

forth in a protracted conflict between Israel and Palestine. There is never justification for attacks on innocent civilians, and we must demand that the anti-Israel sentiment that pervades Palestine be addressed.

The Israelis remain committed to the peace process, and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has done his part in making concessions that pave the way for substantive talks. This has been met by a refusal by the Palestinians to even recognize Israel's right to exist.

Every sovereign nation has a duty and right to defend its citizens. As a result, the United States must continue to support Israel's right to self-defense. Congress must ensure that the administration does not call on Israel to make concessions that endanger its security without demanding similar changes from the Palestinians. Congress must make clear its support for Israel's right to defend its citizens and demand the United Nations enforce a ban on Iranian exports of sophisticated weapons to Hamas and other terrorist groups.

SIDNEY HARMAN

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this week, Sidney Harman—a good friend to me and to so many—died at the age of 92. Sidney was the husband of my friend, Congresswoman Jane Harman; he lived a full, rich life, and he will be deeply missed. Sidney was a pioneering entrepreneur in the field of hi-fi stereo systems—but after his business success, he went on to make outstanding contributions to our country's civic life for decades. He was a strong advocate of civil rights who pitched in as a public school teacher; he was Under Secretary of Commerce under President Carter; he was a dynamic philanthropist who made his mark as a patron of education, the arts, and journalism. His many accomplishments, and the admiration of so many who knew him, are certain to long outlive him. But in the wake of his loss, my sincere condolences are with his wife, Congresswoman Harman, his children; and all those who mourn his passing.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON
THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR
2012

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021:

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, as we debate the House budget resolution today, I ask my colleagues: are you here to make a point, or are you here to make a difference?

We have reached a tipping point in our country's financial future. Our nation is pushed

to the edge of a fiscal cliff. We are over \$14 trillion in debt. CBO projects that the President's budget request will cause net interest payments to skyrocket over the next 10 years—from \$260 billion in 2012 to \$931 billion in 2021. If we continue on our current path, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and interest payments to service the debt will consume all government revenues within 14 years. We're borrowing 41 cents on every dollar. And we're borrowing from nations such as China and Saudi Arabia that do not share our values or national priorities. Moody's has warned that our coveted AAA bond rating could be at risk in as little as a year. We've seen what a downgrade can do to foreign economies, and we must not let that happen here.

Seeing the signs about our nation's financial future, I introduced legislation almost five years ago—during the last Republican House majority—to create an independent bipartisan commission to address unsustainable federal spending, putting everything on the table for discussion—entitlements, all other spending programs and tax policy—and like the Department of Defense's Base Realignment and Closure Commission process, Congress would be required to vote up or down on the commission's recommendations. An iteration of this legislation became the blueprint for President's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, or the Bowles-Simpson Commission.

The President appointed the Bowles-Simpson Commission. He established their working parameters in a manner that, quite frankly, I believed was designed to doom it to failure. Despite this, the report released last December by the commission was supported by a bipartisan majority of the commission's 18 members. It makes clear that addressing the debt and the deficit isn't just a simple exercise in rooting out waste, fraud and abuse, eliminating earmarks, and reining in discretionary spending. Those, to be sure, are important reforms, but alone don't come close to solving the debt and the deficit crisis. Reform must begin with entitlements and other mandatory spending and must also include all other sacred cows, including tax reform and defense spending.

Until two days ago, the President barely acknowledged the work of his commission. He didn't help them assemble the necessary 14 votes to send their recommendations to Congress. Then, he walked away from his commission's recommendations, first by not expressing any views on their report, then silence during the State of the Union, and again silence in his FY 2012 budget request. On Wednesday, the President finally started to recognize the seriousness of this problem. His leadership is needed. But I was disappointed that he failed to offer specific solutions, and seemed more interested in staking out political positions than finding common ground. I hope his call for negotiations across the aisle to develop a legislative framework are successful, but this seems like yet another instance where the President is sidestepping the recommendations of his own fiscal commission.

I believe that the Bowles-Simpson proposal offers the way forward for the most comprehensive and realistic solution to our nation's fiscal problems. I have repeatedly said that, while there are some changes I would make in the plan, if a version of the Bowles-

Simpson plan were given a vote on the House floor, I would vote for it. But we don't have that choice in the House.

