weight and chains around the necks of the children—some not even born yet—that it is unthinkable that somebody would invoke for the children to keep the self-aggrandizing spending going when it is going to come out of the children and their grandchildren's pockets.

We've got some that say, It's all going to work out. Don't worry about it. Look, just let the spending go. Don't rock the boat.

I saw this prayer from Peter Marshall back when he was Chaplain of the Senate. And just for historical purposes, in one of his prayers in the Senate, he said, "Our Father, give us the faith to believe that it is possible for us to live victoriously even in the midst of dangerous opportunity that we call crisis. Help us to see that there is something better than patient endurance or keeping a stiff upper lip, and that whistling in the dark is not really bravery."

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank my colleague for coming down to the floor.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GERLACH (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for Thursday March 31 after 5 p.m. on account of attending a funeral.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 4, 2011, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information

Gary L. Ackerman, Sandy Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alexander, Jason Altmire, Justin Amash, Robert E. Andrews, Steve Austria, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Tammy Baldwin, Lou Barletta, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Karen Bass, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Rick Berg, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Judy Biggert, Brian P. Bilbray, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono Mack, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bruce L. Braley, Mo Brooks, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Vern Buchanan, Larry Bucshon, Ann Marie Buerkle, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G. K. Butterfield, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Francisco "Quico" Canseco, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, John C. Carney, Jr., Andre Carson, John R. Carter, Bill Cassidy, Kathy Castor, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Ben Chandler, Donna M. Christensen, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Hansen Clarke, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. "Gerry" Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Jerry F. Costello, Joe Courtney, Chip Cravaack, Eric A. "Rick" Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Mark S. Critz, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Danny K. Davis, Geoff Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, Rosa L. DeLauro, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Joe Donnelly, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Bob Filner, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Jeff Flake, Charles J. "Chuck" Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Virginia Foxx, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Elton Gallegly, John Garamendi, Cory Gardner, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Gabrielle Giffords,

Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Charles A. Gonzalez, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Al Green, Gene Green, Tim Griffin, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Michael G. Grimm, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutierrez, Ralph M. Hall, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Richard L. Hanna, Jane Harman*, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Nan A. S. Hayworth, Joseph J. Heck, Martin Heinrich, Dean Heller, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Brian Higgins, James A. Himes, Maurice D. Hinchey, Rubén Hinojosa, Mazie Hirono, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Tim Huelskamp, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Robert Hurt, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson Lee, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, Marcy Kaptur, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Dale E. Kildee, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Adam Kinzinger, Larry Kissell, John Kline, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, Jeffrey M. Landry, James R. Langevin, James Lankford, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Christopher J. Lee*, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Lujan, Cynthia M. Lummis, Daniel E. Lungren, Stephen F. Lynch, Connie Mack, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Edward J. Markey, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy, Carolyn McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Jim McDermott, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Brad Miller, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, George Miller, Jeff Miller, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Mick Mulvaney, Christopher S. Murphy, Tim Murphy, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Kristi L. Noem, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee, Pete Olson, John W. Olver, William L. Owens, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Ed Perlmutter, Gary C. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platt, Ted Poe, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Benjamin Quayle, Mike Quigley, Nick J. Rahall II, Charles B. Rangel, Tom Reed, Denny Rehberg, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Silvestre Reyes, Reid J. Ribble, Laura Richardson, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, David Rivera, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Peter J. Roskam, Dennis Ross, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Jon Runyan, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Linda T. Sanchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Robert T. Schilling, Jean Schmidt, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Schweikert, Austin Scott,

David Scott, Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, Tim Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Heath Shuler, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Steve Southerland, Jackie Speier, Cliff Stearns, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, John Sullivan, Betty Sutton, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Scott Tipton, Paul Tonko, Edolphus Towns, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Joe Walsh, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Daniel Webster, Anthony D. Weiner, Peter Welch, Allen B. West, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Frederica Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, C.W. Bill Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

964. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the of the Navy, Case Number 10-03, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

965. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received February 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

966. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8196] received February 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

967. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] received February 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

968. A letter from the Director, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; Amendment to the Bank Secrecy Act Regulations — Reports of Foreign Financial Accounts (RIN: 1506-AB08) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

969. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Minimum Capital (RIN: 2590-AA01) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

970. A letter from the Deputy Director for Operations, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits