



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2011

No. 11

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

Almighty God, Your wisdom is profound beyond our grasp and Your love penetrates all You create to reveal Your infinite beauty in everything and to everyone.

Bless the House of Representatives, its Members, and all who work here serving the people of this Nation. May the vision of righteousness, where justice and peace reign and where truth and true patriotism are standard, remain the constant guide in the daily labor to enact just laws and clear policies.

Gracious God, in truth we recognize that our own insights and powers are not able to right all the wrongs or find the paths to peace and reconciliation. So we turn to You, all powerful Lord, and place our trust in Your faithfulness, now and forever.

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 gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. SLAUGHTER 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five 1-minute speeches from each side.

HOPE VS. REALITY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President's speech last night was long on hope and short on reality.

The administration's answer to America's problems is more investments, which is a fancy word for more spending and more government control.

The administration plans to freeze domestic spending, but domestic spending is already too high. Since last year the national debt has gone up over \$1.7 trillion.

Once again, the administration presents an incomplete solution to America's economic problems: A spending freeze is not enough to fix the deficits or the debt. We must go one step further and actually cut massive out-of-control government spending to get us out of this spending madness.

If we cut spending, then we need to also cut taxes. Putting money back in the hands of the American people is the proven way to stimulate the economy. We must cut both taxes and spending to reboot the American economy. We need less spending, fewer taxes, and less government. Congress needs to deal in reality, not hope.

And that's just the way it is.

UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the President gave a great speech

last night. In it he mentioned the word "jobs" 31 times; he used the word "innovate" 11 times. But he didn't mention the word "unemployment" a single time.

That's because creating jobs is different than ending unemployment. In America capitalism and entrepreneurship have created great things and great wealth. To name a few, the automobile, the personal computer, the airplane. It is my hope that the cure for cancer will come from an enterprising entrepreneur.

But there is one persistent problem that innovation has not solved: unemployment. As FDR said, "Necessitous men are not free men."

So I challenge our leading innovators to help find a way to eliminate unemployment, since Democrats and Republicans have run out of ideas.

Mr. Gates, Mr. Buffett, Mr. Zuckerman, Mr. Immelt, Mr. Mulally: Put your organizational genius, your job-creating skills to use so that our Nation can be free from the threat of unemployment. But don't give us ideas that have been tried before, because none of them have eliminated unemployment.

Our task as leaders should be to end the scourge of unemployment once and for all so that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness can really be available to all Americans.

IRANIAN CHRISTIANS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, on an early morning last month, over 70 Christians in Iran were suddenly arrested and detained by the Iranian authorities. As these Iranian Christians were taken to a notorious Tehran prison, one married couple was forced to leave a 2-year-old child behind. Another mother was taken while breast-feeding her baby.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H473

Eleven were released after hours of harsh interrogation. The fate of the others remains unknown. According to some reports they are suffering through sleep deprivation and blindfolded interrogations. They are likely to face charges of proselytizing, a death penalty offense in Iran.

The peaceful worship of these Christians poses no threat to the Iranian Government, and the government's persistence in accusing its own population of being enemies does nothing to strengthen the regime.

We stand with these oppressed Christians and other religious minorities in Iran that face constant harassment and potential prosecution. Most of all, we call on the Iranian Government to release those prisoners so they can raise their families and peacefully practice their faith.

Mr. Speaker, why would a government that claims to be so powerful be afraid or threatened by such a small, peaceful minority?

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DOCK BROWN

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to pay tribute to a community giant, Mr. Dock M. Brown, a very special friend who passed away yesterday.

As a lifelong resident of Weldon, North Carolina, Dock Brown was an undeniable force who dedicated his 81 years to serving his community and as a champion for education. Dock Brown was a veteran of the Korean War, teacher, principal, county and town commissioner, a State legislator, 50-year deacon at First Baptist Church in Weldon, and much more.

He was a true public servant with a legacy that will live on through the many people he inspired over the years.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the life and work of Dock Monteria Brown and to join me in praying for his wife, Helen, and his entire family and community during these difficult times.

SAFETY OF OUR SHORELINES

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I represent a gulf coast district in Florida; so the safety of our coastlines is critical—it's of the utmost importance to me.

I am troubled that Cuba is moving ahead with plans to drill oil 50 miles off Florida's coast. Florida doesn't allow drilling within 125 miles of our shores; so why in the world would we allow Cuba to drill even closer?

Cuba's rig, built by the Chinese, would even drill deeper than BP's rig that exploded a year ago. And if there was a spill, they claim it would only take 3 days to get to our shores.

Whose problem does it become then? Let me guess, America's problem.

I have introduced legislation to stop this project. I hope my colleagues from both sides will join me in this effort to protect our coast.

TRIBUTE TO JACK LALANNE

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a truly remarkable constituent of mine, Mr. Jack LaLanne, who passed away this past Sunday.

Known as the godfather of fitness, Mr. LaLanne opened his health club in Oakland in 1936. For over 30 years, he starred in "The Jack LaLanne Show," encouraging all Americans to eat healthier and to exercise.

Today, as our country faces an epidemic of obesity, we know that Jack LaLanne's emphasis on physical fitness and healthy eating made him a man truly ahead of his time.

In addition, he accomplished many remarkable feats over the course of his life, such as swimming handcuffed from Alcatraz to Fisherman's Wharf in San Francisco in 1955, completing 1,033 pushups in 23 minutes on TV in 1956, and swimming the Golden Gate Channel towing a 2,500-pound cabin cruiser in 1957.

Jack LaLanne used to say, "I can't afford to die; it would wreck my image." But I think we can all agree that his image is intact and his influence on our Nation's health will continue for years to come.

He is survived by his wife of over 50 years, Elaine, and 3 children: Dan, Yvonne, and Jon.

Thank you, Jack LaLanne, for all you have done for the health of this country.

□ 1010

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a grassroots movement that is currently taking place all across our great Nation, the celebration of National School Choice Week. In many States across the country, events are being held to promote school choice as a commonsense idea that gives every parent the power and freedom to choose what's best for their children's education.

Here in Washington, D.C. we've seen the positive impact of injecting free-market principles into the educational system. While the previous Congress chose to decide against innovation, I sincerely hope this new Congress will see fit to remember that every child is

important and that every child learns differently.

Across this Nation, we are seeing proposals for school choice expansion in places like Wisconsin, Florida, Georgia, Indiana and others. In my home State of South Carolina, I'm pleased to see that legislators in both chambers and on both sides of the aisle have introduced a bill that would give opportunity to all children in South Carolina to attend the school of their choice.

It is imperative that we empower parents with the ability to choose the best educational experience for their child, whether it is public, charter, private, or home school.

May God bless our children, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

CONGRESS ON YOUR CORNER

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, less than 3 weeks ago, a horrible tragedy in Arizona gave our Nation pause. All Americans were horrified at the news that Congresswoman GABBY Giffords, her staff, and constituents were shot in an appalling act of violence. Six people lost their lives that day. Even more were hurt. And our friend GABBY now faces a long road to recovery.

But some good came out of all of that horror. Ordinary Americans risked their lives to help those in need. Violence was denounced from the left and from the right. And Members of Congress pledged to not let this tragedy keep them from meeting with their constituents.

To honor GABBY, the other Tucson victims, and our great democracy, I have introduced a resolution today that designates the first Saturday in January as "National Congress on Your Corner Day."

We cannot allow one single gunman to alter our representative form of government. In that spirit, I will be holding a Congress on Your Corner in my district this weekend. And I know that when GABBY is fully recovered, she will do the same.

To honor all those affected by the Tucson tragedy, I urge support of this resolution.

SUPPORTING FREE AND OPEN ELECTIONS

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last night, President Obama said that the U.S. stands with the people of Tunisia and supports the democratic aspirations of the people. That has not always been true, however. We've stood for far too long with the undemocratic and the dictatorial

Ben Ali, the President of Tunisia. And it is time that we stand, as the President said, with the people of Tunisia now and support their democratic aspirations.

The U.S. gets another chance to stand with the democratic aspirations of another people, the people of Egypt, against the autocratic, dictatorial, and undemocratic leadership of Hosni Mubarak. For too long, the U.S. has stood against the people of Egypt seeking a more democratic country and a more democratic government. Every election has been rigged by the Mubarak government, and the state emergency power laws have been extended so that people would be rounded up so his viable opponents would be thrown into jail and political parties would be outlawed.

The time has come to stop this. The time has come for the United States to tell the Mubarak government that this election has to be free and open. The sole purpose of the election cannot be to pass on a great country to the son of the current leader in spite of the democratic aspirations of the Egyptian people.

REDUCE FEDERAL SPENDING

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, "we have to confront the fact that our government spends more than it takes in. That is not sustainable. Every day, families sacrifice to live within their means. They deserve a government that does the same."

Those are the words that were stated less than 24 hours ago, at 9 o'clock last night, by the President of the United States. And I have to say that truer words have never been spoken.

Mr. Speaker, when Ms. FOXX calls up this rule, we will be proceeding with the first modified open rule for debate in 4 years, and we will be putting ourselves on a path towards reducing the size, scope, and reach of government so that we will send a signal out there that job creation and economic growth can finally, finally get moving.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 359, ELIMINATING TAXPAYER FINANCING OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 54 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 54

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. 359) to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by termi-

nating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions. 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 among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule for a period not to exceed five hours. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee and shall be considered as read. 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. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the 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

Ms. FOXX. 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 54 provides for a modified open rule for consideration of H.R. 359, which is a bill to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of Presidential election campaigns and party conventions.

Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to stand before you in a House dominated by new a Republican majority focused on changing the direction from the failed liberal policies that have dominated Washington for the past 4 years. Although there remains some obstacles to realizing the full breadth of a Republican agenda so desperately needed to pull our economy out of the doldrums, it is indeed a new day.

This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 359, legislation authored by my friend, Mr. COLE, that I have cosponsored as it represents a small step towards a brighter future for our country. Instead of considering legislation providing perpetual spending increases as the solution for all that ails us, in a departure from Washington

groupthink, H.R. 359 would actually reduce Federal spending, Mr. Speaker.

Although this concept may be foreign to many liberals and many Washington Beltway insiders, it's what the Americans expect out of the new Republican majority they recently sent to represent them here in the people's House. Instead, H.R. 359, which CBO estimates would save \$617 million over 10 years, eliminates an expensive Federal program that wastes taxpayer money funding Presidential campaigns and national party conventions.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to the proposed rule to H.R. 359 to terminate the Presidential Election Campaign Fund and the ability for taxpayers to designate \$3 of their Federal tax liability for financing of Presidential election campaign.

This week, Republicans have engaged in what amounts to a shifty attack on a program that successfully limited the influence of corporations and special interests in our Presidential campaigns, tilting the playing field further in favor of multimillionaires who can, and often do, spend their own money.

Just as poll taxes and literacy tests prevented poor people and minorities from voting, eliminating this program will place those without the multimillion-dollar political clout yet another step away from having their day in a Presidential race.

□ 1020

This program allows every taxpaying American to voluntarily check a box—and I think I should reiterate here the individual "opts in" to this program—on their 1040 to put \$3 in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund. A married couple has the option of \$6 if filing jointly.

Checking the "yes" box does not increase the amount of taxes an individual owes, nor does it decrease any refund to which he or she is entitled.

In establishing the checkoff program, Congress left the single most important decision to the taxpayer. The taxpayer, not the House Republican leadership, decides whether he or she wants \$3 of their taxes to be used for the Presidential funding program. The choice is theirs to voluntarily check "yes" or "no." And I might add, during our hearing in the Rules Committee yesterday, several of us, including some of my Republican colleagues, indicated that they had at one time or another participated in this program. And yet now they want to eliminate it. Yes, this program does need improvement, but it is far from ineffective or obsolete.

Since the fund's inception in 1976, every Presidential candidate before 2008 has used the Presidential Election Campaign Fund in the general election,

and Republicans' own 2008 Presidential candidate, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, used it to fund his election.

During the 2008 election cycle, nearly \$17 million of public funds were spent for the Republican convention, and an equivalent amount for Democrats; \$84 million to Republicans for general election grants; and a total of \$18 million for primary matching funds for parties' candidate nominations.

House Republican leaders have promised to bring reform and accountability to Congress, and I quote from the Republican Pledge to America: "We are fighting to bring much-needed sunlight to the process." Is this the kind of reform and sunlight that you pledge to the American people?

YouCut gives Americans a choice? Really? A Web site where you only have the opportunity to vote "yes" for cutting—that is, either you support the Republican agenda, or we do not care what you think. A Web site where saying "yes" to meaningful programs, such as the National Endowment For the Arts, Legal Services Corporation, the Community Development Program, and a fund that was created specifically to empower Presidential candidates to participate in the political system regardless of their socioeconomic status or their relationship with special interest influence, is not welcome.

I have said it before, and I will say it again: A more fitting name for the "YouCut" program would be "CutYou" because it hurts everyday Americans while doing little to cut the Federal deficit.

Simply put, YouCut undercuts our democracy. The summary's headline for the legislation we are considering today is: End the Presidential Election Fund—Savings of \$520 million over 10 years.

The biased paragraph goes on to say: "In short, it provides taxpayer subsidies to political candidates and parties." Not only are the summaries provided on YouCut inaccurate, they are written to elicit a specific response.

We know that use of the fund has declined in recent years. President Obama was the first candidate since the fund's inception to opt out of the public financing in the general election, and other candidates have opted out of public financing in primary elections. If candidates from major parties continue to decline public financing, then the savings from eliminating the fund could and likely will be substantially lower.

Confusing YouCut voters with one-sided jargon and eliminating programs like the Presidential Election Campaign Fund are not the answers; fixing the public financing system and paying attention to what the American people really want are the answers.

What Republicans fail to mention is that the YouCut program is inherently selective, and therefore biased. Neither online nor cell phone voters are able to vote to save a program rather than cut

it. Furthermore, the YouCut program conveniently targets only those who have Internet access and cell phones, which disproportionately leaves out a lot of the poor and elderly. The last time I checked, an undisclosed number of votes on a partisan Web site does not constitute the will of the American people.

Republicans seem to think that this online gimmick is an effective substitute for good governance. Now, the Republicans have promised over and over again that the 112th Congress would be a new wave of accountability and transparency. And yet this, like every other major bill that has been considered thus far, is lacking in both. The Republican leadership has held no hearings or markups, failed to consider alternatives, and crafted a bill so narrow that very few amendments can even be considered germane.

Mr. Speaker, this bill eliminates rather than repairs the Presidential public financing system, which is, in my judgment, irresponsible and will move our Nation in the wrong direction. I suggest that the next campaign more than likely on either side, Republican or Democrat, will cost as much as \$1 billion each.

The House Republican leadership has touted that they are going to change the permissive culture of Congress. Today's consideration of this legislation is evidence that the only thing House Republicans want to do is glorify the permissive culture of their own party.

I urge my colleagues to instead focus on repairing the system and maintain the focus on increasing the roles of average citizens in our Presidential election process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chair 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 my good friend from Grandfather Community for doing her typically wonderful job of managing the rule. I also want to say to my friend from Fort Lauderdale that I appreciate his thoughtful remarks. I am somewhat dumbfounded, though, that for the first time since April 8, 2008—it has been 4 years, April 4, 2008, it was a beach bill that was being considered here—we had a modified open rule. We now are going to allow Members of this House to engage in a free-flowing debate. Our Rules Committee colleague, Mr. POLIS, came up to me last night right before the State of the Union message saying that he was looking forward to offering an amendment that he told me he submitted for the RECORD last night. So we are going to, for the first time in a long time, allow for free-flowing debate. So I can understand why my friend might want to oppose the under-

lying legislation. I disagree with him, but I can't understand why in the world they would conceive of opposing for the first time since April 8, 2008, having the kind of free-flowing debate that both Democrats and Republicans and the American people deserve to see their representatives have in this institution.

And what is this legislation all about? This legislation is all about job creation and economic growth. Job creation and economic growth. And one might say, when you are talking about the Presidential checkoff, how is that about job creation and economic growth?

Well, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker. Last night the President time and time again talked about the importance of creating jobs. And as I said during my 1-minute presentation here, the President made it very clear that we need to make sure that we live within our means. Now, what is it that living within our means will do?

□ 1030

We need to send a message to those potential job creators out there that the United States Government is getting its fiscal house in order so that there can be a level of confidence for those businesses to create jobs. Right now, when you look at the fact that we have this \$14 trillion debt, when you look at the fact that we have deficits as far as the eye can see, it's not sending a very positive signal for those people who want to create jobs.

So you ask, Why is it we're taking on a new program like this? Well, the new estimate has it from \$520 million to \$617 million. This is based on the new estimates.

Now, is it a small amount of money? Of course it's a small amount of money.

Why is this chosen? Well, I think that there is a reason. It's the fact that it has failed.

President Obama chose to cast aside and not utilize this system when he was running for President, and JOHN MCCAIN did use it, as my friend from Fort Lauderdale said in the Rules Committee yesterday. We've already had the President of the United States announce that his plan is to raise \$1 billion for his reelection campaign. That would lead me to conclude that President Obama, assuming he runs for reelection, is not planning to use this fund.

Let's also look at the fact that, since 1980, when it was in effect, 28.7 percent of the American people utilized that checkoff; and today, about 7.3 percent—or something like that—of the American people are using that check-off system that is there.

Now, I listened to the remarks of my friend from Fort Lauderdale in which he said that the notion of getting rid of this would allow corporations to be involved in a much greater way, and he implied that there would be all kinds of corruption.

No one—no one, Mr. Speaker—is advocating that we go back to the way the campaign finance law was before 1974 and Watergate. I mean, it was a horrible, horrible time. Disclosure and accountability are very important, and we have in place today, under the Federal election law, limitations that exist. No corporate contributions are allowed to be made to Federal advocates. No corporate contributions are allowed to be made to Federal candidates.

There is the notion of somehow claiming that, by saving \$617 million, the idea of taking that amount of money off the table and allowing people to voluntarily support the candidates of their choice is somehow going to encourage greater corporate contributions. It's against the law. This does nothing to change that, and I think that it's a very specious argument to propound something other than the case here.