My friend JIM COOPER, whom I have partnered with over the past four years to offer a bipartisan way forward to address the nation's financial crisis, initially planned to offer the principals of the Bowles-Simpson proposal as a substitute amendment to be considered today. Recognizing that the President's recent speech has inflamed partisan passions, he withdrew the amendment so as not to undercut efforts underway in the Senate by the so-called Gang of Six. Had the Cooper substitute been offered, I would have voted for it, even though I did not agree with every part of it, such as the reconciliation instructions Mr. COOPER had for the committee of jurisdiction over the federal workforce. I would have voted yes to indicate my continued support for the principals of the Bowles-Simpson commission. Mr. COOPER has engaged in the kind of bipartisan cooperation that we must have, the kind of forthright, realistic conversation about our nation's fiscal future in which we must engage across the aisle, across the Capitol and down Pennsylvania Avenue if we are to have any hope of coming up with a credible plan to protect the future of our children and grandchildren.

I see the Ryan proposal as an honest attempt to provide a blueprint to continue the conversation on our country's financial future and move forward so that a conference with the Senate can produce a budget plan that ensures our national security and protects the programs on which so many Americans rely. The Ryan bill may not pass the Senate, but I commend the chairman of the House Budget Committee for his courage in putting forth a bold proposal to address our nation's skyrocketing and unfunded financial obligations. While his focus is not the "everything on the table" approach I prefer, I believe Mr. RYAN could provide an opening to force both chambers and the President to deal with entitlement spending that is consuming the federal budget. He deserves credit for taking on an issue so many in Congress would rather continue to kick down the road.

It's easy to stand in the well of the House and criticize any legislation. As I look at Chairman RYAN's measure, I don't agree with every provision. I believe there are some critical issues that are missing and things that must be changed, and there are several things that I do not support and will not support if authorizing legislation is offered to implement his budget blueprint.

As I have stated, I believe everything must be on the table for discussion, starting with all entitlement spending, discretionary program spending, and tax policy. But we have reached the moment of truth for the kind of country we will leave to our children and grandchildren. Therefore, I will vote for the Ryan budget so that we can continue to move this process forward and continue the discussion.

This proposal would put our nation on course to reduce all of the publicly held debt by 2060, a feat not reached since Andrew Jackson's presidency. Relative to the President's proposal, it cuts \$6.2 trillion. Under this plan, within four years, we would reach primary balance on our debt, which the President's proposal never attains.

Reaching primary balance, which is when revenue is greater than spending less interest

payments, is an important milestone that reduces a grave national security threat. This budget blueprint calls for significant reductions in discretionary spending, for reduced tax rates, and for repeal of the health care reform law. Significantly, Mr. RYAN's plan says we can no longer ignore the trillions of dollars in unfunded liabilities that consume our budget. There may be disagreement on the significant changes in Medicare and Medicaid entitlement programs that he proposes, and while his plan is silent on changes needed to reform Social Security entitlements, it does recognize that need. Mr. RYAN has pulled the curtain back on the mandatory spending elephant in the room that we can no longer ignore.

As I have stated, I will vote for the Ryan budget so that we can move forward to fulfill our responsibility to come up with a budget for this fiscal year. We must avoid the recent fiasco we endured which brought us to the brink of a government shutdown because of the failure by the majority in the last Congress to produce a budget.

That being said, I believe the Ryan budget comes up short in a number of areas. I will mention just a few.

First, it misses an opportunity by not fully addressing the Social Security program's growing deficit. For the first time this year, with the Baby Boom generation starting to retire, more is being paid out in benefits than is coming in. I always ask students whether or not they expect to receive Social Security benefits upon retirement. Three years ago, one or two students would answer in the affirmative. Now, no one does. In calling for Social Security to be on the table, my sole motivation is to protect all those in or near retirement and to ensure that the Social Security program remains strong for future generations. The Ryan budget is lacking here.

Second, the Ryan plan, I believe, unfairly targets the federal workforce. I believe that federal employees know that spending must be reduced to ensure that our country's financial future remains strong, and I believe that public servants would be the first in line to make the sacrifices needed. But the massive budget situation we face, I believe, calls for shared sacrifice that does not single out any one area of the federal budget.

