United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 12, 2011 No. 65

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 12, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM GRAVES 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 11:50 a.m.

THE COLOMBIA TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. This Congress is entering its fifth month without bringing a single jobs bill to the House floor, and there are no jobs bills in sight. But we do hear calls for a series of trade agreements, including ones with Colombia and Korea.

At a time when millions of Americans are still looking for work, the House will be spending time protecting corporate investments in foreign countries and not jobs here at home. At a time when multinational corporations have fired 2.9 million American workers, they will be hiring 2.4 million workers overseas. The House will be spending time shoring up corporate overseas investments rather than encouraging investments here at home. And at a time when so many in the Middle East are rising up for democracy and human rights and are receiving support from the United States for those efforts, the House is taking up trade agreements with Colombia that fails to live up to those very values.

One of our most important responsibilities as elected officials is to promote and to protect American jobs. We do this by trying to ensure that American workers do not face unfair competition with countries that keep wages low by repressing essential democratic rights. These are important rights, the right to speak out, the right to protest, the right to organize unions, the right to bargain collectively and directly with their employers, and to support political efforts to improve their economic conditions without reprisals.

But reprisals are what you get in China. Thousands of strikes last year were met not by their employers but by the police and the army, beating up on the workers who were seeking better wages and better working conditions in plants all across China.

What do you get when you protest your rights in Colombia? You get assassinations. You get death squads against union members, union leaders, members of union families all across the country. The American worker can compete; but you can't compete against the Colombian Army, the Colombian death squads, the Chinese Army. That's not fair competition. But that's what's protected in these trade agreements.

Tragically, Colombia stands out as a country where wages are kept low and workers are repressed through widespread violence and other human rights violations. Colombia has earned the reputation as the most dangerous country on Earth for workers trying to build a better life. During the last Colombian President's 8 years in office, 570 union members were assassinated—149 in the last 3 years—and the violence hasn't stopped with the election of the new President.

Reports of assassinations against union members and leaders keep coming. The two most recent ones include the April 8 assassination of Ramiro Sanchez. He was shot repeatedly as he left a union meeting. Mr. Sanchez had received death threats after organizing workers to demand local hiring at an oil company. And the March 30 assassination of Hector Orozco, who was an official with the peasant farmers' union. He and his colleague Gildardo Garcia were found murdered. Days earlier, Mr. Orozco reported that he and other peasants were threatened by an army officer.

On top of the violence is the problem of impunity. Authorities have only investigated a quarter of the union killings since 1986. No one has been held accountable for 98 percent of the crimes against unionists. The violence and impunity came together in another recent case. A few weeks ago, Judge Gloria Gaono was shot in the head in broad daylight. At the time, she was presiding over a politically sensitive case of a military officer accused of murdering three children, one of whom he apparently admitted to raping.

Now Colombia has a new President who says he wants to turn the page on Colombia's past. But these murders and human rights violations are not the past. They are happening today. Before we consider any agreement with Colombia on free trade, real changes must come to Colombia. That is why I

Printed on recycled paper.

have joined with colleagues to lay out a series of benchmarks that should be met by Colombia before the Obama administration sends Congress any trade agreement with that country. These benchmarks are designed to reduce the violence, to protect human rights, and to end the impunity of the death squads and the army, and the actions they take against these families. They require on-the-ground results and verification.

The administration, however, has adopted an action plan for Colombia that does not demand the results on the ground. I appreciate that U.S. and Colombia finally are bringing labor rights into the equation, but their plan only demands results on paper. Under their plan, nothing really needs to actually change in Colombia. Colombia could have a record year of assassinations and still meet the requirements of the plan. Indeed, before the action plan has been fully implemented, the administration is already preparing the way with Congress to implement this trade agreement. If this action plan were made fully enforceable under the agreement and into the future, we could have something more than just results on paper. Unless it is enforceable, this is less than a serious commitment. It is not fair to Colombians, and it's not fair to the American workers, and it's not fair to our national values and does not reflect our national values.

The American worker can compete with any worker in the world. They're rated time and again the most productive workers in the world. But they cannot compete against currency manipulation in China. They cannot compete against the Chinese Army that breaks up the rights of workers to protest, and they cannot compete against the death squads that have been assigned to assassinate union members, union leaders, and union families.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD: PUTTING POLITICS BEFORE THE NEEDS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the recent unprecedented action by the National Labor Relations Board is simply the latest example of this administration putting politics before the needs of the American people. I honestly never thought I would see the day when our government sued a company over creating jobs in South Carolina or anywhere in the United States. The NLRB's position violates States' 10th Amendment liberties and attempts to roll back worker protections for the purpose of satisfying special interests and union bosses.

The NLRB was created to protect workers' rights, but now the worker is left out of the equation in favor of big unions. I ask, what about the workers in South Carolina who lose out in this action? Where have their rights been considered in all of this nonsense? In fact, the National Labor Relations Act says in section 1 that the purpose of the NLRA is ''to promote the full flow of commerce, to prescribe the legitimate rights of both employees and employers in their relations affecting commerce, to provide orderly and peaceful procedures for preventing the interference by either with the legitimate rights of the other, to protect the rights of individual employees in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to define and proscribe practices on the part of labor and management which affect commerce and are inimical to the general welfare, and to protect the rights of the public in connection with labor disputes affecting commerce.''

The NLRB's ruling comes on the heels of previous threats by this radically out-of-touch panel to sue States like South Carolina for constitutionally protecting one of America's most universal freedoms, the right to a secret ballot. Fear that the Federal Government might take away that fundamental principle prompted voters in South Carolina, Arizona, South Dakota, and Utah to overwhelmingly support adding secret ballot protection to their State constitutions. If the NLRB hadn't already made a big enough mockery of individual freedom, they even refused to come to the negotiation table and talk about their concerns with States' attorneys general unless they were willing to first sign a nondisclosure agreement preventing them from sharing what was discussed during the meetings.

Demanding secret meetings, threats, and attacking the right to a secret ballot doesn't exactly create a good track record for the National Labor Relations Board. That's what prompted me to introduce House Resolution 1047, the State Right to Vote Act, which would stop the NLRB from suing States whose voters took a stand against union thuggery for secret elections. And if the NLRB doesn't change the course quickly, I know there will be many in this body, including myself, who will call for the panel's removal altogether.

But, Mr. Speaker, this latest outrage is a unique power grab. Against constitutional and Supreme Court precedents, the NLRB's actions are a clear attack on our State. Think about the context: This administration has spent our Nation into oblivion, doubling the national debt in 2 short years, running over businesses both large and small, mounting takeover after takeover, and reducing the size and scope of our economy in the process. South Carolina's unemployment rate finally dips below 10 percent, and what does this administration do? It sues one of the largest prospective employers in our State just as that company begins to hire workers, potentially costing South Carolina thousands of new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I may be new to Washington, but I promise you I was not born yesterday. Looking at the NLRB's policy and examining recent electoral maps, it's not difficult to see a policy that clearly rewards blue States while severely punishing red ones. Under the NLRB's interpretation of the law, a company with a union workforce anchored in a blue State could not expand or relocate to a red State.

□ 1010

Limiting where companies can conduct business sounds like something that would take place in China or the old Soviet Union, not here in the United States. Since when did America stop being the land of the free?

Let me give this message to anyone looking to start a company in America. Choose your location well. If this action by NLRB is upheld, trust me when I say that we won't be talking about companies making decisions over moving to a right-to-work state versus a union state. We will see decisions made in the context of locating in America or another country.

And what this outrageous action by the NLRB tells you is that you're stuck with very few options. Give into the union's demands, close up your shop, or take your production outside of the United States. The NLRB's actions say build your companies somewhere else, but not in America. So much for the American dream.

Mr. Speaker, this action by the NLRB is unconstitutional and illegal. I call on my colleagues in the Education and Workforce Committee to hold hearings into this bureaucratic atrocity. My South Carolina colleagues and I have introduced legislation to defund this latest lawsuit.

I ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to rescue the American dream and sign on to this legislation. I also ask the American people, pay attention to this problem. Our Founding Fathers would be appalled by this bureaucratic tyranny. It's time to hold our elected officials accountable. Do we want to just say that we're a free nation, or do we really want to be a free nation? Our freedom is under attack. It's time we take a stand.

May God continue to bless America.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF WILLIAM DONALD SCHAEFER

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the legacy of an extraordinary Marylander, Maryland Governor William Donald Schaefer. He died just a few weeks ago after a long time of public service.

William Donald Schaefer was one of the great American mayors. Few mayors can ever say that they transformed a city as thoroughly as did William Donald Schaefer transform Baltimore.

But over his 16-year tenure as mayor of Baltimore, he led a dramatic and

historic turnaround. In 1971, when his mayoralty started, Baltimore was a struggling city, a city plagued by population flight, crime, and decaying urban infrastructure. When so many had given up on Baltimore, Mayor Schaefer made it his mission to stand up to that decay. And we can still see his legacy today. It is a legacy that includes physical landmarks like Camden Yards, the National Aquarium, Baltimore's Harbor Place, and an outstanding light rail system, projects that he saw through to completion as both mayor and Governor of our state.

Just as importantly, Mayor Schaefer's legacy came in thousands of gestures that showed just how deeply he cared about the people he represented and how seriously he took his work: Personally addressing illegal dumping in alleys or broken equipment at parks, driving through the city at night on the lookout for everything from potholes to crime trouble spots, and even jumping into the aquarium's seal pool, complete with a rubber ducky, when the city failed to complete the aquarium on time.

My colleague from Oregon is shaking his head because we all know that famous picture.

Above all, his colorful, passionate, and dedicated leadership added up to the change, not just in Baltimore's appearance and infrastructure, but in the mindset of the words of the Baltimore Sun when they said he ''changed the way the city felt about itself.''

How important leaders are to make that happen in the minds of their people. We have an agenda, by the way, that is Make It In America, that is trying to change that psychology as well, that we're going to make it, we're going to succeed, we're going to expand.

William Donald Schaefer brought that same dedication to his two terms as Maryland Governor. His trademark, no-nonsense style—''do it now'' was his byword—was on display in Annapolis, where he pursued an agenda focused on job creation, strengthening Maryland's schools, which, by the way, now rank number one in the country, and protecting Maryland's natural heritage, including our beloved Chesapeake Bay.

After reaching the highest point in Maryland politics, many would have ridden off into the sunset. But not William Donald Schaefer. He couldn't get enough of the work he loved, and he ran for State Comptroller, and won twice. In his last job he was one of our State's most respected voices for fiscal responsibility.

Before he died, Governor Schaefer was asked how he'd like to be remembered, and he answered, ''There are two words: 'He cared.' People,'' he said, ''mock me and make fun of it. But it's the truth.''

And as someone who worked closely with William Donald Schaefer throughout his years as mayor and Governor and comptroller, I can say, without any hesitation or fear of contradiction, William Donald Schaefer cared. He was a man of the people. He listened, he acted.

It is the truth and it mattered because, at the time when so many wrote off our cities, caring took remarkable courage and strength.

A great architect, Mr. Speaker, was once laid to rest in a building he himself had designed. His tombstone read, and I quote, ''If you seek his monument, look around you.'' Those words apply just as well to William Donald Schaefer, and I hope that the people he served will bear him in mind whenever they enjoy the best of the city of Baltimore and the best of the State of Maryland.

Well done, our good and faithful servant.

HONORING JOHN SNIDER

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

Mr. WALDEN. For the past 12 years, John Snider of Medford, Oregon, has been my district director. He's decided to move on now to pursue other opportunities and other careers. But to me, he was more than just district director. He was my mentor, he was my partner, and always my friend.

John Snider is a terrific man, a great fan of the Oregon Ducks, and he served three Members of Congress in this district as district director, including my most recent predecessor, Robert F. Smith.

He was born and raised in Medford. His roots run deep in the Rogue Valley. He is a guy's guy. He is a terrific man.

My current district office actually sits adjacent to the former Snider Dairy, which his family had and which is now part of downtown Medford.

John and his wife, Candy, currently live in the Rogue Valley, and John's daughter, Robyn, lives up in Grants Pass.

John graduated from St. Mary's High School and was its student body president. He graduated from the University of Oregon, and is a rabid, to say the least, Oregon Ducks fan. And my wife and I had the opportunity to be with John and Candy at the championship game in Arizona earlier this year. And among the 10,000 or 20,000 people at the reception ahead of time, we actually bumped into each other there, as fate would have it, and had a wonderful evening.

John served our country as a member of the United States Coast Guard and as president of the Rotary Club of Medford, where his attendance always spiked when I was the speaker. He was always so busy, he never got to his own Rotary Club; so they always fined him extra heavily when I was there because then he was with me and they had their opportunity to get at him.

John was my eyes and ears throughout the Second District, which is 70,000 square miles of eastern, central, and southern Oregon. We, I think, have traveled in about every conveyance possible, from a wagon behind a tractor to jet engine aircraft, single engine aircraft, twin engine aircraft. We've traveled in those airplanes, small, chartered, with others on our staff who didn't fare as well as John and I. They turned a little green and white and had problems at times. John and I always sort of traveled through it.

We have driven in snow and rain and ice and sleet, and everything we hear about postal officials, from one end of the district to the other. We have flown, we have driven, we have hiked, we have walked, we have been on boats and airplanes, and you name it.

□ 1020

And always at my side, John Snider. When the water was cut off to the Klamath Basin 10 years ago, John was there with me at the bucket brigade, where we took water symbolically out of Lake Ewuana and passed it through 15,000 people into the A Canal, symbolizing this horrible thing that the government had done to the farmers. That deeply affected all of us in the Second District, and especially John and me; and his commitment to those farmers and ranchers continues today, as does mine.

When it came to saving the Medford Tanker Base so that firefighting aircraft could make their circle around the Rogue Valley quicker rather than being shoved out to another hour's flight away, John was there day and night working with Commissioner Walker and others to make sure we could preserve that firefighting base in Medford. And we did, and it's made an enormous difference in saving lives and property.

When President Bush came out to both Applegate and Redmond, John was there helping organize the events ahead of time. And any of you who have been involved in a Presidential visit to your district, you know it happens quickly and you basically go 24/7, and things get changed in the middle of the night and requests come and go: We need a band; no, we don't need a band. We need a garrison-sized flag; no, we don't. John was there making sure it all happened.

John has served as one of my most important advisers, and is passionate about issues related to water and timber, small business development, and the people. He is well-liked by everyone who has ever met or worked with John Snider. He was a true leader in our community and remains so today.

So today, I rise to take the time in the House to honor and recognize my longtime—only until he decided to move on—district director, John Snider, to wish him and his wife Candy and John's daughter Robyn the very best in the years ahead.

We look forward to continuing our friendship and to working together for the betterment of our great State of Oregon, and always to cheer on the Oregon Ducks.

HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share with the House a headline which was reported in yesterday's Connecticut media, which I believe is going to reverberate all across the country. It reads that, ''As Federal Health Reforms Take Effect, Aetna Proposes Rate Cuts.''

Now, for employers who have been seeing double-digit increases for the last decade, to see a headline that says health insurance premiums are going to be cut probably seems like it must be a typo or there must be some April Fool's headline joke. But the fact of the matter is, as that story indicates, because of the Federal health care reform law, the new premiums which are going to go into effect in September that Aetna is proposing have to be reduced anywhere from 5 percent to 19 percent. For policyholders, the savings with these new premium announcements will be up to $3,500 a year on policies that cost about $14,000 today.

Why is this happening? It is because the health care reform law contains a provision which says that insurers must demonstrate that up to 80 to 85 percent of premium dollars have to be spent on health care. It is called the medical loss ratio rule. And under existing premiums that Aetna is collecting these days, only 54 percent of premium dollars are presently being paid on health care.

Now, again, as someone who was a small employer before I came to Congress in 2007 and paid those double-digit increases year in and year out, what we are seeing now is the fact that there is transparency in terms of how premiums are being handled and that people are now understanding and, in fact, regulators are enforcing a rule which says that when you pay health insurance premiums, not all of it, but the bulk of it has to be spent on health care. And because of this medical loss ratio rule, we saw yesterday that Aetna is proposing to cut health insurance premiums for employers. And this is going to be replicated all across the country over the upcoming year as the Department of Health and Human Services is issuing these rules to State insurance departments for implementation.

Thank goodness for those employers who are now going to be seeing real rate relief that we did not repeal the health care reform law. Thank goodness for those employers who are getting small business tax credits back in the mail today for their IRS filings that they submitted this year that we did not repeal the health care reform law. Thank goodness for all the employers across America who are now participating in the early retiree health insurance reform program, which over half the Fortune 500 companies in America have signed up for as a way of moderating early retiree health insurance costs so that they can encourage employees 55 and up to take retirement, opening up opportunities for younger workers in this country, which we desperately need, looking at graduating classes that are facing daunting employment prospects.

The fact of the matter is the health care reform law in terms of small business tax credits, real rate cut relief, early retiree programs that help employment-based health benefits is now rippling through the system and providing help for thousands and thousands of employers all across this country.

We know now that the health care reform law is helping almost 1 million young Americans between the ages of 21 and 26 stay on their parents' health insurance plan.

I was with a student up at the University of Connecticut the other day. His sister was months away from graduating from NYU when she was diagnosed with a rare nerve disorder. And thank goodness for the health insurance reform law that she was able to stay on her parents' health care plan. Now she is receiving lifesaving treatments that are going to allow her to attend law school starting next year.

For seniors we are seeing the new Medicare provisions that will close the doughnut hole, that will provide preventive services like annual checkups, cancer screenings that are now covered 100 percent by the Medicare program as a direct result of the health care reform law. These benefits are now flowing through the system with a bill that was fiscally responsible and that CBO scored as a net saver to America's budget deficit.

Again, I want to make sure people see this headline that employer-based premiums are going down because of the health care reform law provisions that will protect employers and individuals who buy health insurance, so that their premium dollar is actually going to be spent on health care and not on excessive administrative costs and bonuses for people in the insurance industry.

Again, I come from Connecticut. We are proud of the insurance industry. My dad worked as an insurance company lawyer his whole lifetime and sent me to college because of that.

The fact of the matter is these rules are something that the insurance industry can coexist with, they can make a health profit, they can grow their business, but it will stabilize the market so that people are not going to be forced to abandon coverage for their workers and for themselves because of the skyrocketing double-digit increases that we have been experiencing as a Nation for far too long. We have relief in sight, and this headline verifies that.

Let's preserve these protections and make sure that our employers and individuals have access to affordable health care.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. FLORES. As many of you know, this week is National Police Week, a time to give special recognition to law enforcement officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty for the safety and protection of others. I come before you today to honor one of my constituents who did just that.

On April 23, 2011, Johnson County Deputy Sheriff Clifton Taylor was first to the scene of a reported domestic disturbance in Venus, Texas. An anonymous caller had reported a man was threatening people with a weapon. Upon arriving at the scene, Deputy Taylor, two other Johnson County deputies, and an officer from the Venus Police Department were informed that an armed man had fled to another building on the property. Deputy Taylor and the three other officers approached the building, but the gunman immediately opened fire.

Deputy Taylor was shot three times by the gunman and later died. He was 31 years old. His death marks the first time since 1971 that an officer in Johnson County died in the line of duty, and he is the 31st law enforcement officer to be killed by gunfire in the line of duty this year.

Deputy Taylor had been with the department a little more than 3 years. He was deeply committed to serving and protecting his community as a law enforcement officer and will always be remembered as one who placed honor and duty above his own personal interests and safety.

I am deeply humbled by his service and dedication as a Texas law enforcement officer to keeping others safe that he would lay down his life not only for his fellow officers but for the community that he took an oath to protect. His sacrifice exemplifies that set forth in John 15:13: Greater love has no one than this, than to lay down one's life for his friends.

□ 1030

MAKE IT IN AMERICA AND CREATE JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for one reason: to talk about creating jobs, jobs, jobs.

I have been a Member of Congress for 18 weeks, and I still have not seen any plan that would create jobs. My constituents are hurting. They need help, and I don't see any coming. They are losing their homes. They need jobs.

I did not come to Congress to ''drill, baby, drill.'' I did not come to Congress to hand out corporate tax breaks. And I did not come to Congress to end Medicare as we know it. I came to create jobs.

Graduations are happening all across the Nation, and I can't help but wonder, what sort of world will our graduates be entering? What will happen to the class of 2011?

Under the Republican budget plan, graduates are entering a world with job losses and stifled economic growth. Under the Republican legislative agenda, graduates are entering a world in which Big Oil is given a free pass, a free pass to ''drill, baby, drill'' with limited safety regulations and a free pass to drill with limited environmental safeguards.

Under the Republican-controlled House, new graduates are entering into a world in which their elected officials waste time and energy trying to repeal meaningful health care reform. Health care reform is creating jobs for the class of 2011. Thousands of students will be trained in the health care field. Don't repeal their jobs in health care. Leave ObamaCare alone. Leave their jobs alone.

A new graduate doesn't care about personal crusades lawmakers wage against women's rights and abortion. They care about jobs. They care about our Nation's future. They care about their future. Instead of political games, the time has come to focus on jobs. The time has come to focus on our Nation's future.

As States all across the Nation are facing severe fiscal problems, let's stop focusing on ways to end Medicare as we know it and ways to destroy the social support network that has taken generations to build in our country. Our seniors need Medicare. It is the safety net and infrastructure all seniors need as they grow older. Seniors are living longer. They get their prescription drugs, they can play with their grandchildren, and they are thriving under Medicare. Leave Medicare alone.

I propose that from now until August, each of us here in this Chamber come to Washington remembering the mandate from our constituents: focus on jobs, jobs, jobs. I don't care what kind of tea you party with. I don't care who your Presidential candidate is. I don't care how much press you garner. Join me in focusing on jobs, jobs, jobs.

Let's rebuild our manufacturing base, let's keep our beaches clean, and let's make it in America. Make it in America, baby, and create jobs, jobs, jobs.

INFRASTRUCTURE, JOBS, AND ENERGY INDEPENDENCE ACT

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a gallon of gas is over $4, heading to $5. The average family spends $2,200 more on gas than they did 2 years ago. Fourteen million Americans are out of work and wondering how they are going to put food on the table. America's infrastructure is crumbling. A quarter of our bridges are structurally deficient.

The American Society of Civil Engineers says all our infrastructure needs are going to cost over $2 trillion for roads, bridges, water, sewer systems, airports, locks and dams. Where will we find the money?

Well, we send $100 billion each day to foreign nations for oil. OPEC exerts control over world oil prices and wants it to be $200 per barrel. We are 60 percent dependent on foreign oil, and climbing. As a country, we waste 20 to 40 percent of our energy in inefficient buildings and factories.

Mr. Speaker, we want clean air and water. We want to see our highways and bridges fixed. We want clean power plants, lower energy prices, and don't pollute our environment. But where will the money come from?

Today, my colleagues and I on the Energy Working Group are introducing the Infrastructure, Jobs, and Energy Independence Act, a bipartisan bill that for the first time brings forward a comprehensive plan to rebuild America, take back our energy future, and create millions of jobs. We can become energy independent, we can create these jobs, and we can do it all without raising taxes or adding to the national debt.

How? Well, America has enough offshore reserves to replace all oil imports from Venezuela and Saudi Arabia for the next 80 years and enough clean natural gas to power industry for the next 63 years. Yet the drilling moratorium means that instead of using our own resources to grow jobs, we are supporting the economies of unstable regimes that want to do us harm.

Our plan opens the door to the safe, responsible expansion of energy production off our coasts, where there is $8 trillion worth of economic output in oil and gas reserves offshore. Over 20 years, that translates to between $2.5 trillion and $3.7 trillion in new Federal revenues, from lease rights and royalties, without raising taxes.

That is $440 billion for infrastructure of our roads and bridges; $330 billion that we will invest in renewable energy sources and buildings and transportation; $220 billion for clean coal technology; $88 billion for environmental restoration to clean up our lakes, bays, rivers and streams; $66 billion in energy conservation; $110 billion for carbon-free technology and nuclear energy development; $66 billion to rebuild our water and sewer systems in small towns and big cities all across America; $44 billion for LIHEAP; and $660 billion for States that are producing; and also several hundred billion to pay down the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, there is a plan for jobs and energy in America, and this is the plan that estimates are will create about 1 million jobs each year, new jobs in building highways and bridges, new jobs in developing our energy resources. And we can do it all.

I ask my colleagues to support the Infrastructure, Jobs, and Energy Independence Act. Let's rebuild America, let's create jobs without raising taxes, let's stop borrowing from foreign nations, let's pay down our national debt, let's stop buying from OPEC, and let's use our rules and our laws to make sure we do all of this in a way that is environmentally sound so we can create jobs and have energy independence for this and the next generation.

TAPPING AMERICA'S INGENUITY AND CAN-DO SPIRIT

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I want to thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for his leadership, for his vision, and for the understanding that the American people sent us here to do America's work. Not one party's work, not ideological rigidness, but the idea to come together; that this Nation's bounty in terms of energy reserves and mineral resources, if used wisely and safely and reinvested in this Nation's future, can produce what we know needs to be done: strengthening our national security by making sure we control our energy destiny, making sure we control our economy, and making sure there's stability in where that energy comes from so that American families and businesses aren't forced through the ups and downs at the whims of nations that hate us.

We spend billions, hundreds of billions of dollars sending it to those nations that hate us. Heck, they'll hate us for free. And we can keep those jobs at home, we can keep the money at home, and we can invest. It's not an either/or proposition. Taking the royalties that belong to this Nation's people, allowing them to be gained, to be expanded, and to be done in a responsible manner is something everybody in this House wants. We can take those resources and reinvest them.

I am proud to come from southern Minnesota, a place where innovation is the air we breathe. We have the Mayo Clinic; we are the fourth leading producer of wind power; we are the leading producer of biofuels; we have the largest agricultural production; and we have good small employers manufacturing at home. That vision can be one that we control our destiny.

There is a group of us together, Democrats and Republicans, introducing something that can become law, that can do these things, that can reinvest in infrastructure, that can reinvest in conservation, that can make sure that we control our destiny. And the things that happen with dictators in the Middle East, the importance goes down. We control those things. We can do it. It's going to be on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to join this piece of legislation. It is visionary. It is a compromise to get to there. It can work. It adds

nothing to the national debt, but reduces it. It adds nothing in taxes and it lets us control those things.

This bill, and I will add, the gentleman's work and my colleagues from California and across this Nation, was written by us and the American people, not lobbyists, not special interests. We sat in a room together and agreed to get along, to try to come together on things that we could work on to make this country work.

□ 1040

That's going to be introduced today. It can happen. We owe it to the American people to get that done. Let's roll up the sleeves, tap that innovation, do the right things, get to work, and make this country energy independent. Let's secure our future both from a security standpoint and an economic standpoint and create jobs right at home.

Believe it or not, there are solutions coming right out of this Chamber.

CONGRATULATING GAIL ROMIG

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, each year the White House recognizes outstanding teachers for their contributions to the teaching and learning of mathematics and science through the prestigious Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science. On April 28, President Obama named 85 teachers as recipients of the 2010 award, one of which was from the Fifth District of Pennsylvania, Mifflin County resident Ms. Gail Romig, a teacher at State College Area School District.

Today, I want to thank Ms. Romig for her dedication to her students and commitment to the field of mathematics. We live in a global economy that is ever-changing and where America is forced to continually adapt, innovate, and find new ways to remain competitive in the global marketplace. Our competitiveness relies on the excellence of individuals in technical fields such as math and science. We rely on dedicated individuals like Ms. Romig to help create our next generation of technical minds.

From coast to coast, from urban enclaves to rural towns, teachers across the country are utilizing their expertise and creativity to equip the next generation of Americans to succeed and to lead.

Thank you to Ms. Romig and others like her all across the country that are working to ensure America is competitive for generations to come.

AMERICAN CONSERVATION AND CLEAN ENERGY INDEPENDENCE ACT

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join in with my colleagues in the introduction of legislation that we will be discussing later this afternoon: the Infrastructure Jobs and Energy Independence Act of 2011.

First of all, I would like to thank my colleagues who spoke a moment ago, Congressman TIM MURPHY and Congressman TIM WALZ, both who talked so importantly on the need to get our Nation's energy house in order.

Since the long gas lines of 1973, policymakers on both sides of the aisle have attempted various efforts to pursue an energy policy that would reduce our dependence on foreign sources of energy. And what has been lacking through all of those efforts since 1973 is a long-term plan that has bipartisan buy-in which we can stick to both in the near term and longer term to reach those goals. Why hasn't it happened? Because, unfortunately, too often here in these Chambers the lost art of the political compromise has gone away.

But today, with the introduction of the bipartisan Infrastructure Jobs and Energy Independence Act of 2011, we have an opportunity to come together as a House, to come together as a Nation. This is what the Bipartisan Energy Working Group has done over the last few months to really put together a piece of legislation that reflects past efforts, commonsense ideas that will enhance our path toward energy independence and national security through the following means. First, it would increase the production of domestic oil and gas on the Outer Continental Shelf. It would also increase sources of alternative energy utilizing clean energy technologies whenever possible. In addition to that, it would dedicate a fixed percentage of the royalties that we receive from oil and gas that is derived from Federal lands both onshore and offshore, the second-largest source of revenue to our Nation's Treasury, to the following purposes:

First of all, it would invest in our infrastructure revitalization and renewal that provides more jobs that are sorely needed. It would invest in conservation programs. It would invest in environmental restoration projects. It would invest so importantly in renewable energy research and development so that once again we can regain the lead around the world. It would invest in clean energy technology as well as increasing development of existing as well as traditional energy sources, like improving our transmission lines. And it would provide energy assistance for those most in need. Sharing a portion of such royalties with producing States also would provide an incentive for those States. And it would increase the diversification and efficiency of America's transportation system, among other things.

As a Nation, we must work together toward realistic energy policy. At the end of the day, we cannot afford to take any energy sources off the table. As many of you know, I am a firm believer in using all of the energy tools in our Nation's energy toolbox. And that's what we need to do. Conventional energy, together with renewable resources and a strategy for energy conservation, will best serve our long-term energy needs—the best management practices our Nation has to offer.

As we create new comprehensive energy policy to reduce our dependency on foreign sources of energy, reducing our dependence on those nations, it will make a big difference in America. I believe it's important for us to understand and agree to realistic transitional timelines as we embark upon this bipartisan energy policy both in the near term and the long term.

Finally, I look forward to cooperating and collaborating again with the members of the Bipartisan Energy Working Group and other Members of Congress to address ways in which our Nation's energy sources can best be utilized to help us secure that balanced energy future in the 21st century, which is what all Americans want us to do. I believe this legislation that we will introduce this afternoon will put us along that path for a long-term secure energy future for America in the 21st century.

IMPLEMENTING SMART ENERGY PLANS

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

Mr. NUNNELEE. This morning, in Tupelo, Mississippi, Whiteside's Restaurant is quiet. The lights are turned off. Tables around which coffee and conversation had flowed freely, a place where I have enjoyed many great meals, is quiet this morning. And on the front door there's a sign that simply says, ''Due to the economy and Uncle Sam, Whiteside's is closed. Donna Whiteside said that the driving force in her closing her business was higher taxes, increased gas prices, and a sluggish economy. Higher gas prices have become a cruel tax on all Americans. Donna Whiteside saw it as her customers had shrinking disposable incomes because of higher gas prices. Donna Whiteside saw that the cost of her groceries were going up because of higher gas prices.

What is not helping Americans get relief at the pump is the stalling of energy production by this administration. Since taking office, President Obama has actively delayed, blocked, and stalled American energy production—and the American people are sick of these stalling tactics. That's why the House of Representatives is concentrating on three key initiatives that will reverse the Obama administration's policies that are hurting families and small businesses, destroying jobs, and increasing our reliance on foreign oil.

Last week, the House passed the Restarting American Offshore Leasing

Now Act. It will require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct oil and natural gas lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico and offshore Virginia that have been delayed or canceled by this administration. In fact, if we don't have an oil lease this year, it will be the first time in my lifetime that the American public has not had that.

Yesterday, the House voted on the Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act. Since the drilling moratorium was officially lifted in October, the administration has chosen to drag their feet and stalled the permitting process in the gulf. Twelve rigs have already left the gulf for other regions, taking hundreds and even thousands of jobs with them. This steady decline in oil and natural gas production is costing the United States $4.7 million every day in lost revenues. This act speeds up the drilling permitting process and will put thousands of Americans back to work.

Today, we'll vote on the Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act. The administration's actions have placed the Atlantic coast, the Pacific coast, and areas of Alaska off limits. This Act will implement a smart drilling plan requiring the administration to move forward on American energy production in areas containing the most oil and natural gas resources.

In north Mississippi, we're working at leading the way toward helping our Nation become energy secure. All three of these bills combined can create up to 1.2 million jobs that will generate revenue that our Nation needs, and it will put us on the path to achieving energy security, of more American oil, more natural gas, clean coal, nuclear energy, and new technologies such as wind and solar.

□ 1050

Donna Whiteside and the thousands of businesses and families around America need to know that the House of Representatives is listening to them. The House Republican American energy initiatives will free the American people from the Obama administration's stalling games. If the Senate will consider and pass this legislation, it will put an end to higher gas prices that are straining budgets and are compromising our energy security.

REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS OF THE VIOLENT TENNESSEE STORMS

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, today I come to the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to remember the four victims who tragically lost their lives in Bledsoe County as a result of the severe storms and tornadoes that struck middle Tennessee on April 28, 2011.

Loretta Winters Bellos was dearly loved by those in her community. She was described by friends as a generous and beloved friend who will be greatly missed.

Loretta's sister, Patricia Lynette Thompson, attended Brayton Baptist Church in Graysville and was previously very involved in the Tremont Baptist Church. Those that knew her said that her faith and her church family were a very important part of her life. Her family says they will remember her as ''the best mother, grandmother and wife in the world.''

Debbie Gibbs Fox was known as an avid animal lover and her husband, Harold ''Sonny Boy'' Hudson Fox, was described by friends as someone with a lightened spirit who was always a joy to be around.

To all the families and friends of each of these victims, I'm sorry for your loss and offer my deepest sympathies.

I would also like to take a moment to recognize the many emergency management service workers and volunteers that have worked tirelessly to help the victims overcome this terrible tragedy. While touring the damage left by these storms, I was extremely touched by the kindness and generosity of the many people who were there to immediately lend a hand to their neighbors in this time of great need.

I know that the rebuilding process will be difficult and that much was lost, but I'm confident that our community will get through this. My wife, Amy, and I are keeping the families of the affected members in our thoughts and prayers as they begin the process of rebuilding their lives. May God bless you.

CONSTITUENT WORK PERIOD RECAP

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

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, once again it is a privilege to rise this morning and share with my colleagues in the House what my neighbors at home shared with me during the last constituent work period. During those 2 weeks in April, I met with business and community leaders in Wilkes-Barre to see how they're working to keep their downtown alive and vibrant. For example, they converted an old storefront, right in the heart of the city, into a business incubator which encourages local entrepreneurs and start-up firms. The Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Business and Industry is also trying to restore the city's Irem Temple, a local landmark that is a truly beautiful building, one of the last buildings of its kind in the United States.

I toured an ongoing flood control project in the city of Scranton. There, the Army Corps of Engineers is working to make sure the flood walls meet new standards to protect thousands of residents and dozens of businesses. These constituents have been very patient, waiting decades for their relief. Now, the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Emergency Management Agency are finalizing plans that will provide the protection they deserve.

About 200 people came out to my Home to House public forums, where they learned about the issues we're tackling here in Congress. I was eager to talk with them about Medicare reform and about the steps we're taking to cut the outrageous overspending. Most of my constituents understood what we're doing here, especially the senior citizens. They know that we're trying to save the future for their children and their grandchildren. Many of my constituents also told me they don't want us to raise the debt ceiling without securing substantial budget cuts.

But everywhere I went, my neighbors asked me what we're doing here in Congress to lower the price of gas. Over the 2-week constituent work period, regular unleaded gas cost between $3.90 and $4 a gallon. People would come up to me at the gas station as I was filling up and tell me that we need to work harder here to solve this problem. I am happy to report that this week and last I voted on two bills that will put thousands of Americans back to work, while increasing American energy production to help address rising gasoline prices.

There are two events in the constituent work period that stand out for me. One was speaking to a class of students at St. Jude's School in Mountain Top. These bright, eager young men and women were curious about what we do here in Congress. They asked insightful questions. They wanted to learn about Washington. They offered some insights on how to make their futures brighter. As I continue to examine education and workforce programs as a member of the House Education and the Workforce Committee, I will remember these students and their advice.

The second event was the arrival of the Patriot Flag in my hometown of Hazleton. This giant symbol of the United States is traveling around the country to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the September 11 attacks. It was my privilege to stand on the steps of city hall and help first responders, law enforcement, Boy Scouts, and members of the military fold the Patriot Flag.

Less than 36 hours later, we learned that Osama bin Laden was dead. The death of the most visible face of international terrorism is a historic event, and it is one that unified our country. My neighbors in the 11th District of Pennsylvania are proud to congratulate our brave men and women in our Armed Forces and intelligence services, and we thank all of them and their families for their continuing sacrifices. We also commend President Obama for taking bold action.

The spontaneous celebrations after bin Laden's death in front of the White

House, at Ground Zero in New York City, and all across the country once again remind us that there is more that unites us than divides us. We are all, at the core, proud Americans. If we can learn anything from recent events, it is that America is strong and resilient. If we stay dedicated to our efforts, we can get our country back on track.

Fueled with the feedback I heard from my neighbors during 2 weeks at home in northeastern Pennsylvania, I am ready to keep fighting for them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Monsignor Craig Harrison, St. Francis of Assisi Catholic Church, Bakersfield, California, offered the following prayer:

Gracious and loving God, we are grateful for the gifts and blessings You have shown our Nation.

Be with those who are suffering the devastation of the great storms that we have experienced and help us as a Nation to respond.

Bless the women and men gathered here who are called to protect and serve the people of the United States. Watch over and bless all those who serve our Nation abroad.

Guide the Members of this Congress, that their work today will reflect Your love and compassion and guide our Nation to be a leader in justice and peace.

We pray this in the name of the one who created us in love. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIRES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SIRES 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.

WELCOMING MONSIGNOR CRAIG HARRISON

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to welcome Monsignor Craig Harrison from Bakersfield, California, and appreciate that he was able to be here today to open up our floor session with the invocation. It is great to have a fellow Bakersfield High School Driller here on the floor with me.

Since he returned to Bakersfield in 1999 to be the pastor of his hometown parish, Monsignor Craig has had a profound, positive impact on the lives of the thousands in our community. The fact that the number of families in his parish has increased by over 5,000 and enrollment in the parish school has doubled is a testament to his leadership in our community.

He is more than just a faith leader. He is an author of a children's book, he is a faith leader to many of us throughout the community, and, on a personal note, he was a faith leader to my father as he battled his fight with cancer.

Monsignor Craig is a true friend to the Bakersfield community, and I appreciate that he was able to share his words of wisdom on the House floor.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

U.S. FIREFIGHTERS GO TO MEXICO AND FLY OVER TEXAS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the administration is fighting wildfires. In December, the United States sent two firefighting planes to battle fires in Israel. In April, two specially equipped U.S. Air Force C–130 cargo planes and 30 personnel were sent to battle wildfires in Mexico. The fires in Mexico burned about 380 square miles near the Texas border. The United States came to the rescue.

But not everyone gets help from the United States. A wildfire epidemic has also occurred in Texas, with more than 9,000 fires. Two million acres have been burned. That is the size of Rhode Island and Delaware combined and ten times the size of the fires in Mexico. And the State is still on fire.

Texas Governor Perry requested Federal help, but the administration summarily denied the Governor's request. The administration, it seems, is more concerned about taking care of foreign nations while ignoring Americans in Texas. Why does the administration despise Texas? Meanwhile, the fires continue.

And that's just the way it is.

CONDEMNING THE DEATH OF JUAN WILFREDO SOTO

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the brutal beating and subsequent death of Juan Wilfredo Soto. Last Thursday, Soto, while participating in a peaceful protest against the Castro regime, Cuban authorities beat him so badly that he was later taken to the hospital, where he died.

Soto was a brave man and a respected advocate who helped support the hunger strikes of human rights award winner Guillermo Farinas.

Juan Wilfredo Soto's death is the latest brazen illustration of the violent methods the Castro brothers utilize to oppress freedom in Cuba. In the last 2 months reports of oppression have increased.

As many praised the false promises of the Sixth Communist Party Congress held in Cuba last month, few acknowledged the crackdown on dissidents and journalists that took place. Prior to the congress, Cuban authorities reportedly arrested and detained opposition members to ensure that all voices critical to the regime would be silent and that no protests would be visible.

The United States and the international community must join together in condemning the wrongful death of Juan Wilfredo Soto and supporting human rights on the island. We must show Cuban leaders that their brutality is not going to go unnoticed.

MAJORITY'S PLAN FOR MEDICARE IS THE WRONG APPROACH

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if the majority's plan for Medicare ever becomes law, seniors will lose their guaranteed benefit and get a private insurance voucher.

Seniors are calling. They are nervous and justified in asking all sorts of questions about the plan, such as: Will the voucher cover me if I get sick? Will the voucher result in rationed care? And will I need to pay more out of pocket?

The Congressional Budget Office says seniors will pay more—much more. Out-of-pocket costs to seniors will double in 2022 and rise by 68 percent by 2030.

This massive cost shifting saves the Federal Government a lot of money. And where does all of the money taken from seniors and Medicare go? Well, it doesn't pay off the debt. It doesn't create jobs or help folks pay for gas or groceries. But it does go to finance large new tax cuts for the most well-off.

This is the wrong approach to caring for our seniors.

TIME TO STOP POLITICAL GAMES AND WORK TOGETHER

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, right now Californians in my home district face an almost 14 percent unemployment rate and are dealing with the fourth highest rate of foreclosures in the Nation.

What my constituents need above all else is for both of us, Republicans and Democrats, to come together on creating new jobs. Yet in the last 18 weeks the Republicans have controlled the House, they have yet to bring one single bill focused on creating jobs. Instead, they have put forward a partisan agenda that is more about scoring political points than helping American families.

We should be putting American families back to work. We should not be voting to dismantle safety nets for seniors and vulnerable Americans. The Republican attacks on Medicare and Medicaid go against our core values and threaten the health care of 44 million low-income Americans.

It is time to stop political games. Let's work together, and I say let's work together and focus on straightening out our economy and creating jobs.

□ 1210

CONGRATULATING NEWARK COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL BOYS BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Newark Community High School boys basketball team on their 2011 Illinois class 1A championship title. This is a great accomplishment; and their team, coaches, and the entire Newark community should be very proud.

Newark, Illinois, is a town of less than a thousand people. It is symbolic of our great Nation and is a place I am honored to represent. Newark High School, with a total enrollment of less than 200 students, has never before won the State championship. Coach Rick Tollefson, head coach of the Newark Norsemen, has been with the program for 5 years and in that time has led the Norsemen to three consecutive sectional championships as well as this year's State title. It has certainly been an exciting time for this close-knit community.

On behalf of the House of Representatives, I would like to personally congratulate everyone who made Newark history this year, as well as those who made it possible—the school's administrators and the entire Newark community. I appreciate their hard work and dedication to this basketball program and to the students of Newark High School. Congratulations on a job well done.

CODE NAME ''GERONIMO''

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, just last week, the U.S. military carried out a covert operation that ended in the killing of the most wanted terrorist on the planet, Osama bin Laden. The news of Osama bin Laden's death at the hands of our heroic Navy SEALs sent forth a wave of tremendous relief by the American people.

However, Mr. Speaker, we also learned that the U.S. military and the CIA used the code name ''Geronimo'' for the operation to seize and kill Osama bin Laden. The first reports of the details of the raid stated that Osama bin Laden had been identified as ''Geronimo''—enemy killed in action.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly suggest to all my colleagues in the House that you should go and see the movie ''Geronimo'' and see for yourselves if the Chiricahua Apache warrior Geronimo was a terrorist and murderer of thousands of innocent men, women, and children like Osama bin Laden. On the contrary, Geronimo was one of the greatest American Indian warriors who fought against some of the most vicious, cruelest, and inhumane treatment and policies instituted by our Federal Government against his people.

As a Nation—Mr. Speaker—I know we can do better than this. And with all due respect, I believe the President and CIA Director Panetta owe the Apache Nation an apology.

JUAN WILFREDO SOTO

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

Mr. RIVERA. I rise today to inform my colleagues of yet another ruthless murder by the Castro dictatorship in Cuba. Last Sunday, Juan Wilfredo Soto Garcia, a dissident leader on the island, was viciously beaten to death by Castro's state security thugs simply for participating in a peaceful protest.

Soto belonged to Foro Anti-Totalitario Unido, or the United Anti-Totalitarian Forum, a peaceful dissident organization. Witnesses have attested that two of Castro's henchmen cuffed his hands behind his back and then beat him mercilessly and repeatedly with batons until he was dead.

For 30 years, Soto peacefully worked for freedom and change on the island and served 12 years in Castro's political prisons for his pro-democracy advocacy. Last year, Soto stated, ''I hold Cuban state security, the government, and the repressive police here responsible for whatever happens to me in the future.''

This past weekend, he gave the ultimate sacrifice for Cuba's freedom and became yet another victim in the Castro brothers' 50-year reign of terror.

MEDICARE

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, this past Tuesday, 41 House Republicans sent a letter to President Obama pleading with him to stop the criticism of the GOP's plan to turn Medicare into a private voucher system—a system that would cost future seniors thousands of dollars each year. Let bygones be bygones, these Republicans said. Let's wipe the slate clean. Well, I can't help but laugh at the irony.

Last year, in districts all throughout the country, Republican candidates for Congress attacked Democrats for supporting the Affordable Care Act, claiming it cut $500 billion from Medicare—wrongly, I might add.

Fast forward 1 year later, and those same Republicans now in Congress just a few weeks ago voted for a budget that actually embraces the very same $500 billion in savings we found in Medicare in the Affordable Care Act.

There's a difference, though. In the health care law, Democrats took that $500 billion and reinvested it in Medicare to increase the life of the program for more than a decade. What did the Republicans do? They take that $500 billion and use it to pay for more tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and giant oil companies. And Medicare? They dismantle it, forcing future seniors into a new system that will require them to pay upwards of $180,000 more for their care.

The American people will not let them forget.

UNDERSTANDING WHAT'S HAPPENING AT THE PUMP

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, lax regulation and reckless pursuit of higher oil company profits resulted in 11 deaths, 200 million gallons of oil dumped into our gulf waters, tens of thousands of marine and aquatic life lost, and a damaged fishing and tourism industry. A panel of experts showed us how we can learn from past mistakes and implement regulations to ensure that this disaster doesn't happen again. Yet over the last 2 weeks the Republican majority has passed legislation to create an even more lax regulatory environment than existed before the BP oil spill disaster.

Opening our shores to drilling and returning to pre-BP oil spill regulations won't reduce our dependence on foreign

oil, and it won't reduce the price of gas at the pump. The United States holds less than 2 percent of the world's oil reserves while we consume more than 22 percent. Even if all restricted areas in the U.S. could somehow be brought into production at this moment, the oil they would yield under the best scenario is about a million barrels of oil a day—5 percent of our daily consumption.

Those bills shouldn't get any further than the House. The Senate should reject them. The American people should better understand the real cost of giving the oil companies everything they want.

LET'S HELP REBUILD AMERICA

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. It's very clear in these economic times that Americans need jobs and, more accurately, we need the investment that will create jobs. We've got the money to do it. In light of the fact that bin Laden is no longer a threat to Americans, we don't need to spend over $100 billion a year in Afghanistan.

So, again, let's take a share of the money that's gone to rebuild Afghanistan, have it sent back to the U.S. taxpayers right here in the United States to create jobs right here in the U.S. Let's help rebuild American cities like the city of Detroit. When you do that, you rebuild U.S. manufacturing capacity. That will create jobs for thousands and even millions of Americans right here at home. The best way to make it in America: redirect our tax dollars away from Afghanistan in part to create jobs right here for American people.

BROAD RANGE OF ENERGY SOLUTIONS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I visited a local Tampa gas station and spoke with dozens of customers about the impact of rising gas prices on already financially strapped families. Overwhelmingly, my constituents told me that we must look at a broad range of energy solutions to reduce our dependency on foreign oil and reduce the price we pay at the pump. We should increase domestic energy production, promote energy efficiency, and encourage private investment and renewable energy technologies as part of a comprehensive plan to address our energy needs. Not only will this all-inclusive approach ease the burden of high gas prices but it will help create jobs that this country needs.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 754, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 264 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 264

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 754) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1220

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

Mr. SESSIONS. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. House Resolution 264 provides for a structured rule designated by the Rules Committee for consideration of H.R. 754. This rules allows for nine of the amendments submitted to the Rules Committee to be made in order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. The fiscal year 2011 budget process began last Congress with about a dozen hearings and Member briefings and continued into this Congress with more briefings and negotiations. This legislation was introduced by the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the gentleman from Michigan, MIKE ROGERS, and has gone through regular order to achieve its presence on the floor today. H.R. 754 was marked up in the Intelligence Committee and the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California, DAVID DREIER, provided a structured amendment process for nine additional amendments from Republicans and Democrats to be considered today on the House floor.

The bill we are discussing today authorizes the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government for fiscal year 2011 in order to enhance the national security of the United States, to support and assist the Armed Forces of the United States, and to support the President of the United States in the execution of the foreign policy of the United States of America. This bill is a vital tool for congressional oversight of the classified activities of the intelligence community, and it is critical to ensuring that our intelligence agencies have the resources and authorities they need to accomplish this important work on behalf of keeping America free.

The primary vehicle for exercising credible congressional oversight over our intelligence agencies is the intelligence authorization bill. Yet we have not passed a bona fide intelligence authorization bill in 6 years. Although the National Security Act requires intelligence activities to be specifically authorized, in recent years certain appropriation bills have included language that would ''deem'' the intelligence funding to be authorized. This procedure meets the statutory requirement but has weakened the ability, I believe, of Congress in its oversight of intelligence activities in recent years.

The U.S. intelligence community plays a critical role in the war on terrorism and securing our country from the many other threats we face as a

Nation. The recent killing of the terrorist Osama bin Laden is a clear example of the important work our intelligence agencies are doing behind the scenes every single day to protect America and Americans. Keeping the laws governing our intelligence operations up to date and ensuring that there are no unnecessary barriers in the way of future successes are exactly why we are here today and seek the authorization to pass an annual intelligence bill today.

The intelligence authorization bill funds all U.S. intelligence activities, spanning 17 separate agencies. Last year, this funding totaled roughly $80 billion. Our Nation's current challenging fiscal circumstances demand that Congress fulfill its duties and provide the appropriate accountability and financial oversight of our classified intelligence programs through an authorization bill yearly. Additionally, this bill will ensure that Congress funds the requirements of the brave and dedicated men and women in the intelligence community, military and civilian, many of whom directly support the war zones or are engaged in other dangerous operations that keep Americans safe.

The underlying legislation provides oversight and authorization for critical intelligence activities, including global counterterrorism operations such as the one that took out the terrorist Osama bin Laden, tactical intelligence support to support combat units in Iraq, Afghanistan, and wherever else they're needed around the world, cyberdefense, detecting and countering weapons of mass destruction, global monitoring of foreign militaries, weapons tests, and arms control treaties. Additionally, this bill's classified annex provides detailed guidance on intelligence spending, including adjustments to costly programs.

This bill takes an important step forward in the intelligence community to help them meet the same financial accounting standard as other parts of the government. These accounting standards will help uncover savings in the current programs that can be reinvested into vital programs and priorities or returned to the American taxpayer.

I was very pleased this week when the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman MIKE ROGERS, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER), who represents the minority, came to the Rules Committee to talk about the needs of the intelligence community. In particular, I was very pleased as they worked so closely together to ensure that the issues that were contained within this document, the agreements that would be in law, and perhaps more importantly, the important relationships that would be shared by them as we work together to ensure that this country is safe, that we do so in a way where the American people see that keeping America safe, providing the necessary resources to the men and women of the intelligence community and expecting the results that would come from them, is a very important part of what our job as Members of Congress is all about.

I applaud Chairman MIKE ROGERS of Michigan for providing this Congress with a much needed intelligence authorization bill, and I appreciate the exhaustive process on a bipartisan basis not only that Chairman ROGERS has led but that includes a return to regular order in the authorization of this important legislation. I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my friend from Texas for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 754, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for U.S. intelligence and intelligence-related activities within the jurisdiction of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, including the National Intelligence Program and the Military Intelligence Program, as well as for the Intelligence Community Management Account and for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System.

We are considering this legislation at an auspicious time. The death of Osama bin Laden and the disarray in the al Qaeda network comes as a result of years of painstaking effort by the hardworking men and women of the intelligence community, the military, President Bush, and President Obama's gutsy, courageous, and correct call on May 1 of this year. They succeeded admirably in carrying out a difficult and dangerous mission. This legislation codifies many of the lessons learned in recent years that led to Osama bin Laden's demise. It is important that we continue to provide the necessary resources to sustain the momentum the United States and its allies enjoy in the effort to protect our Nation and its citizens.

As the former vice chair of the House Intelligence Committee, I personally know that the intelligence community is the first line of defense against those wishing to do us harm here at home and across the globe. Where terrorists or other elements, as we speak, are plotting attacks, planning operations, or are actively engaged in harming our citizens, the men and women of the intelligence community are devoted to acting on the information they gather to thwart those efforts. We owe them a debt of gratitude and our sincere thanks. These courageous men and women often work quietly, unnoticed, and too often, unrecognized, but nevertheless, they are critical to ensuring the security of our Nation.

I have had the honor and privilege of meeting many of our intelligence professionals during my oversight travel as a member of the Intelligence Committee. I cannot overstate how much I appreciate, and am humbled by, their service. Over the past 10 years, our country has continued to make daily progress against threats, thanks to the service of those dedicated professionals. We must keep in mind, though, that in spite of our best effort, we still face many real threats, and we still have much work to do to get it right.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 754 provides detailed guidance and authorizes appropriations for the many agencies of the intelligence community, while also improving accountability and transparency. It is essential that we streamline and coordinate oversight for counterintelligence. H.R. 754 amends the Counterintelligence Enhancement Act of 2002 to require the national counterintelligence strategy to be aligned with the policies and strategy of the Director of National Intelligence.

It is often reported that our government agencies come under cyberattack all day, every day, 365 days a year. International criminals, malicious individuals, and even other Nations are actively engaged in a constant effort to break into our cyber networks to obtain information, or to wreak havoc on the systems that govern our Nation's infrastructure, financial, military, diplomatic, and social networks. We must, of all things, be mindful of our responsibilities in that area. It can have a devastating impact if not properly attended.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we must consider diversity to be a mission imperative. I have stated time and again that the intelligence community is not diverse enough to successfully meet its requirements and achieve success on its missions. On February 26, 2010, the House of Representatives passed my amendment to H.R. 2701, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, which required the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the heads of the elements of the intelligence community, to submit to Congress a report on the plans of each element of the community to increase diversity. The report is expected to be finalized in October of this year. Simply put, we need people who blend in, who speak the language, and understand the cultures in the countries that we are targeting. It is time for the intelligence community to get serious about improving diversity for the sake of our national security. If the intelligence community is to succeed in its global mission, it must have a global face.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Lake Park, Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas, who's doing a wonderful job this morning managing this bill, PETE SESSIONS.

Mr. Speaker, all of our Nation's great liberties depend on our national security. I think that's something that we can all agree on. This is a bipartisan issue. We're a Nation at war, and we're pitted against terrorists who are bent on destroying our very way of life. As the treasure trove of evidence, which we were so grateful to receive from Osama bin Laden's compound, confirms to us, the enemy is always adapting, always evolving, always plotting further attacks. We have to be informed, and we have to be one step ahead of the enemy at least.

It's our intelligence community, Mr. Speaker, that gives us heroic service, day in and day out. This morning I had the privilege of being at our Nation's Central Intelligence Agency, and I want to commend them for the work that they do, the brilliant work that they did most recently to secure this number one target. Nearly all of it goes unrecognized, Mr. Speaker, until a moment like last Sunday evening, May 1, when a grateful Nation learned that the men and women of our intelligence services, working hand-in-hand with those in military uniform, had brought about the demise of the world's most prominent and notorious terrorist, Osama bin Laden. Years of relentless and diligent pursuit yielded an overwhelming success.

And that's why I'm so honored to be here on the floor today with my distinguished colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) to stand here on the House floor as a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, calling on behalf of my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, to pass the FY 2011 Intelligence authorization bill, because the American people have made it clear, Mr. Speaker.

They've made it clear to us not only once but over and over again. They want this Congress to exercise the utmost seriousness when dealing with our Nation's spending crisis, and so this bill is a step in that direction. It ensures that there is proper congressional financial oversight, and I would like to tip my hat now to the Democrat ranking member, DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, who has done a magnificent job, together with our chairman, MIKE ROGERS, in making sure that we work together as one, seamlessly, in a bipartisan fashion. I have been just so delighted. I've never served on a committee where I've seen greater bipartisanship because we've put down our partisan swords when it comes to securing the safety and security of our Nation.

And this bill is a step in that direction, ensuring there's not only proper congressional financial oversight, something that was lacking unfortunately in the last 6 years, but we are dedicated to making sure that our responsible approach with intelligence does not sacrifice the security of our Nation, and this measure which funds our intelligence community will ensure that our intelligence community has the resources they so richly deserve.

□ 1240

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the ranking member of the Committee on Intelligence, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, first I want to recognize the distinguished vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Mr. HASTINGS, for his hard work over the course of his 8 years on the committee. I had the privilege of serving with Mr. HASTINGS, and know he was committed to supporting our intelligence professionals. He was a leader on the issue of diversity in the intelligence community, and I applaud him for those efforts. Having a diverse intelligence community workforce is not simply the right thing to do, but it is critical to our mission.

Today, I am pleased to join my colleague and friend MICHELE BACHMANN in support of H.R. 754, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. I thank her for her comments about partisan politics. The Intelligence Committee is a bipartisan committee that works together. The stakes are too high for us not to work together, and that's what we're attempting to do.

Now, the killing of Osama bin Laden is clearly the most monumental intelligence achievement in recent history. Our intelligence professionals worked together as a team, brought Osama bin Laden to justice, and killed him. It was a risky mission that was executed with intense training and a high level of skill. These professionals risked their lives to keep our country safe, and no American lives were lost.

I am pleased that Congress can provide the intelligence community with the resources, capabilities, authorities, and oversight they need to continue this great work. After months of negotiations and a number of changes to address many of the concerns of the administration, I believe this bill moves in a positive direction to assert congressional oversight over intelligence activities.

I am also pleased that Chairman ROGERS and I could come to an agreement to add additional counterterrorism positions to the CIA. With this change, I will support the bill. This bill adds several thousand civilian positions above the level enacted in FY 2010. There is also a large increase in personnel at the National Counterterrorism Center, which is the NCTC, among others. The bill adds hundreds of millions of dollars for intelligence above current levels. However, I urge a ''no'' vote on this rule because it does not allow all Members of Congress to offer amendments to this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, with the election of this new large Republican class, some 87 new Members, we picked up, in particular, a Member who will speak here in just a second. He is a young man who devoted his life, not only to his country through his service in the military, but also to law enforcement. He comes to Washington from Florida where he had been a distinguished sheriff of a large department. He came to us with not only a thought and belief about securing this country and of making sure that we took care of our citizens, but perhaps more importantly, he is a clear thinker on seeing not only intelligence issues but also the broader context of protecting this country. He has a son who serves in the military, and he has been very thoughtful.

I yield 3 minutes to a member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Brooksville, Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. I thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), with whom I have the pleasure of serving on the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule, H. Res. 264, and the underlying legislation, H.R. 754.

About a week and a half ago, we all learned that justice had been served: justice for our civil servants working in the Kenya and Tanzania Embassies in 1998, justice for our troops serving on the USS Cole in 2000 and justice for the innocent victims of September 11, 2001.

After many years of hard, stealthy intelligence work, we found Osama bin Laden's hideout in Pakistan. Based upon this information, a highly trained team of Navy SEALs came in, performed its mission and rid the world of one of history's most evil and notorious terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, this would not have been possible without the work of our hardworking intelligence community. It was President Bush who laid the groundwork for this intelligence that ultimately made all of this possible, and it was President Obama who put this information together and made the gutsy call that only a Commander in Chief can make. Both of these men deserve our thanks for the work they did to make this possible.

It is our duty as Members of Congress to ensure that our intelligence community has the tools it needs to continue to keep our Nation safe. That is what H.R. 754 does. As a prior law enforcement officer, I can attest to the value of good Intel in apprehending those who would do dastardly things to our country.

With that, I encourage my colleagues to support the rule, to support the underlying bill, and to support the intelligence community, which is keeping this Nation safe.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, a member of the Judiciary Committee, the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. HASTINGS, thank you for your service years on the Intelligence Committee, and I thank the ranking member and the members who are on the floor.

I rise to support the underlying bill and the rule, recognizing that human intelligence and the resources that provide a safety net for the American people are crucial—the CIA, the Department of Defense and other intelligence civilian agencies, along with the United States military.

I introduced H. Res. 240 to chronicle the successful apprehension and demise of Osama bin Laden, to actually emphasize, when combined together, the brawn and intellect of the United States military. The human intelligence over the years and the work of President Clinton, President Bush and President Obama in the strategic decision that had to be made by the civilian minds, in working with the military minds, has emphasized the constitutional values of this country that civilians, in working with the military, can, in fact, provide the armor protection of the United States of America. I am very grateful for that genius, and I want to thank them. Our legislation had over 50 cosponsors.

As well, I believe now that we can actually say in good conscience: Bring the troops home from Afghanistan. Our mission is accomplished. We realize that human intelligence can help us target those who want to do us harm, and we have the constitutional fabric, along with the United States military, the likes of JSOC and many others in the intelligence community, who work on behalf of the American people. We can bring home the men and women—over 100,000—who are based now in Afghanistan.

Do you know what? Mother's Day was this past weekend, and sadly, soldiers fell in battle on Mother's Day. Let us not have another Mother's Day when some mother in America, somewhere, loses a child to the battle in Afghanistan, not when we can use smart power and use intelligence and use a minimum of force.

It is time now for America to welcome home her heroes with honor and, as well, to thank those who dedicated the brawn and the intellect that could make good on a promise that, yes, you will come to justice if you do harm to the American people.

I ask support for the underlying legislation and the rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I do understand that the Democratic Party is interested in leaving Afghanistan now that Osama bin Laden has been killed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would just urge my colleague not to use a broad reference with reference to the Democratic Party. Everybody in the Democratic Party does not agree that we should leave Afghanistan until the administration and the military and the intelligence community have completed their work.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you.

Reclaiming my time, I appreciate and respect the words, not only from my friend, but I believe he is absolutely correct. I simply hear the drumbeat that comes out of this town about leaving now that there has been a big victory in dealing with the number one terrorist in the world.

I would suggest to you that there is still much work left to be done and that we must not change the focus of the men and women who today are in harm's way. We should not change the focus of the American people in getting them away from the job that is being done on a day-to-day basis and that we should not begin the drumbeat until we have further completed the work that is necessary to ensure that this country is safe.

□ 1250

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to a young member of the Rules Committee, a gentleman who served as mayor of Corning, New York, and a man who has dedicated himself to public service, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. I thank my colleague from Texas for the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule for H.R. 754, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

Mr. Speaker, the intelligence community works long hours in distant parts of the world to keep our country safe. But the thing about the United States intelligence community is that when they do their job right, no one knows about it. When they are successful in that diligence that they perform every day of the week, 24 hours a day, every day of the year, we often do not hear about that success.

I stand here today, Mr. Speaker, to commend the diligent, painstaking work of the United States intelligence officials for all that they do. And in particular, I stand today to recognize the hard work of our intelligence community which resulted in capturing and killing the man who masterminded the multiple attacks which killed thousands of Americans, bringing him to justice this past week. Thanks to the intelligence professionals who work for our country, the world is a safer place without Osama bin Laden.

I have an amendment with my colleague from New York (Mr. GRIMM) that will be discussed on this floor tomorrow, and hopefully supported and voted upon in a bipartisan fashion, to recognize the efforts of those intelligence officials.

Mr. Speaker, I rise also today to commend the work that is being done here in this Chamber, that is being led by this side of the aisle in having an open dialogue, in having an open process. We have nine amendments that are going to be considered under this rule and in this Chamber tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, that is a direct change from the history that has been demonstrated here for years prior to us coming here. It is time that we on this side of the aisle recognize that we are going to listen to the American people. We are going to have an honest conversation with the American people about the issues that we face on a day-to-day basis. And as such, I stand today and urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this rule and ''yes'' on H.R. 754.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Corpus Christi, Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), another one of our brand-new Members, who brings to this House and to the floor not only a commonsense element but the insistence that people from Corpus Christi be represented on the floor of this House in such a way that will benefit not only our country but also the United States military and, in particular, the United States Navy that has a large base in Corpus Christi.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. It's almost like a fog has been lifted over America. We sought to capture or kill Osama bin Laden for 10 years; and just recently, that was accomplished. And it's almost as if the sun is a little bit brighter and the can-do American spirit has been revived, that same spirit that took us to the Moon, that same spirit that has led us to victory in the past.

Our intelligence community is key to that success, as is our military. It is absolutely imperative that we support and back the intelligence community that provides us the knowledge and information that not only helps us win wars but, more importantly, keeps us out of war.

Knowledge is power. What we know about beforehand gives us the opportunity to stop conflicts before they happen. We are also in an era of a tight budget now. We are looking at an authorization bill that increases and provides adequate oversight to our intelligence to make sure those resources are being spent wisely and are being spent in the defense of this Nation, in the furtherance of our interests, and in the furtherance of freedom.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the young gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Rules Committee.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by expressing my appreciation to the distinguished vice chairman of the Rules Committee, my friend from Dallas, Mr. SESSIONS, for his management of this very important rule. And I think it's appropriate that Mr. SESSIONS is a manager of legislation that enjoys strong bipartisan support because he's always seeking a consensus on issues where we can find areas of agreement. And the fact is, we have been able to see the chairman and the ranking member of the Select Committee on Intelligence work together

in a bipartisan way to deal with the very important security and intelligence needs of the United States of America.

My new colleague from Corpus Christi has just said, What a great day for America, the day that we were able to see Osama bin Laden captured and killed, brought to justice. And I congratulate President Obama and, of course, all those who were involved. I congratulate President Bush who, from September 11 forward, was determined to bring Osama bin Laden to justice. And I congratulate all of the men and women in uniform, including those who, as of September 11, 2001, became part of the frontline—that being firefighters and law enforcement—right here on our soil because that was the day, for the first time ever, that we faced an attack on our soil.

But this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is specifically designed to extend our appreciation and thanks, based on an amendment that we've made in order from our colleague from Staten Island, Mr. GRIMM, to those in the intelligence community who have done such a spectacular job in dealing with the challenge of capturing and bringing to justice Osama bin Laden.

We are going to have in this bill a number of amendments made in order. I am particularly proud that as we worked with the members of the Intelligence Committee, recognizing that obviously this bill deals with some very, very sensitive items that, frankly, can't be discussed here on the House floor, but with that in mind, we were able to make in order nine amendments that are going to be offered by Members; five amendments that will be offered by Democrats; four amendments offered by Republicans; and, as I said, the amendment that will allow for the longest period of debate to provide an opportunity for the Members of this House to discuss, and I know it will be, again, bipartisan appreciation to those in the intelligence community who have been able to have the success that we've witnessed most recently.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it's a great day for the United States of America to once again demonstrate the global leadership role that we provide not only economically and geopolitically but through our security, intelligence, and military strength.

I urge my colleagues to support both this rule, which, again, will allow for free-flowing debate and an opportunity for both parties to participate, and the underlying legislation itself.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would in some respects reiterate much of what our colleagues have said with regard to Osama bin Laden. For 10 years, he held the title of scourge of the Earth. And I believe all of us are pleased that to the degree that he contributed to injustice, justice, as it pertains to him, has finally been served.

It is my hope that the families of the terrible events that transpired on 9/11 and the USS *Cole* and the families of the East African embassy bombings can find just a little more solace and just a little more closure as a result of his demise at the hands of extraordinary work on behalf of a substantial number of courageous Americans.

□ 1300

As a Nation, I would ask that we be extremely mindful that al Qaeda has not been removed, nor has the sentiment of this very dangerous societal element, nor are they the only organized structure of radical extremists that would attack our Nation. We must remain ever vigilant.

There was a bit of irony on May 1, 2011, that should not be lost on any of us. One of the events that transpired on that same day was that the late John Paul II, the Pope, was beatified and moved closer to sainthood. On May 1 that occurred. He spent his life blazing a path of enlightenment, peace, love, and uplifting humanity.

The second event that occurred on that day was the demise of bin Laden, who spent his life lighting a path of murder, deceit, and the destruction of humanity. While one found, and is finding, sainthood, the other found Satan.

It is a good thing that he is no longer a plague on the Earth, and the hope for humankind is that Pope John Paul II would be our exemplar of goodness.

Given the immense security challenges facing our Nation, Congress should pass this legislation so that we may continue to fulfill our commitment to the safety and well-being of the American people.

The men and women of the intelligence community may operate in the background, but they are at the forefront of our national defense and deserve every resource necessary to do their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule because, in spite of Mr. REED, my colleague on the Rules Committee, and the distinguished chairman, my good friend, touting the fact that we do have a number of amendments and the time, this is not an open rule; and I would have them to know that if it were an open rule, then all Members would be able to offer an amendment to the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today we've had a distinguished group of speakers, including the gentleman, Mr. HASTINGS, who spent years of his service, not only on behalf of the people of Florida, but on behalf of all of us as he served on the Intelligence Committee.

We have had Members walk in and out of here: the gentlewoman from North Carolina, VIRGINIA FOXX, who brings a thoughtful articulation about her ideas about the protection of this country, not just for the people of North Carolina, but for the people of the United States.

We've had the gentleman, a former sheriff, Mr. NUGENT, a Member of Congress from Florida, also come and talk about their ideas about how you protect this country by protecting the men and women who are engaged in the active and day-to-day business.

The gentleman, Mr. HASTINGS, referred to al Qaeda as not defeated. We still have a threat that is out there. The gentleman, Mr. FARENTHOLD, talked most forthrightly and honestly about the need of the American people to have confidence and thanks for the intelligence community and that which they do.

The gentleman, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, as they bring their ideas forth in an open process that would be allowed in the committee, Intelligence Committee, and then to bring that forward as they would discuss that at the Rules Committee.

Here on the floor of the House of Representatives it's an interesting dialogue that we get into about our hopes and desires about supporting the intelligence community. But we must remember that the need for our intelligence community and for them to have clear direction from this Congress is important.

The killing of the most wanted terrorist in the world, Osama bin Laden, is a perfect example of the necessary intelligence information and support from this Congress for funds and the authorizing process, the oversight that is provided by the Congress.

The men and women in this intelligence community and the Armed Forces serve this Nation; and they provide us victories, day-to-day victories, not only in keeping America safe, but victories with finding and killing terrorists around the globe who would harm America and our allies.

The underlying bill today allows for that continued service by these brave men and women for the benefit of the American people.

Six years ago is far too long for Congress to have skirted its responsibilities to aid and help the intelligence community with an authorization. Now is the time to ensure the appropriate accountability, responsibility, and that funding is given to the intelligence community to carry out their mission to keep America safe and to look forward, as might be said, over the horizon to ensure that whatever is next, they are prepared for it.

I would like to applaud the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan, MIKE ROGERS; and the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER); and the Intelligence Committee for this authorization bill as they work so well with the men and women of the intelligence community on a mission which is important for us to join in with the administration to ensure that our intents are very clear to them.

We live in a dangerous time and in a dangerous world, and I feel much better protected knowing that this hard work is done by so many dedicated people.

So I encourage a ''yes'' vote on the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

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

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 50

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Friday, May 13, 2011, or Saturday, May 14, 2011, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, May 23, 2011, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. (a) The Speaker or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader, shall notify the Members to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the House adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the House shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT). The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

REVERSING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S OFFSHORE MORATORIUM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 257 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1231.

□ 1310

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARDNER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, May 11, 2011, proceedings on amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 112–74, offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING), had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112–74 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 5 by Ms. TSONGAS of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 6 by Ms. BROWN of Florida.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. THOMPSON of California.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. INSLEE of Washington.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 223, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 315]

AYES—195

Ackerman
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—223

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey

Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Akin
Andrews
Cantor
Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
Lamborn
Paul
Ribble
Schock
Sutton
Towns
Wilson (SC)

□ 1336

Messrs. GRAVES of Missouri and DENHAM changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. BROWN OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 134, noes 279, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 316]

AYES—134

Ackerman
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Keating
Kildee
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—279

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Carnahan
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
Holden
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Buchanan
Cantor
Farenthold
Farr
Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Huizenga (MI)
Johnson, Sam
Paul
Polis
Quayle
Ribble
Rooney
Schilling
Sutton
Towns
Weiner
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1341

Messrs. BACA and DOGGETT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 316, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have noted ''no.''

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 265, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 317]

AYES—156

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)

Johnson (GA)
Jones
Keating
Kildee
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—263

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Reyes
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Cantor
Giffords
Griffith (VA)
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
Paul
Poe (TX)
Ribble
Sullivan
Sutton
Towns
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1344

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 256, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

AYES—160

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—256

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Hinojosa
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Reyes
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam

Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Akin
Cantor
Deutch
Giffords
Graves (MO)
Hastings (WA)
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Paul
Ribble
Sutton
Towns
Waters
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CHAFFETZ) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1349

Mr. POSEY changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 318, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER) having assumed the chair, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 257, reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with a further amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOLT. I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Holt moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1231 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 4, line 19, strike the final closing quotation marks and following period, and after line 19 insert the following:

''(7) NO FOREIGN SALES.—In each oil and gas leasing program under this section, the Secretary shall specify that all oil and natural gas produced under leases issued under the program shall be offered for sale only in the United States.''.

Page 6, after line 3, insert the following (and redesignate accordingly):

''(3) REDUCING NUMBER OF NONPRODUCING LEASES.—In developing a 5-year oil and gas leasing program, the Secretary shall seek to reduce the number of nonproducing offshore oil and gas leases by 50 percent by 2017.

Mr. HOLT (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, time and again over the past week, I have referred to the majority's trio of offshore drilling bills as ''amnesia acts.'' They willfully forget the lessons derived at great cost in lives and livelihoods from the Deepwater Horizon spill last summer. Mr. Speaker, and with these amnesia acts, the majority offers false promises to Americans who are struggling to make ends meet as gas prices continue to rise.

The truth is that giving away more of the American people's offshore resources to Big Oil companies will do absolutely nothing to ease the prices at the pump. How do we know? Because the oil giants already are sitting on 11.6 billion barrels of oil in the Gulf of Mexico without lifting a finger to extract it.

If my colleagues really believe that more domestic drilling is the answer to high gas prices, then they should support this final amendment, which does two things: first, to encourage the oil companies to drill on the tens of millions of acres of public land they already hold so that Americans can benefit from domestic oil production before the oil companies rush to lock up more land; and second, the amendment would help to keep the oil produced within the United States of America here at home.

Mr. Speaker, the facts speak for themselves. Opening vast portions of the east and west coasts to drilling makes no sense when 79 percent of all the potential oil resources on the whole continental shelf already are available in the current offshore leasing program. Why risk every inch of American coastline, which supports millions of jobs in tourism and fishing and over $225 billion in related economic activity when the Energy Information Administration tells us that unrestrained offshore drilling might lower gas prices not at all in the foreseeable future and maybe pennies two decades from now?

Oil companies are active on just 10 million of the 34 million acres under lease in the gulf. My Republican colleagues say, yes, but it takes time and money to explore before you can start production. Well, the fact is that of the 24 million lease acres lying fallow in the gulf, they hold 70 percent of the region's technically recoverable oil, but the companies aren't exploring on a single one of those acres. They haven't even submitted exploration plans in those areas. Why should they when they can squat on these resources and still make $32 billion in profits just in the last 3 months?

Mr. Speaker, every kindergartner knows you should clean your plate before you get a second helping. Evidently the oil company executives never learned that lesson. Here is our chance to deliver the lesson to them, and if my colleagues truly believe that we need more drilling, not just more giveaways to Big Oil, then let's at least make sure the oil companies use the resources they have already leased instead of stockpiling them, and let's make sure that Americans get to use the oil produced on their land.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to now yield to the ranking member of the Resources Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

Oil companies already have the drilling rights to public lands the size of Minnesota on which they are not producing oil. Minnesota is the land of 10,000 lakes, and the area oil companies already have could be the land of 10,000 wells but they are not drilling on it. And are Republicans saying they should drill on what they have? No. They want to put drill rigs off our beaches in New England, the Outer Banks, and California, all before we have implemented a single safety reform recommended by the independent blue-ribbon BP spill commission.

Today, five of the largest oil companies testified in defense of their billions of special tax breaks. ConocoPhillips said today it would be un-American to take away Big Oil's tax breaks. Well, it's not un-American. It's unbelievable that Big Oil has the arrogance to continue to defend its tax breaks as consumers are being tipped upside down at the pump.

And how are these tax breaks for Big Oil paid for? I will tell you how. The Republicans are planning to put a drill rig on top of the Medicare program. Republicans are building an oil pipeline into the pocketbooks of our seniors for tax breaks for the oil companies. The Republican agenda is to cut checkups for Grandma and cut checks for Big Oil. They want to cut health care for Grandma and give welfare to the Big

Oil executives. The Republican plan is tax breaks for Big Oil and tough breaks for our Nation's seniors.

Vote ''yes'' on this recommittal motion.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my point of order while rising in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No point of order was reserved.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. This Democrat motion is just one more example of congressional Democrats attempting to obstruct a bill that will increase access to American energy resources. This motion is already the law. The law says the President has an authority to restrict foreign sales, and ''use it or lose it'' is already the law of the land. If my friends want to reduce the nonproducing leases, then we need to get this administration to issue permits in a timely manner.

This motion is trying to deflect criticism from the policies that have been perpetrated that block American energy production, cost jobs and raise prices. It is simply a distraction from the real work that needs to be done to increase the supply of American energy.

The bill we're voting on today represents a real choice, Mr. Speaker, on the future of American energy: a choice between using American energy resources or remaining dependent on an OPEC cartel; a choice between creating jobs in America or creating jobs offshore of Brazil.

With this motion, the party opposite is standing for a ''drill there and not here'' policy. Mr. Speaker, that is not a strategy that will work to create American jobs. The underlying bill will create these jobs.

Finally, this is a choice between strengthening our energy security in the face of $4 a gallon gasoline or being held hostage to the whims of volatile foreign regimes. Mr. Speaker, there can be no national security without energy security.

As a small business man, I know what the pressure of $5 a gallon diesel fuel did to my business back in 2008, and we only had two trucks on the road.

□ 1400

Now think about what this is going to do to every household, every trucking business, every shipper, and every farmer in our country. The Nation's families are hurting, Mr. Speaker. They're trying to decide between putting fuel in their cars to go to work or putting food on their tables to feed their children. We must act to increase the supply of American energy, and Mr. Speaker, this bill will get us moving in the right direction. This is a commonsense, free market solution that can help us restore America's greatness.

Congress took bipartisan action in 2008 to lift the moratorium on offshore drilling and exploration. Yet this administration has unilaterally defied the will of this Congress and the will of the American people by effectively reinstating a moratorium. The energy resources don't belong to President Obama. They belong to the American people, and they should be used to create American jobs, to generate revenue, to reduce gasoline prices, and to strengthen our national security.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion. Let's pass this bill to return these American energy resources back to where they belong, and that is to the American people.

May God continue to bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage, if ordered; adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 50, by the yeas and nays; and adoption of House Resolution 264, by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 243, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

AYES—180

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—243

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)

Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Cantor
Dent
Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
Paul
Ribble
Wilson (SC)

□ 1419

Messrs. FRANK of Massachusetts and POLIS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 179, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 320]

AYES—243

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—179

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Bilbray
Cantor
Giffords
Hall
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
Paul
Ribble
Wilson (SC)

□ 1426

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 50, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 158, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

YEAS—227

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan

Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—158

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Burgess
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Engel
Eshoo
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—46

Bass (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Cantor
Carson (IN)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Davis (IL)
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Giffords
Graves (MO)
Hastings (WA)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Markey
Meeks
Moore
Moran
Paul
Payne
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rush
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Van Hollen
Watt
Weiner
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)

□ 1432

Mr. WELCH changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 321, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 754, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 264) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 754) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 251, nays 133, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

YEAS—251

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Cardoza
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—133

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldwin
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Cohen
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—47

Bass (CA)
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Camp
Cantor
Carson (IN)
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Edwards
Ellison
Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Meeks
Moore
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rush
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Van Hollen
Watt
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1439

Mr. GARAMENDI changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 2011, I inadvertently missed rollcall Nos. 321 and 322. Had I been present I would voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, due to a conflicting engagement at the White House I was absent during the votes on H. Res. 264 and H. Con. Res. 50. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on both measures.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–76) on the resolution (H. Res. 209) directing the Secretary of State to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any document, record, memo, correspondence, or other communication of the Department of State, or any portion of such communication, that refers or relates to any consultation with Congress regarding Operation Odyssey Dawn or military actions in or against Libya, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON TUESDAY, MAY 24, 2011, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCY BINYAMIN NETANYAHU, PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Tuesday, May 24, 2011, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Benjamin Netanyahu, Prime Minister of Israel.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 12, 2011 at 11:30 a.m.:

Appointments:

Board of Visitors of the United States Air Force Academy.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 754.

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

There was no objection.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 264 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 754.

□ 1442

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 754) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with Mr. YODER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to announce that subsequent to reporting the bill, the committee has modified the classified annex to the bill with respect to the authorized level of funding for certain programs, with bipartisan agreement between myself and the ranking member, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. The classified annex containing the modified schedule of authorizations is available for review by all Members of the House, subject to the rules of the House and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, under which procedures were described in my announcement to the House on May 3, 2011. The modified schedule of authorizations is and has been available for review by Members and the period of time required by the rules of the House.

Mr. Chairman, the annual intelligence authorization bill, I do believe, is one of the most important bills that will pass in the House each year. I want to thank my ranking member, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. We sat down at the beginning of January and decided that matters of national security were too important for infectious partisan debate and rhetoric and we decided that we would work out through every cause, as congenially as possible, and agree where we could, on every matter that we had a difference on, moving forward on, again, matters of intelligence and matters of national security.

I think the product we see on the floor today reflects that commitment and that working relationship, and I want to commend Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and the entire House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for their work, their cooperation, and their commitment to our national security to the United States.

We recently saw the successful mission against Osama bin Laden. Our intelligence professionals remain on the front lines in America's defense against our enemies. For the last 6 years, Congress has failed to pass a bona fide intelligence authorization bill with funding authority. Instead, yearly appropriation bills have simply deemed intelligence funding to be authorized.

We must, and I think we agree in a bipartisan way, stop that trend and stop it this year. The continued success of our intelligence community requires effective and aggressive congressional oversight. Such oversight can only be achieved if we get back in the habit of meeting our responsibility of passing an intelligence authorization bill every year.

Mr. Chairman, we have men and women scattered all across this globe who are engaged daily in sometimes often very dangerous work of collecting information to provide our policymakers and our warfighters the information they need to defeat our enemy. From trying to catch spies here in the United States by our FBI to recruiting people who want to cooperate and help the United States on tough issues like nuclear proliferation or terrorism efforts targeted against us or our allies, these folks log countless hours, risk their lives, spend time away from their families, and deserve our praise and our commitment that we will work with them to give them the tools that they need to be successful.

I can't think of a more important time in our history where I have seen intelligence play such an important

role in our world affairs. The world is changing before our eyes, and our intelligence community is providing us the information we need, not just to be safe, but to make good decisions on what that world looks like and what our national interests are country by country, region by region.

I am particularly pleased that this bill has such strong bipartisan support. The legislative provisions are intentionally limited to focus our attention on providing necessary resources to the men and women of the intelligence community as provided in the classified annex. The secrecy that is a necessary part of our country's intelligence work requires that the congressional Intelligence Committees conduct strong and effective oversight on behalf of the American people, and that strong and effective oversight is possible. But without that annual intelligence authorization bill, the bill that we will pass today—we must get back in the habit of passing that bill every year.

We make important commitments in this bill, Mr. Chairman, for the priorities of the intelligence community. Technology has fused in the intelligence collection like I have never seen it, and its increase is exponential over the past 10 years.

We make important investment in the new technologies that allow our intelligence officials and professionals to do the work they need to do. It makes them more effective, and it also makes the investment in the people who oversee that technology even more important. We make that important investment in this FY 2011 intelligence authorization bill as well.

Nothing brings that home like the broad scope of what we saw participate in the Osama bin Laden event of last Sunday. Every single intelligence agency, and I do mean every single one, played a part in that operation, from collecting small bits of information, from putting that piece together, signals intelligence, satellite intelligence, MASINT intelligence, all of those things came together over the course of 10 years.

I credit George Bush and his administration for assembling this new intelligence community that really started after 9/11 and President Obama for making the authorization and the continued policies that allowed us to have that information to go after Osama bin Laden. It was really quite an impressive thing. Both administrations deserve credit for that, and I would hope that today the people of the House of Representatives would celebrate that victory and all the work of the unsung heroes who work in the shadows by passing this FY 2011 so they can get about the business of protecting the United States.

I appreciate, again, this bipartisan consensus.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1450

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I rise in support of H.R. 754, the Intelligence Authorization Act for FY 2011.

The men and women in the military and intelligence community who helped locate al Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden exemplify the extraordinary courage and skill of those who work tirelessly to keep our community safe. They should be commended for a job well done. But our fight against terrorism is not over. We have severely weakened al Qaeda, but we must remain vigilant as we work to eliminate this threat. I believe that it's our responsibility to give our intelligence professionals the resources, capabilities, and authorities they need to do their jobs successfully.

The Intelligence Authorization Act for FY 2011 has thousands of civilian positions above the level enacted in FY 2010 and above the level of people currently on board. This includes counterterrorism positions at the CIA and a large increase in personnel at the National Counterterrorism Center, the NCTC. The bill also adds hundreds of millions of dollars for intelligence above current levels. In response to the Web site WikiLeaks, the bill includes an insider threat detection program that automatically monitors unauthorized access to classified information.

The way Congress conducts effective oversight of the intelligence community is by passing an Intelligence authorization bill to give the intelligence community budgetary direction.

When I first got to the Intelligence Committee 8 years ago, right after 9/11, I was concerned with the lack of coordination and communication within the intelligence community. In the different areas in intelligence—the CIA, NSA, FBI—there was not the communication or coordination that was necessary. But this has definitely changed today. The Osama bin Laden mission proved that. Professionals from all across the intelligence community, including the CIA, NGA, NSA, and Special Ops, all came together as a team to get the job done. We are now on our game. We're working together. We're better than we've ever been. And we clearly have sent a message to the world: If you're going to attack Americans, if you're going to kill Americans, we're going to find you and we're going to bring you to justice.

On the House Select Intelligence Committee we work together. Chairman ROGERS, as he stated before, and I have agreed to work together in a bipartisan manner. The stakes are too high not to do so. I join Chairman ROGERS in saying politics has no place in the Intelligence Committee. The threats are real and the stakes are too high. Sure, we will have disagreements. We will disagree from time to time on policy. But we will work together to work through these issues to do what is right for the intelligence community to protect our country and our national security. This is what we did in this budget.

After months of negotiations with the majority and a number of changes to address many of the concerns of the administration, I believe this bill moves in a positive direction. It goes a long way to help our intelligence professionals get the job done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished member of the Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. LOBIONDO. I would like to start out by thanking you, Chairman ROGERS and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, for refocusing the efforts of the Intel Committee on that which is critically important with the authorization and oversight for our intelligence community.

We have incredibly dedicated men and women who are putting their lives on the line every day in a way that almost all of America will never know. These individuals deserve nothing less than the full attention and help from Congress in the authorization and helping them with the programs that are necessary to continue the dramatic successes such that we've seen with Osama bin Laden.

They have successes every day, ladies and gentlemen. They're not as high profile as the one we had last week, but many of them are just as important. Without the Intelligence authorization bill, we're having them go out with one arm tied behind their backs. It's unfair to them; it's unfair to the country. In these times of turbulence, with an enemy that is bound and determined to hurt our country, we rely on our intelligence community and the great work that they do. This bill will help them do that.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield 3 minutes to a senior member of the Intelligence Committee, the ranking member of the Terrorism Subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank Mr. RUPPERSBERGER for yielding, and I thank Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. ROGERS for their good work in the committee.

As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Human Intelligence, Analysis, and Counterintelligence, I'm pleased that we were able to work through our differences to bring a stronger and now bipartisan Intelligence authorization bill to the floor today.

H.R. 754 will support critical U.S. intelligence capabilities by increasing resources for our country's counterterrorism efforts while also providing needed flexibility to the Central Intelligence Agency to hire the analysts that it needs.

Last year, under the leadership of then-Speaker PELOSI and Chairman

REYES, President Obama signed the first Intelligence Authorization Act in 6 years. That bill included a number of long overdue provisions that supported critical U.S. intelligence capabilities, significantly enhanced congressional oversight, and improved accountability across the entire intelligence community. Today's bill builds on that effort and represents an important step forward towards enacting an Intelligence authorization bill for the second year in a row.

Unfortunately, the process used to produce this bill was badly flawed and there weren't proper hearings to get to where we are now. And that's evidenced by the amendments that we are able to get into this bill to bring it up to the position that it's in. However, with the changes made to the classified annex, I believe this authorization will strengthen our national security and is in the best interest of our intelligence community.

Specifically, the additional funds authorized by this bill to hire more counterterrorism analysts will make our country safer and more secure. It was, after all, counterterrorism analysts that located Osama bin Laden after he had disappeared for nearly 10 years and that are now tracking senior al Qaeda leadership around the globe. By providing more resources to this critical effort, our intelligence community will be able to confront head-on the threat posed by al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations throughout the world. In fact, given the recent success of our counterterrorism effort, this is the strategy we should pursue over our counterinsurgency campaign in Afghanistan, which has not shown the results Congress expected or that the American people demand. This tactical change would significantly reduce our military footprint in countries around the world while allowing our military and intelligence assets to confront terrorism threats wherever they're developed.

Mr. Chair, our intelligence community must be prepared for any and all threats, making it all the more critical for Congress to pass an Intelligence authorization that furthers our national security.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. This legislation is necessary, will enhance the capabilities of the intelligence community, specifically our counterterrorism efforts, and will make our Nation safer.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and thank the members of our intelligence community and their families for their great work and their sacrifice.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to gentlewoman from the great State of North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), a distinguished member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mrs. MYRICK. I'm delighted to be here today because this is a good moment for our intelligence community that we are going to pass an Intelligence bill.

You've heard it said it has been 6 years since there has been an authorization for these people. They are out there every single day in every single agency doing what they do so we can be here to be able to discuss this on the floor and to live freely in this country and around the world. It's extremely important that they have the knowledge and security of knowing that what they do is approved of and authorized by this committee in the House.

It has been good to have a bipartisan agreement in the sense that we worked very well together. Mr. ROGERS and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER worked extremely well. Myself and Mr. THOMPSON, who chair one of the committees, work very well together. The committee members do. And so it's encouraging that we're able to move forward in a way that's very positive for the people of this country relative to their national security.

So I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CHANDLER), a hardworking member of the Technical and Tactical Subcommittee of the Intelligence Committee.

□ 1500

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Osama bin Laden, one of the worst men to walk the Earth since Adolf Hitler, is dead. While on the run for many years, bin Laden continued to plan and coordinate attacks against Americans. He was only found and killed because of the brave men and women in our military and in our intelligence community. We have some of the best intelligence operations in the world, and if we want to continue the fight against terrorism, we need to keep it that way. This bill does just that.

The bill authorizes funding for the dedicated men and women of the intelligence community to help them do their jobs and protect American citizens. In my tenure on the intelligence committee, I have had the privilege of visiting with many of the courageous and extremely bright people who work in intelligence. After meeting them, there is no doubt in my mind that we are in good hands, and I have a greater appreciation for the work they do to keep America safe every day. It is incredibly important that we support those efforts, especially in light of the extraordinary job the intelligence community did in finding and killing bin Laden.

These are tough times with our budget, but the security of our people has got to be our priority.

Last year, under the leadership of Chairman REYES, Congress passed its first Intelligence authorization act since the 2005 bill. I applaud both Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER in their efforts to work out a bipartisan compromise that would help maintain and strengthen our impressive intelligence community. They've done a tremendous job, and it's a breath of fresh air to see everybody working so well together.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas and a member of the Intelligence Committee, Mr. CONAWAY.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, I appreciate the chairman's words, and I hope those aren't mutually exclusive, being distinguished and being from Texas.

I rise in strong, strong support of this year's Intelligence authorization bill and encourage my colleagues, all of them, to support this. But with that strong support comes a modest amount of disappointment in that, through no fault of anyone in particular, we had to make a tough decision to strike section 412 from the bill, which would have allowed certain elements within the intel community to set up their own direct accounts with Treasury. It's a bit of an arcane statement, but it allows greater steps toward achieving auditability across the intelligence community. This provision was intended to promote this goal of better financial accountability and insight into our classified spending.

The intelligence community, Mr. Chairman, must meet the same financial accounting standards as the rest of the government. Those accounting standards will help uncover savings in current programs that can be reinvested into vital intelligence priorities or returned to the taxpayers.

While I am disappointed that the provision was not in the 2011 bill, I have already had good conversations with the chairman in reference to the 2012 bill, which will be in committee in the next couple of weeks, so that we can continue to move the intelligence community, their various slots, toward accountability, which is important for the taxpayer, and it helps give management a reliable tool. If they've got those systems, got the internal controls in place, it will give them tools in order to manage the money, the precious resources that we take from the taxpayers and entrust to the intelligence community to do the great work that they have done over these past years.

There is no greater example of that, of course, than the find-and-fix portion of the bin Laden experience that we saw play out on May 1 and 2, a terrific achievement by folks whose faces will never be seen, whose names will never be known except to them and their colleagues. They'll know who they are. They'll have that great pride of knowing they've done great work for this country using the tools that we provide them.

I urge my colleagues to support the reauthorization bill.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 21½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield 2 minutes to the appropriator member of the House Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I rise in support of this reauthorization.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise to pay tribute to the dedicated men and women of our intelligence community. Their work is not an easy job in the best of times, but over the last 10 years, they've carried an especially heavy day-to-day burden. They work long hours under tremendous pressure, mostly in obscurity, to ensure that Americans are protected everywhere. They are the unsung heroes of national security, and we owe them more than we can possibly repay.

My colleagues, as a Member of the House from a ''9/11 State,'' I take very seriously the findings of the 9/11 Commission. One of the key recommendations of the commission was the need to improve coordination of the numerous congressional committees charged with overseeing and funding the intelligence community and its many activities.

To this end, I commend Chairman MIKE ROGERS for including me as part of the intelligence team in his committee. I would also like to thank Chairman Hal Rogers of the Appropriations Committee for seeing fit to appoint me as one of three liaisons to the Intelligence Committee. We are working closely with the Intelligence Committee to eliminate the daylight that has existed in the past between these two important committees and the legislation that's produced.

The bill Chairman ROGERS and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER have constructed does ensure that our intelligence community has the tools and resources to analyze, predict, respond, and counter all the threats to America and Americans. I commend them for their effort. I am proud to be part of their team.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, also a member of the committee, Mr. WESTMORELAND.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

I cannot stress enough the importance of passing this FY 2011 Intelligence authorization bill. This legislation will not only ensure that our intelligence agencies are sufficiently funded to carry out their functions, but it will hold them fiscally accountable.

It has been 6 years since Congress has passed a complete Intelligence authorization bill. In years past, we have simply continued to ''deem'' funding for our intelligence programs to be authorized through other appropriations bills. Well, our law expressly requires that we explicitly authorize intelligence funding, and that is what we need to do here. We need to start passing an authorization bill each year in order to maintain the success of our intelligence communities and spell out exactly what will be provided. I want to commend Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER and Chairman ROGERS for their work in working together to make sure that this is made possible.

The significance of our country's intelligence cannot be overstated. The killing of Osama bin Laden is a direct example of the meaningful work that these agencies perform in order to protect us. We must continue to provide these men and women with the resources and capabilities that they need and not just place obstacles in their way but give them the resources that will make their job easier and more efficient. This authorization bill provides a detailed blueprint of necessary budget needs for the 17 separate agencies that it covers. It funds both military and civilian members of our intelligence community and directly supports those involved in dangerous operations at home and abroad. They are the very operations that are countering global terrorism and monitoring foreign militaries. These are the operations that make sure America stays on the cutting edge of intelligence technology to be able to detect and thwart threats before they become imminent. These are the people we must ensure are adequately funded.

I ask all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would just like to engage in a colloquy briefly if we can.

As the gentleman knows, I have worked and he has worked to decrease funding for the NDIC, the National Drug Intelligence Center. This is a center that has received hundreds of millions of dollars over the years, yet in 2005 a White House OMB report said that the NDIC ''has proven ineffective in achieving its assigned mission.'' Reports subsequent to that have pointed to similar failures and problems. Yet it still received last year, I think, $44 million.

□ 1510

I had intended to bring an amendment to this authorization bill, but I don't want to hold up this important authorization for FY 11. If I could just ask the chairman if he plans to bring an authorization bill for 2012.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. We plan to bring a bill for 2012, and I will work with you on the NDIC. I couldn't agree more: it's important that we continue to have the government effort focus on illicit drugs; however, the National Drug Intelligence Center has done very little to address this national priority, and I look forward to working with the Member.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to begin by recognizing our military's extraordinary efforts to successfully close a painful chapter in American history. Of course, the military could not have performed their mission so successfully without our intelligence community's unflagging efforts. The men and women of the intelligence community are the unsung heroes of not only the mission to bring Osama bin Laden to justice but many other successful counterterrorism operations, and they deserve tremendous credit.

The successful bin Laden mission highlights the critical role our intelligence community plays in protecting our national security. Two of the intelligence community's chief weapons against terrorism are information and the ability to communicate that information swiftly. I'm proud to say that the airmen at Creech Air Force Base in my home State of Nevada are critical to both capturing and communicating information that is necessary for intelligence operations.

One reason Nevadans elected me last fall was to restore government accountability and oversight. Secretary of Defense Gates and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mullen both identified America's growing debt as our number one national security concern.

As we're fighting the war on terror, we must not allocate resources without due process.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HECK. And we must ensure the intelligence community is accountable for their operations because most of their operations occur outside of the public's view.

Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER are doing incredible work to make these ideas that we share a reality. I applaud their dedication to restoring proper accountability and oversight to the intelligence community. I am confident the Intelligence Authorization Act provides the resources and latitude our intelligence community needs while ensuring fiscal and operational responsibility.

That is why I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 754.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to another distinguished gentleman from the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the chairman and ranking member for their leadership.

I rise today, Mr. Chairman, in support of the fiscal year 2011 Intelligence authorization legislation. On September 11, 2001, our Nation faced the deadliest act of terror in U.S. history. On the evening of May 1, 2011, the mastermind of those attacks, Osama bin Laden, was brought to justice and killed while hiding in a compound in Abbottabad, Pakistan.

Along with the sacrifices our Nation's troops have made over the past 10 years, our intelligence community has played an integral role in fighting the war on terror and keeping America safe. The behind-the-scenes work of the intelligence community leading up to the attack and the raid in Abbottabad was critical to the success of the mission and will continue to be a crucial asset to winning the war on terror.

Completing the Intelligence authorization bill is critical to ensuring that our Nation's intelligence agencies have the tools they need to remain at the forefront of global and national security. This bill provides vital congressional oversight and policy guidance to the intelligence community on behalf of the American people. Congress must ensure these agencies are acting in our best interest and spending taxpayer dollars wisely.

As a member of the House Intelligence Committee and the House Armed Services Committee, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

There are two issues that I would like to discuss that we don't talk about a lot, but I think it is important that we do raise the issue. I know Chairman ROGERS and I and the rest of the committee do work on this issue, and that's our space program and that's also cybersecurity.

We, years ago, responded to Russia's putting up Sputnik by, in 10 years, putting a man on the Moon. What we did basically is we helped create the science of rocket science. We did research and development, and we were able to put a man on the Moon. That was a great day for the United States of America when we did put a man on the Moon.

Now we're in a situation where our space program needs to move forward. We have a lot of issues that we have to deal with in our space program; and the main reason for that is that, if you control the skies, you basically control the world. Space and satellites are so important to what we do, not just from an intelligence point of view, getting the information, taking the pictures, dealing with all sorts of communications. These are things that we do in space, and we have to keep moving ahead. We have to get our younger generation graduating from our colleges to continue to go into space.

And the big threat there is China and Russia. China is putting billions of dollars into space. Their goal is to go to the Moon, and it is our concern that if they do that we have to be with them there. We have to continue our research and development, and we have to be vigilant in our space program. Russia, also, is very active in the space area.

So it's something that isn't talked about a lot, but there's a lot of money that goes into space; and I think we have to do a better job in our military, in our space and intelligence, and let the public know how important space is.

There's also another issue which is of great concern, I think, to the United States of America's national security, and that is the issue of cybersecurity. As we speak, we're being attacked by different governments and who knows what else we're being attacked by, getting information, relevant information, every day we speak. It's a very serious issue; and, unfortunately, the public does not really understand what cyber is about.

Our NSA is as good as any operation in the world in their technology and developing the technology in order to protect our country. We don't control the Internet other than a small part, our dot-mils, the military part. So we have to make sure that our public understands how important cybersecurity is, how we could be attacked.

We just recently had an attack about a month ago on NASDAQ. Just think if we had a cyberattack on our banks and what the lack of confidence would be for our public, and the government can't afford to pay for it all. So there has to be an effort between our government, our military, our NSA, between our private sector and between individuals who have their personal computers. This is an area of the future we need to focus on.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Mr. RUPPERSBERGER for the last remarks. Cybersecurity is a real and growing threat for the United States. We make serious commitments in this FY 11 bill, and we have pledged to work together on separate pieces of legislation to put the United States in a better position to defend itself against cybersecurity. Something that started out so long ago as somebody in their mother's basement hacking into the local school to change their grades has become whole nation-states using the Internet and all of cyberspace to not only steal intellectual property from private enterprise, attempt to hack and steal information from the United States, but also use it for offensive purposes where we have seen the Russians who when they went into Georgia use aggressively cyber to prep the battlefield for their invasion, something that we all need to worry about.

I want to, again, pledge to work with the ranking member on this very, very important issue so that we can get on better footing as we move forward.

Also, on the space, it is one of the things that has given the United States a technological advantage in the world, something that we need to continue to make those investments into the overhead architecture of the United States from communication satellites to all of the things that we do from space. And it is a serious investment on this country, but when you look at the success of something like the Osama bin Laden raid, you realize all of it, from space, to cyber, to signals intelligence, to human intelligence, is something that was invested in in this money; and I'm glad that the ranking member used this opportunity to talk about those very important issues and the commitment in this bill to start to put us on better footing for that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1520

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I believe many valid points have been made in support of H.R. 754, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

First, I want to thank Mr. ROGERS for his leadership and for working together in a bipartisan way to do what's right for our country's national security and to make sure that we do our job in the oversight of all of the intelligence areas. Hopefully, we will continue this relationship as we go forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), a distinguished member of the House Intelligence Committee.

Mr. NUNES. I would like to say thank you to Chairman ROGERS and to Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for really taking the Intelligence Committee and establishing its relevance back in the House. I know we've had some disagreements in the past, but Chairman ROGERS, along with a lot of new members on the committee, have been working closely with the Democrats in a bipartisan way to, I believe, make a real difference in Congress' role in the intelligence community. I want to commend both of them for their honest and hard work. It's never easy because, as I'm learning now since being on the committee, it takes a lot of hours, and it's a lot of hours on behalf of the members that they have to commit to this committee; so having a chairman and a ranking member to really lead us in that effort makes a big difference.

Mr. Chairman, let me speak to the issue at hand, which is that it is very concerning that Congress has not completed an authorization bill in 6 years

even though the terrorist threat has not lessened since September 11, 2001. This has limited an important oversight responsibility of the Congress. The world is too dangerous for Congress not to be more engaged in overseeing 16 intelligence agencies. We simply cannot maintain the status quo of the 111th Congress and ignore laws that require congressional oversight and the authorization of intelligence operations by the House Intelligence Committee.

Congress must meet its responsibilities and again begin to pass annual intelligence authorization bills, which are vital to ensuring, among other things, that the men and women who really risk their lives to be part of this intelligence community are properly funded to carry out their critical mission of defending our country, such as the mission we just saw a couple of weeks ago, that of the killing of Osama bin Laden.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. NUNES. Congress can no longer avoid its responsibilities when our counterintelligence operations provide critical support to our combat units in Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, and in other important places across the world or when our intelligence agencies require new, cutting-edge technology or during a time of unprecedented unrest in the Middle East, Southeast Asia or in other parts of Central and South America.

This does not mention the ever-growing threat that we face in the cyber community, with cyberspace, which is an area that this committee, I believe, will have to spend some significant time on.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NUNES. It also doesn't mention the time that we will have to spend on some foreign countries that are quickly gaining access to minerals that are very hard to come by. So many foreign nations are investing a lot of time, energy and effort into locating not only these minerals, oil, and natural gas all over the world, but they're coming together and working outside the interests of the United States. We have to have intelligence in these areas.

This isn't your typical authorization bill, but it funds 17 intelligence agencies which are critical to the defense of our country. Each agency has a unique perspective on the world, and Congress should be bipartisan in its partnering in these missions throughout the authorization and oversight processes. I look forward to voting ''yes'' on the 11th bill and to working in a bipartisan way on the 12th bill.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to an outstanding member of the Terrorism Subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN).

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

I want to thank Chairman ROGERS, and I also want to thank Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for working together in a bipartisan way to produce this bill. Their leadership was invaluable in moving this bill forward, and it has been critical to all of the committee's efforts during the 112th Congress.

Last year, the President signed into law an Intelligence Authorization Act for the first time since 2005. That bill included a number of important provisions to address the foreign language needs of the intelligence community, including a provision I sponsored, which created a pilot program in African languages under the National Security Education Program.

I am glad we can build upon the FY10 bill and can get another authorization bill signed into law for the second straight year. This bill authorizes the annual funding for the 16 member agencies of the intelligence community; aligns the national counterterrorism strategy with the policies and strategies of the DNI; and requires the DNI to establish an insider threat detection program to prevent unauthorized leaks of classified information.

While this bill is important to our intelligence community's ability to be the first line of defense for America, as we recently saw with the killing of bin Laden in Pakistan, the intelligence community often forms the first line of offense against our enemies as well.

Last month, I traveled to Pakistan and Afghanistan, and witnessed firsthand the tremendous challenge of locating bin Laden and other members of al Qaeda. Finding him would not have been possible without the robust capabilities that are available to the dedicated intelligence professionals at the CIA and other agencies. That is why Congress must continue to provide the intelligence community with every resource it needs to complete its missions.

Again, I extend my gratitude to Chairman ROGERS and to Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for their exceptional work on this legislation, and I also thank the Intelligence Committee staff for its tireless efforts in preparing this year's bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to a former Army captain, the great new Member from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to come to the floor today and thank Chairman ROGERS and the ranking member for the great work they've done.

I do not sit on this committee, but I did have the opportunity to serve in uniform our country. We witnessed what happened in the capture of the world's greatest terrorist, and we saw the great military feats which took place, but we also know all of the enormous work that our intelligence community did to make that happen.

I served in a unit that patrolled the East German and Czechoslovakian border. Every day, we relied on the fact that our intelligence community was providing our military with the finest information and the finest data in as near realtime as it possibly could to make sure that we knew how to deploy our forces and knew the things that needed to be done to keep America safe.

So I want to applaud the efforts of the Intelligence Committee. I want to urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation and the intelligence community, which keeps everyone in America safe.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chairman, in closing, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 provides policy guidelines and sets classified funding levels for the 16 agencies in the intelligence community. Al Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden is gone forever, but our fight against terrorism is far from over.

I believe this bill moves us in the right direction to ensure our topnotch intelligence professionals have the resources, capabilities and authorities they need to keep our country safe.

I also want to acknowledge our staffs on both the Democratic and Republican sides, who worked together very closely with us to help put together this bill. I've always said that you're only as good as your team. We talk about teamwork. You need a good team and a good staff.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I will just take this opportunity to thank both the Democrat and Republican staff members who helped us prepare this bill. For the first time since I have served on the committee, we had both Democrat and Republican staff briefed in a bipartisan way at the same table, all Members in the room. And we think that that improved the value of this product tremendously, something we are hoping to continue.

So my hat is off to all of the staff. We hire professionals from the community, from all walks of life as well to provide us the expertise that we need to provide the proper oversight for the intelligence community. And I do believe, in this great spirit of bipartisanship with Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, that this will give the tools to those 17 agencies who work in secrecy on behalf of the United States the things that they need to accomplish their mission and to keep this great country safe.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 754

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—BUDGET AND PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 102. Classified Schedule of Authorizations.
Sec. 103. Intelligence Community Management Account.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—GENERAL INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MATTERS

Sec. 301. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.
Sec. 302. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.
Sec. 303. Non-reimbursable detail of other personnel.

TITLE IV—MATTERS RELATING TO ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Subtitle A—Office of the Director of National Intelligence

Sec. 401. Schedule and requirements for the National Counterintelligence Strategy.
Sec. 402. Insider threat detection program.

Subtitle B—Other Elements

Sec. 411. Defense Intelligence Agency counterintelligence and expenditures.
Sec. 412. Accounts and transfer authority for appropriations and other amounts for the intelligence elements of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.—The term ''congressional intelligence committees'' means—

(A) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term ''intelligence community'' has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)).

TITLE I—BUDGET AND PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2011 for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the following elements of the United States Government:

(1) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

(2) The Central Intelligence Agency.

(3) The Department of Defense.

(4) The Defense Intelligence Agency.

(5) The National Security Agency.

(6) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.

(7) The Coast Guard.

(8) The Department of State.

(9) The Department of the Treasury.

(10) The Department of Energy.

(11) The Department of Justice.

(12) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(13) The Drug Enforcement Administration.

(14) The National Reconnaissance Office.

(15) The National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.

(16) The Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 102. CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) SPECIFICATIONS OF AMOUNTS AND PERSONNEL LEVELS.—The amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 101 and the authorized personnel levels (expressed as full-time equivalent positions) as of September 30, 2011, for the conduct of the intelligence activities of the elements listed in paragraphs (1) through (16) of section 101, are those specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations prepared to accompany the bill H.R. 754 of the One Hundred Twelfth Congress.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.—The classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in subsection (a) shall be made available to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the President. The President shall provide for suitable distribution of the Schedule, or of appropriate portions of the Schedule, within the executive branch.

SEC. 103. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence for fiscal year 2011 the sum of $660,732,000. Within such amount, funds identified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

(b) AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL LEVELS.—The elements within the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence are authorized 787 full-time equivalent personnel as of September 30, 2011. Personnel serving in such elements may be permanent employees of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence or personnel detailed from other elements of the United States Government.

(c) CLASSIFIED AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account by subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated for the Community Management Account for fiscal year 2011 such additional amounts as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a). Such additional amounts made available for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF PERSONNEL.—In addition to the personnel authorized by subsection (b) for elements of the Intelligence Community Management Account as of September 30, 2011, there are authorized such full-time equivalent personnel for the Community Management Account as of that date as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a).

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund for fiscal year 2011 the sum of $292,000,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MATTERS

SEC. 301. RESTRICTION ON CONDUCT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

The authorization of appropriations by this Act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity which is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

SEC. 302. INCREASE IN EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.

Appropriations authorized by this Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for Federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in such compensation or benefits authorized by law.

SEC. 303. NON-REIMBURSABLE DETAIL OF OTHER PERSONNEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 113A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404h–1) is amended to read as follows:

''NON-REIMBURSABLE DETAIL OF OTHER PERSONNEL

''SEC. 113A. An officer or employee of the United States or member of the Armed Forces may be detailed to the staff of an element of the intelligence community funded through the National Intelligence Program from another element of the intelligence community or from another element of the United States Government on a non-reimbursable basis, as jointly agreed to by the heads of the receiving and detailing elements, for a period not to exceed two years. This section does not limit any other source of authority for reimbursable or non-reimbursable details.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 113A and inserting the following:

''Sec. 113A. Non-reimbursable detail of other personnel.''.

TITLE IV—MATTERS RELATING TO ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Subtitle A—Office of the Director of National Intelligence

SEC. 401. SCHEDULE AND REQUIREMENTS FOR THE NATIONAL COUNTERINTELLIGENCE STRATEGY.

Section 904(d)(2) of the Counterintelligence Enhancement Act of 2002 (50 U.S.C. 402c(d)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Subject'' and inserting the following:

''(A) REQUIREMENT TO PRODUCE.—Subject'';

(2) by striking ''on an annual basis''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) REVISION AND REQUIREMENT.—The National Counterintelligence Strategy shall be revised or updated at least once every three years and shall be aligned with the strategy and policies of the Director of National Intelligence.''.

SEC. 402. INSIDER THREAT DETECTION PROGRAM.

(a) INITIAL OPERATING CAPABILITY.—Not later than October 1, 2012, the Director of National Intelligence shall establish an initial operating capability for an effective automated insider threat detection program for the information resources in each element of the intelligence community in order to detect unauthorized access to, or use or transmission of, classified intelligence.

(b) FULL OPERATING CAPABILITY.—Not later than October 1, 2013, the Director of National Intelligence shall ensure the program described in subsection (a) has reached full operating capability.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than December 1, 2011, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the resources required to implement the insider threat detection program referred to in subsection (a) and any other issues related to such implementation the Director considers appropriate to include in the report.

(d) INFORMATION RESOURCES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''information resources'' means networks, systems, workstations, servers, routers, applications, databases, websites, online collaboration environments, and any other

information resources in an element of the intelligence community designated by the Director of National Intelligence.

Subtitle B—Other Elements

SEC. 411. DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY COUNTERINTELLIGENCE AND EXPENDITURES.

Section 105 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403–5) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(5), by inserting ''and counterintelligence'' after ''human intelligence'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS BY THE DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.—(1) Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency may expend amounts made available to the Director for human intelligence and counterintelligence activities for objects of a confidential, extraordinary, or emergency nature, without regard to the provisions of law or regulation relating to the expenditure of Government funds.

''(2) The Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency may not expend more than five percent of the amounts made available to the Director for human intelligence and counterintelligence activities for a fiscal year for objects of a confidential, extraordinary, or emergency nature in accordance with paragraph (1) during such fiscal year unless—

''(A) the Director notifies the congressional intelligence committees of the intent to expend the amounts; and

''(B) 30 days have elapsed from the date on which the Director notifies the congressional intelligence committees in accordance with subparagraph (A).

''(3) For each expenditure referred to in paragraph (1), the Director shall certify that such expenditure was made for an object of a confidential, extraordinary, or emergency nature.

''(4) Not later than December 31 of each year, the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on any expenditures made during the preceding fiscal year in accordance with paragraph (1).''.

SEC. 412. ACCOUNTS AND TRANSFER AUTHORITY FOR APPROPRIATIONS AND OTHER AMOUNTS FOR THE INTELLIGENCE ELEMENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 21 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 428 the following new section:

''§ 429. Appropriations for defense intelligence elements: accounts for transfer; transfer

''(a) ACCOUNTS FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE ELEMENTS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish one or more accounts for the receipt of appropriations and other amounts transferred pursuant to subsection (b).

''(b) TRANSFERS AUTHORIZED.—(1) There may be transferred to an account established pursuant to subsection (a) the following:

''(A) Appropriations transferred by the Secretary of Defense from appropriations of the Department of Defense available for intelligence, intelligence-related activities, and intelligence-related communications.

''(B) Appropriations and other amounts transferred by the Director of National Intelligence from appropriations and other amounts available for the defense intelligence elements.

''(C) Amounts and reimbursements in connection with transactions authorized by law between the defense intelligence elements and other entities.

''(2) The transfer authority of the Secretary of Defense under paragraph (1)(A) is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Secretary by law.

''(c) AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS AND AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED.—(1) Appropriations transferred pursuant to subsection (b) shall remain available for the same time period, and shall be available for the same purposes, as the appropriations from which transferred.

''(2) Appropriation balances in an account established pursuant to subsection (a) may be transferred back to the account or accounts from which such balances originated as an appropriation refund.

''(d) DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE ELEMENTS DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'defense intelligence elements' means the agencies, offices, and elements of the Department of Defense that are included within the elements of the intelligence community specified in or designated under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 21 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 428 the following new item:

''429. Appropriations for defense intelligence elements: accounts for transfer; transfer.''.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 112–75. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF MICHIGAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 112–75.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 12, line 10, insert ''under the National Intelligence Program'' after ''the Director''.

Page 12, line 17, insert ''under the National Intelligence Program'' after ''the Director''.

Strike section 412.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 264, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is a manager's amendment to the bill that contains two provisions.

The first provision would simply clarify that section 411 of the bill, which relates to certain Defense Intelligence Agency expenditures, applies only to the National Intelligence Program funds. This clarification was requested by the Committee on Armed Services and is largely technical in nature.

The second provision would strike section 412 of the reported bill, which provides for the creation of certain accounts for intelligence funds. While this provision is an important one, intended to promote auditability of intelligence funds, some technical issues have arisen; and I believe it was prudent to hold this over until the FY12 bill. It is something that I support and hope to return to the bill in FY12. I do not believe that either of these changes are controversial and urge Members to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. In this era of tight budgets, I believe it is our responsibility to manage every taxpayer dollar efficiently and effectively. Section 412 of the bill provides the Secretary of Defense authority to transfer certain funds into specific accounts to provide more accurate accounting of money spent. The manager's amendment strikes section 412 from the bill.

Section 412 will allow for an accurate audit of taxpayer dollars. This important tool will save us money in the long run. We must identify programs that are not working and trim those costs. A thorough audit will help us do that. We must ensure any cuts do not negatively impact on the performance of the mission. The administration supports section 412, and so do I.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I thank the ranking member. I look forward to working with him on this particular issue.

As I think the ranking member understands, Mr. Chairman, we've brought in auditors on the committee. This is something we're very committed to in a bipartisan way, to actually have funds that can be audited. It's a bit shocking, I think, to both of us that they have had these funds for such a long time that have not been able to be audited, and we hope to do that on behalf of the taxpayers of the United States.

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

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I agree with the chairman. Staff is working together to try to resolve the issues involving section 412. We look forward to a positive resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BARROW

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 112–75.

Mr. BARROW. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

After section 303, insert the following:

SEC. 304. INTELLIGENCE OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAM.

Section 1024 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 441p) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''subsection (b)'' and inserting ''subsections (b) and (c)'';

(2) by redesignating subsections (c) through (f) as subsections (d) through (g), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (b), the following:

''(c) GRANT PROGRAM FOR HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.—(1) The Director may provide grants to historically black colleges and universities to provide programs of study in educational disciplines identified under subsection (a)(2) or described in paragraph (2).

''(2) A grant provided under paragraph (1) may be used to provide programs of study in the following educational disciplines:

''(A) Intermediate and advanced foreign languages deemed in the immediate interest of the intelligence community, including Farsi, Pashto, Middle Eastern, African, and South Asian dialects.

''(B) Study abroad programs and cultural immersion programs.''; and

(4) in paragraph (g) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1), the following:

''(2) HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY.—The term 'historically black college and university' has the meaning given the term 'part B institution' in section 322 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061).''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) STUDY ABROAD PROGRAM.—The term 'study abroad program' means a program of study that—

''(A) takes places outside the geographical boundaries of the United States;

''(B) focuses on areas of the world that are critical to the national security interests of the United States and are generally underrepresented in study abroad programs at institutions of higher education, including Africa, Asia, Central and Eastern Europe, Eurasia, Latin America, and the Middle East; and

''(C) is a credit or noncredit program.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 264, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for their hard work on this important legislation.

We face a diverse and growing array of threats around the globe, and we need an intelligence community as diverse as the threats we face. My amendment directs the national intelligence director to create a pilot program for Historically Black Colleges and Universities to help develop critical language curricula and study abroad programs. Our defenses have to be as advanced as the means used by our enemies. That means that our human assets have to be as diverse as our enemies. Cultural, language, and educational barriers affect the quality of intelligence we can gather; and it's critical that we have the human assets to overcome these barriers.

The area of Georgia I represent is home to several HBCUs with specific expertise in critical languages. Engaging centers of academic excellence such as these will help the intelligence community meet our strategic security goals and will produce more sophisticated intelligence officers. This, in turn, will make our country more secure. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support this amendment and support passage of the bill.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, while I do not oppose the amendment, I would ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

While I support the intent behind the amendment, I believe it is also important to note for the record—and I appreciate the gentleman's work on this—that the Intelligence Committee has already a number of existing programs and initiatives in this area. I think this will, in fact, enhance that effort.

The proposed amendment has the goal of assisting Historically Black Colleges and Universities in creating and maintaining academic curricula that help the intelligence community meet its workforce diversity and critical language goals. I am happy to say that the community already understands well that a diverse workforce enhances its mission performance. For example, Director Panetta has launched his own initiative at CIA to enhance the diversity of that agency's workforce.

Additionally, there are other initiatives under way to increase the employment and retention of the diverse candidates throughout the intelligence community. And I won't go on, other than to compliment the gentleman for his interest in exposing the number of people who would have the skills to apply and diversify our workforce at the CIA.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. DENT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112–75.

Mr. DENT. I offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 304. INFORMATION ON PURSUIT OF ANWAR AL-AWLAKI.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency shall jointly submit to the congressional intelligence committees—

(1) all information in the possession of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence and the Central Intelligence Agency relating to the pursuit and targeting of Anwar al-Awlaki by the Federal Government; and

(2) an analysis of the legal impediments to pursuing the capture of Anwar al-Awlaki.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 264, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I first want to commend the chairman and the ranking member for the very good work they have done on this bill. They really have worked in a bipartisan manner, and they are really trying to advance the best interests of the intelligence community and this Nation's national security. So I applaud them for the spirit in which they have taken on this legislation.

I will withdraw this amendment after having conversations with the chairman. But the point I want to make about the amendment is that the amendment simply directs the Director of National Intelligence and the CIA that within 90 days of this act to provide the congressional intelligence committees all information possessed by the DNI and the CIA relating to the pursuit and targeting of one Anwar al-Awlaki by the Federal Government as well as an analysis of the legal impediments to pursuing the capture of Anwar al-Awlaki.

Americans are all very much familiar with who Osama bin Laden is. Everybody knows who he is, and we're all extremely gratified about his demise. At the same time, we should all be aware too that Anwar al-Awlaki seems to be the leader of many of the operational aspects of al Qaeda on the Arabian Peninsula. He is a real threat. He is an American citizen. He is also a Yemeni citizen. He has targeted Americans. We always thought he was a spiritual adviser and certainly a recruiter for al Qaeda. But now it's quite clear that he has also gone operational.

□ 1540

We're aware of that as it relates to the underwear bomber, Abdulmutallab and his attempt to the blow up the airliner near Detroit.

So the point of this amendment is to raise awareness on Anwar al-Awlaki, also to point out the fact that he is a citizen, to point out the fact that I think it's important that we consider essentially that he has committed expatriating acts. I mean, the fact that he has targeted American citizens, that he has called for the death of many

Americans, I have legislation that is also prepared to deal with his citizenship issue, that it should be revoked, or at least we should seriously do that, just as we would for any other individual who takes up arms against this country. We have laws on the books from 1944 when there were individuals who were signed up with the Nazi army or the Imperial Army of Japan who took up arms against this country as citizens. Those are expatriating acts.

I simply believe that if an individual takes up arms with al Qaeda or the Taliban or any other terrorist organization, foreign terrorist organization that is intent on killing Americans, that we should treat them just as we would an individual who is an agent of a foreign government or part of a foreign army. That's the whole point.

But recognizing this is probably not the best place to offer this amendment at this time, I have agreed to withdraw it. I appreciate the chairman's consideration, and I will be working to make sure that this Congress has the opportunity to address the citizenship issue of Anwar al-Awlaki. It has reported in the press that our government has a kill or capture order on Mr. Al-Awlaki. I don't know if that is true or not. I read it in the press.

Just last week we saw reports that Anwar al-Awlaki was supposedly the intended target of an attack, unsuccessful, in Yemen, and so he is still alive. And the point I want to make is that I think that if we're targeting an American citizen for assassination, then I think we should at least take up the issue of his citizenship and revoke it if at all possible. So at that point I will address it in another forum.

At this time I would again urge everybody here to support the underlying legislation. I will withdraw this amendment, and I appreciate the chairman and ranking member's consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. GIBSON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 112–75.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV (page 11, after line 20), add the following new section:

SEC. 403. REPORT ON POTENTIAL CONSOLIDATION OF ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

Not later than December 31, 2011, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to congress a report containing any recommendations the Director considers appropriate for consolidating elements of the intelligence community.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 264, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I actually want to begin this afternoon by praising the chairman and the ranking member, all of the members of the intel committee and their staff for truly magnificent work here on behalf of the American people. I've spent some time down in the SCIF and have been through the bill, and I think it's something that everyone can be proud of. And clearly, the operation that occurred about 2 weeks ago that ended in the death of Osama Bin Laden is an example of how intel and operations can be fused for successful operations.

And I'm rising today to offer an amendment to the intel authorization bill that I hope the committee will be willing to accept. It's based on my experiences from the 29 years I served in the United States military, nearly 5 in the New York Army National Guard, and then 24 years in the United States Army.

And I will tell you that, particularly, my experiences in Iraq commanding an airborne infantry battalion task force, and then later as a Division G–3, that's an operations officer for Multinational Division North, I saw firsthand the virtues of intel and operations being fused for successful operations.

And so what concerns me today is the fact that since the 11th of September, we've had significant growth in the intel community to address various concerns. And what I think we need to do now is pause, reflect, and look for ways to consolidate all that growth so that we can continue to have effective intel operations in a manner that's consistent for Republicans, and one that we can afford.

So what I offered is actually a very simple amendment. It asks the Director of National Intelligence to provide his recommendations on consolidation with an eye towards effectiveness and efficiency.

When we initially created this position this, of course, was a result of the Kean Commission after the horrific attacks of the 11th of September, 2001. We created the DNI to help us to really provide leadership in the intel community. In my estimation, we did not provide the adequate budget and legal authorities for him to really accomplish all those duties that we expected of him. So I would think that he would welcome this task to provide his recommendation to us on how we might better organize, consolidate the intel community to perform its very critical function for the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment. And again I want to thank the intel committee, the leadership and all those who provided the work for this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I appreciate Congressman GIBSON's intent. And I also want to thank him for his service in the military. But I believe we should always be looking for efficiencies to help reduce costs throughout the government.

The Director of National Intelligence is conducting a similar review that will identify redundancies without sacrificing core missions. I want to see the product of those efforts before asking the DNI, Director of National Intelligence, to submit an additional report. For this reason I oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBSON. I certainly respect my colleague for all his experiences that he brings before he comes to the Congress, and for the tremendous work he's done in the time that he's been here serving the American people in the United States Congress.

I respectfully disagree with the position, and would like to hear directly from the Director of National Intelligence. I know if I were in his shoes I would welcome this task. I would want to provide the United States Congress, the American people, by way of the United States Congress, to provide the recommendations on the way that he, in this case, the way he sees fit on better organizing the intel community.

So, with a very heavy respect for the ranking member, I still urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

□ 1550

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. RUPPERSBERGER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 112–75.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I rise to offer the amendment for Congresswoman WATERS as her designee.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following new section:

SEC. 403. INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF RACIAL AND ETHNIC MINORITIES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall submit to Congress a report on the degree to which racial and ethnic minorities

in the United States are employed in professional positions in the intelligence community and barriers to the recruitment and retention of additional racial and ethnic minorities in such positions.

(b) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 264, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield to the gentlewoman from California, Congresswoman WATERS.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman.

My amendment requires the inspector general of the intelligence community to report to Congress on racial and ethnic diversity in the intelligence community.

A diverse workforce is essential to intelligence work. People from a variety of backgrounds bring a variety of perspectives to the table to understand the world in which we live. A diverse workforce provides intelligence agencies critical insights into different cultures around the world, where information about potential threats to our national security is being collected and analyzed.

Many leading intelligence officials understand the importance of a diverse workforce. The Web site of the Central Intelligence Agency includes the following statement:

''In order for the CIA to meet our mission of protecting our national security interests, we need to employ a workforce as diverse as America itself, the most diverse Nation on Earth. Diversity reflects the unique ways we vary as intelligence officers. Our nationality, race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, culture, sexual orientation, education, values, beliefs, abilities, and disabilities. These assorted attributes create different demographic, functional, and intellectual views which are so vital to our innovation, agility, collection, and analysis.''

And I really do think that says it all.

Unfortunately, there is virtually no data available to Congress and the public regarding the degree of racial and ethnic diversity in the intelligence community. The most recent publicly available report that discusses this subject is a 1996 report by the Government Accountability Office on personnel practices at intelligence agencies, which focused on equal employment opportunity practices.

The report concluded that intelligence agencies have workforce diversity programs, but results lag far behind other Federal agencies. This report was written more than 5 years before the terrorist attacks of 9/11 and 15 years before the death of Osama bin Laden. Needless to say, both the intelligence community and the world in which it operates have changed tremendously since then.

My amendment states that, within 180 days after the enactment of the bill, the inspector general shall submit to Congress a report on the degree to which racial and ethnic minorities in the United States are employed in professional positions in the intelligence community and barriers to the recruitment and retention of additional racial and ethnic minorities in these position. The amendment requires that the report be submitted in unclassified form, but allows the inspector general to include a classified annex.

It is long past time for Congress to reevaluate the diversity of the intelligence community workforce, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Again, I thank the gentleman, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, for yielding.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, while I do not oppose this amendment, I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I support efforts to create a diverse workforce within the intelligence community. A diverse workforce is instrumental to effectively respond to the complex global threats faced by the United States.

I do have so many concerns that this amendment is duplicative with many efforts which are already under way within the intelligence community to address this issue.

For example, section 338 of the Intelligence Authorization Act of 2010, passed after the fiscal year last year, requires the DNI to coordinate with each element of the IC to provide a report of plans to increase the employment and retention of diverse candidates. Moreover, the DNI has already created a strategic plan on equal employment opportunity and issued Community Directive 110, the Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Program.

It is my hope that the inspector general will consider all of these existing initiatives in the report and use the substantial body of work that has already been done on these issues in completing it.

Nonetheless, I will support the amendment and its laudable goals.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. HINCHEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 112–75.

Mr. HINCHEY. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY IN ARGENTINA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing the following:

(1) A description of any information in the possession of the intelligence community with respect to the following events in the Republic of Argentina:

(A) The accession to power by the military of the Republic of Argentina in 1976.

(B) Violations of human rights committed by officers or agents of the Argentine military and security forces during counterinsurgency or counterterror operations, including by the State Intelligence Secretariat (Secretaria de Inteligencia del Estado), Military Intelligence Detachment 141 (Destacamento de Inteligencia Militar 141 in Cordoba), Military Intelligence Detachment 121 (Destacamento Militar 121 in Rosario), Army Intelligence Battalion 601, the Army Reunion Center (Reunion Central del Ejercito), and the Army First Corps in Buenos Aires.

(C) Operation Condor and Argentina's role in cross-border counterinsurgency or counterterror operations with Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay, or Uruguay.

(2) Information on abductions, torture, disappearances, and executions by security forces and other forms of repression, including the fate of Argentine children born in captivity, that took place at detention centers, including the following:

(A) The Argentine Navy Mechanical School (Escuela Mecanica de la Armada).

(B) Automotores Orletti.

(C) Operaciones Tacticas 18.

(D) La Perla.

(E) Campo de Mayo.

(F) Institutos Militares.

(3) An appendix of declassified records reviewed and used for the report submitted under this subsection.

(4) A descriptive index of information referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) that is classified, including the identity of each document that is classified, the reason for continuing the classification of such document, and an explanation of how the release of the document would damage the national security interests of the United States.

(b) REVIEW OF CLASSIFIED DOCUMENTS.—Not later than two years after the date on which the report required under subsection (a) is submitted, the Director of National Intelligence shall review information referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) that is classified to determine if any of such information should be declassified.

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 264, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, in 1976, amid social unrest and a deep political

crisis in Argentina, a military coup installed one of the cruelest dictatorships South America has ever seen. Illegal detentions, torture, and summary executions of dissidents became routine. Cross-country operations to capture and assassinate dissidents were organized by Argentina in cooperation with Southern Cone military regimes in what is known as Operation Condor.

Over the years, as the victims of the repression increasingly went missing, a new tactic of the Argentine security forces was revealed. It is estimated that 30,000 people disappeared in Argentina between 1976 and 1985. Many of these victims, known as ''the disappeared,'' were abducted. They were tortured and then dropped far out into the ocean.

During the dictatorship, hundreds of children were born into captivity and distributed to members of the Argentine security forces, while their mothers are believed to have been killed.

□ 1600

The identity of some of these children has been discovered, but the majority of their identities and whereabouts remain unknown. My amendment seeks to shed light on the unknown fate of these children, who would be now in their twenties and early thirties.

Given the close relationship with their Argentine counterparts in the intelligence, security and military community, the documentation of the American intelligence community is likely to contain invaluable information to support renewed justice investigations and the search for the children of ''the disappeared.''

This amendment that I am offering would direct the Director of National Intelligence to report to the House and Senate Intelligence panels on information it has regarding the human rights violations of the military government in Argentina and also seeks to help shed light on the unknown fate of the Argentine children who were born in captivity. The amendment instructs the DNI to include an appendix of declassified documents used for the report and gives the authority for the inclusion of a classified annex.

Thousands of families have waited more than 30 years to learn the fate of their loved ones, and today we have an opportunity to make a significant contribution to truth and justice and help bring to a close this troubling chapter in Argentina's history.

In 2008, this amendment was made in order by the Rules Committee and agreed to on the House floor without objection from either party by voice vote. At that time, my dear friend and colleague Peter Hoekstra said, ''I will not oppose this amendment, Mr. Chairman. I will support the amendment.''

So I urge all of us to join in supporting this contribution to truth and justice in the country of Argentina.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I must unfortunately oppose this amendment.

I certainly can sympathize with the gentleman's intention to try to bring some closure for families in this particularly difficult issue in Argentina, and it may certainly result in some information to those who are conducting maybe historical research and analysis and certainly to mend the wounds that have been created in this particular situation.

It would also do something, I think, equally damaging to today's effort in the war on terror. It would divert the intelligence community from its mission of protecting the United States and our interests from current threats. When you think about how difficult it was to take a small piece of information and stretch a nickname, an Arabic nickname applied to someone who is using an alias, who is likely associating with individuals who had Arabic nicknames associated to aliases, and from that little scrap of information, the entire intelligence apparatus spent years trying to develop the right lead to lead us to last Sunday's event to bring Osama bin Laden to justice.

This year, the intelligence community came forward and said, We need more analysts. We need more human resources in order to accomplish this mission. There are too many threats in too many places for our people to handle it. And what this amendment does, although it is very well intended, it takes resources away to apply it to a problem that is 20 to 30 years old. I am sorry, we just don't have that luxury today.

We are concerned, the intelligence community is concerned that the next few months, the next 6 months are crucial when al Qaeda is trying to get its act back together after losing its operational and inspirational leader and how they reach out or lash out in some kind of an attack. It is imperative that every minute of every day be spent targeting those who are seeking to kill Americans or our allies overseas now.

I hope that we find some other alternative to what the gentleman proposes in maybe another way. But redirecting the valuable assets in the fight on terror today I just think is a misuse of our resources and may, in fact, be a dangerous one at that. This is not the time to be disrupting our counterterrorism analysts, our case officers, or anybody in the CIA or other intelligence agencies away from disrupting, dismantling and defeating al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations for the activities of the Government of Argentina nearly 25 years ago.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate what has just been said. But the fact of the matter is that there are no significant costs involved in this. This operation has been looked at in the past. The information that we are asking for in the context of this amendment is readily available. It is not going to take any significant costs whatsoever and it can be done very, very quickly.

This is a situation that really needs to be corrected. It is a violent, deeply disturbing activity that took place in the context of many, many families, many of whom are completely innocent, and the effects of that were in many cases deeply disastrous.

This is something that can be done easily and can be done quickly, and it was supported by the opposition almost unanimously—in fact, unanimously—the last time that this bill came up and this amendment was brought forward.

So I ask the opposition here to reconsider this. Think closely about this, how important this is, how significantly important it is for Argentina and for the United States, and how it can be done readily and easily, and how the results of it being done would be happily taken care of by these two countries. There isn't anyone who is going to deeply object to this, anyone who is significant at least in the context of this operation who is going to deeply object to this.

We need to do this. It is an honest thing and it is something that is going to be positive. It will be deeply positive and effective for us in the context of bringing this about. So I hope that everyone in this body will recognize the significance of this and vote in favor of it.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, again, with deep respect to the Member from New York, and I appreciate your passion on this, I can tell you as a former FBI agent, when you take 1 minute away from your case to cull information, it does take somebody who is operational in some sense, either an analyst or an operator or even on the IT front, to gather, collect, sort that information, to go through it, to put it in the proper form and to get it in the right place.

Really, every minute of every day is so precious to these individuals who are trying to focus on al Qaeda and the current threat. My argument is that this is something that can wait. It has waited 25 years. Probably the next few years won't make a difference, but the next few years in the fight against al Qaeda can mean the life and death of U.S. citizens.

So, again, I hope the gentleman doesn't think it is any condemnation of his effort. I think the time and the place and the resources that would be lost are just not meeting the national security priorities as we look out across what the threat stream is today.

So, unfortunately, I will continue to oppose it. I would like to work with the gentleman on something in the future.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. CARNEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 112–75.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE V—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 501. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE PRIORITY OF RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION SECURITY.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) railway transportation (including subway transit) should be prioritized in the development of transportation security plans by the intelligence community; and

(2) railway transportation security (including subway transit security) should be included in transportation security budgets of the intelligence community.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 264, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware.

□ 1610

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, over the past week, officials have announced that preliminary intelligence gathered from Osama bin Laden's Pakistan hideout shows that al Qaeda had been plotting a terrorist attack on our Nation's rail system. While roughly 1.7 million passengers ride on domestic and international flights daily, every weekday 34 million Americans ride on trains and transit systems. The issue of rail security is more relevant now than ever. And I'm here today to argue for making rail security a national intelligence priority.

On March 11, 2004, nearly 200 people were killed in Madrid as a result of a terrorist bombing while riding the commuter rail to work. In 2005, over 50 people were killed and 700 injured on the London transit system in a series of explosions during the morning rush hour. An attack on our rail system here in the United States would be devastating. It would almost certainly result in the loss of life.

Clearly, terrorist organizations around the world have made rail systems a target. I strongly believe that we need to address the vulnerabilities in our rail system by ensuring that rail security is one of our Nation's top intelligence priorities. That's why I offered this amendment directing the intelligence community to include rail and subway transit security in its transportation security plans and budgets.

The 9/11 Commission report found that over 90 percent of the Nation's annual investment in transportation security is spent on aviation security. While addressing security vulnerabilities within aviation is critical, this allocation leaves too little for surface transportation security, particularly on our rail systems.

''For now, riding trains is safe.'' That's how Transportation Secretary LaHood described the state of our rail system in light of the intelligence found in Osama bin Laden's compound. But we need to do better than that. As a near daily rider of Amtrak myself, I want to know that the United States Government is doing all it can to keep my fellow passengers safe. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so that our intelligence community is able to identify and prevent a terrorist attack on our rail system.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. While I agree with the need for strong security in the railway sector, I just don't believe this amendment is best suited for the Intelligence authorization bill, as it seems to address the policy issues that are not authorized or otherwise addressed in the FY11 Intelligence authorization bill. The intelligence community does not have transportation security plans or transportation security budgets, nor do individual intelligence community agencies. In order to meet the requirement of this, they would have to restructure themselves to bring in the right people to do the plans for security for the railway. I don't think that's what the gentleman intends, but that's clearly what the gentleman's amendment would do.

I would argue that this amendment would be better focused on the Transportation Security Administration, or TSA. That agency, however, falls under the jurisdiction of the Homeland Security Committee and not the Intelligence Committee. The intelligence community does not develop transportation security plans. Rather, the intelligence community, through DHS, provides threat information to the transportation sector to better enable it to develop security plans.

Additionally, I note that this amendment simply expresses the sense of the Congress on the issue. It does not actually compel any action. I would question the real improvement to security on the railway sector from its adoption because, again, it appears that the amendment would not have a real impact. This is really out of the scope of the intelligence community.

I would urge the gentleman to reconsider and contemplate maybe addressing it in the TSA. If the gentleman would like any help and assistance in doing that, I would be eager to try to help the gentleman do that.

Again, given the time pressures on our intelligence community to stop real-time threats and pass that information on to people in the TSA and others, I would argue that this is an amendment that we should all oppose and look for a better opportunity.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARNEY. I would just like to add that I listened to the gentleman and I appreciate his comments. I listened to his remarks earlier on the previous amendment, and he said that the intelligence agencies spend all their time, every waking hour, targeting people trying to kill Americans every day. The facts are that these terrorists are trying to kill Americans on American rail transit systems. And that's the purpose of this amendment—to make sure that this is given a priority in our intelligence plans.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I thank the gentleman for his amendment.

I disagree with the chairman. I believe it's vitally important that we protect our railway infrastructure from terrorist attacks. Just last week, the Department of Homeland Security issued an intelligence message about potential al Qaeda contemplation in February 2010 of plots against the U.S. rail sector.

While there was no imminent threat at that time, we must remain vigilant. It's important that we devote resources to this issue. I hope that we could work together with the chairman if the amendment does not pass so that we can focus on this serious area of threat to our national security.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Delaware has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chair, I would just like to add a few more things before finishing up here. Between 2004 and 2008, there were 500 terrorist attacks waged worldwide against mass transit and passenger rail targets, resulting in over 2,000 deaths and over 9,000 injuries. Five billion passenger miles, intercity and commuter rail, are logged every day in the northeast corridor alone here in the U.S. That represents more than one-third of the daily vehicle miles logged on I–95 between Washington, D.C. and New York City.

My amendment will ensure that the U.S. Government places a priority on ensuring the safety of rail passengers around the country by working to prevent a terrorist attack on our rail system. And I would ask support for this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Again, I appreciate both of the gentlemen's perspectives on this, but this is about the right tool for the right job. The intelligence community is the one that's supposed to develop the intelligence, the threat stream, the lead, and pass it to somebody who is in charge—the TSA in this case—of protecting the transportation sector.

Again, I make the argument it is important, but I just think this is misplaced. The intelligence community would have to try to create this expertise, which they do not have today in the entirety of the intelligence community, to make security plans. This is not what they do. It's not what they're equipped to do. They are not, in most cases, with the exception of the FBI and DEA, they're not domestic agencies. They're agencies that are designed to collect overseas. So it is just not a good fit.

Again, I appreciate the gentleman's position. I just think the community would have to spend a lot of time and resources diverting from its real intention and mission to keep us safe.

Just quickly and just for the record—I think it's important—the information that the gentleman referenced was aspirational. We saw a lot of press reports that I think misrepresented the information that was provided. It was something that Osama bin Laden thought about. It is not something that the intelligence community believes was operational, which means you have to be vigilant all the time on all these issues.

So I commend the gentleman in his effort on trying to bring better security to our railways. Again, just the right tool for the right job. This is not the right place. Unfortunately, I will oppose it but would like to work with the gentleman on the right place to get the job done.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Delaware has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. CARNEY. I certainly thank the gentleman and appreciate his comments and certainly respect his expertise. But I can't imagine that the intelligence agencies aren't, as they're doing their activities—intelligence activities overseas—aren't finding out that there are threats to the U.S. rail system. My amendment would just make that a priority within all the things that they do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware will be postponed.

□ 1620

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BENISHEK) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 754) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, we just finished a very important debate here on the floor dealing with the ability of the American Government to understand the threats that face us across this world. I want to commend my colleagues both on the Republican and Democratic side for working long and hard on the intelligence legislation that will be up on the floor, probably tomorrow.

In the hour ahead, what I would really like to focus on and bring to the attention of the American people is the necessity for jobs. We spend a lot of time talking about security, as we should, and we've certainly seen that in the successful effort to bring down bin Laden and finally see that justice was properly served. Congratulations to the military, to the intelligence community, and particularly to President Obama for his courage in ordering that action, risky to be sure, but ultimately extraordinarily successful.

The other part of American security is our economy. At the end of the day and even at the beginning of the day, this Nation will never be secure unless we have a very strong, vibrant, growing economy that provides every American that wants to work with the opportunity to go to work. And so the focus of our attention for this hour ahead is economic security: how to secure the economic well-being of every American, how to secure the economic well-being of the American public. It can be done.

There are essentially six elements to achieve economic security and economic growth and strength, and we will cover many of those today as we talk about this issue. Let me very briefly lay them out to you.

The first is education. I think we now understand that an individual who has little or no education has very little opportunity to find economic security. It's difficult to get a job if you don't have an education. So for an individual, a good education is essential. Unfortunately across America, report after report, usually every 6 or 7 years a new report comes out and says America at Risk. Our education system isn't measuring up. Yet here in the last 3 months and in the days ahead, my colleagues on the Republican side have consistently cut the education programs that many, indeed millions of Americans depend upon.

Back home in my State of California, education funding is similarly cut, so that now a class that 5 years ago was 20 students is now 30 students. At the University of California, 10 years ago it may have cost $1,500 or $2,000 to go to school to pay the tuition. Now it's $8,000. And in the budget that's being proposed that was presented to the Appropriations Committee today, the Republicans are virtually reducing to a point of nonexistence Pell Grants necessary for higher education.

So education becomes the first key pillar in building a secure economy for an individual. Similarly, it is the pillar to secure a good growing economy for this Nation, because this Nation will not be able to compete economically unless we have the best educated workforce in the world, and we're not even close today. We were in bygone years, 30, 40 years ago, and we can be in the future, but it's going to take a change. As my colleagues come and join me during this hour, we will be talking about the ways in which the education system can be improved and the way in which we can transition people from education to work and back to education and back to work.

The second pillar is research. Research is an essential element, because from that research comes the new products of the future. I think we only need to think about the things that are in our home. The television, the VCR, the other things that we depend upon, were mostly invented in America. The fundamental research for computer chips and the like, America made, and much of the technology that we now find in our green technology, a lot of the wind turbines, the initial wind turbine industry, the solar industry, the photovoltaic and the rest, research in America's great institutions, our universities, our laboratories, led to these kinds of products. The battery technology that we now find in the hybrids, invented in America, but I think most of you would say, but not made in America today. That's true. So what we have seen is that the research, while done in the United States, did not lead to those things being manufactured in the United States. We need to understand why, and we'll go into that today, also.

So education, research, and then the third element is making those things in America. Manufacturing matters, and that is the core subject of today's

discussion: Make it in America. You can educate, you can research, but ultimately you have to make it in America.

Now, there are ways that we can enhance the American manufacturing sector, and my colleagues and I on the Democratic side have put forth a program that we called Make It in America, so that America can make it, so that American families can make it, and we know that these programs that we're proposing will cause that to occur.

□ 1630

The remaining three things that we will talk about, not today, but I want to make sure we lay them out there: Education, research, manufacturing, make it in America, the next element is infrastructure. You have to have roads and streets and sanitation and water systems, communications systems. All of those things are critically important. Fortunately, part of the stimulus program, not enough of it, but a big part of it was to build the infrastructure. The largest surge in infrastructure investment ever in the history of this Nation was the stimulus program, overlooked and certainly overlooked in the politics of last year's election, but it was there. It was a good point, but we have to carry that forward.

Fifth point. We have to be international. Unfortunately, the word ''international'' in America has come to be that we give it all away. The trade agreements of the past often led to the outsourcing of American jobs, and so, as we look to the future, we want to make sure that as we look international we talk about, as President Obama has suggested, that we once again become an export Nation. We can do that. There are programs that will cause that to happen, and also, we need to be quite sure that when we talk about international we talk about fair trade, trade that is fair to American workers.

And so as these trade programs come before us, we will be taking a very hard look at are those programs good for American workers, or are they simply good for Chinese workers. If they are good for those workers overseas and not good for American workers, you can see strong resistance from those of us on the Democratic side who say, wait a minute, international is good. We understand the need to grow markets. We understand the growing markets of the world, but we will no longer allow American workers to be put at a disadvantage by some trade agreement that is not fair to American workers.

The final element is this: we have to change. We cannot be what we were yesterday. We have to be what we can be tomorrow, and our President very clearly points this out as he talks about capturing the future. We can but only if we do these six things, and the final one is change.

Let me go now to a couple of the specific elements that we need to talk about here. Sometimes it's helpful to put up one of these placards. It helps focus at least my attention and perhaps yours. This is the Make It in America Agenda. These issues we've talked about, trade, tax policy, energy policy. Let's pick up the energy policy here.

It is incumbent upon America to secure its energy future. I think all of us go to the gas station from time to time, all too often it seems to me, and you know now we're filling up with $4 a barrel oil. Why? Why did that happen? Well, it basically has happened because for more than 30 years America has talked about energy security. We've talked about ending the importation of oil. We've talked about how we can provide the energy necessary for this Nation. Yet, we now find ourselves in a situation very similar to what we found in the 1970s, that is, insufficient energy available to us. The ''Drill, baby, drill'' mentality that we saw on the floor today is not the solution to this.

The solution to the energy issue is to transform our energy systems from the 19th and 20th century energy system, the fossil fuels, where we are dependent upon the petrol dictators of the world, and on coal, which I think all of us have come to understand presents enormous challenges for us, challenges of climate change, challenges of despoiling the surface of the Earth as we now find in the Appalachian Mountains and enormous health risks that come with the burning of coal. We need to move away from these fossil fuels to the fuels of tomorrow.

As we do that, we need to use our tax dollars to accomplish this goal. Right now, our tax dollars are used to support the oil industry. The oil industry thinks that is all well and good, but how many of you want to have $4 billion, $5 billion, $6 billion, even $12 billion of your tax money go to the wealthiest, most successful industry in the world as a subsidy? This is oil welfare, plain and simple, to the industry that simply does not need it. We're talking about the wealthiest, most successful industries in the world that have, for a century, for a full century, enjoyed the generosity of the American taxpayer. They receive welfare. Plain and simple, it's a subsidy, to subsidize the oil industry.

Yet we know in the last few days the Big Five oil companies have produced record profits in the last quarter. So much so that in the last decade, the decade 2001 until 2010, the oil industry has had over $1 trillion of profit, $1 trillion dollar of profit. At the same time, they have received billions of dollars of subsidies. We need to bring those subsidies back into the Treasury. Tell the oil industry, for a century you have been living off the welfare of the American public taxpayer. No more. That money is coming home.

And we're going to use it for two purposes: one, to reduce the deficit. President Obama has suggested about $4 billion a year. I think you can go as high as $12 billion if you add up all of the subsidies, bringing that money back into the Treasury to be used to reduce the deficit and to support industries of the future. We're talking about a lot of money here. Take a look at this.

ExxonMobil, $10.7 billion of profit in just the last quarter. Oxychem, $1.6 billion. Conoco, $2.1 billion. Oh, you're going to love this. The CEO of Conoco oil a couple of days ago got in front of a microphone and said it is un-American to take away our welfare, to take away our subsidy. I don't think so. I think it is un-American to give the wealthiest industry in the world a subsidy. We can go on and on here. We see Chevron doing very well. Oh, yeah, BP—we know that bunch. They're the ones that didn't have enough money to safely drill for oil, but they did manage to make $7.2 billion of profit this last year.

So, as we look at the energy systems of this Nation, we need to understand that the money that you and I are presently giving to the oil companies as a subsidy needs to be brought back and used to reduce the deficit and to support the energy systems of the future.

I'm going to wrap this very quickly with 2 pieces of legislation that I've introduced that would take those subsidies back from the oil industry and apply them to tomorrow's energy systems, the green energy systems, solar, wind. Our tax money should be used to buy American made solar, wind, turbines, and other green technologies. Right now, our tax money, we do subsidize those industries. Our tax money is used to purchase products that are manufactured offshore. My legislation says, good, we need to subsidize. We need to promote those industries. Those are the industries of the future. Those are energy sources of the future. Let's use that money to buy American-made equipment.

If somebody wants to go buy Chinese solar cells, fine, use your own money. One of these companies wants to go buy European-made wind turbine, that is fine, do it. But don't use my tax money. Don't use your tax money. American tax money must be used to buy American-made equipment.

Similarly, with our gasoline taxes that are now being used to buy buses, trains, and build highways and bridges, great. Good thing to do, but make sure that those things are made in America.

□ 1640

Now let me turn my attention to my colleagues. Three of them have joined us. I notice that our minority whip has joined us today.

Mr. HOYER, you've been the advocate, the leader, of developing the Make It in America strategy. Please share with us your thoughts, and then I'm going to turn to my other two colleagues.

Mr. HOYER. I'll be very brief.

I thank the gentleman for his continuing focus. If I am the corner of the phrase and the focuser of Make It in

America, you are its chief spokesperson and salesperson, so I thank you for that effort.

It's so important because, clearly, Americans are rightfully very concerned at the fact that we don't have enough jobs for the people who are looking for jobs. We've got to have a growth agenda in America. We've got to have an agenda in America that focuses on expanding opportunities. We've got to have an agenda that gives to Americans the sense that they and their families and their children can make it in America.

You have been focusing night after night, week after week, month after month on a jobs agenda, which we call ''Make It in America.'' We've introduced over 25 bills that are focused on trying to help us focus on that agenda, on trying to help business—small, medium and large—expand their businesses and on trying to give them assistance in doing so.

I want to say to the gentleman that, in his continuing to focus on this jobs agenda, it is critically important that Americans understand what the Make It in America agenda is all about so they can contact their Members of Congress and Members of the United States Senate and say, Look, we support the Make It in America agenda. We believe that it's an agenda for our opportunities and our children's opportunities.

I want to say something about the statement, to which the gentleman referred, made by the president of Conoco, a statement that apparently indicates he believes that his company is entitled to a tax preference and that if we did not give that tax preference that somehow it would be un-American. Of course, life, as I like to say, is a series of trade-offs: if we're buying things; national defense; defeating terrorism; making sure our seniors are secure in their pocketbooks and in their health; making sure that we participate in helping young people, particularly disadvantaged young people, get the educational start that they need; making sure that our college students can develop their talents so they can make us a more competitive Nation; and that the innovation, an innovation to which the gentleman referred earlier, will still be done in the United States. Then we need to make sure that the products and technologies that are developed through that enterprise are, in fact, then subject to a Make It in America reality.

As for the gentleman from Conoco, I don't know him, but I applaud the oil companies, and we need the energy that they give us. The fact of the matter is we gave subsidies, and we give subsidies in various areas, as the gentleman from California knows, to encourage doing things that are not now profitable but that will have a long-term payoff for not only the companies but for America. That is why the government invests its money, as governments all over the world do, in developing emerging technologies. The gentleman spoke, of course, of solar, wind and other renewable technologies that will have a tremendous payoff but not in the short term; therefore it's hard to get investors to put money in. That's why governments, not just in this country but all over the world, have done this in the past: for instance, when the prices of gasoline were not such that they provided the resources to encourage research, which we knew we needed, and drilling, which we knew we needed.

Yet now, when you have the profits of the product, I am shocked, frankly, that those who promote the free market system, which ought to be driven by the markets, driven by demand, driven by profits, would now say, notwithstanding the fact that oil profits among the Big Five, in particular, are up to historic levels, that we should still continue to ask our taxpayers to subsidize them even further. That seems to me to make no sense.

But back to the principal focus of making it in America: The gentleman has been so right in his focus of making sure that we create the kind of environment in this country that will empower people to make things in America, to grow things in America, to sell them here, but also to sell them around the world. The President has indicated he wants to double exports. The only way we're going to double exports is if we make things in America to sell overseas. That's the only way you can get exports whether they be goods, frankly, or services. We ought not to preclude the growth of the service sector in our economy servicing overseas, whatever that service agency might be.

So I want to thank the gentleman for continuing to keep the focus on an agenda that, I hope, our Republican colleagues will embrace as well. This is not a partisan agenda. I don't think there is a Member of this Congress who doesn't want to grow the economy and create jobs. We believe that the Make It in America agenda is focused on doing just that, and I would encourage our Republican colleagues, our Democratic colleagues, our brethren in the Senate to join together to pass this Make It in America agenda so we can see a resurgence of the manufacturing might of this great country that when we continue to be the inventing, innovative, developing center of the world's economy that we also, once we've done all that, then bring it to scale, or make it in America.

Andy Grove of Intel, as you know, has observed that if, in fact, what we continue to do is do the voltaic cells, do the chips, do the other technologies and if we then take the products to scale overseas, inevitably, Andy Grove believes—and I share this view—that our inventors, innovators and developers, themselves, will go overseas. The American public, by large numbers, understands that that's not a policy that is defensible or profitable for them, for their families or for America in the long term.

So I thank the gentleman from California for his focus, for his tenacity and for his compelling advocacy of the Make It in America agenda.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you very much, Mr. Leader, for what you've done. Mr. HOYER, you've been on this, actually, longer than I. You have some history in this House that goes way back. I think about a program that you and the Democrats put forward before I arrived. I've only been here now about 20 months. It was the stimulus bill, the American Recovery Act.

In that Recovery Act, there was about $12 billion for transportation. In that transportation program, you and the Democrats, signed by President Obama, said that the money had to be spent—and this was the high-speed rail program—on American-made high-speed rail.

Guess what happened?

Of the high-speed rail companies of the world—none were made in America—the Japanese, the Chinese, the Germans, the French, and the Spanish all began to find American manufacturing plants because they wanted access to the high-speed rail money that was in the stimulus bill.

The point here is that, if we use our tax money wisely and say to the world ''come and build a high-speed rail, but you're going to make it in America,'' they will establish those manufacturing plants here in America. It's already happening. In Sacramento, Siemens, and in New York, a couple of the European companies are already locating those manufacturing plants.

SHEILA JACKSON LEE, from the great State of Texas, has now joined us, and she has been on this issue for a long time.

So, if you would, share with us your thoughts on how America can make it by making it in America.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from California.

If it were allowed on the floor, I would say, ''Yippee,'' but I will try to adhere to protocol or take a lariat and circle it around out of excitement.

□ 1650

Thank you very much for the years of tenure and leadership that you brought from the legislature in the State of California. You brought it here with a sense of action, and we thank you. I am delighted that our Democratic whip has been at the forefront of this issue. And the gentleman from Rhode Island—I know others may be coming—is a mayor, a former mayor who understands the importance of jobs.

Let me just say, to add to your comment, both President Clinton and President Reagan have quotes that suggest that if you build infrastructure, it is an investment that will continue to give and give and give. Since 9/11, my good friend, I have been on the Homeland Security Committee, and

the attention of the United States, rightly so, has been on securing the homeland and national security. And just one moment so I can transfer into this discussion, 70 percent of the American people now with the capture and demise of Osama bin Laden still are concerned about our security but, in actuality, believe that our troops can come home completely. I hope that we can move in that direction. This is not a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. Seventy percent of the American people frankly believe our troops have done an enormous tribute to themselves and to the American people.

What does that mean? It means bright young men and women are going to be coming home. And let it be known that they will not just come home in need of health services. They will come home eager to participate in the American Dream. And, frankly, I want to make sure they can do that, and I want to make sure we end the war in Afghanistan.

But I believe we have, as you have mentioned, the tools of the trade. I see this word ''trade,'' and some of us get a little nervous about that. But let me tell you how I explain trade. I want every item that can be sold overseas to someone else from the United States to be sold. I have taken to inventorying the manufacturers in the 18th Congressional District in Texas. And if I might, if you are listening, call (713) 655–0050 and let our office know you exist, that you make something in the 18th Congressional District in Texas. And I would venture to say that my colleagues will tell you call them or get on their Web site, because we want you to be able to sell it overseas.

Make It in America is to recognize the validity of the product you have made. We want to make sure that there are taxes that are fair to manufacturers. I am in the Manufacturing Caucus. We want to generate it. Energy means all kinds of energy, and I will dwell on that very lightly. But I am a person who is an equal opportunity welcomer of solar and biofuels and a number of other energy types to join in energy.

Labor, I have already said to you, I am trying to bring our soldiers home. But there are young people graduating from college in 2011. They were at my town hall meeting, to my distinguished friend, and they asked me about work. And I said to them that we in this Congress are working to provide jobs for the talented young people that will walk across those various stadiums and auditoriums getting their diplomas, doing what we asked them to do. Can we put them to work?

And then, of course, if you reinvest in America, I will tell the State of Texas—I don't want to get into anyone else's business—that we don't have to close schools. We don't have to lay off teachers. We can educate the workforce. And some of the workforce can be those with their hands, vocational trades, learning to manufacture, building the high-speed rails that I am so excited about that I am trying to find some land in the 18th Congressional District or somewhere in Texas and say, Come one, come all.

By the way, I serve on the Intellectual Property Committee on Judiciary, and every time I have a hearing in that committee, I say that this is the work of the 21st century, protecting the genius of America, and it's a lot of them. It's unbelievable the inventors who are here. I want them to know that there is some value of first to file to protect their product.

And lastly, what you have been talking about, the idea of redoing our infrastructure. A good friend of ours who served as the chairman of the Transportation Committee was such a leader, a distinguished gentleman from Minnesota. He, in the course of his service in the last couple of years, had a bridge collapse in that State. He kept saying over and over again, Build infrastructure and you'll put America to work.

I wanted to capture these words as a mandate, as an instructive vision that the Democrats have captured. And the only thing we need are partners. The President has already shown his proudness and his ability to put dollars to make jobs and to build infrastructure. I have seen public housing go up. I have seen roads being improved, dams, bridges, and of course, light rail and high-speed rail. So we've got the right thinking.

And I don't want to stop without just adding this point: There's not one of us that does not have the consciousness and the sense to recognize that we must have responsible spending and responsible reduction. I take great offense to anyone who suggests that I am opening the treasure chest and throwing money to the wind. I believe that education is valuable. Infrastructure is valuable. But there are ways that we can reasonably, down the road, as Mark Zandi has said, begin our belt tightening. But we have to recognize that the debt ceiling is not for the State of Texas or California—it is to help this Nation—but we do it sensibly. I hope we can do a clean one, by the way. But the point is that Make It in America is an engine of job creation.

And I just want to thank the gentlemen for constantly bringing us to the floor, giving us the opportunity, of course, to do as the Boy Scouts may have done and to recite these words: Trade, taxes, energy, labor, education, intellectual property, and infrastructure, and go around to our constituents in telling them we are not going to forget you. And I believe that we're going to create some jobs and watch America continue to have its economy not only make baby steps, but it's going to be spinning. It's going to be humming, and people are going to be back to work. I am grateful for this philosophy and this mission.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you so very much, Ms. JACKSON LEE. You have been a leader in all of these issues over these many, many years and speak wisely and legislate very wisely on that.

The tax issue out there is one that just always befuddles me. It befuddles me as to why my colleagues on the Republican side just don't seem to get the message. We passed a tax bill last year that ended the subsidy that international, multinational companies were given to off-shore jobs. $12 billion a year of our tax money was given to these huge American companies when they off-shored jobs. What was that all about? I still haven't found out where that law came from. But it was in the Tax Code, and American companies were taking advantage of that tax reduction, tax subsidy, corporate welfare to send jobs overseas. We passed a bill. It's over. The President signed it. Not one of my Republican colleagues voted for that. I don't understand. I'm befuddled by their lack of support for American companies who want to keep jobs here. Apparently they're willing to support American companies that want to send jobs offshore. Anyway, one small example.

I wonder what it's like to be the mayor of the largest town in Rhode Island. It was probably an enormous experience. And then to bring that experience here to the floor of the Congress and to the committees and to share with us all of that down-home, on-the-ground experience of bringing jobs to the community.

Mr. CICILLINE, if you would care to share with us some of that experience in the legislation that you've brought to us.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman from California for his leadership on Making It in America, and I certainly thank our leader, Mr. HOYER, for making this a priority.

I think we all realize the single biggest responsibility that we have is to get the American people back to work. I know in my home State, families are hurting. With one of the highest unemployment rates in the country, our single greatest responsibility is to do everything we can to get people back to work. And I've been disappointed that we've been here for 5 months and there hasn't really been, from our friends on the other side of the aisle, a jobs agenda, jobs legislation. And I'm really pleased that we on the Democratic side have put forth a very ambitious but very important agenda of Making It in America.

□ 1700

When you think about it, we've had an economy that was built on bubbles and credit swaps and all kinds of things, and they all failed and they hurt families in this country very, very badly.

I think what we need to do is return to this idea of making things again in this country that we can sell all over the world, and having policies developed at the national level, at the State level, at the local level that support

manufacturing, that give American manufacturers the ability to compete in the global marketplace, give them an ability to grow jobs, and to create opportunities to make things that we can sell to the rest of the world so we can export American-made goods, not export American jobs.

We have the best workers, the best minds, we have the best innovators in the world, and what we need is to have policies at the national level that recognize we have to make things again. We need to stop the Chinese from cheating in manufacturing and having an unfair advantage, and we need to recognize that this is an important part of rebuilding the economy of this country.

We've put forth, as you know, Mr. GARAMENDI, with your leadership, a whole agenda, a whole set of bills that will help jump-start and support what's already happening in American manufacturing.

Try to go into a store and find something with those three words: Made in America. It's almost impossible. We can change that. We have to change it. And the agenda that we've put forth will help to do that.

The bill that I am lead sponsor on is the Make It in America Block Grant. It's a simple idea: take resources and invest them in American manufacturing. Help manufacturers retrofit their buildings for more energy efficiency, retrain workers for the new equipment of the 21st century. Buy new equipment, increase their exports. The kinds of tools that we know, that I hear from manufacturers when I travel throughout my district and talk to them and listen to them, what they need to give them a chance to compete in this global marketplace.

We have responsibilities to do that. It's the best way we can grow jobs. You're absolutely right. It's unimaginable that tens of billions of dollars in subsidies are being given to big oil companies, corporate welfare at a time when our constituents are facing some of the highest gas prices ever.

The short-term strategy is we have to pass anti-gouging legislation, we have to release some of the strategic reserves that will lower the price at the pump now, and we have to invest in a long-term strategy of clean energy, renewable energy, the kinds of investments in the manufacturing area particularly that will lead to a good energy future for our country.

I thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI, for your leadership. This is an important agenda. It's not just about job creation. It's about regaining that position as the leaders of the world of manufacturing.

Rhode Island led the Industrial Revolution. We have a long history of innovation, of manufacturing. This country can lead again in this area, but we need to have policies that support the great minds that are doing this work, the great manufacturing. We need to have job training that gives people the skills necessary to take these jobs, and we need to make it a national priority so that we can start making things here again, and so that American families can make it in America by relying on manufacturing.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. CICILLINE. And we note that your part of the Nation was where the manufacturing started in America, and the rivers, taking the power of the rivers and using it to start the mills and eventually creating the early American economy and continuing on to this day in a very special part of this Nation, the Rhode Island and the New England area.

There are many, many things to say. As you were talking, Mr. CICILLINE, and bringing us up to date on how we can do these things, I notice that two of my colleagues came in to join us.

Again, Mr. TONKO, you were here for the very first Make It in America discussion, you and I, on this floor some months ago talking about what we can do in this rebuilding the great American manufacturing base, the strength of America, the incredible innovation that's possible, and you just happen to come from one of those areas where it was done and it's still being done.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You're from New York, right? The Albany area, upstate New York.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely, Representative.

Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for bringing us together in what is this usual important discussion. You have done that time and time again for us to focus on an innovation economy, on building it, and making it in America is an important aspect of the work we do. Thank you for bringing that to the attention of the greater public that watches these proceedings.

I do represent this region in upstate New York where we have the confluence of the Hudson and Mohawk Rivers, and it was birth to the Erie Canal, and that birth to the Erie Canal developed a port called New York, which became a major metro area, and a necklace of communities that were given birth to by that canal movement that became epicenters of invention and innovation, that then inspired a westward movement, and not only inspired the growth of this great Nation, but impacted the quality of life of people throughout the globe.

That pioneer spirit should speak to us again as we develop budgets, as we promote public policy. It should be about investing, not dis-investing. It should be about funding, not defunding.

The current climate here in this House with the new majority is to defund, to take those dollars away from economic recovery and to shift them over to tax cuts for millionaires, tax cuts for billionaires, ending Medicare, block granting Medicaid, dis-investing, providing for corporate loopholes.

This is not the strategy that America needs. This attack on middle class America is unwarranted. It is not going to resolve what we need to resolve here in the great United States of America.

We need to invest in a way that allows us to bulk up and compete and compete effectively on the global scene so that we can drive this clean energy economy, this innovation economy.

I know from my work prior to coming here to the House of Representatives, with NYSERDA, the New York State Energy, Research and Development Authority, there is job opportunity galore. There are entrepreneurs, there are innovators that work with the Angel Network, work with venture capitalists, and work with public funding like that from the Federal Government that enable us to take ideas and move them along. Where R&D is, where research and development lands, so will manufacturing. That's what we have within our grasp, but what I see happening is walking away from that progressive approach and catering to a crowd that has grown stronger and stronger through this recession.

When we look at some of the outcomes as the majority here challenges us about not doing the mindless handouts to oil companies, we're seeing some of the CEOs garnering some quarter of a million shares, prime shares of stock. That's what they're doing with these payments, these handouts to the oil companies, when we could invest that in job creation, and that's what this Make It in America is all about.