Mr. Speaker, I will say again we are going to have a rigorous debate on this, and Members are going to have an opportunity to participate. If Members do want to oppose the underlying legislation, I think they should be welcomed to do that, but I still find it very hard to believe that for the first time in the history of our Republic, now approaching 222 years this spring, we saw an entire Congress have not a single bill considered under an open amendment process; and while this is not an open rule—and I'm not claiming it's an open rule—it is a modified open rule that does allow for the kind of free-flowing debate that we haven't seen in a long period of time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with Ms. FOXX in support of this rule. Then let's have the free-flowing debate and allow, as Speaker BOEHNER regularly says, the House to work its will. Then we'll have a vote, and people can vote however they'd like at the end of the debate.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, that free-flowing debate consists of six preprinted amendments. Five of those amendments are not in order. So we're going to have a free-flowing debate on six matters that are offered; and if what he just said is going to give the American public the impression that we're having a free-flowing debate, then I must have missed something.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Let me just say that, obviously, this is a very positive step in the direction for allowing for that debate. If we had 100 amendments filed that were germane, we'd have the outside time limit and an opportunity for a debate to take place on those amendments.

So, again, any Member had the chance—Democrat or Republican alike—to file amendments last night so

that we could consider them on the House floor, and I think it's a great thing.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I reclaim my time merely to point out that I don't consider five matters that are not in order and one that's going to be ultimately debated to be a free-flowing debate.

We'll get there. Perhaps we'll get there after we listen to my good friend, the former chair of this committee and the distinguished ranking member from New York.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

You know, it's rather ironic that we are having this debate today, because it is almost exactly 1 year from the day the Supreme Court decided the Citizens United case. That decision opened the floodgates for anonymous special interests and corporations to dump unlimited amounts of cash into our political system. Predictably, the result of this awful judgment was to set loose a torrent of secret money to influence the midterm elections this past November.

Now my Republican colleagues propose to further erode whatever protections our government has left against a state of "democracy for the highest bidder" by attempting to undo our system of Presidential public financing.

Let's remember where this system came from. It was a direct response to the Wild West—unregulated, free-wheeling campaigns that led up to the Watergate scandal. The atmosphere of that time was described by campaign finance expert Fred Wertheimer as so bad that contributors to Richard Nixon's reelection campaign were "literally flying into Washington with satchels of cash." Hidden, unregulated, private money ruled.

In response to that, Congress acted as much as it could to clean up that system, and we have done fairly well with that.

Our democracy will not be able to afford a return to that corruption, but that is what we start today with this bill. This bill will result in even more corporate and special interest money in our campaigns than we have today—and that's really saying something. We don't even know how much money comes in from foreign money.

The Presidential Election Campaign Fund is the one place in our Federal electoral system where we take some of the pressure off of candidates who otherwise have to raise bushels of private money. For the life of me, I can't see how this bill does anything other than add insult to the injury of the terrible Citizens United decision last year. This bill will also take away from American taxpayers the freedom to choose to support good government, to choose to support the public financing of campaigns.

Republicans cite the low participation rate as a reason to scrap the en-

tire program. I don't see the sense of that argument. The amount of money that goes into the Presidential Election Campaign Fund is directly proportional to how many people check the box on the tax form. Apparently, there is enough support for the program for American taxpayers to designate a projected \$617 million, since that's the number being thrown around here today, to be saved over the next 10 years. That sounds to me like enough support to keep the program around. Now, that is certainly not to say that this current system is perfect. It has not really been changed since the seventies. On the contrary, our current system is one in dire need of reform.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlelady an additional minute.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. As the Washington Post said yesterday in an editorial opposing this bill: We have a great need to rehab it. Let's fix it. Don't junk it.

I wholeheartedly agree.

I'd like to see an honest attempt to reform our campaign finance system to provide for openness, transparency and good government. I hope that the other side will join me in supporting such an effort. There are already two bills introduced last Congress and being circulated now that will do just that. The House's very own campaign finance policy expert, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, introduced a bill last year, H.R. 6061, the Presidential Funding Act of 2010, which would strengthen and expand the system the Republicans want to dismantle, to bring the system into line with the reality of today's campaigns and boost participation rates.

Also, H.R. 5175 in the last Congress, the DISCLOSE Act, which this House passed last year. The DISCLOSE Act would make sure we know where the money flooding our campaigns is coming from.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, "no" on the rule, and "no" on the bill. Instead of this anti-small-d-democratic bill the Republicans have brought to the floor without any public input, without any committee hearings and markups, let's debate a serious plan to improve our campaign finance system and strengthen our democracy.

□ 1040

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to our colleagues across the aisle who are complaining about some of the proposed amendments being declared not germane that it is not the Republicans who decide whether amendments are germane or not germane; it is the Parliamentarian's office that decides that. They can do the same thing to our amendments as well as to the Democrats' amendments.

