United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 4, 2011 No. 47

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEST).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC
April 4, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ALLEN WEST to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

CONFLICT IN LIBYA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address three aspects of the conflict in Libya. The first of these is I think the most important. Our efforts to bring freedom and democracy to Libya should not be the occasion to undermine democracy and the rule of law here in the United States. Now there is considerable constitutional argument about the powers of the President. There are those who say he cannot take any military action without first an action by Congress. But in 1802, President Jefferson sent American naval and marine forces, in the words of the song, to the shores of Tripoli, and the founding generation of this country thought that that was consistent with Presidential power. So those who think that the President has no power to ever engage, I think must look at our history, as well as the text of our Constitution.

At the same time, there are those who say the President can do anything without congressional approval, and I think those folks go way too far. The answer is the War Powers Act, the law of the land, and we need to make sure that it is followed.

Now that law not only requires various reports and consultation, it says that if hostilities are to continue for more than 60 days, that Congress must pass in both Houses a resolution authorizing such activity, and that if after 60 days Congress has not passed such resolution, then the President has 30 days to withdraw. This is the law of the land.

And yet last week in both private session and in public hearings, high ranking members of the State Department declared by their vagueness that they might not follow the War Powers Act. That is why it is critical that we as a Nation demand that even those who are sworn to uphold the law, follow the law themselves, and that we in Congress add to any spending bill a provision that says no funds shall be spent for the purpose of violating section 5 of the War Powers Act which some also refer to as the War Powers Resolution.

Second, who pays for all of this? The cost is far greater than the $500 million to $600 million being estimated by the Defense Department. I am a CPA. They are using the marginal cost approach, which is widely discredited. Any full costing will show what the American people fully understand, and that is that this is costing us billions of dollars every week. Now, we have seized $30 billion of Libyan assets, assets of Qadhafi that were invested here in the United States. Those assets should be used first before we use money collected from American taxpayers.

Libya produces more oil per capita than any nation you can find on a map without a magnifying glass; more oil per capita, per person, than even Saudi Arabia. I realize Libya will need to be rebuilt, but its oil revenues will return and provide for that. And we should quietly insist that the Benghazi council pass a resolution authorizing the United States to use those seized Libyan assets to fund our military efforts.

But there is something even more that we should insist on from those who are running eastern Libya, and that is that they use their best efforts, and I realize they are disorganized, to cut off their contact with and even seek to extradite those in their midst who have American blood on their hands. There is, for example, Mr. al-Hasadi who fought us in Afghanistan and Pakistan who brags that he dispatched soldiers to kill America's finest in Iraq, and who is now one of the rebel commanders. We should insist that such individuals be turned over to the United States, and if they can't find them, that they at least disassociate themselves.

Now, the administration responds by saying that Qadhafi has American blood on his hands. And I am sure that Qadhafi has, after Pan Am 103, more American blood on his hands than do any collection of rebel leaders. But is this the standard by which we judge those that we ask our men and women to die for, to put themselves in harm's way for, to kill for?

I do not think that it makes sense to say that the rebels should be aided as long as they have less American blood on their hands than does Mr. Qadhafi.

Printed on recycled paper.

The test of whether these rebels will be allies and friends of America, or the opposite, is whether they turn over or use their best efforts to turn over al-Hasadi to the United States.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord God, Your loving and sustaining presence breaks through certain moments of time. You enlighten Your people to take the next step and make the necessary decisions that will lead them through the maze of present needs.

Guide the Members of the House of Representatives, that priorities will reflect the full promise of Your compassion for those most in need, build greater justice, and secure the path of peace in this fragile and complex world.

Lord, be with us now and years to come.

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 Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POMPEO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

DO WHAT IS RIGHT THIS WEEK

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this is an important week for American families. The continuing resolution expires Friday. Liberals are clearly responsible for a possible government shutdown.

The American people know spending is out of control with a record deficit in February of $223 billion. Borrowing from creditors overseas is $5 billion a day, putting American jobs at risk. Senior citizens are threatened with their savings and Social Security becoming worthless. Young people are being burdened with crushing debt which will lead to oppressive taxation.

How did this week arise?

The budget for this year was not adopted by the liberal House last year. The continuing resolution for this year was passed by the new conservative House but has not been adopted by the current liberal Senate.

Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has fought for the Pledge to America which the voters supported last November with a record of over 63 liberals being defeated. Senate liberals have been revealed scheming inflammatory name-calling of Republican Whip KEVIN MCCARTHY, instead of good faith negotiations.

I hope this week the Senate liberals put politics aside and do what is right for commonsense government. We cannot mortgage the future to happiness.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

A COUNTRY WHERE WE MUST BRING DEMOCRACY

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

Mr. KUCINICH. It is said our government runs on a system of checks and balances. But when it comes to war, the administration writes all the checks and Congress doesn't know what the balance is. The administration can wage war and ignore Congress, says the Secretary of State. Shut up and keep giving them the money.

Expanding war expands the Pentagon, costing more than $700 billion this year. That's 50 percent of discretionary spending. The United States funds 25 percent of NATO's military expenses.

All of these wars cost trillions. As of today, we will have spent $805 billion to bring democracy to Iraq, $443 billion to bring democracy to Afghanistan, perhaps over a billion dollars already to bring democracy to Libya.

I have an idea. Let's bring democracy to America. Instead of cutting programs for the poor, for children, for pregnant women, or shutting down the government, let's shut the wars down. Build bridges at home—don't blow them up abroad. Bring democracy to America. Jobs for all, health care for all, education for all, retirement security for all. End the wars.

CONGRATULATING WSU SHOCKER BASKETBALL

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the tremendous accomplishment of Wichita State University and its men's basketball team. Shocker Basketball is rich in tradition, with 10,000 screaming fans at nearly every game.

For the first time, Wichita State University is now the reigning champion of the National Invitation Tournament. Last Thursday, they finished their tourney run with a convincing victory over a worthy opponent, the Crimson Tide of the University of Alabama. This was a glorious cap to an excellent season.

This year, the Shockers won 29 games, the most in the university's history—losing two games to Final Four opponents during the season by a total of only five points.

It is my honor to congratulate Wichita State University, its President Don Beggs, athletic director Eric Sexton, the basketball team's head coach Gregg Marshall and his staff, and all the great young men who played their hearts out in New York to bring the title back to Wichita.

A great season for the mighty Shocker Nation.

MTXE. Go Shox.

THE HUNGER FAST OF 2011

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the Hunger Fast of 2011, the efforts by anti-hunger leaders to highlight the draconian cuts to important, lifesaving programs included in H.R. 1, the House Republican budget proposal, continues to expand.

Every day the number of Hunger Fast participants increases. Every day awareness of these cuts to those programs that provide a circle of protection rises. Every day the resolve to fight these cuts grows.

I am thankful and proud of these brave Americans who are giving up food to fight against these harmful cuts to programs like WIC, as well as other important safety-net programs. This weekend, more joined this effort, including the heads and members of SEIU, MoveOn, and many others.

Budgets are moral documents, and the cuts in H.R. 1 cross that moral line. I stand with the participants of Hunger Fast in opposition to H.R. 1. Instead of cutting programs that help people get access to food and nutrition, we should commit ourselves to ending hunger in America.

Please go to www.hungerfast.org for more information.

TRIBUTE TO STACY LEWIS

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a milestone in the

life of a lady professional golfer, Stacy Lewis, of The Woodlands, Texas, and of late, the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville.

Ms. Lewis won her first LPGA golf tournament yesterday in California—the Kraft Nabisco Championship, a major event on the LPGA tour.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose today is not necessarily to bring attention to a sporting achievement, but rather to acknowledge the hardship in this young lady's life that makes this accomplishment incredible.

Stacy suffered from scoliosis as a child and spent her teen years in a back brace. Only because of her drive and determination did she reach the pinnacle of women's professional sports. To add to that, she dominated the field the very week her grandfather passed away.

I am proud of Stacy Lewis. I admire her grit. Literally and figuratively, she has a spine of steel. I join her parents, Dale and Carol Lewis, and the Razorback Nation in saluting her for what we all hope is the first of many championship trophies.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY FINCH

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today is many things in different people's lives. To many, it's the NCAA final tournament game. To many in my city of Memphis, Tennessee, it is a day that 43 years ago, Dr. Martin Luther King was assassinated. It's a holiday in my city, and we reflect on his great talents and his dream and reflect on all that we've learned since then.

But yesterday, the 3rd of April, a great Memphian named Larry Finch died. He put together those two events. He was a basketball player and a basketball star like none other in Memphis and maybe like none other in the United States of America. And he was a person who brought people together in the way that Dr. King dreamed they would. The city of Memphis was split and hurt and racially divided in 1968, and because of that racial divide, it caused Dr. King to have to come to Memphis to stand up for the sanitation workers and the right of employees to have bargaining units and a dignity in life. And Memphis was even racially hurt more because of that assassination.

But Larry Finch stayed home in Memphis, a local basketball player who really was the first great basketball star of African American descent to play at Memphis State. He took our team to the national finals in 1973, and he ignited the city like never before. Whites and blacks came together to cheer for Memphis State and for Larry Finch. He spent his entire life in Memphis and was our head coach for 11 years, winning more games at Memphis State than any coach in history.

He was a beloved individual who brought people together and didn't know race. He died Saturday. He will have his homegoing this coming Saturday.

I show you the Memphis Commercial Appeal from the day after he died: ''The Greatest.'' The entire first section is nothing but Larry Finch and his story from Orange Mound, Tennessee, and Melrose High School to Memphis State and the Final Four, where he had 29 points—and we would have won but for Bill Walton having the game of his life.

I mourn my friend Larry Finch. The city of Memphis mourns Larry Finch. Sports can be more than winning and losing. Larry Finch did that. He was a great American. We're lucky he came this way for the people of Memphis and our Nation.

□ 1410

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 the motion 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.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

REDUCING DEFENSE DEPARTMENT PRINTING AND REPRODUCTION BUDGET

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1246) to reduce the amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for printing and reproduction.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1246

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

SECTION 1. REDUCTION IN AMOUNTS OTHERWISE AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR PRINTING AND REPRODUCTION.

The following amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Defense are hereby reduced by 10 percent:

(1) The amount for Operation and Maintenance for the Army, for printing and reproduction.

(2) The amount for Operation and Maintenance for the Navy, for printing and reproduction.

(3) The amount for Operation and Maintenance for the Marine Corps, for printing and reproduction.

(4) The amount for Operation and Maintenance for the Air Force, for printing and reproduction.

(5) The amount for Operation and Maintenance for Defense-wise activities, for printing and reproduction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST) and the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 1246. It is a simple, commonsense bill that calls for an overall 10 percent reduction in the printing and reproduction costs of the Department of Defense.

More importantly, the American people support H.R. 1246, as more than 150,000 people voted online via the YouCut program on passing this bill. The American people are behind this, and we need to be behind the American people. H.R. 1246 will help us keep our promise to the American people that we will cut waste, fraud and abuse in government spending and spend taxpayer dollars more efficiently, and that includes every department or agency.

In fiscal year 2012, the Department of Defense proposes to spend $357 million for printing and reproduction services. Now, I am not arguing that paper copies are no longer needed. We all still rely on paper. But I do not understand why we need examples of these expensive, high-gloss color briefing slides and slick books that the DOD sends over here for everything from briefing slides to budget rollouts and miscellaneous reports. If anyone is interested, the House Armed Services Committee has a boatload of these fancy printed reports. I think the information that DOD needs to get to us, as well as share internally amongst themselves or with the public, can just as easily be conveyed using plain black-and-white copies that are printed on both sides. Nowadays, a lot can be transmitted electronically.

During my 22 years of active duty service in the United States Army, I witnessed the growth of the excessive PowerPoint briefs and reproduction. I am well aware of areas where saving money is very possible, and this is one of those areas.

These cuts are aimed at wasteful Defense Department spending and will not affect the overall mission of our men and women in uniform in protecting our national security. Mr. Speaker, a mere 10 percent reduction to this one account would save taxpayers $35.7 million in fiscal year 2012 and nearly $180 million over the next 5 years. We owe it to the taxpayers to take this step.

Now, this may seem like a small amount to some, but imagine if every Member of Congress, all 435 of us, took it upon ourselves to do the exact same

and find where we could cut some wasteful spending. We would regain the trust and confidence of the American people as good stewards of their resources. Let's pass H.R. 1246.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 1246 is an innocuous-sounding bill that proposes to help reduce Federal spending and reduce waste by cutting 10 percent of the Pentagon's printing and reproduction services budget. I believe most of us would agree that the goal of H.R. 1246, to reduce dependence on paper copies in a time of proliferating electronic media, is one that most of us would find reasonable.

In effect, however, the bill does little to address the much more serious deficit issues facing our Nation today, including issues in the defense arena that should be thoughtfully debated by Members of this Congress. The bill is estimated to save some $35.7 million in fiscal year 2012, and then another $180 million over the next 5 fiscal years, which hardly makes a dent in the multitrillion-dollar deficit facing our Nation.

One could also argue that the bill is ill-timed, coming on the heels of increasing requests for the Department of Defense to produce documents for oversight being conducted by congressional committees. Indeed, requests from the Congress for required reports, including, Mr. Speaker, from our own House Armed Services Committee, number in the hundreds and thousands. So it would seem somewhat hypocritical of us to be cutting funding for printing and reproduction services when we, we Members of Congress, are asking for more and more and more reports.

Mr. Speaker, while I will not encourage my colleagues to oppose this bill, I consider it a bad use of valuable floor time that could be used to address legislation to put this country on a track toward greater fiscal responsibility.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say this. I do believe that we must take a first step when we talk about deficit reduction. I think that this is one of the important things. As I said in my statement, if each and every one of us in this House, all 435, made the effort to find these instances of fraud, waste and abuse, then we could have more significant cuts into our deficit and, of course, into our debt. And I think at a critical time when, the gentlewoman from Guam just stated, maybe perhaps also following along with this, we do need to look at the amount of requests for reports that we are having.

But still, as we are talking about efficiency in the Department of Defense, this is a first step toward that efficiency occurring. And I think that anyone that would not be willing to support this says that they are not willing to take that first step toward getting the Department of Defense and all our departments and all of our agencies to be more effective and more efficient. But as well, that does start with us here in the Members of the House of Representatives.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the previous speaker.

There are 435 voting Members of Congress, but there are 441 Members of the United States House of Representatives. Although I represent a territory and I am not allowed to vote, I do make requests during committee time for reports.

I just wanted to make that correction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1420

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, at this time I have no further requests, and also apologies to you, Madam.

I am prepared to close after my colleague has yielded back her time.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1246.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. WEST. 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DOLD) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REDUCING DEFENSE DEPARTMENT PRINTING AND REPRODUCTION BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on the motion to suspend the rules previously postponed.

The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1246) to reduce the amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for printing and reproduction, 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 gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 0, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

YEAS—393

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack

Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—39

Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Brady (PA)
Engel
Fattah
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Gohmert
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Holden
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Kind
Landry
Lee (CA)
Lipinski
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Nunnelee
Olver
Payne
Poe (TX)
Ribble
Schmidt
Scott, David
Shuler
Slaughter
Sutton
Tiberi
Waters
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

□ 1852

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.

Stated for:

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 4, 2011, had I been here, I would have voted in support of H.R. 1246—To reduce the amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for printing and reproduction.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for votes in the House Chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 225.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was detained in my congressional district, therefore I could not be present for the vote today on Monday, April 4, 2011. If I were present I would have voted "yea" for the following bill: H.R. 1246—To reduce the amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for printing and reproduction.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 225 for final passage of H.R. 1246, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1323

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 1323.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 37, DISAPPROVING FCC INTERNET AND BROADBAND REGULATIONS

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–53) on the resolution (H. Res. 200) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to regulating the Internet and broadband industry practices, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCING THE PASSING OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN JOHN ADLER

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to convey to the House the extremely sad news that our former colleague from New Jersey, John Adler, passed away earlier today. Congressman Adler recently underwent emergency heart surgery at the University of Pennsylvania Hospital in an attempt to resolve a staph infection. John Adler was 51.

In Congress, John served with distinction on both the Financial Services and Veterans' Affairs Committees. As a New Jersey State Senator for 17 years, John served as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and sponsored laws requiring pension forfeitures and mandatory prison for corrupt officials and to require smoke-free places. He also sponsored legislation to address environmental and health issues.

Mr. Speaker, John Adler had a razor-sharp wit, tenacity, an extraordinary sense of humor and a great big smile, and we will miss him. I, along with my colleagues, extend our deepest condolences to Shelley, his wife, and their four sons.

REMEMBERING AND MOURNING JOHN ADLER

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I can't believe that John Adler's life was cut so short. I really want to reach out to Shelley, his children, and his friends. Our heartfelt condolences go out to the entire Adler family. John was a friend, my wife was a friend with his wife, and my daughter was a friend of one of his sons.

It is amazing to me that he was able to accomplish so much in the short time that he was here. He grew up in real adversity. He was really kind of a person—I wouldn't say rags to riches, but I would say someone who had a very hard life growing up and at a young age was very successful, went to Harvard undergraduate, Harvard Law School, became a successful attorney, and then became a member of the State Senate for many years and chairman of the State Senate Judiciary Committee before he was elected to Congress. But beyond that, he also had a great sense of humor. I think many of us know many times when we were on the floor and you would go up and ask him about something, and he would tell you a joke or make fun of something. That was another aspect of him that I could certainly never forget.

He decided at a young age that he was going to make a life in government. He could have done so many things, made a lot of money, but instead decided to devote his life to politics. My heart goes out to him. I want to remember him as an admirable example for so many of us.

REMEMBERING AND MOURNING JOHN ADLER

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

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to express my sincere condolences to the family and friends of former Congressman John Adler. My deepest sympathies go out to those that knew him best and loved him most, his wife, Shelley, and their four sons—Jeffrey, Alex, Andrew, and Oliver.

Congressman Adler was a committed and compassionate public servant who fought tirelessly for the causes in which he believed. His legacy of public service includes elected office as a council member in Cherry Hill, New Jersey, his tenure in the New Jersey State Senate, and representing New Jersey's Third Congressional District here in the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, words often fail to accurately reflect the true measure of one's life, but I hope that Shelley, their sons,

and extended family and friends may take comfort in John's many accomplishments and knowing that his lifetime of public service has left a lasting legacy for which they can be most proud.

REMEMBERING AND MOURNING JOHN ADLER

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in shock and sympathy at the loss, the death of John Adler, and send my sympathy and condolences to Shelley and the family.

I won't recount his many accomplishments or paint a full picture of John Adler, a truly wonderful public servant. I hope there will be occasion for the testimonial and memorial here at another time. But I do want to express to his many friends and many admirers sympathy and condolences.

John Adler was dedicated to the service of the people of New Jersey. And you will hear again and again, if you didn't know John, about his wonderful cheerfulness and humor that he showed in good times and in bad.

A good friend to many of us, a friend to the people of New Jersey—a real loss.

□ 1900

PASSING OF JOHN ADLER

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

Mr. LANCE. I am shocked and saddened to learn of the passing of John Adler at age 51. John was a friend of mine for 20 years. We served together in the New Jersey State Senate for 7 years sitting next to each other, divided only by the center aisle.

When we arrived in Washington in 2009, John and I were the only freshmen Members of Congress from New Jersey. We worked together on many issues here and served together on the Financial Services Committee. I believe John Adler worked for the best interests of New Jersey and, more recently, for the entire Nation.

My wife, Heidi, and I are friends with the Adler family, including John's beloved wife, Shelley, and their four sons—Jeffrey, now at Harvard, Alexander at Cornell, Andrew, and Oliver.

Heidi and I extend our deepest sympathy to the Adler family. Today our hearts are broken and we are devastated.

REMEMBERING JOHN ADLER

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who've known John for a long time and who have loved and cherished him, this is a very tragic and difficult occasion. I hope that Shelley and his boys know, in the depths of their grief, the breadth of love and respect for John that people feel tonight.

His loss is tragic beyond words, but we can, for a moment, celebrate a victory over tragedy tonight that one person in 51 brief years could touch the lives and achieve the achievements that John Adler did in his life. His life was far too short, but it was rich, it was filled with laughter and achievement, and those of us who have been touched by his friendship count ourselves richer for the benefit of that.

May God bless his family and rest his soul.

RECOGNIZING EXPLORAVISION REGIONAL FINALIST FROM OUR LADY OF LOURDES ACADEMY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to recognize the success of a local group of ninth grade students from my congressional district in south Florida, Our Lady of Lourdes Academy.

Guided by their teacher, Susan Fleming, these four young ladies—Gabriela Ballesteros, Christina Gutierrez, Lauren Lopez, and Diana Lopez—have been selected as regional winning finalist in the Toshiba/National Science Teachers Association ExploraVision competition.

This group of intelligent young ladies envisioned an innovative proposal for medical technology, a surgical procedure that would treat patients whose vocal cords have been paralyzed, allowing them to speak again. Their groundbreaking idea was selected from over 4,000 entries and over 13,000 students.

Innovative students like these four impressive girls will help lead our Nation into the future, and I wish them much success in the upcoming national judging phase.

LOCAL TAXPAYER RELIEF ACT OF 2011

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, before I talk about the bipartisan Local Taxpayer Relief Act, to reauthorize Impact Aid, before I go to that, I, too, would like to add my condolences to the family of John Adler.

John and I used to do yoga and tai-chi together—he much more often than I—at 6:30 in the morning. I got to know him and to really admire him for the commitment that he had to be of service. And the times that I would miss our tai-chi sessions, he would say, ''We missed you, Mazie.''

We miss you, John.

IMPACT AID

Most public school funding comes from local property taxes. However, in areas with Federal property, Indian lands, or military bases, school districts cannot collect these needed revenues. Without relief, taxpayers in these federally impacted areas would need to pay more to support the same level of education as other districts.

The bipartisan bill that I am introducing today would make sure that these districts would have the kind of Federal support through Impact Aid that they need to ensure that all of our students, our children, have the kind of good education they deserve. Impact Aid supports over 12 million children in more than 1,300 school districts in every single State, D.C. and the U.S. territories.

I want to acknowledge the work of the National Association of Federally Impacted Schools, NAFIS, who worked tirelessly to bring this bill to the floor. The Impact Aid Coalition includes 105 Members of Congress.

I thank my principal cosponsor Congresswoman KRISTI NOEM of South Dakota for her partnership, and I urge all my colleagues to support the bill.

DEMOCRATS' PLAN TO SHUT DOWN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for one reason—to expose the Democrats' carefully designed plan to shut down the Federal Government.

This Friday, the short-term continuing resolution expires, but the Democrats have yet to offer any real solutions for our budget mess. They just want to keep on spending, taxing, and borrowing. I believe they're dodging their responsibilities on purpose.

The Democratic leadership is trying to back us into a corner with only two ways out: keep spending money at their outrageous levels or shut down the government. We are in an economic emergency, and neither of these options will do anything for America's financial crisis. I believe they actually want to shut down the government for their own political purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my Democrat colleagues to do what is right for America—to get serious about cutting spending before we find ourselves so deeply mired in debt that digging out becomes impossible.

THE CLEAN AIR ACT MUST BE KEPT ALIVE

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, we will all breathe easier if we are able to reach a bipartisan consensus about this budget impasse that we now have. But we will

not all breathe easier if the Republicans succeed in essentially eliminating the ability of Uncle Sam to enforce the Clean Air Act.

Now, I know it seems pretty shocking, but the fact of the matter is, tonight, as these discussions are going on, the Republicans want to put a rider—one of these noxious viruses on a bill—a rider that would make it illegal for the Environmental Protection Agency to protect our children's health against asthma in enforcing the Clean Air Act.

Now, this is pretty amazing. It cannot stand. We are encouraged that the majority leader has said they will not allow these riders.

Let's get a compromise to deal with this deficit, not make it harder for our kids to breathe, not make it easier for asthma to ravage our kids, and let's preserve a bipartisan success in the Clean Air Act.

10TH ANNIVERSARY OF MICROSOFT IN FARGO, NORTH DAKOTA

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

Mr. BERG. Today I would like to recognize the 10th anniversary of Microsoft having invested in Fargo, North Dakota. Since coming to North Dakota, Microsoft has helped to create hundreds of jobs, and it's increased the economic opportunity in our State.

Ten years ago tomorrow, Microsoft acquired Great Plains Software in Fargo, a local homegrown company. At the time, Great Plains employed 800 people. Today, there are more than 1,500 people working in Fargo for Microsoft. And the Microsoft campus continues to grow. In fact today, there are more than 60 open positions at Microsoft looking for people.

This is what our country needs throughout all the States. I am pleased that companies like Microsoft have felt confident in investing in our State and our people.

Congratulations to Fargo Microsoft employees on your 10-year anniversary, and thank you for the positive work you've done for the Fargo community.

□ 1910

IN MEMORY OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE JOHN ADLER

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, it is on days like this in the House when you lose a colleague, John Adler, who passed, served in the previous Congress, that you realize how many good men and women come and serve in this House of Representatives, and what an honor it is to serve with them and to spend time with them while they are here on this Earth. It is also a reminder on how sometimes good people pass early, so we need to all enjoy each day the opportunity that God has given for us to live.

John Adler was a fine man, he served honorably in this Congress, and he cared about human beings. He was my friend, and I will miss him.

CELEBRATING THE PATTERSON FAMILY

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to celebrate an American family in Colorado. Steve and Angie Patterson, in Denver, Colorado, have three wonderful children, Caid, Marin, and tonight we pay special tribute to their son Jake, celebrating his 10th birthday. They will soon be the next generation of Americans leading this country, making choices. The choices that we make in this place will impact their lives and their future. They are counting on us to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I wish that they have a very happy celebration together for the family, and we wish them the best.

IN MEMORY OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE JOHN ADLER

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

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I too am here to acknowledge the passing of a wonderful human being and my friend, John Adler. Congressman John Adler served in the House of Representatives representing a portion of our State of New Jersey. John was a hysterically funny guy, brilliant. He was a loving husband, a loving father to four outstanding young men.

He was a leader in the New Jersey State Senate, recognized for his intelligence and his contribution to the people of New Jersey. I am still in shock at his passing. He did not deserve to die young. He was such a good man. I want to convey my thoughts and prayers to his wonderful wife, Shelley, and to their four sons, Jeffrey, Alex, Andrew, and Oliver, on the passing of this great and good and wonderful man, John Adler.

HONORING JERRY SLOAN

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate a native southern Illinoisan and a living legend in the sport of basketball, Mr. Jerry Sloan of McLeansboro, Illinois, who retired recently as head coach of the NBA's Utah Jazz. Jerry never forgot his humble roots. Throughout his playing and coaching career, he exhibited a hard-work ethic, a down-to-Earth demeanor, and an unassuming style.

Jerry ended what was the longest tenure with the same team of an active head coach in the four major sports leagues. He is third on the all-time NBA wins list with 1,221.

Jerry was an outstanding athlete at McLeansboro High School and played college basketball at the University of Evansville, leading the Purple Aces to consecutive Division II national championships. He was drafted into the NBA by the Baltimore Bullets and then went to the Chicago Bulls in the expansion draft. He played 10 years with the Bulls and has his No. 4 jersey retired by the team.

In 1979, Jerry was named head coach of the Bulls. He resigned in 1982 and joined the Jazz as an assistant coach in 1984. He became the Jazz head coach in 1988. Jerry led the Jazz to the NBA finals twice. He was inducted into the Naismith Basketball Hall of Fame in 2009. Jerry is a gracious, honest, tractor-loving guy. He will be missed in Utah, but those of us in southern Illinois will welcome the chance to see him more often.

IN MEMORY OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE JOHN ADLER

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

Mr. WELCH. John Adler was in the class just after me, and I got to know him well because the freshman and sophomore classes went through learning how to serve in this Congress together. I also got to know him because we happened to have our lockers in the same section of the gym. And I am stunned, as we all are.

But what was so amazing to me, in my getting to know John Adler, was I learned about his Harvard education, the college and the law school. I had some assumptions about him that he had a much more prosperous early life than he did. He had to earn everything that he got. I also learned about the challenges that he faced. And what was clear to me, as it was to all of us who got to know him, is that he was a person who made a decision that whatever the challenge, he was going to face it with good humor, with optimism, with a sense of doing the work because it was worth doing in and of itself.

I also remember many times asking him about his weekend; and what he always responded with was something about his family. It wasn't about the speech he gave; it wasn't about the press release or a story in the paper on TV. It was always, every single time, about his family. John Adler was a good friend. He will be missed. A wonderful, wonderful servant in Congress.

GOP DOCTORS CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBS). Under the Speaker's announced

policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, what we are going to do here for the next hour is talk about why we feel so strongly the need to repeal, and if not successful, to defund so many provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

But, Mr. Speaker, before I get started in the subject at hand, I do want to join my colleagues, particularly my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle, in remembering our colleague John Adler. I didn't realize that John had been sick. I didn't realize that John had had surgery. I didn't realize until just moments ago that our colleague from New Jersey had died. As I sat here listening to the New Jersey delegation on both sides of the aisle talk about John, it helped me understand a little bit better about him.

All I know about John is that he was a great guy and a really, really nice Member of this body and someone that I respected. I got to know him, Mr. Speaker, in the House gym at 6 o'clock in the morning usually. He would be working out, and I would be working out—I am 15 years older than John was—and we just struck up a good friendship. I truly will miss him, as well as my other colleagues, as they express their sympathy to his wife and his four sons. But truly a great Member.

It reminds me too, Mr. Speaker, that as we do our work, as we do our work with 1-minutes, and we do our work with 5-minute Special Orders, and now this leadership hour talking about a very important issue that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the most part, almost 100 percent of them feel very differently about this issue, we differ on a lot of things, and we will continue to do that. It has gone on forever.

But the point I would like to make, and I will conclude with this, is that there are 435 people in this House of Representatives. And sometimes we Republicans are in the majority and sometimes the Democrats are in the majority, and the worm turns, and nothing is forever.

But we have good, decent men and women serving here representing their districts and doing the work of the people. And God bless them. God bless each and every one of them. God bless a Member like John Adler, who died much too young, as my colleagues have said already.

But we want to always keep in mind that as we argue and debate and make points and feel very strongly about an issue, that doesn't mean we don't love one another. And we do. And I loved John Adler. He was a great Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, again here we are, though, getting right back into the business at hand. And this is a hugely important week, a hugely important week as we try to come to some conclusion in regard to how much money we need to cut out of, not this fiscal year we are in right now, but the last fiscal year, which started—well, actually we are in the fiscal year, but it started on October 1 of 2010.

□ 1920

Here we are, what is it, the 4th of April, 2011, so half of the fiscal year has already expired and we have not funded the government except in this piecemeal fashion.

We didn't have a budget, we didn't have spending bills, and we put these little 2-week Band-Aids, 2, 3 weeks, a little bit of cutting, but from my perspective and from my side of the aisle and our leadership not nearly, nearly enough. And we are faced with this tremendous issue of trying to reach a compromise and an agreement to lower spending.

The American people certainly gave a mandate, I think, to 87 new Republicans and 9 new Democrats to come up here and quit all this spending. Let's not have $1.5 trillion deficits year after year after year. That's how you get to $14 trillion worth of debt, and that's what we are facing right now; and, indeed, in a month or so, we are going to be asked to even raise that debt ceiling statutorily to say, well, we will continue to borrow and kick the can down the road.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, these are times that try men and women's souls, and we all feel very strongly about our position. But I know my leadership and Members on this side of the aisle, and I hope our Democrat colleagues, feel the same way. We hope and pray that we can do the people's work and cut this spending and get this country back on a sound fiscal footing so that as we go forward to the 2012 budget, which we will hear about tomorrow, that we will continue to work hard to finally balance this budget and get our country out of this significant debt.

Speaking of debt, Mr. Speaker, the reason I am here tonight, I represent the caucus on the Republican side of the aisle known as the House GOP Doctors Caucus. There are, I think, 21 of us now, doctors and nurses on this side of the aisle, with just years and years of clinical experience.

As an example, I spent 26 years practicing my specialty of obstetrics and gynecology. We have registered nurses that are part of the Doctors Caucus. We have specialists, general surgeons, cardiothoracic surgeons, family practitioners, gastroenterologists. I could go on and on, but some of them, hopefully, will be with me during this hour, will join me in a few minutes to talk a little bit more about our concerns, their concerns, Mr. Speaker, with the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010.

This was a bill, a law, that was finally passed and signed by President Obama on March 23, 2010, after about a year and a half of debating the issue in both this Chamber and in the Senate Chamber; and when it finally came down to the reality that there weren't enough votes on the Senate side, it was passed by something called reconciliation which, to this day, I don't think the American people understand. But, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you this, what they do understand is they don't like it, they didn't like the process, and they don't like the policy.

Now, I have heard the President say, and I have heard the Democratic leadership in the 111th Congress, when this bill was passed, talk about how Congress and particularly the Democratic Members have been trying to pass a comprehensive massive health care reform law for almost 100 years. They talked about Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and they talked about John Fitzgerald Kennedy and they talked about, of course, President Bill Clinton and saying, you know, we finally got there, we finally did it, we finally accomplished what we were trying to do for almost 100 years.

Well, they missed the point, Mr. Speaker, because the reason why that type of legislation was not passed in 100 years is because the American people back then didn't want it anymore than they do today; and some 62 percent still say, very loudly and very clearly, in poll after poll after poll, we don't want the Federal Government taking over health care, one-sixth of our economy, lock, stock and barrel. We don't want that.

We want improvement in our health care; and no matter how good something might be, there is always room for improvement and, clearly, our health care system is too expensive. We agree with that. I think Members on both sides of the aisle can reach that conclusion pretty clearly.

So there is agreement to try to do everything we can to continue to provide the best health care in the world. It's not true when people say our health care system is like that of a Third World country. Nothing could be further from the truth. We have the greatest health care system in the world, and some of the doctors in the House GOP caucus will be with me tonight to talk about that.

You know the old expression, don't throw the baby out with the bath water, I think that's what we have tended to do here. We have enacted into law—on March 23 of last year, it's already had its 1-year anniversary a couple of weeks ago—we have done something that I think is not only opposed to what the American people want, you should never do that, but it's bad, it's bad medicine.

It's bad for consumers, it's bad for patients, it's certainly bad for corporate America. And it's absolutely bad for the taxpayer. It's a top-down sort of system where a bureaucracy comes between literally and figuratively a doctor and his or her patient. That's not a prescription for improving our health care system.

I have got a couple of posters here with me, and I wanted to reference these to my colleagues. In fact, I will have several more, but I am going to keep this one up on my far left, that one that shows the picture, I forget what his name is. Maybe one of my colleagues will remember.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Boss Hogg.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Well, I remember Boss Hogg, but I was trying to remember what the actor's name is; I don't think he is still living. But I think most of my colleagues do remember Boss Hogg from that old series ''The Dukes of Hazzard.'' It was one of my favorites, kind of like poking fun at ourselves, really; sort of like Archie Bunker and ''All in the Family'' and things like that that those of us who have been around awhile can look back on and laugh and get a chuckle out of it.

But Boss Hogg sort of represents the boss, the bureaucracy, if you will, of the government, Big Government, running health care. Under old Boss Hogg's picture, there he is with that cigar in his hand: you can have whatever you like as long as the boss approves it.

And that's really the way it has turned out, what we talked about in the House. I think it was H.R., House of Representatives, bill No. 3200. It was Senate bill 3590 or H.R. 3590, a shell bill that came over from the Senate and finally was passed into law and became known as the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

But that law has so much bureaucracy, and I will get into some of the numbers on that in regard to all of the new folks in the government that would control health care, but all under this giant government takeover, and Boss Hogg sort of represents that to me as a way of communicating with the public.

But in any regard, before I continue with some of the statistics on the bill, I see that I am joined by my colleague from Georgia, a fellow physician and a member of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, who is a family practice physician from the Athens area where the great University of Georgia is located. Dr. PAUL BROUN is actually a doctor who makes house calls, which is really unique and refreshing. He has been a welcome addition to not only our Georgia delegation but this body.

I yield to the gentleman from Athens and Augusta and my hometown, Dr. PAUL BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY.

Dr. GINGREY, I have taken a history and physical of ObamaCare. I have looked at all the laboratory results, I have looked at all the X-ray results, and I have got a diagnosis:

ObamaCare is a destroyer. It's going to destroy jobs in America. In fact, already, it has destroyed jobs. I have got a lady in my district that right now today has eight people in her employment. She desperately wants to expand her business, she would like to hire at least one or two people for her small business, but she is not going to do it because of the onerous effect of ObamaCare on her business.

□ 1930

So it is destroying at least one or two jobs in that one lady's business. I have got another businessman in my district that wants to make a $31 million expansion of his business. He has the cash in the bank. He doesn't even have to borrow it with all the regulations and all the problems that we are facing with the financial problems that the Dodd-Frank bill has placed on banks as well as small businesses. He wants to make a $31 million expansion of his business. But he is not going to do it because of ObamaCare and because of the increased taxes and also the increased burden that this is going to place on him. That is killing hundreds of jobs just in two businesses within my district.

So it's going to destroy jobs.

But it's also going to destroy budgets. It expands Medicaid. In fact, the State of Georgia has a balanced budget amendment to our State constitution, and our general assembly is just going through the process of trying to balance its budget with a $2 billion shortfall because of the downturn of the economy, the downturn of the economy that was created basically because of policy that was put in place by Democrats. BARNEY FRANK was a big part of that, too.

But ObamaCare expands Medicaid markedly. In fact, the State of Georgia is going to have to add at least about half again as many people to the Medicaid rolls in Georgia, and the State budget is going to have to pick that up, and it's going to destroy the State of Georgia's budget. It's going to destroy every State budget in this country. And it's going to destroy our budget. It's certainly not affordable.

In fact, we see this administration has already, I think it is 1,168 waivers that they've already given to unions and businesses and different entities just because of the onerous financial effects it's going to cost all those people.

And it's going to destroy family budgets. I had a lady tell me about her 26-year-old son recently, that his insurance doubled from last year to this because of ObamaCare. He is paying for his insurance himself. He's self-employed. And he can't afford it.

So it's going to destroy budgets. It's going to destroy family budgets, it's going to destroy State budgets, and it's going to destroy the Federal budget. Not only is it going to destroy jobs and destroy budgets, but it's also going to destroy the quality of health care. In fact, Dr. GINGREY, we were told, and I'm sure you're going to bring this up, the American people were told by the President, if you like your insurance you can keep it. Nothing could be further from the truth. The American people need to understand it. The American people need to understand ObamaCare was designed to force everybody out of their private insurance into a single-payer, socialized health care system that the President himself said that he wanted just before ObamaCare was passed into law.

So my diagnosis is that it's a destroyer. It's going to destroy jobs, it's going to destroy budgets, and it's going to destroy the quality of health care. And also we need to have a plan of action. So I made the assessment, so we need to have a plan of action, and our plan of action, Dr. GINGREY, is—and the American people need to understand this—it's absolutely critical that we repeal ObamaCare and replace that law with something that makes sense, that truly lowers the cost of health care.

There have been numerous Republican bills introduced here in this Congress, in the last Congress, that would lower the cost of health care. I introduced two that would repeal ObamaCare and would replace it with something else. One is a comprehensive bill. I call it the Patient Option Act. It's 106 pages, not almost 3,000. And then I introduced another act that Democrat after Democrat colleagues told me, PAUL, this makes sense, more so than ObamaCare. It's a good first step. The American people want us to do it in a step-by-step process. It would allow purchases for individuals and businesses across State lines. It would allow anybody in this country to buy insurance through an association. They would have multiple insurance products at a much lower cost. It would stimulate the States to set up high-risk pools. Several States have already done that. Mississippi, I talked to Governor Haley Barbour about his plan. Their high-risk pool that they have in Mississippi has been very successful. Colorado has done the same thing I understand.

And the fourth thing that it would do is it would allow everybody to deduct 100 percent of their health care costs off their income taxes. That would change the dynamics of health care. So, Dr. GINGREY, I have done that physical examination and history, history and physical, my subjective, objective assessment, and the plan. The plan is, we must, absolutely must, repeal ObamaCare and replace it with something else, a market-based system that literally lowers the cost of health care and keeps all decisions in the doctor-patient relationship.

ObamaCare does none of those. It's not affordable for the government nor individuals nor businesses. It's certainly not going to preserve the quality of care, because it is a destroyer. So I have made that diagnosis, Dr. GINGREY, and I would yield back to you for our further discussion.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution and for being with us this evening. I realize there are conflicting things going on on Capitol Hill this

evening, very important things. But I really appreciate Dr. BROUN being with us.

We have also been joined by another member of the Doctors Caucus, that is our good friend and new Member, freshman Member from the great, great State of New York, where my daughter and son-in-law reside. ANN MARIE BUERKLE is a registered nurse, Mr. Speaker, by profession and certainly knows of what she speaks in regard to health care, representing the Angels of Mercy, if you will.

She is concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the health insurance industry and the complexity of such, and maybe even wants to discuss some ways that we could change and improve, certainly improvement is called for, and it doesn't have to be within a 2,400-page bill, as Dr. BROUN was mentioning ObamaCare entails.

So at this time, I'm proud to yield to Representative ANN MARIE BUERKLE.

□ 1940

Ms. BUERKLE. Mr. Speaker, it is good to be here. I thank the distinguished gentleman, my colleague from Georgia. I am very honored to be here to speak about health care in the United States of America.

As was said, I am a registered nurse. I have been a registered nurse since 1972, a time in our Nation's health history where the physician and the patient had a relationship, and the government had not injected itself into that relationship. And then after awhile, I went into law. And for the last 13 years, Mr. Speaker, I have been a health care attorney for a large teaching hospital in upstate New York, for the last 13 years.

What we did in that hospital and in my role as an assistant attorney general, we look at money, money that was owed to the State of New York. So I had a very up close and personal look at the complexity of health care in our country today.

I contend that this bill, this piece of legislation that does anything but reform health care, will only increase the complexity of health care in this country. It will only make it more complicated. It will once again put the government right in the middle of the patient-physician relationship. I contend that is not what the United States of America is about. We need to let the free market play here in our health care system.

I have spoken in my district to many, many people. I have done all kinds of talks, but there is nothing more up close and personal and of great concern to me than the health care system in our country. It is an issue that affects every American in one way, shape or form. This health care bill does not improve the health care system in this country.

I came to Washington with a wide range of goals as a freshman, as my colleague has mentioned, but nothing more important to me than repealing this health care bill; this 2,000-plus-page bill that does anything but reform health care. It adds to the complexity of an already complex system. It puts the government in places where it shouldn't be, and it doesn't protect that patient-physician relationship.

Last week when I was in the district, I had my very first health care advisory council meeting. I spoke with a group of physicians, a group of health care providers, hospital administrators, and we had a conversation. I said to them: What are your concerns as health care providers? You are on the front line. What can we do down in Washington on health care to make the delivery system better and more affordable?

They looked at me, and interestingly enough, all of the people on the front lines came up with different solutions because, as you can imagine, doctors and health care providers are good at diagnosing. The question is now about the solution. What are we going to do for health care in this country?

We are here tonight to say this bill is the wrong bill for this country, but we are not willing to leave it go at that. We understand that true health care reform will include medical malpractice reform. We need tort reform in this country. We need to increase the use of health savings accounts. We need to make insurance portable so when a person loses their job, they don't necessarily lose their health care coverage. We need to allow for the purchase of health care across State lines. We need to put the patient back in the center of health care. And I contend that this health care bill does not do that.

So as we sat around, I said to my group of health care advisors, I said to them, What is it that concerns you most regarding health care in this country? The first thing was our health care, this health care bill that was just passed. And when you get into why does it concern you, because it adds so many layers of bureaucracy and regulations to an already ladened bureaucracy, already an industry and system that is ladened with regulations. If you talk to a hospital or a physician, the regulations and the impediments they have to access that patient for health care are incredible.

So the concern with this bill is it adds so many more layers. It takes this health care bill, and one of the biggest problems with this health care bill is that it takes a piece of legislation and it hands it off to the regulators. Then, with the regulators, they are left to interpret and to deal with and come up with regulations that affect our health care providers.

Beyond that, they recognize the need for tort reform. We need medical malpractice liability reform. If we are going to talk about reducing the cost of health care, we must consider that. And then they talked about the increased regulations on the health care profession.

What we all agreed upon in that meeting was that the health care in this country, it is a good health care system. We have good health care. The quality of health care is not the issue. The issue is the system of health care. And this bill that was passed in 2010 does nothing to make that health care system better. It only complicates it. It only ladens it with more regulations and once again puts the government back in between the physician and the patient relationship.

I thank my colleague who has an esteemed history of being a medical provider in the health care industry. He understands these issues. He understands what good health care is and what a good health care system would look like. And so I commend him and thank him for this opportunity to speak.

I think what we need to do in Washington is to repeal this health care bill. We need to put our heads together collectively and talk to the professionals, talk to the health care providers, talk to the patients, and get together and come up with a systemic plan that will reduce the cost of health care, help to improve access to health care, and not affect the quality of the wonderful health care that the United States of America offers.

In my years in the attorney general's office representing a large teaching hospital, I know how many people wanted to come to this country for health care—I know people from Canada and from Europe—because they knew they had access to good, quality care. They knew they wouldn't have a 6- or 9-month wait. I think with this system, if we allow it to go on, this health care bill, we will see those 6- and 9-month waits while patients are waiting for the government to make a decision about their health care access.

So we need to repeal this bill. We need to enact true health care reform so we can improve access, we can reduce the cost of health care, and we can maintain the fine quality of health care in this system.

I thank my colleague.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for sharing her thoughts. Certainly, I agree completely with her. She clearly knows of what she speaks.

This law, it is no longer a bill, it is now the law. Patient Protection Affordable Care Act, it has been the law for a little more than a year, as I said earlier. Of course, the Congressional Budget Office that estimates the cost of laws that we put into effect, they give us an estimate when it is in the bill form so Members can decide whether or not what we are about to do is something that is affordable. And the estimate of this law costing $900 billion, Mr. Speaker, the true cost over the next 20 years is probably in the neighborhood of $3 trillion, not $900 billion.

But I do want to just talk about that number and remind my colleagues

about the pay-for provision that the Democratic Party, the former majority party in the 111th Congress, had in place at the time this bill was passed. Everything had to be paid for, so you had to figure out a way to come up with the money.

In passing this bill and paying for it, Mr. Speaker, some $570 billion was taken out of the current Medicare program. The Medicare program, which serves something like 47 million of our seniors, 5 or 6 million of them are younger people who are on disability that are covered under Medicare. And we literally, to help pay for this new entitlement, this new entitlement which has very little to do with Medicare except that half of the money, half of the pay-for in this $900 billion was taken from a program, Medicare, servicing our disabled and our elderly, providing them health care, half of the money was taken out of that system. The actuaries and the Medicare trustees tell us that over the next 75 years, the unfunded liability, Mr. Speaker, of Medicare is something like $35 trillion, with a ''t,'' $35 trillion. And yet we took the money by cutting Medicare Advantage something like $120 billion. We cut money out of hospice. We cut money out of long-term care, skilled nursing homes.

□ 1950

We cut money out of home health care. We taxed everything that even looked like it had anything to do with health care: durable medical equipment, supplying oxygen for people who were and are continuing to struggle from chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. ''Emphysema'' is a term we use a lot, and I think most people would recognize that.

Finally, we came up and said, okay, we've paid for this; but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we did absolutely nothing in regard to medical liability reform, something that probably if we enacted it—and if there were something in this bill, ObamaCare, as the President did promise that there would be—could save $200 billion a year, according to the RAND Corporation and other think tanks, from the overall cost of health care, which is one-sixth of our entire economy, of our gross domestic product in a year. That's how big this industry is. So there is essentially nothing in the bill about medical liability reform.

Why do I say that, Mr. Speaker?

My colleagues, I think you understand that it's not about the high insurance premiums that doctors have to pay on an annual basis so that they can practice and be protected from liability if something goes wrong. Obviously, they need that protection and those health insurance premiums for the high-risk specialties like the one that I enjoyed for 26 years, OB/GYN, and neurosurgery.

Mr. Speaker, think about that doctor at the Tucson Medical Center who was there in that emergency room when our colleague, Representative GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, was taken there literally near death. I think Dr. Rhee was his name, R-H-E-E. In fact, Dr. Rhee, I learned later, was a graduate of the great school that I went to, Georgia Tech, the Georgia Institute of Technology. Dr. Rhee spent his career in the military after completing medical school. He served his country for something like 22, 23 years, and he happened to be in that emergency room as head of the trauma center and had had all that specialty training and all those years of treating our wounded warriors in many conflicts—I'm sure in Afghanistan and Iraq.

If he had not been there for our colleague GABRIELLE GIFFORDS—God bless her—we would be talking about her today as we were talking earlier about John Adler, our former colleague from the great State of New Jersey who died today. But that doctor was there. He was there.

I fear, as I talk about this new health care law, there is hardly any provision in there that would provide for doctors, even for primary care physicians. There is some attempt, but when you take all the additional Medicaid-eligible patients, increasing the minimum eligibility at 138 percent of the Federal poverty level, you add just millions of additional patients to be seen and literally hundreds of billions of dollars of additional cost onto the backs of our States that have to have balanced budgets, unlike here in the Federal Government where we just keep borrowing money and where we're now up to $14 trillion worth of debt.

So we have a huge problem in regard to this law that the CBO says costs $900 billion over 10 years. I say—and this poster points it out—the true cost, which is the last bullet point with the red dot, is $2.2 trillion and counting; but as Ms. PELOSI said—and I quote her in the third bullet point here—''we have to pass the bill to find out what's in it.'' That was before the bill passed. Clearly, we are finding out now, unfortunately, what the true cost is.

Mr. Speaker, I want to yield additional time to my colleague from New York.

Ms. BUERKLE. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague just brought up the cost of this health care bill. I think it's interesting to talk about and insert what I have heard from the health care community throughout the course of this discussion.

For many hospitals which have a high level of indigent patients, there is what is called a disproportionate share of money that is paid to those hospitals to help them offset the cost of treating folks who are on Medicaid and who are not able to afford their own health care coverage. This health care bill removes the disproportionate share. It phases out that payment to hospitals so that they can afford to treat indigent patients who cannot afford health care. I think that's a very significant piece of this bill—of this law—that was not discussed nor how it will impact and how it will hurt hospitals.

I think, beyond that, we need to talk about seniors and the choices that this health care bill takes away from seniors—again, that wasn't discussed—which are the Medicare Advantage programs and all of the disadvantages that this bill will cause to seniors. We need to keep our health care system intact so those who need the system, such as the seniors, have access to good health care and so their coverage is not hurt. This bill does hurt the senior coverage.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is absolutely right.

As I pointed out in that $500 billion-plus cut-out of the Medicare program to help pay for this new entitlement of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, $120 billion of the $500 billion-plus was taken from the Medicare Advantage program. The Medicare Advantage program enrolls about 20 to 25 percent of our Medicare beneficiaries.

Why so many?

We are talking about, maybe, 11 million or 12 million who sign up and decide that, rather than the traditional fee-for-service and just pick a doctor out of the Yellow Pages who accepts Medicare, it's more like a health maintenance organization that emphasizes wellness, that emphasizes prevention, tests that are not typically covered under traditional fee-for-service Medicare, like colon cancer screening, breast cancer screening, mammograms for women, especially between the ages of 40 and 60, prostate cancer screening for men, annual physical examinations, follow-ups from a nurse practitioner within the doctor's office, maybe even on a monthly basis to make sure that the senior is taking the medication that was prescribed by the primary care doctor.

All of these things are included with Medicare Advantage. That's why it's called Medicare Advantage. It is an advantage with very little additional cost. In fact, people who are under those programs typically don't have to buy supplemental insurance to cover co-pays and deductibles and hospital care after they've exhausted their benefits. So that's why so many choose that.

Yet what we have done is we've stripped—we've gutted—that program so badly that, of those 12 million, it's estimated 7 million of them will lose that coverage under Medicare Advantage. They'll have to get it under the traditional Medicare, and they'll have to pay $130 a month extra for that supplemental whether they get it through a plan that's endorsed by the American Association of Retired Persons or through some health insurance company, but the average cost is going to be an additional $130 a month for those folks.

□ 2000

So as we talk about the cost, I do want to shift, Mr. Speaker, to the cost

to employers. In this next slide, where the title says, ''ObamaCare Hurts Workers, Increases Costs,'' the majority of employers anticipate health care reform will increase health costs. And most say they plan to pass the increases on to their employees—88 percent plan to do that—or reduce health benefits and programs, 74 percent.

This idea of setting up these exchanges throughout the 50 States and territories and that only 6 million people who have employer-provided health insurance can keep it, they won't need to be on the exchanges, Mr. Speaker, that is absolute poppycock. It's probably going to end up being about 130 million people who get their health care provided today by their employer will end up in those exchanges. And that's why I say this cost that was estimated by the CBO of $900 billion will be in the trillions, because when all of these people morph out of the employer-provided health care onto these exchanges, think how many of them will be eligible for a Federal subsidy to help them pay for that insurance. Because the law says, the so-called ''Affordable Care Act,'' that anybody with an income of less than 400 percent—not 100 percent, not 200 percent, not 300—400 percent of the Federal poverty level—which is getting close to $90,000 for a family of four—I think of my four children and their families of two and three and four, and I know what their incomes are—the Federal Government will be subsidizing so many people that the cost, the true cost will be astronomical, and it is something that we cannot afford. That's why our representative from New York and our other representative from Georgia spoke earlier about we can't do this, we can't afford to do this. We need to repeal this law. It is a bad law.

I've said before, Mr. Speaker, that in my humble opinion I think it's the worst law that has ever been passed in this Congress. There have been some folks on the other side of the aisle—well, not on the other side of the aisle, but the more liberal media who took me to task for saying that, but I truly believe it. I truly believe it's one of the worst laws that was ever passed. And we have made every effort to repeal it.

One of the first things we did in the 112th Congress was pass H.R. 2 to repeal ObamaCare. We sent it over to the Senate, and the Senate—which is controlled by the Democratic majority and led by the Senator from Nevada, HARRY REID—just simply, I guess, put that in file 13, and H.R. 2 is sort of dead in the water over on the Senate side.

So what we are doing now, it is our obligation because of what the American people have told us: Over 60 percent of them a year after passage of the bill, despite the fact that Ms. PELOSI said, once we pass it and you find out what's in it, you'll like it. No, they don't. They don't like it. They don't like it one darn bit better, and they wanted us to repeal. We made every effort at repeal.

And now we're into Plan B, Mr. Speaker. Plan B, of course, is to try to defund especially the parts of the bill that are on automatic pilot, that we have no control over. And when I say ''we,'' I don't mean the new Republican majority in the House of Representatives; I mean every Member of Congress—100 Senators, 435 Members of the House, both sides of the aisle. For goodness sakes, we ought to have control over the spending.

This is not a poster. I don't have a poster on this one. But tomorrow, in the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. Speaker, the committee on which I am proud to serve, along with several of our other House GOP doctor members, we are going to have a markup on several bills to change this automatic pilot spending under ObamaCare and put it into the more typical discretionary spending where Members of Congress can say, do we want to spend that money? And if we do want to spend the money, how much do we want to spend? And that we have oversight and we can make sure every year that we look at the program, and if it's not working then defund it.

And these bills—and I'll just mention them real quickly—H.R. 1217, a bill to repeal the prevention and public health fund, $17.5 billion that the Secretary of Health and Human Services has control over, a fund of money that she can spend in any way she wants to. You think back to the ads that we saw with Andy Griffith as the pitchman on television last year about the great value of this new law and how it's going to strengthen and improve Medicare. How you do that by cutting $500 billion out of a program is beyond me. But that money, that $17.5 billion in this prevention and public health fund, can be spent indiscriminately by a decision made by whoever the Secretary of Health and Human Services might be. H.R. 1216, H.R. 1215, H.R. 1214 and H.R. 1213, in the aggregate, this is over $18 billion worth of spending that we Members of Congress have no control over. We're going to get control over it, though, and we're going to defund anywhere we feel that it is wasted, duplicative spending that the American people can ill afford.

I want to go ahead and point out a few other things that are on the slides, Mr. Speaker. I mentioned, of course, the $575 billion in cuts from the Medicare program. I mentioned the 7.4 million people who will lose that coverage under Medicare Advantage because of that $126 billion pay-for. I didn't mention, though, on this slide the third bullet point.

Many physicians may stop taking Medicare patients because reimbursements will be below the cost of providing the care. Now, is that Representative PHIL GINGREY from the 11th of Georgia, is that a statement that I've made? Well, maybe I have made it. But I'm quoting the Actuary of Medicare, Richard Foster, who we had last week as a witness before the Energy and Commerce Committee talking about some of these things. This bears repeating, Mr. Speaker; ''Many physicians may stop taking Medicare patients because reimbursements will be below the cost of providing the care'' Richard Foster, Committee on Medicare and Medicaid Services, Chief Actuary.

Today, doctors are reimbursed under the Medicare program by a formula, an arcane, very difficult—you talk about calculus being difficult; understanding the sustainable growth rate formula to determine how doctors are reimbursed for providing their service, whether it's their brain power or their surgical skills, is beyond anybody's comprehension. And every year, for the last 6 or 7 years, when you apply that formula to the next year's reimbursement level, there is a cut from the last year's reimbursement—2 percent, 3 percent, 4 percent—to the point now, Mr. Speaker, what we have done, of course, we here in the Congress have mitigated those cuts and said we're not going to enact those cuts because these doctors will not be able to provide the care, just as Mr. Foster, the Actuary, said. And if we don't put a bandaid on these cuts and mitigate them, then the doctors will just drop out of the program. And I don't care how much you expand access and hand out more insurance cards, if there are no doctors there to see you, you're not going to have care. You do not have decent care—you don't have any care.

□ 2010

So in this bill, in this new law, not only is that formula still there, and the doctors are facing a 31-percent cut in their reimbursement if we don't mitigate it once again come December 31 of this year, not only is that on their backs, but in ObamaCare, there's this new provision called IPAB, this new bureaucracy—Independent Payment Advisory Board—that's going to actually cut the doctors even more. The Actuary is right: We're not going to have doctors providing the care.

And that's because we've taken money out of this program and put it into an entirely new entitlement program for the most part for young people. Some entitlement, when you force them to buy health insurance in many instances when they don't need it and they don't want it.

Mr. Speaker, I see we've been joined by the cochairman, along with myself, the cochairman of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, my classmate from the 108th Congress, the Member from Pennsylvania, my friend and colleague, Dr. TIM MURPHY.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank you for yielding, Dr. GINGREY.

You know, all of us in the Doctors Caucus are people who have treated patients, and we know full well the value of quality health care. We also know what happens when bureaucracy gets

between the patient and the doctor, and you find yourself spending as much time worried about paperwork and forms and what the government is going to do than sometimes your dealing with your patient. That's not good health care. And that certainly isn't good health care reform.

All of us who are health care professionals know that the treatment should not be more harmful than the illness itself. And what happens with the health care bill that was passed, when you look at some of the parts of this and realize what it does to the patient, to taxes, to employers, to hospitals, to community health centers, to the cost of drugs, you have to conclude that we did not fix the problem; we financed the problem and it is growing and growing. And that's not the right direction.

Let me give you a couple of examples.

This bill, this act, actually creates about 1,900-plus new duties and responsibilities for the Secretary of Health. It has a hundred or more boards, panels, and commissions of people that we don't yet know who they are to write regulations that we don't yet know what they are.

We also know that despite the words about the goal, the actual means to get there and what happens isn't what is purported to be doing.

Let's look at, for example, we keep hearing about 35 million Americans will be covered. And yet, we also hear from various consulting firms that it won't be 9 million Americans that will lose their health insurance, it may be tens of millions of people who will lose their private insurance. So covering 35 million but perhaps the same or double that losing their insurance doesn't get us to where we need to be.

We also heard that health care costs were going to go down. I had someone from HHS from Philadelphia come to my office and they told me with a smile that wasn't it great that health care costs were only going up 2 or 3 percent. I asked this person if they bothered to talk to some of the employers in the State of Pennsylvania, because a lot of them told me their health care costs are going up 20 and 30 and 40 percent. I asked if they'd talked to some of the families whose children were covered on plans before that exclusively cover children to find out that those plans were not going to cover children any more because of the way the government decided to design those.

Our goal should be to treat. Our goal should be to help. Our goal should not be to stop at just rhetoric and say, ''We have good intentions, and therefore we have good outcomes.'' But good intentions don't make good outcomes.

Where we could be spending money is on some real reforms. One of the issues that we've been united on has been to help community health centers. One community health center in Pittsburgh that I visited with, the Squirrel Hill Health Center, treats about 700,000 individuals through more than 2.3 million visits annually. These community health centers in Pennsylvania, there are 45 in 67 counties—60 percent urban and 40 percent rural. Their patient base is 68 percent Medicaid, uninsured, and 93 percent of patients of incomes at or below the 200 percent of the Federal poverty level.

What is interesting is how much lower in costs those clinics throughout Pennsylvania, quite frankly throughout the Nation, could provide high-quality health care.

But what we've created is a couple of burdens. I found it interesting as part of the health care bill that one of the things we passed was an amendment that Congressman GENE GREEN, a Democrat from Texas, and I had authored to allow doctors to volunteer at community health centers. If Dr. GINGREY wanted to go to a community health center and volunteer, and if I wanted to and any of the other ones, we couldn't do it. And the reason being that those community health centers say, ''We can't afford to have you volunteer.'' Because in order to volunteer, they'd have to pay the medical malpractice costs instead of having them in the Federal Torts Claims Act—employees of those clinics can do that—and that adds to their costs. In the meantime, those clinics are short 10, 15, 20 percent of what they need in providers.

They are a tried and true method of bringing people together, people from a wide range of disciplines: OBGYNs, family practitioners, dentists, podiatrists, social workers, psychologists, to work. That's one of the many things we could be doing. But along those lines, there are a great many things that we can be doing.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I want to thank you, Dr. Murphy, and I appreciate you coming.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time. I know our time is up.

I just refer to our last poster in conclusion: Repeal and Replace ObamaCare.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to start off by saying in response to some of what I've just listened to—and I'm not going to take it point by point. I just want to point out that what we passed last year is not ObamaCare. To the people of this country it is your care. And if you allow it to be repealed, defunded, or picked apart piece-by-piece, President Obama will still have his health care insurance and so will many of the people who are trying to take away yours, your care.

Just remember that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act was not to provide care for us. It was to provide care and access to quality, affordable health care for you. It is not ObamaCare. It's your care.

At this time I'd like to yield to my colleague from Maryland, Congresswoman DONNA EDWARDS.

Ms. EDWARDS. I would like to thank Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN for the time.

And just a reminder that today, April 4, is a sad remembrance in some ways of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. in Memphis, Tennessee, some 43 years ago. It is such an irony that we're here this evening at this time because there are so many things for which Dr. King fought and struggled that are ever-present today both in our policy and our politics and in our national culture and through our social fabric.

During this year also we commemorate the 40th anniversary of the Congressional Black Caucus. It's important for us to remember that the Congressional Black Caucus was founded to tackle the injustices that Dr. King pointed to and to promote equity in the United States and with and through our United States political process.

Dr. King dedicated his life to the then-uncomfortable conversations on injustice faced by African Americans across the country. Dr. King knew that tackling discrimination in the United States could not only focus on knocking down social barriers but also economic barriers that held African American workers, held low-wage workers from economic wealth to sustain their families.

I want to thank Dr. CHRISTENSEN and so many of my other colleagues who've joined me in the introduction of House Resolution 198, recognizing the coordinated struggle of workers during the 1968 Memphis sanitation workers strike to voice their grievances and reach a collective agreement for rights in the workplace. What an irony here in 2011 that the battles for which Dr. King fought so valiantly are today's battles.

□ 2020

House Resolution 198 has among it, today, 55 cosponsors. We recognize that we may not be able to move this measure to the floor, but it is an important remembrance, commemoration of the struggle of those sanitation workers, those city workers, those municipal workers as they tried to organize.

As Dr. King knew, organized labor is a cornerstone of our democracy, and the organizations of organized labor have altered many facets of our Nation. They've changed our Nation for the better. Organized workers will forever change the labor debate in Memphis through their collective will. That's what happened in Memphis on those days 43 years ago.

Just 2 weeks ago, we recognized the 100-year anniversary of the deadly Triangle Shirtwaist Factory fire, which

ushered in improved safety standards for workers. And decades later, the deaths of two sanitation workers in Memphis resulted in a movement to grant workers in Memphis, Tennessee, the basic rights in a workplace. Dr. King believed that the struggle in Memphis for workers' rights was akin to the civil rights movement. It was a partner to the civil rights movement.

The motto of the sanitation workers strike was, ''I am a man,'' signifying the demeaning way in which African American men had been treated and referred to as boys. ''I am a man.'' What powerful words urging the city to grant them the full rights to equality and justice guaranteed under the principles of our Nation. Dr. King stood in solidarity with the strikers in the fight for justice and the basic human rights for all men and women in the workplace and in society.

Indeed, there are many of us in this Congress who stand in solidarity with the strikers and workers across this country, municipal workers, private sector workers, public sector workers who are fighting every day for justice in their workplaces. Indeed, 43 years ago is the struggle of today. And thanks very much to the legacy of those strikers in Memphis and to Dr. King, we actually live in a Nation where workers all over the United States can indeed demand justice and fair working conditions.

These basic rights allow men and women to pursue economic wealth and pursue the American Dream. But in recent days, we face a virtual assault on basic workers' rights, things that we have known for generations in this country. And even though those events are unfolding in Wisconsin, the outcome of whether the unions have the right to collective bargaining in that State will affect union members across this country. Indeed, that was the fight and the struggle for justice of sanitation workers.

I want to refer to Dr. King's speech in Memphis at a rally on behalf of sanitation workers. He said, ''We've got to give ourselves to this struggle until the end. Nothing would be more tragic than to stop at this point in Memphis. We've got to see it through.''

We face the same challenge today. We have to push through in States like Wisconsin and Indiana and Ohio and across this country to help public employees and, indeed, all employees fight against the injustices that they face in their workplace.

In Dr. King's last speech, he highlighted the perils at which he sought equality and justice for all men and women. In his words, I quote, ''I may not get there with you, but I want you to know tonight that we as a people will get to the promised land.'' And for workers, what is that promised land? It is the promised land of a workplace that is safe. It is the promised land in which one makes wages that allow one to take care of one's family and contribute to the community. It is a workplace that actually respects workers as partners in the success of a company and a workplace.

Dr. King at this time, when he addressed workers in Memphis, had already faced threats against his life, including a stab wound that he had suffered at a book signing in New York. In his speech, Dr. King recalled the doctors saying that had he sneezed following the attack he would have died, but noted he was glad that he did not or else he would have missed the progress in the civil rights movement.

Today is a day of remembrance for so many of us. On the point of injustice, Dr. King said so poignantly the issue is injustice. The issue is the refusal of Memphis to be fair and honest in its dealings with its public servants, who happened to be sanitation workers. Now we have got to keep attention on that. And just as he reminded us 43 years ago, we have to keep the attention on our workers, who struggle every day.

Dr. King was determined to be in Memphis with those workers. And let's think about where we are here 43 years from that fated day in April. Our country is moving out of recession. We continue to stand with workers and stand with job creation, some of us do, to reverse the effects of the recession on our most vulnerable communities, and to empower all Americans, empower workers.

The unemployment rate among the African American population remains far too high, at 16.6 percent in March of this year. Now, the overall unemployment rate has fallen. We are grateful for that. But I think were Dr. King alive today, he would probably acknowledge the struggle of those who are working and those who want to work, the many who are chronically unemployed in their communities across this country.

The unemployment rate among African American men was 20.2 percent in March of this year, just last month. The unemployment rate among African American women was 11.7 percent in March. Put these numbers up against national numbers of unemployment of 8.8 percent. While those numbers again, thanks to the brilliant efforts of the President of the United States, of the Democrats in Congress during the 111th Congress, who actually brought us to a point where we put in some policies that could bring down the unemployment rate, those numbers are still troubling among minority groups.