I regret that the Ryan proposal seeks to make government service an unattractive career choice by freezing pay levels, which the President has already frozen for two years, for an additional three years; by imposing drastic hiring restrictions, and by changing retirement plans. Unlike their counterparts in state government, federal employees pay Social Security taxes and contribute to their pensions. The Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund is not facing insolvency.

Federal employees are on the front lines working to ensure that our government is running as efficiently and effectively as possible to provide the services taxpayers expect. We must be careful in budget plans that we first do no harm in our vital efforts to attract, recruit and retain the best and brightest for public service. Day in and day out, federal employees make our nation a safer and better place.

The FBI agent working to find a kidnapped child, the DEA agent keeping drugs out of schools, the DOJ attorney prosecuting a child molester, other law enforcement and intelligence agents risking their lives every day on the front lines side by side with our armed

forces in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other fronts in the Global War on Terror—all are federal employees. The first American killed in Afghanistan, Mike Spann, was a CIA agent and a constituent from my congressional district. Imagine how a CIA employee or an FBI agent working side by side in Afghanistan with the U.S. military would feel knowing that his or her pay would be frozen for five years. A year ago January, I attended funerals for some of the seven CIA agents who were killed by a Taliban suicide bomber at Forward Operative Base Chapman near the Afghanistan-Pakistan border. The Washington Post has reported on "the post 9/11 brain drain at the CIA."

The Border Patrol agent shot and killed in Arizona this past December who was working to stop the flow of illegal immigrants across our southern border, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agent who was killed and the two who were shot this past February outside of Mexico City, doctors who tend to our veterans and wounded warriors in veterans hospitals and who are developing new prosthetic devices to help them recover, medical researchers at NIH working to develop cures for cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's, and autism—all are dedicated federal employees who I'm sure could find more lucrative jobs in the private sector, but who are committed to public service. Dr. Francis Collins, the physician who mapped the human genome and serves as director of the National Institutes of Health, is a federal employee. The National Weather Service meteorologist who tracks hurricanes, the SBA staffer who helps a new business start up, the FDA inspector working to stop a salmonella outbreak—all are federal employees. As we consider ways to find budget savings, it is important to remember the jobs federal employees perform.

The third area in which I believe the Ryan budget could be improved is providing for the needs of the most vulnerable in our society. As the Congress deals with the budget, we must always do it in a way that does not neglect the needs of the poor. Scripture (Proverbs 19:17) tells us, "He who is kind to the poor lends to the Lord." And in the New Testament Jesus talks a lot about the poor. In Matthew 25 he says that if we ignore the poor and hungry it is the same as ignoring him.

Are we giving false hope to the neediest of our society by refusing to acknowledge that society's safety nets have such gaping holes in their finances that they will collapse within 20 years? We must carefully consider proposals that impact the most vulnerable. The budget before us assumes that program cuts can be absorbed by projecting that unemployment levels will drop to an unheard of 2.8 percent in 10 years. This would be the lowest levels since 1953. I believe this is unrealistic when considering the unemployment rate has historically been 5 percent.

The fourth area of concern with the Ryan budget is its lack of a reform plan to make the tax code fairer and simpler. This budget takes some steps forward, but it could be improved by forcefully calling for a closer examination of tax expenditures, as was detailed by the Bowles-Simpson Commission.

Our colleagues across the Capitol may have the comprehensive Bowles-Simpson plan as a budget choice, and I applaud the efforts of six senators who are working across the aisle to translate this proposal into legislative text. I wholeheartedly support the work of SAXBY

CHAMBLISS, Republican of Georgia; MARK WARNER, Democrat of Virginia; MIKE CRAPO, Republican of Idaho; RICHARD DURBIN, Democrat of Illinois; TOM COBURN, Republican of Oklahoma, and KENT CONRAD, Democrat of North Dakota.

It is disappointing that some have attacked these senators for daring to engage in a discussion putting everything on the table. Regrettably, this seems to be a tried and true technique whenever an attempt to reform the tax code is made.