I now yield such time as he may consume to my colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I could not get over here to the floor fast enough when I saw this rule come up for debate, and I rise in strong support of this rule today and in strong support of the underlying legislation.

I am pleased to be joined on this day after the State of the Union not just by my colleagues but with so many young people in the gallery today, because that is exactly what this debate is about.

We've heard much talk on the floor of this House over the past week about the upcoming CBO baseline report. Well, if it arrived in your email boxes this morning like it did mine, you saw that CBO's most recent score predicts a \$6.9 trillion, 10-year operating deficit. That's not the \$14 trillion in debt that these young people are going to have to pay back, it's the actual operating deficit, the additional debt that we're going to add over the next 10 years. This proposal today is one small step towards attacking that operating deficit.

Now we're talking about big numbers here today. Somewhere between \$500 million and \$600 million will be saved with the elimination of this proposal. But folks, \$6.9 trillion is where we have to go over the next 10 years. So if you think that this underlying proposal, the public financing proposal, has some merit, I look forward to debating that when the time comes, when we get our operating deficit under control. But we don't just need to pass this provision today; we need to pass this provision and 10,000 more just like it to get to a balanced budget.

Now, I want you to think about that. All of the discussion, all of the gnashing of teeth, the handwringing about eliminating this provision today, folks, this is just the beginning. This proposal and 10,000 more just like it are what we need to pass in this House. The question isn't why are we bringing up this proposal today; the question is why don't we have three or four or five more just like it.

I look forward to joining with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to talk about those provisions, talk about those spending items in our budget that we can get rid of. But folks, I am absolutely certain, as the YouCut site pointed out when America voted, that public financing is one of the top 10,000 things that we can get rid of. We don't have to decide today whether this is number one of the 10,000 most wasteful programs in government or number 10,000 of the 10,000 most wasteful programs in government; we only have to decide if it's somewhere on that spectrum. I tell you that it is, and I rise in strong support of this rule.

The second reason I had to rush over here to the floor is I'm brand new. I've been in this House less than 1 month, and I'm down here speaking on a rule that offers an open amendment process.

Now, if anybody has been watching the House floor, as I have, over the past 2 years, you might wonder what an open amendment process is, and you would be right to wonder because you've never seen one. I may be a freshman in this body, but folks who came 2 years before me, the sopho-

mores in this body, they don't have any more experience in this process than I do, because this is the first open amendment process that we've seen on the floor of the House. Why are we seeing it? Because it's the right thing to do for the institution.

Speaker BOEHNER has made a point of saying the House is going to work its will. I come from a very conservative district in the northeastern suburbs of Atlanta. And I tell you, when the House works its will, we're not always going to get what we want in the northeastern suburbs of Atlanta, because the House sits kind of here in the middle, and I'm a little further over here on the right-hand side of the spectrum. But in order for this Congress to work, in order for this House to work, in order to restore the dignity of this House, we have to allow the House to work its will.

I am just so pleased, in my very first month in Congress, that we not only have seen very narrowly focused pieces of legislation come to the floor, but we're seeing them come to the floor under an open amendment process.

And let me just say one thing about that open amendment process, particularly for folks, again, who haven't seen one before, folks who are in the gallery or watching on TV who have not seen an open amendment process before. Just because it's open doesn't mean you can do whatever you want to do on the House floor. We're talking about the public financing of elections today. So if you have an amendment that's going to change the way we finance education, that amendment is not going to be germane. If you have an amendment about what you want to do with the health care system, that amendment is not going to be germane.

When you bring narrowly crafted pieces of legislation to the floor, the amendments that are germane are narrowly crafted amendments. And folks, I love that. For too long we have had 2,000-page bills, 1,000-page bills that folks can't read and can't understand and that can't be amended. And I am so pleased today to be standing here in strong support of my colleague from North Carolina's resolution. I will be voting in favor of the rule, and I will be voting in favor of the underlying legislation.

I thank the gentlelady for the time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to occupants of the gallery.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Florida for allowing me to speak on the rule.

I rise in opposition today to the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, first it was repealing patients' rights; then it was a budget resolution with no budget. Every one of

us in this Chamber was elected to Congress with a goal of creating jobs and growing our economy, yet there hasn't been any talk about that.

Today, the Republican leadership has brought to the floor another piece of political posturing that takes us away from that goal of creating jobs for millions of Americans and establishing economic stability and growth. Rather than wasting time bringing these bills to the floor, we should be working to develop innovative, bipartisan solutions that will create jobs, reduce the deficit, and put our economy back on track.

We can all agree that our campaign finance system is broken. In every election, more and more dollars are spent by wealthy corporations and special interests on campaigns, inflicting great damage on the American people's trust in government. I know a lot of my friends wanted to turn the television off by the end of the last campaign. But ending the Presidential Campaign Fund would only further breach that trust.