But I will say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the challenges that we have is that in this country, where workers struggle every day, we look at stagnant wages that have really crippled the American workforce, the public sector workforce, the private sector workforce in this country, that we still have a lot to do when it comes to creating jobs. And yet here we are again this week—I don't know what day we are on—89 days not having created any jobs to address those very concerns that Dr. King had just 43 years ago.

Just a reminder to us all that according to Dr. King, he said so profoundly about the American labor movement, and I quote again Dr. King, and I wish that I could do it with his eloquence, but I think it is important for us to be reminded of his words. ''The labor movement was the principal force that transformed misery and despair into hope and progress. Out of its bold struggles, economic and social reform gave birth to unemployment insurance, old age pensions, government relief for the destitute, and above all, new wage levels that meant not mere survival, but a tolerable life.'' He continued, ''The captains of industry did not lead this transformation; they resisted it until they were overcome. When in the thirties the wave of union organization crested over our Nation, it carried to secure shores not only itself but the whole society.''

Dr. King recognized so profoundly the connection between the struggle of workers, the struggle of the sanitation workers in Memphis to the struggles of the American labor movement, and, in fact, to its foundation.

With that, I recognize that my colleague from New York, PAUL TONKO, has joined us on the floor. Perhaps he would care to join in this discussion.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative EDWARDS, for bringing us together this evening on what I think is a very timely discussion.

You know, it seems as though 43-year-old history resonates profoundly today. The same battles for which Martin Luther King had fought, the eloquence with which he raised America's consciousness is needed today, not only in the halls of government but across America, to understand that there is an attack, I believe, on workers.

□ 2030

There is a diminution of the impact of our middle class, our working families in this country, when we look at the fact that the top 10 percent of Americans now own or earn around 50 percent of our national income.

We look at stats from 1950 that has the executive salaries somewhere in a 30-to-1 ratio compared to the American worker. By the year 2000, that had changed drastically to some 300-to-1 to 500-to-1. So it's obvious that the gap between those who are drawing large paychecks and the workers, the masses that make things work, that have the need to have purchasing power so as to enable our economy to function and function well, have been threatened. They have been at risk.

And I think the whole moral fabric that Martin Luther King embraced, the entire mission to raise America's people as one by providing for the dignity of the American workers, was a tremendously strong statement in defense of all people, not just people of color, people of every demographic, people of every racial persuasion that could provide for a stronger America. It was that vision that he had and he shared it

so eloquently, and his climb to the mountaintop was bringing all of America's children and people along.

He knew that the empowerment of the individual meant the empowerment of the society. As we weave the strands of diversity into the fabric of America, our mosaic growing stronger and brighter and more vibrant enables us to be a Nation that really, truly is unique if we could just empower the American worker.

I see the raid now on this middle class in these Chambers, in the congressional Chambers, both the House and the Senate being so focused on a dismantling of the power of the working families, of the true middle class of our society. That is a wrong move. That is one that will devastate our economy and one that is not utilizing, embracing the intellectual capacity of this great Nation.

Cuts to our children through Head Start or in classroom experience is the worst cut of any because it's our future that we are playing with. We are not allowing for the dignity, again, of which Martin Luther King spoke, to be felt in the classroom; and that magic of learning is dulled, is dulled, by these painful cuts.

So we have got to respond, respond with compassion and with our eyes wide open knowing that that message of 43 years ago and that powerful statement made about the dignity of labor, the evening before he was brought down, still speaks to every one of us, or at least ought to, so that we can provide for the sorts of policy and the resource advocacy, the distribution of income across this country in a way that really empowers the individual and families.

That, I think, is the mission that is still there for each and every one of us. So many of us were inspired by the words of John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Robert F. Kennedy. It drew people to the public arena. They wanted to be involved; they saw government as a noble mission. And that tarnished atmosphere that's prevailing today has allowed for misrepresentation of facts or denial of data that really should guide our process here, as Martin often called for fairness, for equitable treatment, for justice.

Those are the factors that drive the dignity. So it is a challenge to us, but I think we are up for that challenge, and I remain optimistic. If we just provide the boost to our Nation's working families, to our middle class, then we are all empowered. I think that tide would lift all boats.

So, thank you, Representative EDWARDS, for bringing us together on a very important discussion.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I would like to thank my colleague from Maryland for helping to organize this hour and our colleague from New York for joining us. I was in medical school here in Washington D.C. on the day that Dr. King was assassinated, and it was obviously a very dark day and weekend that followed.

But I recalled, and I think it would have had to have been the Sunday of the following week, was a Sunday dedicated to Dr. Martin Luther King. On that day, as you went to church or were out and about D.C., there was such a feeling of fellowship and brotherhood and respect for each other, and even, I would say, love for each other as neighbors in this country and on this planet.

It would be wonderful to see the spirit of that day revived in this Congress and across our Nation as we remember not only the day but, more importantly, the words and the legacy of Dr. King and as we remember all that he was fighting for. Specifically tonight we remember the sanitation workers whose strike he went out to Nashville to support on that fateful evening.

And in his speech he mentioned a few things that he said in that speech the night before he was killed. He called also for his listeners to develop a ''dangerous unselfishness'' and said that the question before them, and I would say the question before us today, is ''not if I stop to help the sanitation workers,'' and I am going to add in here, as we would say today, not if we stopped to help the sanitation workers, the teachers, the firefighters, the policemen and all workers whose rights are under attack in our country today, what will happen to my job?

But he said the question is: ''If I do not stop to help the sanitation workers what will happen to them?'' And as our colleague from New York said, his concern went beyond that. It was also what would happen to our Nation.

He also then said right after that: ''Let us rise up tonight with a greater readiness. Let us stand with a greater determination. And let us move in these powerful days, these days of challenge to make America what it ought to be. We have an opportunity to make America a better Nation.''

These words are an urgent call to us today as well, as both of my colleagues have said, to stand with a greater determination on behalf of the working men and women in this country; to stand with a greater determination for help for the poor; to stand with a greater determination for clean air and clean energy for us and our children, clean air for our children and us to breathe, and clean energy and responding to this threat of climate change; to stand with greater determination for jobs and economic opportunity, especially for the most distressed parts of our country; to stand with greater determination for a quality education for every child and to stand with greater determination for equal access to quality health care and wellness for everyone in this country regardless of race, ethnicity, gender identity or geography.

Another quote from Dr. King that I use often as we talk about health disparities is this quote. He said:—Of all the forms of inequality, injustice in health care is the most shocking and inhumane.''

I want to focus on that for a moment because among the many challenges that we face today is that of eliminating the injustice in health care. We Democrats took a major step forward in this effort with the passage of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act in the 111th Congress. Not only does it expand coverage to millions of Americans and families who have never had insurance before, but it also includes provisions that would end the travesty which Dr. Martin Luther King called the most shocking and inhumane.

Now that the health care door is finally being opened to all; now that we have furthered the effort to end the discrimination that exists in our health system; now that we have a chance to end the tens of thousands of premature, preventable deaths in people of color, and the poor, and those who live in our rural areas and our territories; now that we have done all of that, the Republican majority is doing everything they can think of to try and slam that door shut again.

□ 2040

In this 40th anniversary year, the Congressional Black Caucus is committed to building upon the legacy of our founders. In the area of health, we are particularly committed to specifically building on the legacy of Congressman Louis Stokes to not let that door or any door be closed to African Americans or to anyone anywhere in this country. We will not let those doors be closed.

And we know that our Democrats will stand with us with greater determination to protect the Affordable Care law and the lives of countless Americans who would continue to be in jeopardy without that law. And it's time for the good people of this country to stand with us.

Let us not have to repent, as Dr. King said, not for actions of bad people, but for the appalling silence of good people.

This country should no longer tolerate that African Americans, Latinos and Native Americans have a much higher infant mortality than our white counterparts; that diabetes and its complications should be so much higher in those same populations as well as in Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders; or that African Americans should have higher death rates from cancer and diabetes than all of the other population groups; or that Native Americans should have higher deaths from sudden infant death syndrome and chronic liver disease than all of the other population groups combined; or that Asian Americans should have such high incidences of tuberculosis, about 24 times the average national rate, and higher incidences of hepatitis B; and no longer should this country tolerate that in 2010, after 8 years, that the Department of Health and Human Services would still be reporting in the national health disparities report that

fewer than 20 percent of disparities faced by African Americans, American Indians, Alaska Natives and Hispanics showed any evidence of narrowing. Fewer than 20 percent showed any evidence of narrowing.

It is time for all of us to rise to our better nature, as Dr. King would call us to do, and to begin to work together to close gaps faced in many different areas by large segments of our population. We must stand in stronger determination to build that better nation and to realize the beloved community that Dr. King envisioned.

In our 40th year, the Congressional Black Caucus remains more committed, more determined than ever to realizing his dream, a dream that still burns brightly in the hearts of all of us who honor Dr. Martin Luther King and the life that he gave to ensure freedom and justice on behalf of all of us.

With that, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Ms. EDWARDS. Thank you, Dr. CHRISTENSEN.

I just want to take a moment to yield to my colleague, vice chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus from the great State, my original home State of North Carolina, G.K. BUTTERFIELD.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Let me thank the gentlelady for yielding the time this evening and thank her for her leadership in the Congress. The Congressional Black Caucus goes out of its way each week to try to present to the Nation issues that are critically important to African Americans residing in this country, and Congresswoman DONNA EDWARDS and Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN have been in the forefront of making that happen. And so I want to thank them so very much for their leadership.

I especially want to thank them for their willingness to come to the floor tonight to commemorate the life and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. April 4 always brings back memories of a very tragic day in the life of our country. It is a day that I shall never, ever forget.

The civil rights movement and the voting rights movement took place during my years in high school. Those were very precious moments in my history, and I remember so well the work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The world must remember, our country must remember, we must understand that Martin Luther King's leadership was very profound, but it only lasted for about 13 years. So many people don't recognize that.

Dr. King started his leadership at age 26, and it tragically ended at age 39. It was on December 1 of 1955 that Dr. King was drafted, at age 26, to lead the Montgomery bus boycott. That was the day in Alabama history when the black citizens of Montgomery decided that they would boycott city buses until they could sit anywhere they wanted instead of being relegated to the back when a white citizen boarded the bus. A black seamstress named Rosa Parks was denied a seat of her choice because of the color of her skin, and Dr. King at the age of 26 took the leadership of that movement and focused the attention of the world on this injustice. And the Supreme Court of this country, the following year, agreed with his position.

Then several years later, in April of 1963, it was on a Friday evening, it was Good Friday, Dr. King again led a march in Birmingham, Alabama, to end segregation in public accommodations. Dr. King was arrested and spent the next 11 days confined in jail. During that time, Mr. Speaker, he wrote that great document called ''Letter from Birmingham Jail.'' I would only wish that our citizens would look up that letter on the Internet and read for themselves ''Letter from Birmingham Jail.'' And several weeks later, the Birmingham leaders announced that local accommodations would be integrated.

After that great victory in Birmingham, and after Dr. King wrote his letter, Dr. King and other civil rights leaders planned and then they executed the 1963 March on Washington. So many of us have heard of and some of us participated in that march. It was a hot summer day here in the Nation's capital on August 28, 1963. I was there as a young 16-year-old high school student.

That march was a demand. It was a demand for civil rights legislation. President John F. Kennedy had agreed with the movement and had made a historic speech on June 11, 1963, calling on this Nation to end segregation in public accommodations. And on June 20, 1963, a bill was introduced into this House of Representatives here on Capitol Hill, and that bill was fiercely debated to provide civil rights for all citizens. But then the march took place in August of 1963. It was a great day; 250,000 people descended on the Nation's capital demanding civil rights. And less than 90 days later, President Kennedy was tragically assassinated in Dallas, Texas.

As a result of his assassination, President Johnson, becoming the President of our country, promised the Nation that the civil rights bill that was pending in the Congress would continue to be debated, and it would be signed into law, and it was, on July 2, 1964.

And so after that civil rights bill was passed, Dr. King received the coveted Nobel Peace Prize. And we honor and we celebrate that great history.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Civil Rights Act was not enough. There had to be a voting rights bill that was debated and passed by this Congress. Finally, in 1965, Congress passed the 1965 Voting Rights Act because of the work of Dr. King.

Because of the Voting Rights Act, there has now been a transformation, a political transformation in the southern part of our country where I am from. I represent eastern North Carolina, which is a community in my State that suffered from years of discrimination and electoral discrimination. But I'm proud to say that in my congressional district alone, there are more than 300 African American elected officials elected to office, and we attribute much of this success to the life and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

I want to thank the gentlelady for recognizing this great American on this day. My home town of Wilson, North Carolina, was supposed to have been the visit of Dr. King on this day in 1968. But because of the events in Memphis, Tennessee, he diverted and went to Memphis to aid with the garbage strike and to help those who could not help themselves. And so we celebrate this great legacy tonight.

Ms. EDWARDS. Thank you, Congressman BUTTERFIELD, for your leadership as vice chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, but also for your reminder of our so important history that is linked both to the struggle of African Americans in this country, to the struggle of labor, and for a reminder also historically of the fact that Dr. King was supposed to have had a next place to be when his life was ended on April 4, 43 years ago today.

□ 2050

I would like to take just this moment, if I could, to recount for us the history of the 1968 American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Memphis sanitation workers' strike, the chronology.

Beginning on Sunday, January 31 of that year, the rain sent workers home. Then beginning on Tuesday, February 1 of that year, two sanitation workers were killed in an accident on a city truck.