Senator TOM COBURN is an honest, ethical, decent, member of Congress with whom I served when he was in the House. One of our nation's leading conservative budget hawks, who may have as good, if not a better record than most members of the House and Senate on tax policy, he is currently leading an effort to eliminate one of the more recognizable tax expenditures, the credit given to the producers of ethanol. This is a tax credit that many, such as the editorial board of the Wall Street Journal, think should be eliminated. Ethanol, through tax credits, tariffs, and friendly regulations, is one of the most subsidized industries in the United States. The government has created a perverse policy in which farmers are incentivized to grow corn to produce a "dirty fuel." Food prices rise because this domestic crop does not enter our food supply.

Yet Americans for Tax Reform, led by Grover Norquist, has been engaging in bullying tactics designed to stop Senator COBURN's effort and exert undue influence on this process. This is the same Grover Norquist who, according to Senate Report 109-325, "Gimmie Five—An Investigation of Tribal Lobbying Matters, allowed disgraced and convicted lobbyist Jack Abramoff to use ATR as a conduit to finance grassroots lobbying campaigns. When this occurred, ATR kept a cut for itself. Watch the documentary Casino Jack It's all there.

We will never be able to reform the tax code if any attempt to eliminate a tax expenditure—spending through the tax code—is equated to a tax increase. Senator COBURN has called out ATR and Mr. Norquist, pointing out that by this logic, "reducing provisions in the code such as the Earned Income Tax Credit would constitute a violation of your pledge [to oppose tax increases] unless it was 'offset' by another so-called 'tax cut,' such as an expansion of the ethanol subsidy. That is hardly sound conservative economics."

On March 24, the New York Times reported that General Electric, which posted a profit of \$14.2 billion, of which \$5.1 billion came from operations within the United States, did not pay any taxes to the federal government. Not only did they owe nothing to the federal government, they claimed a tax benefit of \$3.2 billion. Many provisions used by their accountants were initially designed as short-term tax breaks to spur economic growth. But as frequently happens, such as with the ethanol subsidy, once a tax cut is enacted, it is nearly impossible to eliminate. If this is not an example of the need to fully reexamine our tax code, I don't know what is. That's why everything in our budget discussion must be on the table.

There is never a convenient time to make hard decisions, but the longer we put off fixing the problem, the worse the medicine will be and greater the number of Americans will be hurt.

America is living on borrowed dollars and borrowed time. As a nation we are moving

closer and closer to the edge of the financial cliff. A few steps forward and we will start a free fall into a canyon of debt which could be the economic death of America as we know it.

Is that what we want for our children and grandchildren?

Have we lost the national will to make tough decisions that may require sacrifice?

Have we lost the political courage to reject the partisan and special interest demands and do what is right for our country?

This is an American issue; not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue. I will continue to work to try to achieve balance in our budget plan. Our goal must be a bipartisan document that can pass the House and the Senate. Is the Ryan plan perfect? No. But it at least recognizes the road that we must take. How we get there is the conversation we must continue to have because the financial future for our children and grandchildren is at stake.

I urge my colleagues to heed the wisdom of the father of our country at his farewell address in 1796. President George Washington admonished his fellow countrymen: "We should avoid ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden of which we ourselves ought to bear."

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF JENNIFER GUZOWSKI ON HER OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young woman from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Jennifer Guzowski of Tiffin, Ohio has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York.

Jennifer brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2015. While attending Tiffin Columbian High School in Tiffin, Ohio, Jennifer earned academic letters and attained a grade point average that placed her in the top fifteen percent of her graduating class. Jennifer was also inducted into the National Honor Society, was a student representative on the school board and held various leadership positions in the school band.

Throughout high school, Jennifer was a member of the junior varsity and varsity soccer teams, displaying her leadership skills as captain of the junior varsity soccer team. She was also awarded a varsity letter for soccer during her senior year and was the recipient of two Golden Shoe Awards. I am confident that Jennifer will carry the lessons of her student and athletic leadership to West Point.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Jennifer Guzowski on the acceptance of her appointment to the United States Military Academy in West Point where she will gain a world-class education and invaluable leadership experience. I am positive that Jennifer will excel during her career in West Point, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to her as she begins her service to the nation.

HONORING COLONEL JACK POTTER

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a loyal friend, a brave hero, and a caring individual who recently turned 92 years young. Retired Colonel Jack Potter of San Rafael California, was born March 20, 1919, served in the Army from World War II through 1974, and has consistently worked for the benefit of veterans since his retirement.