I know when we put those down payments on invention and innovation, we can expect lucrative dividends and we can have job growth, and the kind of job growth that is secure because it stakes itself in the community as small business and they grow within the community; they grow and expand their opportunity.

I have, within the capital region of New York, the third fastest growing hub for science and tech jobs, and that's happening because of investment from the public sector, partnered with private sector investments, and it works. It's a winning formula, and I would say that we just need to pursue in that fashion and we can gain tremendously. And why would you change that slow but steady growth upward in recovery from the recession? After 8.2 million jobs lost through the Bush recession, why would you turn that around? And that's the attempt right here. Stop it, turn it around and go back into the ditch that drove this recession.

I just think we don't want to repeat that recent history of Reaganomics and the second Bush Presidency. It is devastating to the economy. It's devastating to America's working families, middle class. It's devastating to job growth.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. TONKO.

You started with the Erie Canal. It's interesting to note that at that period of time, which was the last decades of the 1700s and the early 1800s, the

United States Government set out on a course to build infrastructure, and the infrastructure was the canal systems at that time, and you so quickly and correctly pointed out the growth that came from that. That lesson, now more than 200 years old, needs to be repeated in America once again.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. I think what people will say too is, well, we don't make those products anymore in America. Well, we might be able to if we modernize our manufacturing processes.

But also, if you're going to try and convince, if we try to convince each other that all the products that America can make, design, engineer, discover and manufacture are over, what are we telling ourselves?

There are products coming out as we speak. There are products coming out every week, and a sophisticated society braces itself to invest in education, in R&D, in the down payments of taking ideas and moving them along; and we can then manufacture those latest products on the scene. That's the growth of a sophisticated society.

□ 1710

So this can-do spirit prevails in the Democratic Caucus in this great House in which we serve. I am proud to serve with these Members who are visionary, who are supportive, reinforcing the efforts of manufacturing of a newest kind here in the country.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You talk about innovation and new things.

Last week, I was out in my district talking to manufacturers. One company is called Bridgelux—''lux'' I think is light, bridge lighting to the future. They make LED lights. The kind of things that are now in the stores—when you get a flashlight, it's an LED flashlight. They have taken those LEDs to a whole new level of technology and advancement.

In fact, if we would put them in these lights here in the Chamber, we could reduce the energy consumption by about 90 percent, which wouldn't be a bad thing for the taxpayers. Their particular system would allow those lights to change color, which might put me in a better color; that wouldn't be such a bad thing, and to dim when people are not here, and move the lights, and in that way improve our ability to see while simultaneously saving us a lot of energy.

The company is 2 years old, has 250 employees, is manufacturing these advanced LED lighting systems in Livermore in my district, and I am going, ''Go Bridgelux, go!''

They need something, though. They need access to the American markets. And that is where the use of our tax dollars, in this case perhaps the local tax dollars in the cities around that area, would reach out and save the taxpayers a bundle of money by buying lights from that company.

Mr. TONKO. Not only is it promoting energy efficiency; it can help us along this trail of energy self-sufficiency, which then pulls us out of our dependency, which is gluttonous to date, on unfriendly nations providing us our supplies for energy. It just doesn't make any sense.

The clarion call that we heard at the voting booth last fall was to start growing the economy, stop shrinking the middle class, and that is what we are about with this Make It in America.

I know our friend, Representative TIM RYAN from Ohio, has something to add to that agenda because he has been aggressive on this, also.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Indeed.

Mr. RYAN, you come from a part of the world that was and is going to be, given your leadership and the leadership of this Make It in America agenda, the premier manufacturing place in the world. We will contend in California; we will be happy to contend for that and compete for that title, but you are in the process of rebuilding the manufacturing base in the heartland of America.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It's interesting. My district, the Youngstown-Warren metropolitan district, was the fastest growing in job development in the last month or two.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Name those places again.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Youngstown and Warren, Ohio.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We are talking about what America thinks was yesterday, and you are telling me it's the fastest growing?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And it is just recent. But in large part, a couple of different things.

There is $1 billion invested into a steel mill, but also we have a major auto plant. And it was the work of the last Congress and the President saying we cannot lose the American auto industry, and they made investments in companies like General Motors. Now we have three shifts selling the Chevy Cruze all over the world. Every employee got a $4,000 bonus a few weeks back that they are spending in our community. These are the kinds of things that happen when you make things in America, when you manufacture products in the United States of America.

But the goal here I think for all of us is to wrestle control from the major multinational corporations who are running this institution and then have undue influence over the government. Whether it is globalization moving manufacturing offshore, or if it is the oil companies who not only aren't paying taxes but are completely content with our citizens sending $1 billion a day out of the United States to go try to find cheap oil, which isn't so cheap anymore, and diminishing day by day, what we are saying here is, if we drive that $1 billion a day back into the United States economy for the kind of research and development that is going on in Upstate New York, that is going on in California, that is going on in Youngstown State University and Akron University with polymers, if we pump billions of dollars into this, instead of falling from first to second to third in the green energy revolution behind China and Germany, we will start leading it. And it is about coming up with the next technologies that you gentlemen were sitting here talking about, whether it's lightbulbs or something else. We need to discover that here in the United States, and then make it here in the United States.

But what all the major tech companies are saying now, they want to manufacture here in the United States. There is so much risk when you move your operations to China, losing intellectual property, losing the cutting edge, losing the quality, that there is an incentive here.

But if we don't pump money into research, that is why this whole philosophy that every single thing the government ever does is awful and the government should just serve big business, cut taxes for the oil companies, make sure that the big multinationals don't pay anything in taxes, and we will come back and cut NIH, cut energy investment, cut the National Science Foundation, cut the National Institutes for Science and Technology, their standards and technology. These are the kinds of things that we have got to be investing in. It starts with let's get out of this dependency on foreign oil, $4 a gallon is nonsense, and this illusion that if we continue to keep drilling, we are somehow going to drop the price, is an illusion. Let's take control of our own destiny here.

I want to just show real quick this chart. This is the U.S. balance of trade from 1960 to 2010. If you will look in the last 10 to 15 years, we now have $500 billion in a trade imbalance. Most of this is energy. Most of this is oil. What are we thinking? We are giving away the house.

This is not good public policy. This is not good economics. Let's take control. Let's invest in our own people. A billion a day we send to another country that doesn't like us, and it finances the war on terrorism? And then we take our budget and have three wars going on at the same time. So we pay them to run the terrorist operations, and then we pay our own military to go to the Middle East to try to stop it. Meanwhile, the middle class in the United States, we have a $3 trillion deficit on the roads and bridges and infrastructure, sewer. College expenses are going up. We're not doing research. This is a recipe for disaster for the United States.

I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you very much for that.

You just reminded me of last night at 2:30 in the morning, the House Armed Services Committee completed the markup that is moving out of committee, the National Defense Act. We do it every year. Seven hundred billion dollars.

A study done by one of the think tanks came up with the number that America spends about 17 percent of its total defense budget protecting the flow of oil out of the Middle East. So you can add that to the deficit. That is over $100 billion a year that we spend of our tax money to protect the flow of oil, not only for us, but for the rest of the world.

We need to build a domestic energy system not based on carbon-based fuels, but rather the future energy, all of the clean green technologies, nuclear and others, that will provide us with the energy security we need.

In doing so, each and every one of those, if we spend our tax dollars on buying American-made systems, will come back, just as you say, and build our communities stronger along the way.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We had a group in Cleveland, Ohio, do a study a few years back that, if you added in that cost, the 17 percent of our military budget that protects the oil lines, supply lines for oil all over the world, the actual cost of a gallon of gas would be another $1, $1.50, because of the subsidy. It's another subsidy to make oil come here.

All we are saying is pump that money back into the research. Somebody in this country will come up with some synthetic, some magical something or other that will replicate diesel fuel. It will happen if we put the money into it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It is actually already there. It is called advanced biofuels, algae-based fuels, everything from cosmetic oils to fuel for the Navy ships. So we can do these things. But, again, it is how we deploy our resources.

We have about 5 minutes, and we are going to do a lightning round between the three of us. I am going to turn to Mr. TONKO.

□ 1720

Mr. TONKO. I would just encourage us here in Washington on the Hill as we develop policy and debate budgets to keep in mind the history that should be replicated, sound history, history that had a proven track record, like that of the global race on space.

Some of us are old enough to have been youngsters or adolescents when that message, that very noble vision, of President JFK and his offering in an inaugural address that we are going to win the race on space, the global race on space, and land a person first on the Moon. And it was more than that poetry of landing the first astronaut on the Moon, that happened to be an American, and his quote of ''one small step for man, one giant step for mankind.'' It went well beyond that. It was this opening of the gates to technology that then invaded every sector of our economy, all aspects of life. And it was that technology investment that grew because of the soundness of a plan that enabled us to win a global race.

Now, that was done with passionate resolve and a thoughtfulness and a clear vision. We need to embrace that sort of American spirit, that pioneer spirit in this present moment and repeat good history, sound history, that grew our economy. I think we can do it and I believe we can do it, and Make It in America is the way to make it all happen.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Give him a minute of my time. He's from Pennsylvania. He can't help it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I look up and find another colleague here. We have just a few moments left.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I appreciate the gentleman from California. I come from a region of the country, western Pennsylvania, bordering my friend from Ohio, and I was listening to the debate, and I just wanted to talk about this same issue.

This is the key to our recovery and our continued leadership and innovation in this country because, as we have seen in western Pennsylvania and all across this country, the American worker is going to compete and win on a level playing field against anybody in the world any day of the week. We just want to make sure that we have a tax policy that is in place, a trade policy that is in place, and a manufacturing and jobs policy that is in place that is going to allow the American worker that level playing field to compete and win against the rest of the world.

Mr. GARAMENDI. As a great example, your colleague next to you there has a piece of legislation that calls for fairness in the financial markets, the value of the dollar versus the value of the Chinese yuan. Mr. RYAN, you have put it out there. You say it has to be fair. Wrap it for us.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is clearly currency manipulation. Here is the deal: Chevron, $19 million refunded from the IRS last year. They made $10 billion. Valero Energy, 25th largest company in America, $68 billion in sales last year; they got a $157 million tax refund check subsidized by the taxpayer.

If we are going to do this, we need shared sacrifice. We need everybody to contribute, especially those people making a lot of money, to help us reinvest. These folks are benefiting from an old-age industry—that we are running out of oil. It only makes sense. It went into the ground for 4 billion years. We pulled it out in 150 years, and we are burning it. Something is happening. It is an old industry and we are subsidizing it. We need to be Americans who invest in the next great technology to lead the world.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And indeed we will. Over the weeks and months ahead, we are going to talk about the Make It in America agenda, the legislation that has been introduced by the Democratic Caucus here in the House of Representatives. There are about 25 pieces of legislation, ranging from the ones that we talked about here, using our tax money when we buy solar equipment, make sure it is made in America. A bus, if you are going to use our tax money, make sure where it is made. Innovation, the innovation economy, all of those things. This is legislation that we have, infrastructure financing and all the rest. We are going to talk about it piece by piece.

I thank my colleagues for joining us. I have the sense that behind me we are about to be gaveled that we are out of time. I want to thank the American public for listening to the Make It in America agenda.

AMERICAN JOBS AND THE NATIONAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the American people for watching today.

I wanted to talk with my colleagues here today about jobs, how we create jobs in America, and what we are going to do about our national debt. We have a spending problem in America, and we have heard a lot from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They have been talking about jobs bills. I heard someone say that we haven't passed any legislation or taken up any legislation in this House that addresses jobs. Well, that puzzles me. Maybe they have been absent, but it seems to me since I arrived here in January, we have been focused on jobs, and I just want to give a few examples.

Number one, this week we have been working on energy legislation that will open up drilling, open up drilling in parts of the country where right now it is prohibited. Those will be jobs. Those are jobs, good-paying jobs in the energy sector. Not only will that allow for the creation of jobs; it will allow for our country to be more energy independent.

We have taken up all sorts of legislation regarding health care since I have been here. We voted to repeal and to work on some legislation to replace the Obama health care law. Well, I talk to small businesses, business owners, all the time, and they tell me that the Obama health care law hurts them; that because of the increased price that they have to pay, that they can't hire as many people. That is a piece of legislation that directly addresses job creation.

There was a provision that a lot of small businesses will tell you about; it was a 1099 provision that was included in the Obama health care law. We repealed that. We were fortunate enough to convince the Senate to pass it and the President to sign it.

I am joined by my colleague from Indiana. I want to say this, and then I am going to turn it over to him. Every time that we deal with our spending problem in this House, every time that we deal with our debt problem and our deficit, every time that we try to get

our fiscal house in order and make this government live within its means, the way folks back in Arkansas do, where they live within a budget, every time we do that we are creating a better environment in this country for job creation.

So don't let anyone tell you that there is the issue of the spending and the debt and then there is the issue of the jobs. They are all one issue. They are all one. If we want to see the kind of innovation and job creation that we are accustomed to in this country, if we want to see it continue, if we want to continue to be the leader in innovation and technological advancement and job creation, we better deal with our spending problem, or we are not going to see that kind of job creation.

Furthermore, if we don't deal with the debt, and we have a debt crisis, we are going to see job losses that will make what happened in September of 2008 pale in comparison.

I want to yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank my friend from Arkansas, TIM GRIFFIN. I know we are going to talk about Medicare, and we are going to talk about the debt ceiling, but I want to thank you for rising to address what has happened on the House floor this very last hour, because what you say is absolutely the truth. And if we have to, my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, as new Members keep speaking truth to power, then we will do that.

But the fact of the matter is every time, every time the government confiscates the property of the American people, which is their money, you are exactly right, you take away their freedom, their property, their ability to invest that dollar as they see fit. And when that private sector money is in the hands of a small business or a large business, an ice cream shop or an oil company, they have a better opportunity and know better what to do with that dollar in terms of investment, in terms of growing the government, than any government bureaucrat or anyone on the floor of the House ever can.

I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, why every other industrialized nation on the face of this Earth understands that when you pull a lump of coal from the ground, when you take some oil from the ground, when you exploit in the best sense of that word our natural resources, you create wealth.

□ 1730

You raise the standard of living for all involved. Why is one party in this country so masochistic that they can't understand that?

Thank you for your time.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

I was thinking about some of what I heard, Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago. I think that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe that if you leave the lid on a full cookie jar, that means you're out of cookies. I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, just because we have banned drilling and exploration for natural gas and for oil on the east coast and the west coast and Alaska and the gulf, just because we've banned it doesn't mean we're out of it. Just because you leave the top on the cookie jar doesn't mean you have run out of cookies.

You have got to actually take specific steps to develop energy. We are an energy-rich Nation. I happen to believe in an all-of-the-above policy. I think we ought to be pursuing renewable energy, wind, and solar. But at the same time we ought to be pursuing natural resources that we can use right now. Natural gas. We have a lot of it in Arkansas, and we would love to continue developing it. It's interesting to me that at a time when this administration put obstacles up to energy development in the gulf and elsewhere around the United States that would help us be more energy independent, at the same time they were encouraging energy production in foreign countries. It makes no sense.

I now yield to my friend from Indiana, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Thanks to my colleague from Arkansas. I appreciate his comments and what he is saying, and I agree with him wholeheartedly. I can tell you as a small business owner from Indiana, coming from a family farm background and having a small trucking operation, all of the talk here on this floor and in Washington doesn't make a lot of sense to a lot of Hoosiers. Growing up in the agricultural industry, it's hard work. And I know that my granddad and my father and other family members, my brothers, they're all willing to work hard. But I can tell you what: When the government makes it difficult, it's tough to go out there and say, I'm going to keep doing it. When the government comes in and says, We're going to make it harder for you to do your business, you start thinking twice, Do I really want to do what I love to do.

Who creates jobs? Is it the government? I know some in this town believe that the government creates jobs. Well, how do they create that job? They take your dollar, my dollar, they collect it in taxes, and then they put it in a pot, and then we have this large entity we call Congress and bureaucracies, and our Federal Government decides we're going to pick and choose what type of jobs we're going to create. We're going to take those dollars that we've collected from the hardworking taxpayer and create a job.

Well, that's not creating wealth. The folks in my district who build cars, they build steel, RVs, and medical devices that help enhance the quality of life. Agriculture. Boats. We're one of the largest manufacturing districts in the country. That's where wealth is created. That is where jobs are created. The government doesn't build any of that stuff. And they shouldn't. They can't do it as well as what the private sector can. But what the government does is spend money. That's why our jobs are looking somewhere else—because of the threat of higher taxes, the threat of regulation.

We've got the EPA that comes in. Most of the folks that come into our office since I've been elected to Congress—this last year, I would say 90 percent of them come in and start talking about the regulation that the EPA and the enforcement attitude that the EPA has on our small businesses. How can any small business grow to be a big business if they're going to continually be hampered by our own government? FDA, OSHA mandates. We're going to be talking about Medicare. What is that going to look like in the future? And taxes.

We hear our colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about the way government can grow business. The best way is to get out of the way. Right now, America has the highest corporate income tax in the industrialized world. Look at the other countries, whether Japan, Greece. All these other countries are finally figuring out because of just natural economic laws that you can't spend more money than you take in. Why would we want to raise taxes even more when people are starting to say, I'm out of here. I'm tired of doing business here. I don't think my dollar is safe in this country. And they're going to start taking their money overseas. That's why our jobs are leaving.

I believe it's important that we have a flattened tax policy—one that is fair to everybody across the country, one that is not going to pick and choose winners.

I appreciate what you're saying because jobs are not created by the government, they're created by Americans just like Henry Ford. The government didn't subsidize Henry Ford in creating the combustion engine. They didn't go out and subsidize Henry Ford in creating the Ford Motor Company. How many other small businesses started? So many American businesses started in a garage or somebody's shop and grew into some of the greatest companies in the world. But our government now wants to go in and make it more difficult for them and for small businesses.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

My colleague from Indiana was just talking about competitiveness. The question is, How do we compete? What is competitiveness? Well, we have to start with the premise that the private sector is the primary job creator in this country. They're not just the primary job creator—they're the primary innovator. They are the primary source of technological advancement. And that leads to jobs. So the question is, Do we want businesses to be attracted to our country or do we want them to flee our country? That's the question.

That's the question of competitiveness. I want to live in an America that is attractive to job creators.

You can talk about big business; can you talk about small business, you can talk about mom-and-pop shops. You don't even have to define each size business; they're all job creators. We've got in my district, the Second District of Arkansas, we've got all sorts of job creators. And I love them all equally. We've got small businesses, we've got Hewlett Packard, we've got Caterpillar. They all create jobs. When businesses look for a home somewhere on this planet, we want them to look at the United States and say, That's where I want to do business. I can do better there. My labor will be rewarded there. The taxes are not so burdensome there. The regulations don't crush my business there. That's where opportunity is. That's the America that we're trying to create.

□ 1740

The gentleman from Indiana referenced some of the conversations he has had with constituents. I have them every day. They come in my office and they say, This agency is not working with me; it's working against me. This part of government is an obstacle. Can you help me? Can you help me break through so that I can just do my business and create jobs and make a living?

That's ultimately the America that we're talking about.

Since we're talking about competitiveness and we're talking about jobs, that ultimately, as some of us were talking about earlier, leads us to a conversation about debt.

I would now yield to my friend and colleague from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas. I appreciate his leadership and his friendship and his service to our great State, the great State of Arkansas.

I am thrilled that we're having the conversation that we're having here, late in the day, regarding these types of issues that in my strongest opinion are impacting our ability to create jobs; and that's the prize that we all keep our eye on here in these Chambers is what can we do to strengthen our capacity to put people back to work, because I think at the end of the day that's exactly what people elected us to do last November is to come up here and change this climate, change this culture and put the entrepreneur back in charge, because that's where job creation comes from.

A couple of points before I go to some notes that I brought specifically for this afternoon's presentation, and that is that this cloud of uncertainty that continues to hover over the economy of the United States of America is influenced by a number of things, but let me just take two or three of them.

The threat of higher taxes, and not just the threat of higher taxes but the relationship of the threat of higher taxes to the issues of the deficit and the debt. I made these comments not too long ago on this very floor, that in private business, in business in general, your debt is usually tied to your assets, the assets of the company. Most businesspeople get that. But in government, your debt is tied to your capacity to increase taxes. So this debt and deficit issue that we continue to struggle with as a country and the prospect of that debt continuing to rise—and not too long from now we're going to have a vote on increasing the statutory limit on debt—influences, I think contributes to, this cloud of uncertainty that leads a prospective entrepreneur, a prospective job creator, to not do what that person would like to do, even with trillions of dollars sitting on the balance sheets of corporate America, the hesitancy to create these jobs influenced by the threat of higher taxes.

And then I think also, fundamental to this cloud of uncertainty, as I call it, continuous overregulation by this government, that the prospective job creator cannot compute the input costs associated with more government regulation. Notice I haven't even mentioned the impact of the health care law, ObamaCare, as we call it. It's hard to compute the input costs of this health care law. And then more recently, the threat of higher energy prices and a flawed, if not almost nonexistent, energy policy of this administration.

Just think about it. You're a prospective job creator, you've got an idea, you're a creative person, you want to live the American Dream, but standing in your way between your dream and your capacity to do something creatively and resourcefully, to put people to work, to contribute to society, are things like higher taxes, more government regulation and red tape, the impact of when I hire these people, the impact of ObamaCare, and then on top of all of that, the price at the pump and higher energy prices. I just don't see why the other side cannot understand why we're not creating jobs, why we continue to hover at the 9 percent level on unemployment.

Just a couple of weeks ago, we passed on this floor a budget for 2012, and in that budget immediately, before the ink was dry, we were being criticized because of what we were trying to do and what I believe is the reasonable approach to solving our Nation's fiscal problems, and that is finally delving into something that nobody ever wanted to touch, and that's the entitlement programs, the mandatory spending side of the house, where most of the money is.

I just want to make a couple of these comments as it concerns Medicare, because I heard back from my constituents. A tele-town hall meeting the other night, the first phone call I got from Bella Vista, Arkansas, was a gentleman worried because he had heard that we were attempting to take his Medicare away. In 1965 when that program was created, baby boomers were teenagers, and now 10,000 baby boomers a day enter qualification for Medicare. When Medicare was created in 1965, the life expectancy of a human being was around 70, a little younger. Today it's close to 80 years of age. Medicare spending is growing at an unsustainable rate of 7.2 percent every year. Seniors are already facing access issues.

Think about this. Under the current system, one in three primary doctors are limiting Medicare patients. One in eight are forced to deny Medicare patients altogether. If the Medicare program is allowed to continue without any change at all, the Congressional Budget Office projects it goes bankrupt in 9 years. Basically, if we allow Medicare to maintain the status quo, Medicare collapses.

So we're leading. Our conference is leading. We're taking mandatory spending and entitlement programs and we're deciding that we're going to throw our cards down on the table. We're going to do something about it.

The plan that we voted to approve just a couple of weeks ago preserves, protects Medicare for those 55 and over, not just those drawing Medicare but those nearing retirement, people that have planned their lives around that program. We don't change that for those people. That needs to be said. It needs to be repeated over and over again. But again we get demagogued about it because, at the surface level, it sounds like we're trying to just take it away. Let me repeat again. Those 55 and older, not affected by the proposed reforms that we support.

Starting in 2022, new Medicare beneficiaries would be enrolled in the same kind of health care program that I have, that my colleague from Arkansas has, and my other colleagues who have spoken here tonight. Future Medicare recipients would be able to choose from a list of guaranteed coverage options and they'd be given the ability to choose a plan that works best for them. It's not a voucher system. It's premium support. No money changes hands between the government and the individual. It's modeled after what Members of Congress and Federal employees already have.

The reforms are designed to decrease the fraud within the system and requires congressional oversight by requiring transparent pricing and minimum benefit and quality standards and instituting more competitive forces. My friends, that's what the free enterprise system is about, and I believe if it has worked for 235 years of this great country, it should be also the way forward.

Let me finish by saying this. Like my colleague from Arkansas, he and I came in as freshmen together on January 5 in these hallowed Chambers. We didn't come here to do nothing. We didn't come here to kick the old can down the road, to ignore the facts. We came here to act with dispatch and

make a difference for our country. That's why I'm pleased to join my colleagues here of our great freshman class in providing this information to the American public. It's not only what we were elected to do; it is our moral duty to do it and to do it as soon as we can and to do it with the sense of purpose that I think defines the 112th Congress.

□ 1750

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you to my colleague from Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague makes a great point, and I think what we've been talking about here over the last few minutes is that the jobs issue is not separate from the debt issue. We have to deal with the debt in order to create an environment in this country that attracts business and where jobs can be created.

I want to take just a second here. We've heard a lot about Medicare and about the debt; and I think it's important to emphasize here, as this chart shows, that of our yearly spending, well over half is what we call mandatory spending. That is spending that doesn't have to be renewed every year, spending that's in the books, in the law. It just happens. That includes Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. The bad news is, if we do nothing to this big chunk here called Medicare, we do nothing, Medicare goes bankrupt.

This next chart shows that in just a couple of decades, the entire Federal budget at this point right here, the entire Federal budget will be consumed by Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

What does all this tell us? Well, it tells us a couple of things. Number one, we have to do something to reform our system so that we don't have a crisis; and, number two, it tells us that if we don't reform Medicare, it goes away. It no longer exists.

I tell folks all the time when they say, well, you're going to try to end Medicare as we know it, and I say, whoa, whoa, whoa, Medicare as we know it ends itself in just a short number of years. It ends itself. And I say to my friends when they mention something like that, I say, well, if someone really wanted to harm Medicare, they wouldn't propose a bold reform to save it. They would just quietly do nothing because if you quietly do nothing, you kick the can a little further down the road, Medicare goes bankrupt. With no action, Medicare goes bankrupt.

What would that look like? Well, it would look a lot like the President's plan. I don't believe that the President wants to harm Medicare, but I'm certain that he's failed to take the steps necessary to save it. What would a plan look like that harms Medicare? It would look like the President's plan, a plan, a budget that doubles our debt in five and triples it in 10 and does nothing to save Medicare. It's silent on that and on Medicaid and on Social Security.

I would like to yield now to the gentleman from Arizona. Thank you for joining us.

Mr. QUAYLE. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding and for talking about these important issues, and one thing that I do want to talk about is something you just said: kicking the can down the road. We can no longer afford to do that because every year we do not address and solve the problems related to our mandatory spending, they add close to $10 trillion each year to our unfunded liabilities. Those are the liabilities that are going to be put on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. So kicking the can down the road is no longer an option.

Now, I want to get back to something the gentleman from Arkansas talked about earlier, and that is about making America competitive in the global marketplace. We live in a global economy. Nothing is going to change that, but what America has to do and what we have to do here in the House is to make America the most competitive country on the face of the Earth. We need to make America the best place and the safest place to do business, and that's what we were charged to do when we came in in this 112th Congress, and that's what we've been doing from day one.

Because when we came in here, we said we were going to do two things. We were going to get the American people back to work by creating jobs and pro-growth economic policies, and we were going to rein in our out-of-control Federal spending. And we've been doing that.

Since day one, week by week, we have been addressing our problem with out-of-control government spending. Sometimes it was millions of dollars here, other times it's billions, and still other times it's been trillion dollars of savings to be able to make our country prosperous again. That right there is the charge of my generation and our generation to return America's prosperity. That's what we're doing here in the House. That's what the Republican House majority has been doing since day one of the 112th Congress.

One of the things that we did just a few weeks ago was we passed a 2012 budget plan that sets our fiscal course on the right path. It sets us up so that we will have that prosperity, so that the crushing burden of government spending is not passed on to future generations. Immediately, practically before the vote was even cast, we heard from our friends on the other side of the aisle that we were starting to end Medicare as we know it. Funny thing how short their memory is, because Medicare as we know it was actually ended by the previous Congress when they passed ObamaCare.

And Medicare as we know it was ended in two different ways. First, they took over $500 billion out of Medicare to fund their government takeover of health care, and the second thing and the most dangerous thing that they did was they established the Independent Payment Advisory Board. What this is, a lot of people don't really know what it is, but it's a bureaucratic 15-person panel that will actually determine how we are going to provide health care to our seniors. Now, these are not elected officials, these are appointed by the President, and they will be making decisions on how to reduce our Medicare costs by actually preventing certain treatments to our patients, to our seniors. This will get in the middle of the doctor-patient relationship, which is one of the most important relationships that there is. We need to have the trust between our doctors and patients and not taking dictates from a 15-person panel of bureaucrats here in Washington, D.C.

The great thing is that there's really no oversight. Now, Congress can go in and say, well, we don't agree with the independent advisory board, but you know what it takes, it takes an act of two-thirds majority in the House to override one of their decisions. Now, I've only been here 4 months, but I can tell you, two-thirds majority is almost near impossible.

So this is what we have to do: we have to educate and tell everybody and get the facts out to the American people because, like the other gentleman from Arkansas said, after the 2012 budget was passed, I, too, had a teletown hall and one of my first questions was from a caller in my district who was on Medicare and asked, Are you really getting rid of Medicare for me because I rely on it. That's when I had to tell her the facts that, no, absolutely not. Those who are in or near retirement, their benefits will not change because they have planned for those benefits to be there. However, we are going to save Medicare from the implosion that will occur if we do nothing because in 9 years, 9 short years, Medicare will be bankrupt and the 2012 budget that the House Republicans passed will save Medicare bankruptcy, put us on strong fiscal footing going forward, and return America's prosperity to future generations.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you so much to the gentleman from Arizona. I appreciate you making those clear points.

I want to go to the gentleman from Indiana who has risen.

Mr. ROKITA. Thank you. I want to thank the gentleman from Arkansas. I want to associate my comments with the ones just made by the gentleman from Arizona. They're excellent. I think they accurately stated, along with the other gentleman from Arkansas, why we're here as new Members: to grow this economy, make this in the 21st century the best place on Earth to grow a family, to grow jobs, to grow a business.

□ 1800

But you can't have that discussion if we're also not going to talk about how

big this government is, how much bigger it's going to get and who has to pay for it. The ''who has to pay for it,'' my good friend, is not necessarily us. It's our kids and our grandkids who are simply going to be left with the tab so that some of us can have more on our plates now. These were reckless promises made by politicians who came before us on this very floor, on that other floor and all around this town. The simple fact of the matter is they can't possibly be paid for.

What I'd like to do, as I continue to work with you on the floor tonight and rise again a little bit later, is, as a member of the Budget Committee, simply put on the floor some facts and figures so that we understand where we are as we go about talking of solutions.

We are $14 trillion, rounding, in debt right now—this hour, this day. If you look out into the future and you see our new red menace, the tidal wave of debt that is about to come crashing down on us, the total bill is nearly $100 trillion. The total cost year over year of waiting, of kicking that can down the road, as we've heard tonight, a road that's quickly coming to an end, is over $12 trillion. It's more expensive. Let's break it down, because I will be the first to admit on the floor of the House here tonight, sir, that I can't count to $1 trillion. I can't count that high. I can't comprehend what $1 trillion means, not to mention $14 trillion, not to mention $100 trillion.

$1 trillion is one thousand billion. $1 billion is one thousand million. Well now, maybe we're getting somewhere in breaking it down.

Let's break it down by hour. In the hour we're spending in talking with the American people about this serious problem, this country will borrow in this hour over $170 million—just in this hour. For every dollar this Federal Government spends, we are borrowing 42 cents of it.

Let's put it in terms of days. We've heard about Tax Day, that day every year when we find that Americans can finally keep what they earn, keep their own property and start working for themselves; but we also have a Debt Day now. Debt Day this year is July 27. Every day this Federal Government operates on and after July 27 it is operating on borrowed money.

Let's put it in terms of speed. Let's say we're driving down a highway and our historical debt is a car. It would be going down that highway at historical speeds of 65 miles an hour, and that's probably bad enough if the car is debt, but it has gotten a lot worse recently. Let's say there is another car coming up in our rear view mirror and that we look and it's coming up fast. Maybe the license plate reads—but we may not be able to read it—''hope and change,'' and it's coming up and it zooms right by us. How fast, sir, do we think that car had been going if the debt car that we'd historically been riding in had already been going 65 miles an hour? Would it be 70? 100? No. That car that just passed us by, that new debt car that we're currently spending on, is going over 7,000 miles an hour.

That's the challenge we're up against, and the only help that we've gotten from the other side in tackling this challenge is name-calling and demagoguery. It's old tactics. Yet I'm hopeful, sir. I'm hopeful because, every day that we get to talk about this and every day over the last couple of years that we've gotten to talk about this, we are educating our fellow citizens more. We are doing a great job. We are winning the argument. I think, at this time, we are ready to tackle this debt problem if we talk honestly and directly with the American people.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you for that. Thank you to the gentleman from Indiana.

I think the point that you're making is that we first have to identify the problem, and the problem is a spending problem. We don't have a revenue problem. We have a spending problem. We are spending too much money. We have made promises that the government can't keep. Saying that we just need more revenue is like a gambler who's sitting at a slot machine, saying, ''I don't have a gambling problem. I just don't have enough money.'' We have a spending problem, folks, and that's why we have to talk about all of the different programs, and I have been one who has been willing to say we've got to look at everything at a time like this.

I want to yield to my friend from Illinois, but before I do, I want to point one thing out. You mentioned demagoguery. We're trying to responsibly address the spending problem in all parts of the budget, including Medicare, so I just want to run through a couple of attacks, a couple of misrepresentations that I've been hearing. Then I'd like to hear from my colleague from Illinois, but let me point this out.

The first thing that I heard was that our plan in the House is a voucher program, that premium support, which is the core of our Medicare reform for those under 55. For those 55 and over, there are no changes, but premium support is the core of those under 55. I stood here on the floor, and I said, This is a program much like the one Members of Congress have, much like the ones that Federal employees have. The gentleman from the other side of the aisle said, It's a voucher plan.

Is it or is it not? It's not a voucher plan, but you don't have to take my word for it.

What's interesting is that, back in 1999, President Clinton recognized that we had a Medicare problem, a spending problem within Medicare. So what did President Clinton do? He appointed a Medicare commission. Who led that commission? One of the co-chairs was a Democrat Senator from Louisiana, John Breaux. John Breaux was an advocate for something called ''premium support.''