Then just days later on Monday, February 12, Memphis sanitation and public employees went on strike after last-minute attempts to resolve their grievances had failed. While the newspapers claimed that 200 workers of the 1,300 remained on the job, really only 38 of 180 trucks moved. The mayor of the city said the strike is illegal, but that his office stood ready to talk to anyone about legitimate questions of the time.

Little did these workers know that through the month of February, as black leaders and ministers gathered from city-wide organizations in support of the strike, through the days of March when the ministers and the city announced that Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., would come to Memphis, 116 strikers and supporters were arrested for sitting at city hall. And then through the month of March, the newspapers claimed that the strike was failing as scabs were operating 90 garbage trucks. But 17,000 Memphians attended a rally where Dr. King called for a city-wide march on March 22.

Then as Dr. King returned to Memphis on April 3, and he addressed the rally, delivering his famous ''I've Been to the Mountaintop'' address, then that

day, on April 4, on April 4, 1968, as he prepared to march with the workers, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was assassinated on the balcony of his hotel in Memphis, Tennessee.

In the days following his assassination, the workers continued their strike in honor of Dr. King and with renewed courage and resolve to demand safe working conditions. It is this simple phrase ''I am a man'' that drove him, a simple phrase, one that acknowledged their humanhood, one that acknowledged them as workers: I am a man.

And then finally on April 16, some 3 months after the start of their strike, the sanitation workers of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFSCME, agreed and reached an agreement with the city officials, granting an increase in pay, a grievance procedure, and overtime pay.

This is the history of the sanitation workers of Memphis. It is the history of workers throughout this country, and it is the history of workers today.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. You know, the dignity that was addressed, the respect factor of ''I am a man,'' that rhetoric that speaks to the working individual, that speaks to humanity, the man, the woman, the child, the dignity of the individual, the respect shown, was all that was embraced in that message, that struck all of America, touched all Americans.

I am of the age that I remember that tragic day. It came so clustered. In a short 5 years, we lost three great leaders to bullets. It is just really a tragic outcome that you can't help but find yourself questioning what if their march continued, how different would America be?

I find it so interesting that his last major appearance and effort was for workers, fighting for workers, for the dignity of work and the dignity of workers.

The assault on workers' rights that he was addressing we see today in the news. We see it in Wisconsin. We see it in Michigan. We see it in Ohio. And it is like the same battles are here to be fought and won.

So the spirit of Martin encourages, I think, builds our determination and our resilience to make a difference. The efforts that America needs to associate with the overall cause and concern for job creation and job retention is so vitally important. Many would choose to have us believe that it is a high rate of firings that is occurring out there, but it is really a low rate of hirings, which is a different sort of saga. We need to invest now in worker opportunities, in training, retraining, in education, and in job creation.

I am a firm believer, and I know many are, that unemployment is driving our deficit and that if we invest in jobs, if we invest in the worker, we will see a corresponding benefit on the flip side of a reduced deficit for this Nation.

I think the stats tell it all. The bottom 50 percent of income earners in the United States now collectively own less than 1 percent of the Nation's wealth. That is a startling fact. And we need to make certain that there is more justice that is produced out there. As I said earlier, I really do believe that the purchasing power that we can enhance for America's working families, for our middle class, for the mainstream worker out there is an empowerment for all of us. Someone needs to purchase the products that those perched on the top may produce by their ownership. But the worker to build that product and the worker to buy that product is an important key, perhaps the most important ingredient in the equation.

When we look at the fact that some five people are lined up for every job opportunity in this country, and when we look at the fact that workers' rights are under assault today in many areas across this country, there is a great amount of unfinished business.

And on this anniversary commemoration of a great leader's death, it is important for us to recommit our energies and our spirit to speaking to the needs of America's workers. Nothing could honor Dr. Martin Luther King's legacy and the man more vibrantly than speaking to job creation, job retention, workers' rights and prevention of what we are seeing where there is an assault on those rights across this country.

Thank you, Representative EDWARDS, for bringing this solemn opportunity together on this floor where so many issues were addressed in favorable measure, that were driven by the courage and the boldness and the noble vision of Dr. Martin Luther King and other great leaders, like JFK and RFK, who traveled that same era in history.

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman from New York and appreciate your leadership and your being here this evening to mark this day with us for workers.

With that, I yield to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. It should give all of the workers who are fighting for their rights today extra incentive, some extra inspiration as we commemorate this day and all that Dr. Martin Luther King fought for as they continue that fight and we continue to support them in that fight.

I am reminded that on April 7 in the capital of Illinois, in Springfield, I was out there a week ago, they will be having a major rally on behalf of working people in this country. I want to salute the folks in Springfield on that march.

In addition to fighting for workers' rights, when Dr. King died, he was planning the Poor People's Campaign in Washington. I was here studying for my boards. I went over to volunteer in the medical tent. It rained and it poured; but people came in from all over this country, particularly the South, to the Poor People's Campaign to call attention to the plight of the poor in this country.

As we are celebrating as a Congressional Black Caucus our 40th anniversary, we are still carrying on that fight. Our main agenda, theme, is ''Creating Pathways Out of Poverty.'' We have had that as our agenda for the last 2 years, and we continue with that for this Congress as well.

That was a remarkable time as well. I think it did a lot to change my life in the middle of my medical studies and the course of my career. It probably has something to do with why I am here today. I wanted to also just remind everyone that as we fight for the workers, and remember Dr. King's fight for working men and women, he also was steadfastly working to help define pathways out of poverty for those who were poor then; and we continue in our 40th year to fight for the poor and help them find ways to lift them up and lift their families out of poverty.

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and in bringing us together in these important hours on the floor of the House of Representatives to discuss the issues that are of the deepest concern to communities of color, to working families across this country, and a reminder of the reason why many of us have chosen to serve.

□ 2100

Dr. King knew so deeply that the middle class is, indeed, the backbone of the American economy and that by strengthening the middle class we move our Nation forward. He would understand today that, by giving tax breaks to oil companies and special privileges to the wealthy, we forget our allegiance to the most populous among us—the middle class. He understood the importance of the struggle of sanitation workers, of organizing workers, of making sure that workers were able to take care of themselves and their families as a way of moving workers into the middle class. He understood, like so many of us do, particularly for African American people, that our connection to organized labor is so important because it is through the ability to organize and to fight for our rights against injustice that we are able to move our families into the middle class.

Dr. King knew so tremendously the connection between the plight of Negroes and working people. He said at the AFL–CIO convention in December 1961: ''Negroes are almost entirely a working people. There are pitifully few Negro millionaires and few Negro employers. Our needs are identical with labor's needs—decent wages, fair working conditions, livable housing, old age security, health and welfare measures, conditions in which families can grow,

have education for their children and respect in the community.'' Dr. King spoke those words in December 1961. Those words could be spoken today.

Dr. King reminded the workers of the United Auto Workers at the District 65 convention in September 1962 that in the area of politics that labor and African Americans, Negroes, have identical interests. He said: ''Labor has grave problems today of employment, shorter hours, old age security, housing, and retraining against the impact of automation. The Congress and the administration are almost as indifferent to labor's program as they are toward that of the Negro. Toward both, they offer vastly less than adequate remedies for the problems which are a torment to us day after day.''

Those words spoken today speak to the plight of the workforce, to minority communities and to working families across this country. Those words spoken in 1962 could be spoken today in 2011, some 40 some years later.

One of the things that I continue to be touched by is that I was just a young girl when Dr. King died on April 4, but I always remember that day. I remember that day in my family. I remember the sadness and the tragedy, but I also remember the struggle. I think generations since my own and up until now recall that struggle and, I think, today, for the sanitation workers and remembering their struggle of some 3 months to gain the respect and dignity in the workplace: I am a man.

Now, if we had to create this placard today, we might write ''I am a woman; I am a man; I am a human being''; but it still speaks to the same value, to the value of humanity and justice in the workplace. That's the value that Dr. King spoke to. It is a value for which he died. It is a value that lives in his legacy.

So, again, I am just pleased that my colleagues have been able to join with us today, not on a day of sadness, April 4, but on a day of remembrance, on a day of reinvigoration and recommitment to those ideals that have guided us and that continue to guide us in our struggle with and for the workers across this country.

With that, I would like to yield again, just very briefly, to my colleague from New York, PAUL TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative EDWARDS.

I would have to say that I truly believe that, if Dr. King were in our presence today, he would remind us that a budget is a series of priorities. What we place high, what we place most precious in that budget, we would see as a document that speaks to a family. Just like a household will balance its needs, its concerns with its ability to pay and put together the balancing, so too does the family of America require that sort of tender balancing.

He would remind us, whether they are employed, critically unemployed or marginally underemployed, whatever the situation might be, that today America's middle class families are living paycheck to paycheck. That's becoming more and more the scenario. He would have suggested, look, we need to take that concern for mortgages, that concern for college tuition, that concern for just pay, that concern for utility bills, that concern for food costs and energy costs, and we need to invest in the American working families.

Contrast that with what the other scenario might look like: handouts to oil companies, corporate loopholes that are not shut, tax breaks for the most comfortable in society. That is the contrast he would challenge us to face head on and to understand it's about social and economic justice. It's about bringing more balance, more fairness into the equation.

As a clergyman, he embraced the faith and brought it into the community; he brought it into America; he challenged us to respond in compassionate measure. We have it within our means to do this in a fair and just way, and that's why we are at a tipping point in this Nation's history where we need to look at revitalizing the middle class.

I represent many modest annual income households. They have told me their fear is about maintaining their homes; their fear is about educating their children; their fear is about tomorrow having the opportunity. I'm optimistic that we can do it because we have the skills here within the Congress to make it happen and to make it work in a progressive fashion. Do we have the will? That would be the challenge. That would be the challenge from Dr. King this very evening: Do we have the will to move forward in a progressive fashion?

So thank you, Representative EDWARDS, for bringing us together tonight in tribute to a giant of an individual, an icon in our midst.

Ms. EDWARDS. Thank you, Mr. TONKO.

With that, I'd like to yield to Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you.

Just briefly, I want to again thank you for helping us to commemorate not only the sanitation workers' strike but the life and legacy of Dr. King.

It is unfortunate, as we are here tonight, remembering the day that the assassination took place of this great American and great human being, that the day after, we expect a budget that is going to do just the opposite of what Dr. King would have wanted us to do.

In the last Congress, we were able to strengthen Medicare, to expand its solvency 12 years. We were able to pass the Affordable Care Act, which would expand Medicaid and make sure that, even though you were poor, you would have the ability to have quality health care. Tomorrow, we expect a budget that's going to talk about privatizing Medicare, ending it as we know it—sacrificing the health care for seniors and children—making an enormous cut in Medicaid, and really taking away the hope that people had when we passed the Affordable Care Act that they could not only have health care but that they could really aspire to improving their health—their own well-being as well as that of their families and their communities.

So we meet here this evening to talk about Dr. King, to talk about the challenges that our working men and women have, and to talk about the challenges of health care for those who are poor—those of all races and ethnicities—and to recommit ourselves in the memory of Dr. King to fight for working men and women and for those who need that extra hand to lift themselves and their families out of poverty.

□ 2110

I just want to say that the Congressional Black Caucus has been doing this for 40 years now.

I want to again recognize our founding members for their perspicacity and their perseverance—we still have two of those members serving with us, Congressman CHARLES RANGEL and Congressman JOHN CONYERS—and to let the American people know that we will continue to fight on their behalf tomorrow and every day as long as it is necessary.

Ms. EDWARDS. Thank you very much, Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN.

I am so proud to be a member of the Congressional Black Caucus with a 40-year history and legacy of fighting for justice and looking out for the most vulnerable and giving voice to people who would not have a voice in this United States Congress.

We are about ready to close, and I would like to end the evening and the hour by pointing those at home, those in this Chamber to an op-ed in today's paper that actually brings together the two forces that Dr. King was bringing together even just before he was so tragically assassinated, bringing together the civil rights movement and the labor movement.

In an op-ed today in today's Washington Post entitled, ''The Middle Class Dream That Cannot Die,'' Benjamin Todd Jealous, who is the president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the NAACP, and Mary K. Henry, who is the international president of the Service Employees International Union, draw together that middle class dream for the American people that's built on a foundation of civil rights and social justice and partnered with labor and working people.

''I Am a Man.'' I would like to close this evening by reminding again, all of us, that April 4 and the years we remember in between are years about building upon a tragedy to build a legacy. ''I Am a Man.'' Dr. King reminded us again about the fight for jobs and retirement security and health care and care for the most vulnerable.

Those are still today's struggles: the workers that we've spoken about in

Wisconsin and Ohio and Indiana and all across this country who struggle for that dignity. ''I Am a Man,'' Dr. King's words, in his famous speech, ''I've Been to the Mountain Top'' that he spoke just before he was assassinated. And I just want to read a portion of that that really speaks to me as a Member of Congress, as a member of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Dr. King said: ''Let us rise up tonight with a greater readiness. Let us stand with a greater determination. And let us move on these powerful days, these days of challenge, to make America what it ought to be. We have an opportunity to make America a better Nation.''

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

FAIR TAX

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

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the Speaker.

I'm glad I was able to get in on the tail end of that previous Special Order. As a proud resident of the State of Georgia, of course we have the King Center open to folks each and every day of the week. And if folks have not had a chance to go by and see that, it is really a fantastic testimony to the life and times of a gentleman whose true impact on this country we may not know for generations and generations to come. I could not be prouder to have that in Georgia, so I very much appreciate being able to listen in.

I, too, am down here to talk about opportunity tonight. It is April 4, it's tax season, and the Fair Tax is a proposal that is near and dear to my heart and a proposal that I believe has its time coming in opportunity.

The largest tax that 80 percent of American families pay, Mr. Speaker, is the payroll tax. That's the FICA tax that our teenagers begin to see when they take on their part-time jobs. Eighty percent of American families pay more in that FICA tax than they do in income taxes or any other tax on their ledger, and yet we spend all of our time talking about income taxes.