Recent polls have found that the public overwhelmingly believes that money buys elections—by 5 to 1 in some polls. And it's no surprise, because election spending has gone up fourfold between the 2006 and 2010 congressional elections. With a voluntary \$3 individual contribution, the Presidential Campaign Fund is a modest part of the answer to the Nation's campaign finance needs, not the problem. It is a way to include the people's voice in our government by honoring small donations and helping restore the people's faith in democracy.

Nearly all Presidential candidates from both parties over the past 35 years have used this fund as a way to reduce the emphasis on fundraising and special interests. Our democracy in its current form would cease to exist if only the rich and powerful could influence public officials.

I ask you today, when the middle class is suffering and job creation is our number one goal, why do we continue to talk about giving more power to big money contributors for Presidential campaigns? After the Supreme Court's terrible decision on Citizens United, we need the exact opposite of this bill—true, reasonable campaign finance reform. That's how democracy is restored and people are empowered.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. POLIS. The people's House should not be spending its time cutting off the connection of the people of this country to the White House. Yes, our Presidential campaign finance system is broken. It needs to be repaired, not eliminated, so we can have a fair way of electing our leaders.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my colleague from Colorado,

this is not cutting off access of our citizens to the White House. Our citizens have voted in lots of different ways to express their opinions in this country in the last year or so. In November, they voted to replace our spendthrift colleagues on the other side of the aisle with people on our side of the aisle who want to cut government spending. They voted on this program by reducing their involvement in this program to a very small number. If they wanted this program, they could have continued to participate in it. They participated in the YouCut program, which singled out this program as something that needed to be cut.

We are listening to the American people, Mr. Speaker—we are doing that in many different ways; this is one of the ways—because they've told us at least in three different ways that they want a different kind of working going on in Washington, D.C. They don't want a lot of spending; they want us to cut back spending. And they've told us this on this program three different ways. So I would like to point that out.

Mr. Speaker, according to Congressional Quarterly, nearly \$139 million in public funds were spent during the 2008 election cycle, including \$17 million each for the Democratic and Republican conventions, \$84 million to Republicans for general elections grants, and a total of \$18 million for primary matching funds for candidates for the nominations of Democrats, Republicans, and other parties.

□ 1050

As is the case with so many other actions, the Federal Government has no business funding political campaigns, particularly while the troubled economy demands fiscal restraint. And let me point out that the way the Federal Government gets its money is, again, by taxing the American people or, in this case, by using funds that the people have said that it could be used for.

The proposal embodied by H.R. 359 first received attention as a result of then-Republican Minority Whip CANTOR's initiative dubbed "YouCut." Majority Leader CANTOR is continuing this innovative effort which encourages public participation in our wonderful American democracy.

The Web site, located at majorityleader.gov/YouCut, for the first time enables Americans to make their voices heard by voting weekly on various proposals to shrink, rather than grow, Federal spending. As I said in my earlier remarks, this is one of the ways the American people can tell us what they think.

According to the official YouCut Web site, "The Presidential Election Campaign Fund provides Federal tax dollars in the form of matching funds to candidates in Presidential primaries provided the candidates qualify and agree to abide by certain spending and contribution limits. It provides grants to qualifying Presidential candidates in general elections, if they agree not

to accept other contributions. The program also provides grants to sponsor national party conventions.

"In short, it provides taxpayer subsidies to political candidates and parties. Since 2000, some major candidates have chosen to forgo public financing. While some have argued that providing even more taxpayer funding for this program might entice more candidates to participate, eliminating the program altogether . . . would require candidates and political parties to rely on private donations rather than tax dollars. The amount of funding for the public financing system is determined by checkoffs on income tax returns, and taxpayer participation via the checkoffs has declined," Mr. Speaker, "from 28.7 percent in 1980 to 7.3 percent in 2009." And that's the end of the quote from the Web site.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the American people are telling us how they feel about this program because they're not using the checkoff.

As the program grows increasingly less popular, its purpose is accordingly muddled. For example, while on the campaign trail, then-candidate Barack Obama, who portrayed himself as a longtime supporter of public financing, ultimately broke his pledge to participate in the presidential public financing system. If public financing isn't good enough for such a vehement supporter, why should taxpayers finance partisan political campaigns?

That's why I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, my good friend, GERRY CONNOLLY.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my good friend.

Mr. Speaker, we just heard a reference to YouCut and that this was one of the most popular cuts suggested by people on this Republican blog. Well, Mr. Speaker, 10 million Americans want to participate in public financing of Presidential campaigns. And I would dare say that dwarfs anything we've heard from YouCut. So if we're going to get in the business of what the American people want and how they've expressed themselves, 10 million voices are in threat of being silenced today by this rule and the underlying legislation.