So the plan that we're advocating, that we've passed in the House, was not created by a few in a back room last week or a couple of months ago. It's based on something that the Clinton Medicare commission discussed in 1999. I just want to point this out.

This is an excerpt from an op-ed written by Senator Breaux. He says, ''What exactly is a 'premium support model,' and what does my particular version do? 'Premium support' means the government would literally support or pay part of the premium for a defined core package of Medicare benefits.''

Look at this. This is the Democrat Senator, Clinton's co-chair of the Medicare commission. In 1999, he says, ''This is not a voucher program but an alternative to the current system. My plan combines the best that the private sector has to offer with the government protections we need to maintain the social safety net.''

It's pretty clear it's not a voucher program. No matter what you've heard, it's not a voucher program. I've said repeatedly that it's the type of plan that we have, and others have said, no, that's not true. Well, Senator Breaux thinks it's true. He says, ''I've proposed a premium support Medicare plan, modeled after the health care plan, serving nearly 10 million Federal workers, retirees and their families.'' So there is a lot of misinformation out there, and I ask folks to get the facts.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DOLD. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas, and I thank my colleagues for coming down this evening to have this important discussion about the direction of our Nation.

I can tell you I've had an opportunity to talk to a number of Congressmen, several of them in the freshman class and who come from different backgrounds. By ''different backgrounds,'' I mean that they don't come from the traditional political realm. They come from business: those who have met a budget, who have met a payroll and who have created jobs.

□ 1810

There's no question that some of the big issues that we face today are about jobs and the economy. How do we jump-start the economy? How do we create more jobs? I think that certainly the Federal Government is going to play a role, and the role the Federal Government can play is to create an environment that allows the private sector to grow and to thrive.

We have heard tonight about our debt and our deficit. The deficit that we face right now is significant. We're doing about $1.5 trillion in deficit spending. The gentleman from Indiana talked about our debt and how fast we're mounting this debt. When I talk in my town hall meetings and I ask people does anybody have any idea what $1.5 trillion really means, I tell them that my daughter, who is 9, she knows what 1.5 is. She says it's a little bit more than one and not quite two. And I say, You know what, Harper?

That's exactly right. But when we say $1.5 trillion, it works out to be about $3.4 million a minute. Another way to look at it is $58,000 a second. We can't even say it fast enough. $58,000 a second is what we're spending in deficit spending right now.

Now, the chart that was up just a little bit before talked about the pie and what we were spending. The big thing that we're looking at in terms of the discretionary spending, our discretionary spending went up 84 percent over the last 2 years, 84 percent. Now, I know household incomes across my district and across America did not go up 84 percent, but let's be fair. A significant portion of that was the stimulus package. So if we strip out the stimulus and say that we're not even going to include that, discretionary spending over the last 2 years went up 24 percent. That's still a heck of a lot more than families that have tightened their belts all across America have dealt with over the last several years.

There is no question; we have a spending problem in Washington. We've had a spending problem in Washington for a long time on both sides of the aisle. And I'm here to say that we are prepared to say things have to change. I'm not here pointing my finger in any direction, but saying I know that my colleagues and I on both sides of the aisle are prepared to roll up our sleeves and get something done.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DOLD. I absolutely will yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Would you agree with me that there is no way to address the debt issue without entitlement reform, and that entitlement reform must include Medicare?

Mr. DOLD. There is no question in my mind. But the big issues that we face at this point in time have to be dealing with the mandatory spending, of which entitlement reform—and I had a town hall meeting just this weekend where somebody said that he doesn't like the idea of calling it an ''entitlement,'' seeing that he's paid into a system all of his life. He likes to, prefers to call it ''earned benefits.''

The long and the short of it is that the mandatory spending that's going on needs to be addressed. What we've done in this budget is try to address what's going on in terms of the mandatory spending. There is no question that it's going to spiral out of control. It's growing at a rate of 7.2 percent each year. It's growing by leaps and bounds and will eventually take over the entire Federal budget.

So we have to talk about Medicare. We talk about saving Medicare, which is critically important. In Lake County, part of my district, trying to find a physician that's willing to take additional Medicare patients is very difficult to find. The Mayo Clinic in Arizona is recently saying that they're not taking any more Medicare patients. This, to me, is alarming.

What we need to be doing today is trying to come together to have a fact-based conversation with the American public so that we can solve the big issues of our time. I'm fearful that I may be the first generation of Americans that leaves our country worse than the one I received from my parents and grandparents; and that, to me, is absolutely unacceptable.

We have to talk about how do we grow revenues. We're going to grow revenues on the backs of the private sector. We have to address the mandatory spending that's going on here in Washington.

And everything must be on the table. That means that defense has to be on the table. It means that agriculture has to be on the table, every single department. But what we do need is we do need to have a willing partner on the other side of the aisle that is willing to come to the table and have this discussion about what it is that we need to do to put ourselves on the right course.

We know that the attack ads have come in. They're saying that Medicare as we know it is going to end. Well, that's true. It's going to end because it's going to go bankrupt if we do nothing in 9 years. I believe that we have to strengthen Medicare for future generations.

The plan that's been put in place says to those seniors, those that have paid into the system for years and years, that we must keep our promises. So for those 55 and older, there are no changes. For those 54 and younger, many of them don't even believe that there is going to be a social safety net for them. I believe that we have to strengthen it. We have to strengthen it so that it is there for future generations.

So what we want to do today is make sure that we are coming to the table to have a fact-based conversation about the problems that we face. And I know that we have to have that serious conversation now. I came to Congress to be part of a solution.

The other night, I was tucking my 9-year-old into bed and she asked me quite simply, Why are you not here during the week, Daddy? And I had to tell her, It's because I am trying to make the country a better place for you and your brothers and sisters. She said, Is it working? I said, I certainly hope so. We're going to do everything we can to make sure that the next generation has a better and stronger America than the one that you and I know today.

So it is time for us to have this conversation. It is time for us to step up. And I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Arkansas for putting this time together. I look forward to coming back up again and having some more conversations about it. But the time is now. We cannot wait any longer.

Certainly taking time away from my business, from the employees and other family members, and one of the reasons that I decided to run—and I see my other colleague over here, a small business owner, one of the reasons he decided to run as well—is that the Federal Government was making it harder and harder for me to put the key in the door and open up my business each and every day. That's not what we want to do. They should be making it easier for us to put the key in the door. They should be making it easier to be able to provide benefits to those people with whom we work.

So with that, I appreciate the gentleman for the time.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I just want to point out that the gentleman from Illinois mentioned some of the nonsense, some of the attacks that the other side has been making on those of us who are trying to save Medicare and responsibly deal with the budget. The Union Leader newspaper took a look at some of the attacks and said, ''Ending Medicare''—the idea that we're trying to end it—''is a big scary lie.'' And PolitiFact, which is a Web site that takes a look at political attacks—it determines how much validity there is—it gave our colleagues on the other side, it gave their attacks the ''pants on fire'' rating—as in, ''liar, liar, pants on fire''—on their Truth-O-Meter. So there's a lot of misinformation out there.

I would like to now yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY. I appreciate that.

To my friend from Arkansas and the rest of my colleagues that are here tonight, I have to tell you, it's only been about 4 months since we all came here, and I think we all came for the right reason. We came for a cause and not a career.

I have got to tell you, the reason I am here tonight is because I had a telephone town hall today, and the folks that called me were seniors. The disturbing part about the conversations were that the most vulnerable folks out there, the people who lived within their means for the longest, made the most sacrifices, did the most to keep the promise that America holds for all of us, are the ones that are being attacked now. And they are not being attacked with facts; they are being attacked with fear.

I have friends who are Democrats, but I would ask them to please, if you can't confuse them, then try to convince them. If you don't have the right facts, then quit using fear. And if they're going to use fear to make these people not able to sleep at night, to make it uncomfortable for them to lay their head on the pillow at night, the same people that have done so much to make the country great, if you are going to continue to lie to them and tell them, Those Republicans are going to take away your health care; they're going to take away Medicare; they are going to take away Medicaid; they're going to ruin Social Security for you, please, please, play by the rules. Play by the rules. Do what's right. Do what's right for America.

This is not about Republicans. This is not about Democrats. This is about Americans. And this is especially about seniors. I am one right now. My birthday was just the other day. I am 63 years old. I don't think of myself as a senior. But you know what? The folks that I see after church on Sunday and who I have coffee with, they are seniors. They are in their seventies and they are in their eighties, and to have to sit there with them and tell them, We are not taking away your Medicare. We're the only ones that have a plan to save it.

□ 1820

We are not taking away your Social Security. We're the only ones that have a plan to make sure it's safe. If we can't be honest, if we can't look each other in the eye and say that we are here to fix it, that we are here to make America have the stability that it once had; if we can not tell our seniors, it's okay folks, we're not going to take anything from you, we're going to work together to get it fixed—and this is the thing that bothers me. After listening to those folks today on the phone, I am convinced that there is something seriously wrong within this House.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I will yield.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. You know, you hit a point that seniors are thinking about. They're thinking that they're on a fixed income. They're looking at rising prices, whether it's at the gas pump—we talked today about solving American energy issues, but they're thinking about the rising commodity prices.

I brought with me a bank note, this is an official currency note from the Bank of Zimbabwe. If you look at it, and I know it's going to be difficult, but it's a $100 trillion bank note. A Wall Street Journal article said, How to turn $100 trillion into $5 and feel good about it. It's worth about $5 on eBay. They quit printing them in 2009.

It drives home the point that the policies of this administration are increasing the cost of commodities, the cost of fuel, devaluing our currency, and that applies to health care as well.

Seniors are concerned. They've got every right to be concerned. One thing about the Republican budget, and one thing that the gentleman from Arkansas is trying to point out, that we're trying to solve the problems of this Nation here in this body. This Republican freshman class is taking the bull by the horns to bring home the issue to the American people and let them know we're trying to solve these problems. So I commend him.

Mr. KELLY. I appreciate that. If I may, and I'm going to wrap up. We came here for a cause. We did not come here for a career. And if you cannot win the debate by using facts, and if you have to use fear, then shame on you. Shame on you. Go home. Go home. If you don't want to fix it, if you don't want to play by the rules, if you don't want to make America sleep safely again and sleep soundly, then go home.

There is a level of fairness that needs to be played by. And I will tell you this, I have never in my life been subjected and have watched seniors been put through so much, and it's not necessary.

If it's about your party, and if it's about trying to convince them, then doggone it, you're using the wrong message. Let's make sure that we fix it for the future, because it's there for our seniors, and it's there for our children.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you very much for that.

I now yield to the lady from New York.

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues from South Carolina and from Arkansas for putting together this hour, which is of so much value.

I am here as a physician who's also a Member of Congress. I've had the privilege of taking care of elderly patients for 16 years in private practice and in hospital settings, and I have two parents whom I cherish who have been Medicare recipients for many years.

And the facts of the case, as our colleague from Pennsylvania has aptly pointed out, we have to go by the facts of the case. And as a doctor, that's what we always did, and approach them with compassion and sensitivity to be sure.

But the facts of the case are that we currently have roughly 10,000 Americans, baby boomers, now entering Medicare eligibility every day. On average, each of them will have contributed approximately $110,000 in payroll taxes over their lifetimes, and that's a lot of money. There's no question. But, Medicare will spend, on average, it's projected, approximately $330,000 on their care. As all of us can tell, unfortunately, that's not something that we can sustain. That's not something that our children and our grandchildren will be able to pay for. That is what is threatening the future for everyone, including our seniors and including all of us who will be senior citizens, Good Lord willing, by and by.

We know that in the Affordable Care Act measures were taken to control the cost of Medicare. One of the measures, in fact, took funding away from Medicare, roughly half a trillion dollars. So we know we need to do something about it.

The way the Affordable Care Act approaches it is to have the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB, which is a board of bureaucrats that's going to decide how money is spent on our seniors' care. I, as a doctor, and as a daughter, would much prefer to see us have that choice. That's why premium support makes sense.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. MCKEON (during the Special Order of Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas), from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–77) on the resolution (H. Res. 208) directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any document, record, memo, correspondence, or other communication of the Department of Defense, or any portion of such communication, that refers or relates to any consultation with Congress regarding Operation Odyssey Dawn or military actions in or against Libya, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE ECONOMY AND THE STABILITY OF THE MIDDLE CLASS

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity this evening for the Democratic Caucus in the House to address this budget and to go forward with a discussion on our stand on the issues and solutions that we're proposing is an important opportunity for us to be able to dialogue here amongst each other on the House floor and also to share that messaging with the viewing public.

Certainly, the general public out there is watching many of these proposals. They are concerned about the stability of the middle class. They're concerned about the economy, concerned about job creation.

We are now well into the 112th session of Congress. We watch as many weeks and months have passed without one single measure that would increase jobs in this country coming before the House. Nothing that deals with the economy, nothing that deals with the retention of jobs or the job creation situation has been produced here as legislation and voted upon on the House floor, a rather dismal track record when the clarion call, the message that resonated from the voting booth to these Halls of Congress on the Hill in Washington was very clear: Start growing the economy, stop shrinking the middle class, and people are concerned about the opportunities that will be passed by. As we walk through these very difficult times, it is about job creation and retention.

There's also a concern that there has been this very strong attempt to make the comfortable even more comfortable with the new Republican majority in the House. And we'll talk about that. Let's talk about it.

We have a situation where people will allow for corporate loopholes that cost

our economy money. They'll allow for a continuation of millionaires and billionaires to receive tax cuts; they'll advance the reducing of Medicaid, where two-thirds of those dollars go toward sustaining the elderly in health care settings; and they want to end Medicare. And all of this is professed to be some sort of savings in Federal Government.

Well, that is only part of the story. The real truth is that these savings quickly dissipate. They're gone because they are used as payment for tax cuts for millionaires, handouts to the oil companies that sit on historic profit that has been realized, $1 trillion nearly in profit realized by the big oil companies of this Nation, and that is the vulgar outcome that has so infuriated the middle class.

As I travel to my district, I hear repeatedly about the concerns to end Medicare. People will say, we're not ending it, we're fixing it; that we're not really providing for an end, we're offering, at first what was a voucher, now it's called ''a transformation.''

Look, as we shift risk from the government to the individual senior household, we are ending a benefit that has lasted for some four and-a-half decades, that came about for the very reasons that seniors could not access an affordable health care plan, that there was cherry-picking going on, that only the easiest to insure would be covered, that those who might have come with some preexisting condition would be passed by, and where the notion of an affordable health care insurance premium, a policy that was unaffordable, was just beyond the grasp of our Nation's seniors. And so it's why the program grew in strength and popularity, and why it has provided stability for our Nation's seniors.

Now, when we look at what's happening here, we'll talk about the many dynamics, but there are those who professed very boldly that what we're doing here is exactly what the Congress has in terms of an insurance policy.

Well, Congress has about 72 cents of its premium costs covered. With this plan, with this voucher plan initiated in this Republican budget approved in this House, the Republicans suggest with their plan that it would be every 32 cents on a dollar covered with their voucher program. And just what guarantee is there that the senior who shops will, in fact, land a policy that will cover them? So it's very concerning.

We just recently did a mailing that informed people of the various reforms that are being proposed. We also solicited their input on what priorities they believe we should hold in our hearts and minds here as we move forward, and we've received a great supply of information already in the very infant days in responding.

□ 1830

As they come in, they keep growing more and more one-sided.

Let me just hold up what the first few days has produced. We have one pile here of speaking out against the Medicare end. This is one copy. We have yet a second pile all received in the first few days of people receiving their mailing. We saw those two bulky piles. This is the response in favor of. Well beyond 90 percent of the returns to date is: don't mess with benefits.

Now, mindful, when we were addressing the Affordable Care Act, when we were holding town forums, when we were holding some 3,000 to 4,000 forums across this country discussing the health care reforms, how to improve it, what exactly is included, what the priorities ought to be, there were clarion calls of ending Medicare, of death panels, and all sorts of risks to the seniors, and denying access and affordability. Well, we proved that that was not the case, that it was misinformation.

This one walks right into that argument, because it ends Medicare. It ends Medicare and it turns it into a voucher system, and it has everyone shopping in the private sector insurance market to get their coverage. We can't allow this to happen.

We have seen, since the initiation of Medicare, the growth in premiums in the private sector market, and that equates to some 5,000 percent. That's a huge increase. But there are friends out there that helped to bring the wrong candidates to this House, and I think it's time for them to come forward, as they believe, to get some sort of return on that investment.

Well, we cannot afford to have that investment come down onto the senior community, because we know it will be devastating. So we are going to continue to do battle to fight that Medicare issue. To end Medicare would be devastating to our Nation's seniors. Can we make it stronger? Absolutely. Can we provide more stability? Absolutely. That began in the ACA, the Affordable Care Act. We are going to continue to work on it. But seniors did not tell me—and I talked to my colleagues, they did not tell colleagues across this Nation: go back to Washington. We want to return to Washington. End our Medicare program. They said absolutely the reverse, and they knew they were benefited by it.

There are a number of others that attacked the middle class, working families of this country. We are going to work to make certain that there is not an attack on the middle class, because that attack drains worthy programs of dollars and then gets transferred over to payments for millionaire tax cuts, billionaire tax cuts, Big Oil handouts, and corporate loopholes to be paid for.

We are joined this evening by a very good friend who has entered the House this year as a freshman Member. He is the former mayor of Providence, Rhode Island. He now represents Rhode Island's First Congressional District. He has been an outspoken voice. I am impressed with DAVID CICILLINE's absolute impassioned voice to save Medicare. He has been outspoken on the House floor, and he has been outspoken in our caucus. It is a pleasure, Representative CICILLINE, to have you here this evening to talk about this Medicare situation and perhaps what you are hearing in your district.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for his kind words and for giving me an opportunity to be a part of this discussion tonight and for your leadership on your importance of preserving Medicare for seniors in this country. I hear from constituents in my district about the importance of strengthening and protecting Medicare.

To give you an idea of how important this issue is in Rhode Island, more than 170,000 Rhode Islanders rely upon Medicare for a reliable, quality, and low-cost hospital and medical insurance as well as prescription drug coverage. More than 65,000 seniors and people with disabilities in Rhode Island rely upon Medicaid coverage for their long-term care.

When I participated in the debate, and actually when I listened during the debate on this very floor about the Republican budget proposal and about what it did to Medicare, my friends on the other side of the aisle said this will strengthen Medicare. And I thought, how could they make that claim? Because I knew what their proposal did was ending Medicare as we know it, as a guarantee for people 55 and under; and it ended this important safety net and turned it into a voucher system for our seniors.

Now, I unfortunately no longer have my grandparents; they have all passed. But the idea that my grandmother or grandfather in their later years would have to go into the private insurance market and buy insurance because they would have lost the protection of Medicare is something which I think nobody should be prepared to accept.

What is even more disturbing is that what the Republicans passed in that budget when they ended Medicare as we know it also resulted in increased costs for our seniors. See, the difference is nothing in their proposal will reduce costs of health care. That's really what we need to do. We don't need to shift the cost to our seniors and visit that problem upon them, because then they have the burden of enduring additional health care costs. We need to obviously eliminate fraud and waste and abuse, invest in wellness and prevention, invest in information technology, all the things that will drive down health care costs. But shifting the burden to our seniors should not be the answer.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office—this isn't Republicans and Democrats. This is nonpartisan—they said that this Republican budget, which was passed by the Republicans, would actually increase health care costs for our seniors, provide less costs and be more expensive, and it would restore the doughnut hole and make prescription drugs more expensive for our

seniors. And in addition to that, when you take their budget proposal in the aggregate, it would add $8 trillion to the deficit over the next 10 years. So it doesn't even reduce the deficit.

We all recognize we have got to reduce the deficit; we have to cut spending. We have to be serious about it, but we can't do it at the expense of our seniors, of protecting Medicare, strengthening Medicare so that our seniors have access to quality health care, and that's a responsibility that we have.

There are lots of ways that we have to look at every part of this budget, eliminate fraud and waste, get rid of programs that don't work, be serious about looking at our military spending and what is happening in Afghanistan; we are spending $2 billion a week or more than that now. Look at the billions of dollars that we are giving in subsidies to big oil companies. They proposed in their budget another tax cut for the richest Americans, the millionaires and billionaires. At the same time, we are ending Medicare as we know it. It is the wrong priorities. We can do better than this. Our seniors deserve better than this.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for giving me an opportunity to share my observation that Rhode Island seniors are depending on me and this Congress to protect and strengthen Medicare. They expect us to deal with this deficit in a responsible way, be serious about budget cutting, but maintain our commitment to our seniors.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative CICILLINE. And, again, thank you for your outspokenness, because we need to make certain that all of America is involved in this dialogue, because this is a critical tipping point in this Nation's history. We can raid on the middle class and cut domestic programs that feed their very heart and soul, or we can do it intelligently, where we share the pain.

Speaking of sharing the pain, a budget, as you indicate, is nothing more, nothing less than our values, our principles, our priorities. And we have seen where the priorities lie with the majority of this House. They have said it is about Big Oil first; it is about corporate loopholes first. It is about millionaires and billionaires first. The people now see this. They see this because they know they are going to have to pay two times what they pay today for Medicare coverage out of their pocket. They know it's shifting risk from government to the senior citizen household, the senior citizen individual. They know that, by the year 2030, triple the amount of money, plus the risk of going out there and making certain that you can find a carrier that will cover you, because they will put your coverage at the whims of the insurance company. If they want to cover some of your health care needs, they will. If not, they won't. And that is really what will ache here. What really happened was that we are taking this moral compass that has been expressed by a program like Medicare and denouncing it, saying that, look, go fend for yourself, find your program.

What I find most generous about my district seniors, and I'm certain this is across the country, coast to coast, they are saying: I'm not just talking about myself or my generation. I am talking about my children and grandchildren. We know what comfort, what security, what stability this brought our household.

□ 1840

What comfort does it bring to adult children to know that their relatives, their parents are sitting in a situation that is responding with dignity?

And when you talk about the principles, about the priorities, look at the road to ruin. They call it the ''path to prosperity'' with the Ryan plan with the Republican budget. The road to ruin, as I refer to it, really takes money from our seniors on Medicare, $4.3 trillion, that then goes and transfers itself over to, guess what? $4.2 trillion worth of benefits for Big Oil and millionaires and billionaires.

So the scales are balanced in terms of where the dollars are, but the real pain here is that they get emptied from the seniors' coffers, programs that address a basic core need of health care, and then get emptied into the pockets of millionaires and billionaires and Big Oil.

I know our friend from California, Representative JOHN GARAMENDI, who is always leading us on the floor with wonderful, interesting discussion, has something to say about big oil companies, and it speaks to this flipping from one side of the scale to the other, where an equal amount of money found in savings by cutting the middle class, by cutting our seniors is now going to be spent. It is not savings. It was accruing the dollars necessary to just transfer over in some sort of way and some sort of painful way that finds itself with oil companies, millionaires and billionaires.

Representative GARAMENDI, please.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you very much for what you are doing, bringing up this critically important issue. As you were saying, nothing is more important than the question of who we are as Americans and our values; what is it that we really care about and how do we structure, how do we create a society that reflects those values.

Before 1964, the largest segment of the American population that was in abject poverty were seniors. They had no health care. They couldn't get insurance. They were basically the poor of the poor. But as a result of the fundamental goodness of America, Medicare was created, a medical insurance program for seniors so that they would have available to them doctors' services and hospital services. And it worked.

Now, I was the insurance commissioner in California for 8 years, elected statewide by 34 million people to oversee, to regulate the insurance companies. And in that process we were looking and watching the Medicare program. It wasn't private insurance, but it was part of the health insurance system; and we knew that it worked.

It is exceedingly efficient. It works for less than 2 percent. You got a nationwide insurance policy. Wherever you are in America, you get the exact same insurance policy. Doctors know how to bill; hospitals know how to bill. It is efficient; it is effective. It works. More than that, it is an expression of the basic goodness of America.

I was surprised, shocked, angered when the Republican budget came forward and proposed that Medicare be terminated for all who want to live to the age of 65. Terminated. Ended. That wasn't all that the Republicans proposed. They proposed that not only would it be terminated, but that all future Medicare enrollees would be given a voucher worth about one-half the cost of insurance and told to go to the insurance companies and buy a policy.

Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Time out, Mr. Republican. Time out. What are you saying? You are going to take the population that has preexisting conditions—there are very few that are 65 years of age that don't have preexisting conditions—and you are going to turn them over to the most voracious sharks in this Nation, the health insurance companies? No way. No way. They are going to get chewed up, spit out and uninsured, or else charged a small fortune. This is the most un-American, the most inhumane thing that could be imagined for seniors, for tomorrow's seniors. We cannot let it happen.

Then, on top of that, in the very next breath they proposed to continue billions of dollars of subsidies, taking money literally out of the pockets of seniors and working men and women and giving it to Big Oil, who happens to have big profits, just as you have on your card up there. Not only Big Oil, but the wealthiest people in America, people whose incomes are $1 million, $10 million, $1 billion a year income, and give them an additional tax break, so that in 10 years it is $4 trillion of tax breaks to the big oil companies and those, not millionaires, but those whose annual income is in the millions. What is going on here?

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, if you will suffer an interruption and yield, you talk about those Big Oil profits. You talk about the trillions they are willing to spend. And then they have the audacity to say it is a spending problem.

Well, where are we spending? We are making the comfortable more comfortable. With those Big Oil handouts, up to 90 percent, according to studies released, up to 90 percent are going toward bonuses for executives in the oil industry—up to 90 percent. What quantifiable societal good is there from

these handouts? They are mindless. And today, today, someone from the industry was quoted as saying to not offer these handouts is un-American. It is unbelievable.

Mr. CICILLINE. If the gentleman will yield, I think what is just shocking is that that claim was made today, and really what is un-American is to end Medicare. The reality is Medicare reflects our values as a country. We decided as a Nation that we wanted to ensure that our seniors in their final years, that they have lived a life and played by the rules, done what is right, that they can live with security and dignity and without the fear, the anxiety of worrying how they would have access to basic health care, because we decided as a country that we wanted to ensure, to guarantee that our seniors could live with dignity and with proper health care.

The idea of ending that and requiring them to go buy it with a voucher, that is un-American.

Mr. TONKO. Right. And when you look at the statistics, the median household salary for our seniors is $19,000; the average individual salary is $19,000. When you look at the onerous outcome of having to reach for thousands more dollars out of your pocket on a base of a median of $19,000, when we are looking at millionaires and billionaires getting even more assistance, that is spending. So let's not get off track here. It is spending.

Where are we going to invest? Investing in health care, a basic core need, when premiums in the last decade have risen over 130 percent and where the administrative costs of the private sector and insurance are higher, where they are much lower in Medicare, where the advertising costs aren't there, where we know we have had coverage. And now we are going: here is your voucher payment. It is not going to be indexed appropriately so that with time it becomes less and less valuable.

This is the kind of un-American behavior that we are witnessing here and that people get upset about saying they are lies, they are fear tactics. This is what is happening. It ends Medicare.

Once you remove the risk that falls with government and transfer it over to our Nation's seniors, you have ended the core principle. When you deny a given bit of certainty and stability to our seniors, you have ended Medicare. When you are going to inflate the cost of health care, you have ended Medicare. And we have now taken that money and transferred it over to the big oil companies.

Representative GARAMENDI.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you for yielding. If you add to that destruction, the termination of Medicare, the way in which the Republicans have already voted for on this floor to end the Health Care Reform Act, which regulated the insurance companies and said the insurance companies could no longer discriminate based upon preexisting conditions, discriminate based upon age and whether you are a woman or a man, all of those protections that are in the health care reform law would be terminated.

So not only are you taking the Medicare program and ending it, giving the seniors a voucher that is perhaps half of the cost of a health insurance policy, you are eliminating the restrictions that were placed on the insurance companies for discriminating against people that have preexisting conditions.

□ 1850

So you've literally taken these people and thrown them to the sharks. On top of that, the rest of the proposal was to take the Medicaid program, which is health insurance for impoverished children, and give a block grant to the State that's worth about half of the cost, a $700 billion cut out of that program for children's health care, and you say, What's this? This is not us. This is not America. These are harsh, cruel programs that are being foisted upon the American citizens.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, if you will, that Medicaid cut also will impact the Nation's seniors because when they're in institutional settings we know about 66 percent of the expenditure is for our seniors. Again, we understand the compassion that is required. We know the American spirit to respond to those who have served society so well. And in their golden years they need the assistance. But every attempt that is being made here, we have tried every which way to inform the public of the attack on Medicare, the attack on Social Security, to privatize Social Security. This is about giving Big Oil, big insurance companies, big banks more business. This is like cashing in on being good to some people here. That is not how this government should be guided. It should be guided on the principles of providing the basic core needs in a way that's most effective, most efficient.

We have even attempted—the House was addressing the Republican version of the budget. I introduced an amendment on the Budget Committee where I serve and presented it before the Budget Committee, and it went down by party vote to stop the attack on Medicare, to end Medicare. There was an absolute amendment that said, Let's pull out ending Medicare from your budget plan. It was denied. Then, I traveled to the Rules Committee and attempted once more before the bill came to the House, Let's stop the effort to end Medicare. It was denied at the Rules Committee again with the Republican majority at the Rules Committee.

So now we're visiting this situation. And the budget was approved in this House with this raid on the middle class and the attack on the values of the middle class, of working families. It is really disturbing that the most comfortable continue to get that effort made their way. And especially when history speaks—and speaks so abundantly well to us. It should resonate. When we put people to work with FDR's programs back years ago, decades ago, the result was 8.5 million people put to work and public projects built that still serve us well today. JFK investing in global technology to win the space race. Those are examples of things that worked. LBJ promoting a Medicare program. Now we're repeating this driving the car into the ditch scenario. Reaganomics and its trickle-down didn't work. The Bush II Presidency and its cuts to the millionaire, billionaire companies didn't work. Why would we revisit that as we crawl out of the most painful recession and propose ending Medicare—ending Medicare—denying dignity to our Nation's seniors and avoiding the fundamental responsibility of good government, efficient government, which is what I think the voters asked for in November, not this sort of pain.

Representative CICILLINE.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman. In addition to that, the other part of the Republican budget that passed in this Chamber was also to restore the doughnut hole; to make prescription drugs more expensive for our seniors and to eliminate the free preventative care. I know, from talking to seniors in my own district, there are too many seniors faced with a choice of, do I buy my groceries, or do I buy the prescription drugs that are necessary to keep me healthy. No senior in America should be faced with that choice. And this bill, this budget that the Republicans passed, will raise prescription costs for our seniors.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you.

Representative GARAMENDI, we have about 4 minutes remaining in our one-half hour here of dialogue.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I'll take a lightning minute here.

It really comes down to a question of: Where do you stand? Who do you stand for? It's very, very clear. If there's ever a dichotomy and a clear opportunity to see where you stand, it is in the Republican budget. Let's be very clear. It terminates Medicare; gives seniors a voucher that is worth perhaps half of the cost of insurance; takes $700 billion out of Medicaid. And that is, as you said, the long-term care for seniors in nursing homes. And it continues the tax cuts for people whose income is millions, billions; continues the tax subsidies for Big Oil—$4 billion, $5 billion a year to companies that have made over a trillion dollars in the last decade. And just in this quarter, Exxon, $10.7 billion; Oxy, $1.6 billion; Conoco, $2.1 billion. This is one quarter, 3 months of earnings. Billions and billions of dollars. And then they want to continue.

Where do you stand? Do you stand for the working men and women, the seniors, those people that need to be able to get health care, or do you stand for the very, very rich and the big oil companies? The Republicans have made it

clear. There's a difference here between where we stand as Democrats and where they stand as Republicans.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI. I appreciate you and Representative CICILLINE joining in this important half-hour of discussion. But I can clearly state that no one that I talked to in this House, no Representative, was hearing advocacy to end Medicare during our campaigns last year. I didn't hear one individual tell me that—senior, non-senior. I didn't hear anyone ask me to give more profits, more handouts, to big oil companies. I didn't hear one person say, Protect the corporate loopholes for corporations out there. I didn't hear anyone say, Hand more tax cuts to millionaires and billionaires.

I did hear, Make my budget work at home. I need the basics. I did hear, I can't survive with the situation as it is. I did hear, We need jobs. I did hear, Start growing our economy. Stop shrinking the middle class.

Well, evidently this majority was not listening. There was anger—undeniable anger, understandable anger—that existed out there. But this is not this quantification that they were looking for. They did not want to see this as a result, as an outcome. I think we need to continue to fight this effort to end Medicare, and we're going to continue that fight.

With that, I thank the gentlemen for joining me in this half hour.

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

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. It's a privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, in this great deliberative body. I came here to talk about a different subject matter. But after I listened to my colleagues for a little while, I believe it's pretty important that we set some of this record straight. I don't know where they would be satisfied. It seems as though the attack is on anybody that's in free enterprise and the support goes to anything that is government. Anything that raises taxes and grows government is good, and anything that taxes free enterprise, and especially profits—those evil profits—are bad. That's the theme that I hear from the gentlemen who spent the previous half hour or hour demagoguing the issue of Big Oil and big insurance companies. This is particularly appalling to me when I walk in here on the floor and I hear a statement made by the gentleman from California saying this: You're going to turn them over to the most voracious sharks in the country—the health insurance companies. Well, if it happens to be that the health insurance companies are operating without competition, keeping their prices down, why doesn't the gentleman or others that might believe that engage in the health insurance industry?

The President of the United States made it very clear. He said he wanted more competition in the health insurance industry. He wanted to create a government-run, government-owned health insurance industry as part of ObamaCare. And he didn't realize, I don't think, when he uttered that statement, at least before ObamaCare was passed and began to knock the competition out of the way, that there were 1,300 health insurance companies in America—1,300—and over 100,000 policy varieties that one could choose from depending on the State that you might live in.

That's a lot of companies, and they've all been shot down here with a blanket allegation that they're voracious sharks. How can anybody be a voracious shark if there are 1,300 companies to compete against and 100,000 policies to choose from? Surely, there's something there that would satisfy the gentleman from the perspective of that array of variety that was available before the President decided he wanted to make the 1,301st insurance company be the Federal Government and perhaps give us a half-dozen or so policy varieties with a community rating that compressed it down, that raises the health insurance premiums for the youngest, lowest income people among us, and subsidizes the premiums for the highest income people among us.