We rarely take a look at the payroll tax. We'll spend hours on the House floor talking about tax credits and tax deductions and tax expenditures and tax exemptions. We'll talk about lobbyists and the tax opportunities that they're looking for for their big business clients. We'll talk about loopholes and all of the unfairness of the United States Tax Code, but we rarely talk about the payroll tax.

It has been my commitment here in this month of April—which is one of the few times during the year that everyone is willing to focus on taxes for an extended period of time—to come down here and implore my colleagues to take a look at the Fair Tax and join us in our fight to repeal the income tax—both the personal income tax and the corporate income tax—the payroll tax, the capital gains tax, the gift tax, dividend tax, estate tax, self-employment tax, and on and on, to replace them all with a single-rate personal consumption tax, the Fair Tax.

I was talking with a CEO in my district while I was home who said, Rob, we're trying to leave America just as fast as we can. You've passed some laws recently that make it a littler harder for us to do that, it's going to take us some time, but we're leaving as fast as we can because America is just not a climate to do business in anymore.

We heard my colleagues who spoke previously say that our unemployment isn't because people are being fired; it's because new people are not being hired, and the folks who generate those jobs are the small businesses in this country. How do you generate those jobs when you have the highest corporate tax rate in the world, when you have some of the highest self-employment taxes in the world, and on and on and on?

We can do a lot in this country to destroy success. We can't do a lot to create success. We have a platform here in this country already on which anyone, by the sweat of their brow, can make something of themselves. And yet one of the founders of Home Depot—a very proud company from the great State of Georgia—wrote in The Wall Street Journal last year that if he and his three colleagues got together today to try to start that company they would fail, that they could not succeed in starting a company in today's business environment, the regulatory environment, the labor environment, and the tax environment.

Here in April I'll be returning to the floor each and every day through April 15 to talk about one little part of the Fair Tax. We talked a little bit last Friday about how it does away with every single corporate exemption on the books—every loophole, every credit, every favor, absolutely every one. It's the only bill in Congress that does that, Mr. Speaker. It eliminates every single corporate loophole in the Tax Code because we know that businesses don't pay taxes anyway. We eliminate the corporate income tax, and we allow that to be paid at the personal consumer level.

Tonight, I just want to talk about jobs. I want to talk about that jobs don't come from the Federal Government, that jobs don't even come from big corporations. Jobs come from small entrepreneurs and risk-takers.

The power to tax is the power to destroy, and we have used the power to tax income, to tax that productiveness that each and every American goes to work for every day. Our Founding Fathers had a different view; they taxed consumption. They put tariffs on the goods that they imported from overseas under the theory that if you had enough money to spend on a silver tea set from England, you had enough money to participate in funding your Federal Government.

That all changed in the early part of the 20th century, and we have an opportunity to change it back, H.R. 25, the Fair Tax—the single most largely co-sponsored tax bill in either the House or the Senate, more cosponsors on that bill than any other piece of fundamental tax legislation. We need more help. Today, we have 59 cosponsors of that legislation, and we need more help to make the Fair Tax a reality.

We'll have, over the next 15 days, those opportunities. You can visit our Web page at Woodall.house.gov. You can visit the Fair Tax folks' Web page at fairtax.org. Come and see what the Fair Tax offers in terms of opportunity.

The current Tax Code brings power to this city. Whether you sit on the left or whether you sit on the right, something happens when you get to Washington and you suddenly believe you're the smartest person in the room, and you begin to find ways to manipulate people's behavior in hopes that you can make them happy too.

□ 2120

Well, I could create a world my father would love and my mother would hate.

We're not in the business of making people happy. We're in the business of ensuring opportunity. We can absolutely ensure that everyone in this country is poor. We cannot ensure that everyone is rich. We can only provide opportunity. The Fair Tax provides that opportunity by completely removing the impediments that are there to growth today.

Eighty percent of American families pay more in payroll taxes than income taxes. As you fill out your tax forms headed towards April 15, I want you to look at that income tax figure. And if you're self-employed, you'll see the self-employment tax figure there beside it. Eighty percent of American families never get touched by a tax bill that we do here.

As we move the Fair Tax forward, we're going to change that, and we're going to make America an opportunity society once again.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'm grateful to you for indulging me this evening to talk a little bit about a passion that's near and dear to my heart.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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 9 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2326

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky) at 11 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BACA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today through April 6 on account of surgery.

Mrs. BLACK (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of being unavoidably detained due to inclement weather, specifically high winds and tornadoes in middle Tennessee en route to the Capitol Building.

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of other congressional business.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 5, 2011, 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:

1002. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Potassium benzoate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0117; FRL-8863-2] received March 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1003. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Peroxyacetic Acid; Amendment to an Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0021; FRL-8865-3] received March 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1004. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fomesafen; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0122; FRL-8858-5] received March 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1005. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on assistance provided by the Department of Defense to civilian sporting events in support of essential security and safety, covering the period of calendar year 2010, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2564(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1006. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 3 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1007. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Thomas G. Miller, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1008. A letter from the Chairman, Congressional Oversight Panel, transmitting the Panel's monthly report pursuant to Section 125(b)(1) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, Pub. L. 110-343; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1009. A letter from the Executive Director, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2010 Annual Report; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1010. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of 5-Methoxy-N,N-Dimethyltryptamine into Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act [Docket No.: DEA-331F] received February 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1011. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Updating Cross-References for the Oklahoma State Implementation Plan [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0517; FRL-9275-7] received March 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1012. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Texas: Final Authorization of State-initiated Changes and Incorporation by Reference of State Hazardous Waste Management Program [EPA-R06-RCRA-2010-0587; FRL-9274-4] received March 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1013. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Tennessee; Redesignation of the Knoxville 1997 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2010-0666-201052; FRL-9277-1] received March 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1014. 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; Indiana; Kentucky; Louisville Nonattainment Area; Determination of Attainment of the 1997 Annual Fine Particle Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0210; FRL-9277-2] received March 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1015. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines [EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0708; FRL-9277-3] (RIN: 2060-AQ78) received March 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1016. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: New Substitute in the Motor Vehicle Air Conditioning Sector under the Significant New Alternatives Policy (SNAP) Program [EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0664; FRL-9275-8] (RIN: 2060-AP11) received March 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1017. A letter from the Policy Adv./Chief, Wireless Telecom. Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Review of Part 87 of the Commission's Rules Concerning the Aviation Radio Service [WT Docket No.: 01-289] received February 22, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1018. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Enfield, New Hampshire; Hartford and White River Junction, Vermont; and Keeseville and Morrisonville, New York) [MB Docket No. 05-162] received February 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1019. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Implementation of Section 304 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Commercial Availability of Navigation Devices, Compatibility Between Cable Systems and Consumer Electronics Equipment [CS Docket No.: 97-80] [PP Docket No.: 00-67] [File Nos. EB-07-SE-351, EB-07-SE-352] received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1020. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 11-06, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1021. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-140, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1022. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination to waive for a period of six months the restrictions of Section 1003 of Public Law 100-204; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1023. A letter from the Chairman, International Fund for Ireland, transmitting the Fund's Annual Report and Accounts covering the period 1 October 2009 to 30 September 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1024. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's annual report for fiscal year 2010, in accordance with Section 203(a) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1025. 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 Vessels Harvesting Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket

No.: 0910131362-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XA187) received February 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1026. A letter from the 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-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; Closure of the 2010-2011 Recreational Sector for Black Sea Bass in the South Atlantic [Docket No.: 0907271173-0629-03] (RIN: 0648-XA154) received February 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1027. 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; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No.: 0910131363-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XA151) received February 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1028. 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; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XA195) received February 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1029. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Guided Sport Charter Vessel Fishery for Halibut; Recordkeeping and Reporting [Docket No.: 0911201413-1051-02] (RIN: 0648-AY38) received February 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1030. 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; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XA199) received February 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1031. A letter from the Delegated the Authority of the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Montana Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1032. A letter from the Delegated the Authority of the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the North Dakota Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1033. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's quarterly report from the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. HALL: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 970. A bill to reauthorize the civil aviation research and development projects and activities of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112–52). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. A resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to regulating the Internet and broadband industry practices (Rept. 112–53). 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. OLSON (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 1341. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the Environmental Protection Agency to include in any notice of rule making a statement regarding the impact of the rule on jobs loss or creation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mrs. NOEM):

H.R. 1342. A bill to reauthorize the impact aid program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 1343. A bill to return unused or reclaimed funds made available for broadband awards in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 to the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. BRALEY of Iowa (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 1344. A bill to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1345. A bill to rescind any unobligated discretionary appropriations returned to the Federal Government by a State or locality and require that such funds be retained in the general fund of the Treasury for deficit reduction; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1346. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to make oil-producing and exporting cartels illegal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1347. A bill to combat international oil price fixing and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a credit against income tax of at least $1,000 to offset high 2011 gasoline and diesel fuel prices; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 1348. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend public safety officers' death benefits to fire police officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 1349. A bill to establish an advisory committee to issue nonbinding government-wide guidelines on making public information available on the Internet, to require publicly available Government information held by the executive branch to be made available on the Internet, to express the sense of Congress that publicly available information held by the legislative and judicial branches should be available on the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Ms. WATERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1350. A bill to provide additional resources for Federal investigations and prosecutions of crimes related to the 2008 Financial Crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 1351. A bill to amend the provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to the methodology for calculating the amount of any Postal surplus or supplemental liability under the Civil Service Retirement System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 1352. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from issuing any new lease that authorizes the production of oil or natural gas under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to a person that does not renegotiate existing leases held by the person to incorporate limitations on royalty relief based on market price that are equal to or less than price thresholds that apply to other leases under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 1353. A bill to reinstate and transfer certain hydroelectric licenses and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. JONES, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1354. A bill to amend titles 10 and 41, United States Code, to allow contracting officers to consider information regarding domestic employment before awarding a Federal contract, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. CANSECO):

H.R. 1355. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to move the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection into the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. GARDNER):

H.R. 1356. A bill to provide amortization authority in certain situations, for purposes of capital calculation under the Financial Institutions Examination Council's Consolidated Reports of Condition and Income; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GONZÁLEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 1357. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to change the rules relating to enrollment of residents of Puerto Rico under part B of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 1358. A bill to rescind certain Federal funds identified by States as unwanted and use the funds to reduce the Federal debt; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RIVERA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 1359. A bill to amend section 105 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to temporarily increase the limit on the portion of community development block grants amounts for certain entitlement communities that may be used for public services; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1360. A bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a permanent background check system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WATERS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1361. A bill to provide for restroom gender parity in Federal buildings; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. YODER:

H.R. 1362. A bill to ensure that members of the Armed Forces continue to receive their pay and allowances despite a shutdown of the Federal Government and in the event that the debt of the United States Government reaches the statutory limit; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 1363. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. CANTOR (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H. Res. 201. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May as Ehlers-Danlos Syndrome Awareness Month to increase the knowledge of this little-known, potentially fatal, genetic disease; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1341.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof. (Necessary and Proper Regulations to Effectuate Powers)

By Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 1342.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 1343.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution (''The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes'').

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 1344.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1345.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to the Tenth Amendment: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1346.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1347.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 1348.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 1349.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The legislature power vested in Congress by Article I of the Constitution to conduct oversight of executive agencies, and the ''Necessary and Proper'' clause found in Article I, section 8, cl.18.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1350.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article. I. Section. 8.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 1351.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1352.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article IV, Section 3, which provides that Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 1353.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 1354.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The enumerated powers in Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 1355.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among

the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 1356.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 1357.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 1358.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .''

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 1359.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I—The Legislative Branch.

Section 1: The Legislature:

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 8:

Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Clause 18. The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 1360.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: The Child Protection Improvements Act of 2011 is constitutionally authorized under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. The Necessary and Proper Clause supports the expansion of congressional authority beyond the explicit authorities that are directly discernible from the text. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 1361.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This Bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, known as the ''General Welfare Clause.'' This provision grants Congress the broad power ''to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''[1]

[1] Please note, pursuant to Article I, section 8, Congress has the power ''to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. YODER:

H.R. 1362.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 1 & 12 of the United States Constitution, Which grants Congress the power to provide for the common defense; to raise and support an Army and

Article I, section 9, Clause 7 of the United State Constitution, Which states that ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law''

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 1363.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 23: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 25: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 56: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 58: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BROOKS, and Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 59: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 114: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. REED.
H.R. 122: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 178: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 258: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 324: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 361: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 365: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 369: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 412: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 420: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 422: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 452: Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 456: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 563: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 576: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 640: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 719: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 721: Mr. KELLY.
H.R. 745: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 747: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 750: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 763: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 776: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 780: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 782: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 805: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 809: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 812: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. SHULER.
H.R. 816: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 822: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. REED.
H.R. 860: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 862: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 865: Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 878: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 912: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 942: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 965: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 984: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. YODER, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 998: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 1023: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1025: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1041: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HECK, Mr. JONES, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1058: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1081: Mr. WEST, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 1093: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GARRETT, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 1112: Mr. CARTER and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 1144: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1199: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1206: Mr. DOLD, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1219: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 1228: Mr. SCALISE and Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 1234: Mr. BOREN, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 1252: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 1254: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1259: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 1266: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 1281: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 1291: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 1297: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REICHERT, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. WEBSTER, and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 1302: Mr. WELCH.
H.J. Res. 46: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H. Res. 25: Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H. Res. 85: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H. Res. 137: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. ANDREWS.
H. Res. 142: Mr. DOLD.
H. Res. 166: Mr. ELLISON.
H. Res. 172: Mr. GRIMM.
H. Res. 176: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 177: Mr. COBLE.

H. Res. 185: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 198: Mr. HOYER, Mr. WELCH, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.R. 1363, the Department of Defense and Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 rule XXI.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1323: Mr. MCKEON.