It has been my privilege to work closely with Col. Potter for 18 years. His friendship and assistance have been invaluable to me over those years. Through Jack, I learned about veterans' issues, from the importance of national legislation to ensure they get the benefits they deserve to some of the challenges faced by local vets in Marin County. On Memorial Day, 2008, we authored a column together in the local newspaper calling for better benefits and health treatment for our veterans.

Jack was drafted into the Army in 1941. He was commissioned as an Infantry 2nd Lt. after Pearl Harbor and commanded an Infantry Rifle company seeing combat in the South Pacific. He remained in the Army after the war, serving in Europe, Korea, and South America, as well as in many positions stateside. He also attended The Industrial College of the Armed Forces and earned an MBA at George Washington University.

During the Vietnam conflict, Jack was assigned as the Commander of the Vietnam Region Exchange which operated more than 150 exchange activities with a total of more than 10,000 personnel. He continued his service stateside, in California, where his assignment as Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics for the Sixth U.S. Army brought him to the Presidio in the Bay Area. He retired on August 1, 1974, after serving 33 years, 4 months, and 15 days on active duty. On the date of his retirement ceremonies, Jack was testifying in Nebraska in the federal trial of the American Indian Movement. At 12:01 a.m. on August 2, the U.S. Attorney General purchased Jack's first drink as a civilian.

After 31 changes of station, Jack and his wife now live in Marin County, California where Jack became active in veteran's affairs. Serving in various positions in the Military Officers Association of America, and the Marin County United Veterans Council, Jack has been a whirlwind for veterans' causes—he advocated personally for a number of vets who needed help, organized Veterans and Memorial Day events and a Tricare information session with me, and still found time to regularly bring doughnuts to my office staff.

One of Jack's most prominent roles was that of Master of Ceremonies at Marin County's Memorial Day celebrations. He last served that function in 2009, before retiring for health reasons. At that emotional event, 500 people honored Army Spc. Jake Vellozo who had recently been killed in Iraq. Jake's name was added to a veteran's monument that had been built at Jack's urging. And Jack was thrilled to learn that recently the House of Representatives passed my bill to name the local post office in Inverness after Jake Vellozo.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege to work with and work for Col. Jack Potter. His quiet

determination on behalf of all veterans is a reminder of the daily heroism and sacrifice of all our troops. Thank you, Jack, for all your efforts.

NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS WEEK

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Crime Victims' Rights Week.

And the month of April is Sexual Assault Awareness Month.

These two occasions remind us of the importance of educating our fellow citizens about how we can help victims of this terrible crime and how we can stop sexual assault before it happens.

According to the National Institute for Justice and the CDC, every two minutes someone in the United States is sexually assaulted.

And one out of every six women has been the victim of an attempted or completed rape in her lifetime.

As both a prosecutor and a judge back in Texas, I dealt with rape cases for 30 years.

I learned firsthand the devastation sexual assault victims experience.

Sexual Assault does not just physically harm the victim but is an assault on their entire being.

We need to promote justice for sexual assault victims here in Congress and throughout this great nation because justice is what we do in America.

JUSTICE FOR SERGEI MAGNITSKY
ACT

HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on November 16, 2009—almost a year and a half ago now—Sergei Magnitsky died in a Russian detention center. While deaths in detention centers do occur all over the world, and the United States is no exception, what sets Mr. Magnitsky's case apart from many of the others are two remarkable facts.

The first remarkable fact is that Mr. Magnitsky was imprisoned not because he had committed a crime, but because he reported one—he just reported it to the wrong people, the very Russian government officials who had orchestrated a massive tax fraud scheme, and continued to report them increasingly louder the more he was threatened by Russian officials to keep quiet.

The second remarkable fact is that with all the necessary medical intervention, his death most likely could have been prevented—but this medical intervention was purposely withheld as punishment. These two facts make Sergei Magnitsky an emblematic victim of much larger human rights problems in the Russian Federation, the utter corruption and the complete lack of the rule of law in that country. This is what makes the Justice for Sergei Magnitsky Act not just an urgent intervention and attempt to establish accountability