□ 1900

That's ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, and it clearly is. The gentlemen seemed to have forgotten what they all worked together to do to America over the last 19 months. They worked to impose ObamaCare on 300 million Americans, 306 or so million Americans, and they come here on the floor tonight to talk about the effort on the part of Republicans to try to save this Republic from the voracious appetite of government, the voracious shark of government that feeds upon the sustenance of the American people, that puts into debt every single person, every man, woman and child in America, and puts the mortgage on their head the day they are born.

Last fall, I talked about my granddaughter, my most recent granddaughter, Reagan Ann King. She's about 7 months old now, 6 to 7 months old. On the day she was born, her share of the national debt was $44,000. Welcome to America; welcome to the world; welcome into life. You owe Uncle Sam $44,000, and the interest is building. The interest is building, and this young lady is going to have to work a long time to pay that off.

I hear the same Members over here, at least from the same party, talking about the average debt that a college graduate has, that student loans are costing too much money. They had to confiscate all the access to the marketplace for the free market on student loans and turn it completely into a government-run operation because they believed that somebody was making money off the interest, and they lamented that an average student loan when someone graduated from college was in the area of maybe $20,000 to $40,000. But it doesn't concern them that their policy and the President of the United States and the former Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, and the majority leader of the United States Senate, HARRY REID, the three of them, the ruling troika, President Obama, NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID, could get in a phone booth and do what they would to America, and they have driven up this national debt and deficit to the point where it is appalling to the fiscally responsible Americans who pay their bills on time with the paycheck that they have with the amount that's left after they pay their taxes and their payroll.

They want more government, more taxes, more irresponsibility. They want the nonproductive sector of the economy to feed on the productive sector of the economy, and they stand here and talk about a company that they claim made over, maybe the aggregate of all these companies, made over a trillion dollars in profits in the last decade. I'd like to see that data. And perhaps, if they have anybody on that side of the aisle that's ever actually engaged in business, they would do a calculation to see what the return on investment was, what was the capital investment that returned that kind of an investment, if those numbers would actually hold up under scrutiny, and I suspect they won't. Then, if they're going to do a legitimate measure, they would also take a look and see what have been the windfall profits of the Federal Government in collecting royalties off the product that has been produced by these companies that are doing high-risk exploration in deep waters to make sure, yes, for a profit—they should have a profit—but they also are making sure that there is cheaper energy here in the United States certainly than there would be otherwise if we didn't have these companies exploring for oil in places like the gulf coast and up in the Bakken region, and if we didn't have some kind of support here in Congress to open up offshore drilling, drilling on the non-national park public lands in America.

We're an energy-rich nation. We have a large share of the world's energy and a smaller percentage of the world's population, and we have that energy, I suspect, because we've actually explored for it, identified it, measured it and quantified it. But, of course, that stuff escapes the people on the other side that are making these arguments for political reasons.

The talking points of the Democrats are now, demagogue the Republican budget, attack the Republicans and accuse them of threatening senior citizens, and they completely deny the

fact that people 55 and up in the Republican budget are expressly protected from any kind of budgetary changes. It is truly an entitlement for those 55 and up.

I'm not going to take the stand that we should then transfer that all the way down and guarantee my little granddaughter, Reagan Ann King, that her anticipated Medicare and Social Security benefits will be what she expects them to be on the day she's born with her $44,000 worth of national debt that she has to pay off. Are we going to guarantee her that she gets her retirement benefits under Social Security in the amount that has been calculated in the actuarial tables and a promise? Is that an entitlement? Are we going to guarantee her the level of Medicare? Are we going to take away any incentive for all children born in America to establish themselves, to protect themselves, to plan for their own retirement, their own future, and perhaps be responsible enough to take themselves off the entitlement rolls so that there can be a future for America?

This economy collapses unless we address it. If we don't have the will, if we're going to listen to this kind of talk and cower before that and misdirect the American people with statements that clearly cannot be supported by the facts and think somehow there's a solution, my question is: What's your solution? More debt, more deficit, more demagoguery? For what? You'll put America into debt to exchange it for more political power? We saw what you did with political power and the American people rejected it in a resounding election just last November, and the large super-Democrat majority in this Congress turned completely over to a large Republican majority instead. Eighty-seven freshmen Republicans. You should be able to understand, none of them got elected because they want to grow government or increase the debt and deficit. Not one. Every one ran on the repeal of ObamaCare.

While I'm on the subject, Mr. Speaker, I would make this point. Of all that was said about what it is that allegedly Republicans would do with seniors, here's what ObamaCare exactly does with seniors. It cuts Medicare by $532 billion, a direct assault on seniors, a direct assault on their Medicare. Now. It's not a delay. It's as soon as they can get this monstrosity implemented, and they believe that they're going to take that money and roll it over into something else, and it was part of the smoke and mirrors to come up with a CBO score that they could allege that it was actually going to be a money saver.

But the American people threw a lot of people out of office last November because they knew when the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader all say the same thing, we're going to insure 30 million more people with ObamaCare and it's going to be at no cost, 30 million more people insured at no cost, the American people know that's false. No matter how many times it's repeated, they know that that's false. You can't get more for less. Things cost money.

And they could understand this. That if you take the 306 or so million Americans and if you're concerned that there is a percentage of them that are uninsured, we should only be concerned about the Americans that were uninsured and remain uninsured, I might add, that don't have affordable options.

If Bill Gates is uninsured, I don't have any heartburn over that. Bill Gates can manage his own health care. He can be self-insured. He may well be, for all I know. If Warren Buffett is uninsured, I'm not concerned about that. He can manage his own health care. If somebody that's making $174,000 is uninsured, I'm not concerned about that person because they're making enough money to take care of their own health insurance. And on down the line. To what level?

But the people that they're trying to argue were uninsured, this larger number of around 46 million uninsured Americans, when you start subtracting from that those that are eligible for Medicaid but don't bother to sign up, those that are eligible under their employer but opt out, those who are here in the United States illegally. I don't want to cover them, Mr. Speaker. As you begin subtracting from the 46 million and you get down to the number of those Americans that are uninsured and do not have affordable options, that number turns out to be not 46 million but 12.1 million. That's making $75,000 or less. That's the measure. Those who are uninsured and don't have an affordable option.

Now, 12.1 million is still a lot of people, but it only amounts to less than 4 percent of the U.S. population. And ObamaCare completely transforms the best health care system in the world, the best health care delivery system in the world, and the best health insurance system in the world to try to get at a small percentage of the less than 4 percent of Americans who were uninsured without affordable options.

What do we have today? Do you hear any Democrats coming to the floor to tell us how many people are uninsured in America after ObamaCare was passed?

□ 1910

I can offer this guarantee. It's more. There are more that are uninsured today than there were on the day that ObamaCare was passed because more employers became more doubtful about what it would be that would be imposed upon them. There are fewer employees today than there would be if ObamaCare had never passed because the companies don't have the confidence that they can operate within the environment of an implemented ObamaCare.

And I listen to demagoguery on big insurance companies, Big Oil, big banks. Well, America is set up on competition, and if these companies have such a market share and such an advantage that now they can take unreasonable profits from the marketplace, somebody's going to get in the market and they're going to start a bank and oil company or insurance company.

But here's what I'm for within the area of health insurance. I want to allow people to buy insurance across State lines. I want the people in New Jersey, the young man that's buying a typical policy, in good health, roughly at age 23, for $6,000 a year—that's before ObamaCare passed—I want him to be able to go to Kentucky and buy that similar typical policy for a 23-year-old healthy male in Kentucky for about $1,000 a year. Isn't that a good solution? That way your 1,300 health insurance companies that we had are competing all against each other instead of being isolated within the States, operating under individual State mandates. And they can then afford policies that can have higher deductibles, higher copayments and significantly lower premiums.

And I want to see people get off the entitlement rolls, both of Social Security and of Medicare, and this can be done. And, Mr. Speaker, I will take you quickly down the path of how we get there with Medicare and HSAs.

Under the HSA legislation that was passed in 2003 under Medicare part D, a young couple, let's just say, they presumably fell in love and got married at age 20 and went to work on their life's work. I can do the math work with round figures. And over the course of 45 years of work, from 20 until 65, they maxed out on their health savings account. They started at $5,150 a year for that couple, and then it grows by COLA on up and just continues as long as there is a cost-of-living allowance that increases it. And if you subtract from that amount $2,000 a year that would come out of their health savings account in what we might call typical expenses of health care, going to the doctor, doing those things that you don't want to put on your insurance policy and if you compounded the balance of that health savings account at 4 percent, which is historically accurate—and I did this math before we had the downturn over the last 2½ years—it comes up to this.

That couple would arrive at Medicare eligibility age 65 with a health savings account that had $950,000 in it. $950,000, Mr. Speaker. Now, the liability, the present value, present negative value of an individual that arrives at Medicare eligibility age today is about $72,000. That's the average that the Federal Government would be paying for health care benefits for the duration of the life of the individual after they reach 65 Medicare eligibility, $72,000. So the couple then would be at $144,000, and you have to adjust it for inflation, but I just go without tonight for the purposes of mental figuring.

So you would take the $950,000 and you subtract $144,000 to take care of

what would be the premium for a Medicare replacement policy, a paid-up Medicare replacement policy similar to an annuitized health care plan for life. And now you're in this area of—let's just say $806,000 would be the balance in your health savings account, $806,000. And what's the Federal Government's interest in that health savings account after that point? They want to tax it as regular income as it comes out of that account as being spent by the individual, or they want to tax it as death tax later on if the people, once they pass away, to tax it on the way to their heirs, the death tax.

Why wouldn't this Federal Government offer to the people that have their health savings account, why wouldn't it offer them this? Buy a Medicare replacement policy, and you can keep the change tax free and you can will it to your children or you can use it as a pension plan.

Now, we're already solving this situation of Social Security, Medicare by allowing HSAs to grow and let people manage their own lives. That's the kind of thing that we need to have going on for solutions, not demagoguery, not trying to conflate the philosophy of a budget that's designed to get us to balance.

Where's your balanced budget over there on that side of the aisle? Is there a single one of you that will stand up and tell me that you have offered a balanced budget? You didn't even offer a budget when NANCY PELOSI was Speaker the last year or two here, and now you're here attacking this budget. You don't have a plan. You don't have a platform to stand on to criticize this platform, and you had plenty of opportunity to offer your own. But there's no balanced budget that's being offered on this side of the aisle. That's clear. That's why no one responds to me, or I'd yield to someone who wanted to allege that Democrats offered a balanced budget. If they did, it would be with—what's that word? The voracious shark of tax increases would be what would happen, Mr. Speaker.

So I think perhaps we've dispatched what took place in the previous half hour or an hour, and I will then now, without segue, transition into the subject matter that I came here to talk about. That's this.

Day before yesterday, I listened to the President's speech that he gave in El Paso, Texas, and it was surprising in a way, a bit shocking in a way. It was a political speech on immigration. I mean, that's clear. And the people that analyzed it came to the same conclusion that I did, Mr. Speaker.

But as I listened to the President of the United States, who was standing in El Paso very near the border of the United States, begin to ridicule people who want border security, well, first, he uttered the breathtaking statement that the border fence is, quote, basically complete, close quote. Mr. Speaker, the border fence is basically complete, uttered by the President of the United States? I have a few data points I think he should go back and revisit.

One of them is, Mr. President, there are 2,000 miles of southern border, about 4,000 miles of northern border. But just dealing with the southern border, 2,000 miles of southern border.

Now, whatever it was that Janet Napolitano told you, Mr. President, here are the facts on the border fence as of today, as constructed. Out of the 2,000 miles, there are 350 miles of pedestrian fence. That's called primary fencing. That's a fence that you don't just walk through. It's a bit of a barrier. They get climbed all the time, but it's a single fence. Often it's a chain-link fence. I don't know if they're referring to the barbwire fence. I suspect not, because I think actually we've got a little bit more of that on the border. Even the Federal Government, the Department of Homeland Security claims the primary fencing, pedestrian fencing is 350 miles out of the 2,000 miles. Now, they add this all up and they say we've got all of these miles of fencing, but if it's double fencing or triple fencing, they count each mile of it even if it's layered. Then, if that's the case, it's all done, it's a triple fencing, then we've got 6,000 miles of fence, Mr. Speaker, but that isn't the case at all.

Here's the comparison. 350 miles of primary fencing or pedestrian fencing. Now, we know that a single fence doesn't do us a lot. It slows some traffic down and it gives a line of demarcation. Double fencing slows them down a lot better, and it sets up kind of a no man's land we can patrol and sometimes catch illegals inside of that before they climb the second fence and go off into the underbrush.

So of the secondary fencing they have, there's not 350 miles of that. Remember, 2,000-mile border. Secondary fencing, 36.3 miles. Now, remember the primary fencing, 350 miles; the secondary fencing, 36.3 miles. I'm going to tell you that we don't have a lot of effectiveness until we get to at least the secondary fencing component of this.

So of 2,000 miles of border, 36.3 miles of secondary fencing, 36.3 miles is kind of what you can say is somewhat built, but a lot of it requires also triple fencing. And I've been down to visit the triple fencing, and that exists in a number of places and it exists very effectively in some areas of Arizona, in the southwest corner of Arizona, of course on the Mexican border.

Now, when you look at the border, out of the 2,000-mile border, the fence that is—they call it tertiary, that's the third layer of fence. I have 350 miles of primary fencing, 36.3 miles of double fencing; and of that 36.3 miles, 14.3 miles are triple fencing.

□ 1920

The triple fencing, as far as I know, has never been defeated by anyone. They go around it. They may tunnel under it sometimes, but they've not defeated the fencing, and it's been pretty effective. But if you've got effective fencing at 14.3 of the 2,000 miles and within 220 yards of that triple fencing—and by the way, there is triple fencing in El Paso—the President is standing within 220 yards of triple fencing in El Paso, arguing that the fencing is basically complete, and he's ridiculing Americans who want border security by saying—now I'm just going to include myself in this—that we'll never be satisfied, that we keep raising the bar. Well, no. I always set the bar up pretty high. I don't think I need to raise it.

It reminds me of the way Margaret Thatcher once responded to a student when she was in Iowa and she was asked the question, What have you changed your mind on since you left office? She thought a little bit, and she said, Goodness. I was in office 11½ years. My principles were very soundly based. I saw no reason to change them.

Well, the principle that I've laid out for border security, as far as infrastructure on the border, is this: We've got 2,000 miles on the southern border through which comes 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in America. I don't suggest that we have to build 2,000 miles of triple fencing. I want to build a fence, a wall, and a fence. Yes, that's effective. It's cost-effective as well. I only suggest that we build that fence until they quit going around the end, Mr. Speaker. That will be the measure. That's how we'll know if it's effective. If they're going around the end, we'll extend it a few more miles. If they keep going around the end, we'll keep building. If the illegals are still entering the United States, then we'll build it from Brownsville all the way up to San Diego or to Tijuana if you prefer.

The President said the fence is basically complete, that he's basically got 14.3 miles of completed fencing on 2,000. I don't think anybody is going to think that that's a very basic completion. I should have, perhaps, done this math, but if I just do 14.3 miles and if I divide that by 2,000 miles, I get—let me see—seven-tenths of 1 percent of completion. That would be the President's idea of basically complete. Seven-tenths of 1 percent of the entire 2,000-mile border has triple fencing on it and 2½ times more than that, so maybe you'd have, oh, let's say, 18 or 19—1.9 percent completed if you'd just consider the double fencing instead of the triple fencing.

And the President is making fun of people who might want a moat?

I have a picture here. I've flown that within the last couple of months in a helicopter to evaluate the border, almost all of it, all the way from El Paso across all of New Mexico and almost all of Arizona—I know I've flown all of it at one time or another—and it occurred to me that the President was standing pretty close to the moat at the time, 220 yards away from right there at the border. Not only does it have the triple fencing that Janet

Napolitano made fun of—she said, If you show me a 20-foot fence, I'll show you a 21-foot ladder—but in El Paso, here's what we have:

We have the Rio Grande River, moat No. 1, with water in it, flowing down. You have a fence. You have a patrol road. You have another fence. Then you have a canal that has a fairly fast current in it and a lot of water with concrete sides and bottom. Then you have another fence, so you have triple fencing. If anybody is going to come into the United States into El Paso, they've got to get across the river—sometimes swim, most of the time wade—climb a fence, avoid the Border Patrol that has a patrol road and stations posted along inside the column of the two fences, climb a second fence, get into the canal, swim the canal, get up over the top of the next fence and into El Paso.

Mr. President, it's not happening in El Paso because fences work. By the way, the natural water streams there have been really useful as well, and I think that, if I had any staff that stood me up within 220 yards of a structure like that to make fun of it, I'd probably have different staff the next day. I hope he takes note of that, Mr. Speaker. I make these points that the immigration situation in the United States is this:

We have a GAO study, and this study that just emerged here a few weeks ago tells us that there are a number of people who die in the Arizona desert while sneaking into the United States. The loss of every one of those personal lives is a tragedy, and it's of high proportion to their families, but I began asking the question: How many Americans die at the hands of those who do get into the United States? That study report comes out and tells us this:

In the Federal, State and local prisons in America—and this is a very minimum number. This is a floor, not a ceiling. We know the number is higher. We know it's no lower than this—there are currently incarcerated 25,064 criminal aliens who were arrested for homicide and who are currently incarcerated in those prisons that I mentioned in the United States. That's 25,064 homicide victims at a minimum that we know of, and that's some of the price for our not securing our border.

If we had 100 percent enforcement on our border and 100 percent enforcement over people in the United States illegally, then theoretically at least all 25,000 of those people would be alive. They would not be under the ground in the United States—one coffin at a time, one obscure village at a time, one tragedy in a family at a time. It's more than 25,000, certainly, which is a number that soars when you think of it, a number of multiples of the victims of September 11, and we sit here and say, Well, you know, it's only people who want to come here to make a better life.

It's not only that to the families who have lost victims to this.

I just sat down and had a discussion within the last couple of hours with Tiffany Hartley, whose husband was a victim of the vicious murder out on the jet skis on Falcon Lake, which is just north of McAllen, Texas, on September 30 of last year.

The tragedy of his death, the unwillingness on the part of this administration to go in and investigate his death, to find the perpetrators who killed her husband, and come to the truth of that incident is inexcusable and unconscionable. The Justice Department needs to drill in with this. They need to turn up their diplomatic pressure. The State Department, Hillary Clinton, needs to connect with the Mexican consul. Let's get to the bottom of this. Let's get the facts as they stand. Let's find out who investigated what and when, and let's take a look at the communications as they go back and forth so we can get a sense of the level of focus that maybe existed or maybe didn't exist.

I'm calling upon Eric Holder to take a look at the murder of David Hartley. Do so for Tiffany. Help her get some closure.

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

A SLAP IN THE FACE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS—SUM TOTAL OR NOT

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to get something off my chest.

Last night, the President hosted a poetry event at the White House. The invitation of one of his guests has sparked a lot of anger, and let me explain why.

The musician wrote a song in which he vocally supports a convicted cop killer and her escape from jail. Oh, by the way, she's still at large, living in Cuba, living the good life. It may not mean much to some, but I've got a serious problem with this.

Before coming to Congress, I spent 37 years as a cop. I lost friends in the line of duty, and I'm not the only one. As we speak here right now, police officers—thousands of them—are coming to Washington, D.C., to go to the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. Tomorrow night, those men and women will attend a candlelight vigil to honor those law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty. This is the 23rd Annual Candlelight Vigil at the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. This year, it will also include a 36-year-old father of three, who was struck down last Tuesday night.

The White House press secretary said the President opposes the lyrics in question but that they do not represent the sum total of the artist's work.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure I don't care. It's not the point.

The point is that you've got thousands of men and women in law enforcement who put their lives on the line every day for this great Nation, just like our troops, and the President invited to the White House someone who supports and glorifies a convicted killer of a police officer—an officer who volunteered to protect his community. He was a husband and a father. The loss was not only to that community but to America.

Our law enforcement officers are the first line of defense for America. Mr. President, can you not see what this means to the people who put their lives on the line every day? It's a slap in the face—sum total or not.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 13, 2011, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1552. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Additions in Indiana, Maine, Ohio, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin [Docket No.: APHIS-2010-0075] received April 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1553. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Citrus Canker, Citrus Greening, and Asian Citrus Psyllid; Interstate Movement of Regulated Nursery Stock [Docket No.: APHIS-2010-0048] (RIN: 0579-AD29) received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1554. A letter from the Secretary, Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting a report detailing an Average Procurement Unit Cost and a Program Acquisition Unit Cost breach for the Global Hawk program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(e)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1555. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on Additional Assignment Pay or Special Duty Pay for Afghanistan, pursuant to Public Law 111-84, section 619; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1556. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Minimizing the Use of Materials Containing Hexavalent Chromium (DFARS Case 2009-D004) (RIN: 0750-AG35) received May 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1557. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Glenn F. Spears, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1558. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Chances

in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received May 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1559. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to South Africa pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1560. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting Annual Report to Congress on Food Facilities, Food Imports, and FDA Foreign Offices Provisions of the FDA Food Safety and Modernization Act, pursuant to Public Law 111-353, section 201(b); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1561. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Connecticut: Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Permitting Authority and Tailoring Rule Revision [EPA-R01-OAR-2010-0996, A-1-FRL-9286-4] received May 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1562. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Multi-walled Carbon Nanotubes; Significant New Use Rule [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2009-0686; FRL-8865-2] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received May 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1563. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District (ICAPCD) [EPA-R09-OAR-2007-1073; FRL-9292-4] received May 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1564. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0430; FRL-9292-7] received May 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1565. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — WISCONSIN: Incorporation by Reference of Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Program [FRL-9293-9] received May 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1566. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Editorial Corrections to the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No.: 100709293-1073-01] (RIN: 0694-AE96) received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1567. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Wassenaar Arrangement 2010 Plenary Agreements Implementation: Categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Parts I and II, 6, 7, 8 and 9 of the Commerce Control List, Definitions, Reports [Docket No.: 110124056-1119-01] (RIN: 0694-AF11) received May 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1568. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1569. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting the Corporation's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with the and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1570. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting in accordance with the provisions of section 17(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-576, and the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, the Corporation's 2010 Annual Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1571. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for Fiscal Year 2010 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1572. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for Fiscal Year 2010 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1573. A letter from the General Counsel, Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board, transmitting the Board's Annual No FEAR Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1574. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting a reassessment of the allocation of Federal and non-Federal costs for construction of the Cerrillos Dam; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1575. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Caregivers Program (RIN: 2900-AN94) received May 5, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1576. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — May 2011 (Rev. Rule. 2011-11) received April 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1577. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Administration's certification that the level of screening services and protection provided at San Francisco International Airport will be equal to or greater than the level that would be provided at the airport by TSA Transportation Security Officers, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44920(d); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

1578. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, ''Status on Medicare Contracting Reform Implementation'', pursuant to Public Law 108-173, section 911(a); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

1579. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Self-Certification and Employee Training of Mail-Order Distributors of Scheduled Listed Chemical Products [Docket No.: DEA-3471] (RIN: 1117-AB30) received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

1580. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare and Medicaid Programs: Changes Affecting Hospital and Critical Access Hospital Conditions of Participation: Telemedicine Credentialing and Privileging [CMS-3227-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ05) received May 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1581. A letter from the Acting Asistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the Millenium Challenge Corporation's (MCC) activities for fiscal year 2010, pursuant to Public Law 108-199, section 613; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Natural Resources, and Oversight and Government Reform.

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:

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 209. Resolution directing the Secretary of State to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any document, record, memo, correspondence, or other communication of the Department of State, or any portion of such communication, that refers or relates to any consultation with Congress regarding Operation Odyssey Dawn or military actions in or against Libya; with amendments (Rept. 112–76). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McKEON: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 208. Resolution directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any document, record, memo, correspondence, or other communication of the Department of Defense, or any portion of such communication, that refers or relates to any consultation with Congress regarding Operation Odyssey Dawn or military actions in or against Libya; with amendments (Rept. 112–77). 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. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 1858. A bill to reauthorize the Northwest Straits Marine Conservation Initiative Act to promote the protection of the resources of the Northwest Straits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 1859. A bill to ensure the availability of reasonably priced conventional mortgages to borrowers in all economic cycles by encouraging private sector capital to support the secondary mortgage market, limiting the role of the Federal government and the exposure of taxpayers, and other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 1860. A bill to promote neutrality, simplicity, and fairness in the taxation of digital goods and digital services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. BOSWELL):

H.R. 1861. A bill to greatly enhance America's path toward energy independence and economic and national security, to conserve energy use, to promote innovation, to achieve lower emissions, cleaner air, cleaner water, and cleaner land, to rebuild our Nation's aging roads, bridges, locks, and dams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Science, Space, and Technology, Transportation and Infrastructure, the Budget, the Judiciary, Rules, and Education and the Workforce, 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. BILBRAY (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DENT, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HOLT, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 1862. A bill to launch a national strategy to support regenerative medicine through funding for research and commercial development of regenerative medicine products and development of a regulatory environment that enables rapid approval of safe and effective products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUINTA (for himself and Mr. BASS of New Hampshire):

H.R. 1863. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that veterans in each of the 48 contiguous States are able to receive services in at least one full-service Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in the State or receive comparable services provided by contract in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 1864. A bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. AUSTRIA, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 1865. A bill to protect the right of individuals to bear arms at water resources development projects administered by the Secretary of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1866. A bill to require Members of Congress to disclose delinquent tax liability and to require an ethics inquiry into, and the garnishment of the wages of, a Member with Federal tax liability; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 1867. A bill to amend title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, in the case of airline pilots who are required by regulation to retire at age 60, to compute the actuarial value of monthly benefits in the form of a life annuity commencing at age 60; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. TERRY, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. HOLDEN):

H.R. 1868. A bill to require the inclusion of coal-derived fuel at certain volumes in aviation fuel, motor vehicle fuel, home heating oil, and boiler fuel; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 1869. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish lifelong learning accounts to provide an incentive for employees to save for career-related skills development and to promote a competitive workforce through lifelong learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. CONNOLLY of Virginia (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 1870. A bill to safely increase domestic oil and gas production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Education and the Workforce, 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. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1871. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the extension of the tax collection period merely because the taxpayer is a member of the Armed Forces who is hospitalized as a result of combat zone injuries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 1872. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to consider the impact on employment levels and economic activity prior to issuing a regulation, policy statement, guidance, or other requirement, implementing any new or substantially altered program, or issuing or denying any permit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and 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. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. CHU, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. STARK, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WATT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 1873. A bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 1874. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to increase the maximum age limit for an original appointment to a position as a Federal law enforcement officer in the case of any individual who has been discharged or released from active duty in the armed forces under honorable conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia):

H.R. 1875. A bill to lower gas prices by making investments in cleaner vehicle technologies and infrastructure; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. STARK, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BACA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia,

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. CHU, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 1876. A bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and House Administration, 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. HUNTER:

H.R. 1877. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to prohibit family members of individuals detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, from visiting such individuals; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KISSELL:

H.R. 1878. A bill to require that the same access to transportation and public accommodations that is afforded to individuals with disabilities who use service animals under the Americans with Disabilities Act be afforded to certified trainers of service animals; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. DICKS, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SIRES, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia):

H.R. 1879. A bill to promote secure ferry transportation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. REYES, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. OLVER, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H.R. 1880. A bill to require, on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the first reported cases of AIDS, reporting on the implementation of the National HIV/AIDS Strategy and on the status of international progress towards achieving universal access to HIV/AIDS treatment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. LUJÁN (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WU, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. OLVER):

H.R. 1881. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Secretary of Labor, to establish a program to provide for workforce training and education, at community colleges, in sustainable energy; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1882. A bill to ensure that local educational agencies and units of local governments are compensated for tax revenues lost when the Federal Government takes land into trust for the benefit of a federally recognized Indian tribe or an individual Indian; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. JONES, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1883. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to regulate the subsidies paid to rum producers in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 1884. A bill to designate additional segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, in the States of Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 1885. A bill to require that State and local pretrial services agencies receiving federal financial assistance report to the Department of Justice on defendants released by such agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. STARK, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BASS of California, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1886. A bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 1887. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and 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. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 1888. A bill to facilitate the export of United States agricultural products to Cuba as authorized by the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, to remove impediments to the export to Cuba of medical devices and medicines, to allow travel to Cuba by United States legal residents, to establish an agricultural export promotion program with respect to Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Agriculture, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHULER:

H.R. 1889. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to suspend the excise tax on highway motor fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 1890. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require, as a condition and term of any exploration plan or development and production plan submitted under that Act, that the applicant for the plan must submit an oil spill containment and clean-up plan capable of handling a worst-case scenario oil spill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. WALSH of Illinois):

H.J. Res. 62. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to give States the right to repeal Federal laws and regulations when ratified by the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. POMPEO (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. LABRADOR):

H. Res. 267. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should end all subsidies aimed at specific energy technologies or fuels; 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.

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. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 1858.

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

Under Article 1, Section 2 of the Constitution, ''the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States.'' As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.'' I was elected in 2010 to serve in the 112th Congress as certified by the Secretary of State of Washington state.

Article III, Section 2 states that the Supreme Court has ''the judicial power'' that ''shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States.'' Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution provides that the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land when stating ''The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one Supreme Court.''

The power of judicial review of the Supreme Court was upheld in Marbury v Madison in 1803, giving the Supreme Court the authority to strike down any law it deems unconstitutional. Members of Congress, having been elected and taken the oath of office, are given the authority to introduce legislation and only the Supreme Court, as established by the Constitution and precedent, can determine the Constitutionality of this authority.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 1859.

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

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 1860.

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

The Commerce Clause; section 5 of the 14th Amendment

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1861.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to the Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 1862.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 1863.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, the bill is authorized by Congress' power to ''provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 1864.

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

The Commerce Clause (Article I, Section 8, Clause 3)

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 1865.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution and the Second Amendment which states: A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1866.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 1867.

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

Art. 1 sec. 8, clause 1 and 3

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 1868.

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

Interstate Commerce Clause: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 1869.

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 Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 1870.

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

Artice 1

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1871.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 1872.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (Interstate Commerce Clause) in conjunction with Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause).

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 (Spending Clause).

Article III, Section 2 (Judicial Power).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 1873.

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

Article I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 1874.

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 I, section 8 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing the militia, and to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces, and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.''

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 1875.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1876.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1877.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 states that ''Congress shall have the power to . . . provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; . . .'' In addition Article I, Section 8, Clause 10 states that Congress shall have the power ''to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations;'' Also, Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 grants Congress the power ''to . . . make rules concerning captures on land and water;''.

By Mr. KISSELL:

H.R. 1878.

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

Enforcement—14th Amendment Section 5

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 1879.

Regulation—Article 1, Section 8 Clause 3

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

Under Article 1, Section 2 of the Constitution, ''the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States.'' As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.'' I was elected in 2010 to serve in the 112th Congress as certified by the Secretary of State of Washington state.

Article III, Section 2 states that the Supreme Court has ''the judicial power'' that ''shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States.'' Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution provides that the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land when stating ''The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court.''

The power of judicial review of the Supreme Court was upheld in Marbury v Madison in 1803, giving the Supreme Court the authority to strike down any law it deems unconstitutional. Members of Congress, having been elected and taken the oath of office, are given the authority to introduce legislation and only the Supreme Court, as established by the Constitution and precedent, can determine the Constitutionality of this authority.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 1880.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LUJÁN:

H.R. 1881.

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

Article 1 Section 1

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1882.

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, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 1883.

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: (1)

provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; (2) 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 (3) to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territories of the United States, as provided for under Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 1884.

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 and Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1885.

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.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1886.

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

From the U.S. Constitution:

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.

From the Universal Declaration on Human Rights:

Article 13

(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.

(2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and return to his country.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1887.

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.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1888.

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.

By Mr. SHULER:

H.R. 1889.

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.''

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 1890.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.J. Res. 62.

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 V of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 100: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 104: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 198: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 272: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 298: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. CANSECO.

H.R. 300: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 365: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 401: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 459: Mr. KELLY.

H.R. 539: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 615: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 639: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DENT, Mr. FORBES, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 674: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRAVAACK, and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 718: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORBES, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 719: Mr. SCHOCK and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 721: Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 733: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 735: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 800: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 807: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 843: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H.R. 864: Mr. WU.

H.R. 886: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BERG, Mr. BOREN, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. FARR, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BARROW, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WOODALL, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 891: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 956: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 975: Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 997: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 998: Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 1031: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 1041: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1044: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 1070: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1075: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1093: Mr. COBLE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 1114: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1120: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1154: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H.R. 1193: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1195: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1206: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 1211: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 1242: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1259: Mr. JORDAN and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 1262: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 1269: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 1274: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1288: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1332: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WELCH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BACA, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1351: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BACA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SIRES, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1366: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1380: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 1383: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1386: Mr. WELCH and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1391: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1398: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1402: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1425: Mr. WALSH of Illinois and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1429: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1466: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1498: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MICA, Mr. HARPER, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1501: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 1515: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1523: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1527: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1530: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1574: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. STARK, and Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1585: Mr. MACK.

H.R. 1586: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 1588: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1614: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1619: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1626: Mr. RIGELL, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. LONG, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1635: Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 1639: Mr. RIVERA.

H.R. 1646: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1648: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1666: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 1704: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BACA, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 1705: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 1723: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 1741: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1748: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1801: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1815: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. WATT, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. STARK, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. NEAL, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. CASTOR of

Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WU, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1817: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1831: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1833: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1842: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FARR, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. TIBERI.

H.J. Res. 42: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.J. Res. 56: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. JORDAN.

H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 20: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. CHU, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. WATT.

H. Res. 25: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MARINO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H. Res. 95: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H. Res. 137: Mr. SERRANO.

H. Res. 242: Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MOORE, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H. Res. 244: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. TOWNS.

H. Res. 254: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H. Res. 256: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. PAULSEN.

H. Res. 265: Ms. RICHARDSON.