The idea that we're going to save money and solve the deficit by eliminating public financing in presidential campaigns is fallacious. But I will give the other side credit: It is intellectually honest. When you have a Supreme Court ruling like Citizens United that fosters anonymous financing of campaigns, no wonder you want to delete public financing of campaigns.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2

minutes to my friend of longstanding, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I don't like to reference the Republican chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER, because he did leave the floor. But he made a couple of statements that I have to comment on.

First of all, he said that this Republican initiative is about creating jobs. Nothing could be further from the truth, in my opinion. I've watched as the Republicans have been in the majority now for about 3 or 4 weeks, and they're not doing anything to create jobs. And this certainly doesn't create jobs.

And then Mr. DREIER said that there can be no corporate contributions under the current law. Well, the Citizens United case clearly says that there are unlimited corporate contributions, and that's the problem. Rather than having public financing of campaigns—which this legislation would eliminate—we're going to have more and more corporations just spending millions and millions of dollars to finance campaigns. And that's what this is all about.

This is the Republicans basically catering to special interests and the large corporations who will spend unlimited amounts of corporate money on campaigns, and not having in this case a public financing component through voluntary largely small donations.

Now, I have to say this is a system that we have now that's been in place since Watergate. It was a reform that Democrats and Republicans used, a reform of a very bad system that the Watergate scandal showed was not the way we should go. And I agree that the system needs to be updated, but it should be changed to meet the needs of today's elections that are costing more, and more primaries, and the focus should be on small donations, not getting rid of small donations.

But what we see instead is the Republican majority eliminating the system altogether and making Presidential campaigns more susceptible to what I call outside influence.

We saw the effect of the Citizens United case in the past election, where corporations and special interests poured money to sway the elections in their favor. With disclosure requirements almost nonexistent, we have no way of knowing whether foreign corporations or entities were contributing to the elections. And we have to question whose side the new Republican House majority is on.

Unfortunately, it appears that this is just another attempt by the Republicans to support their special interest friends and big corporations who have an unfair and undue influence on our electoral process.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the American people are buying these tired arguments that our colleagues across the aisle are using

about us wanting to be the tools of corporate interest. That is not the issue here.

The issue here is that the public has said in at least three different ways, as I said before, that this program is not worth continuing.

My colleague from Virginia said that we're denying 10 million Americans the opportunity to participate in donating to campaigns. That isn't true. Individuals can donate to any campaign they want to. So these American people who are now doing the checkoff can easily write a \$3 check to the candidates of their choice. We're not stopping that in any way whatsoever.

What we are doing is saying we don't need to be supporting political conventions, primarily, and candidates. They're perfectly capable of raising the money directly from the American people. And what we are doing, though, is saying that \$617 million is real money. Our colleagues across the aisle don't think \$617 million will put a dent in our deficit? That shows you how far away from the American people they are. They don't think of \$617 million as significant.

Mr. Speaker, the American people think that \$617 million is significant. They want us to cut spending wherever we can, and this is a program that has long ago outlived its usefulness.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1100

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I am one of those people among the 10 million that did do the checkoff of \$3 for publicly-financed Presidential campaigns and to support the national parties' conventions. I feel very strongly that my \$3 now is directed in a way that I did not wish that it should be directed.

I do urge my friend from North Carolina to understand that at least one Member on this side clearly understands that \$617 million is a whole whale of a lot of money. To some of us, \$617 or \$67 is a whole lot of money. That said, what is balanced here is whether or not we should try in this institution to eliminate the kind of corruption that comes by virtue of a flood of dollars going into campaigns.

To correct my colleague from California—and I wish he were here; I would yield to him to respond—when he cites the fact that no corporate dollars can be contributed to the respective candidates who are on the ballot, he is absolutely correct. That is the law. But under the aegis of the Citizens United decision, corporations and individuals can contribute anonymously to any campaign. And we saw evidence of that on both sides.

Now, I have seen every iteration of reform during the last 50 years in the United States of America. Some of it was good and some of it didn't achieve its mark. This particular measure had some limitations and at the very same time did permit people like Eugene McCarthy, Jimmy Carter, Pat Bu-

chanan, Pat Robertson, Jerry Brown, Jesse Jackson, Sr., just to mention a few, and more recently my good friend Dr. RON PAUL—it gave them an opportunity to put forward their ideas. And the argument that they can go out there and raise the kind of money that would allow for that to happen I think is specious at best.

For most candidates, public funding from the Presidential election campaign fund has been the source of sorely needed funds at crucial points in Presidential races. To make matters worse, as has been pointed out by Ms. SLAUGHTER and myself and others, the legislation we are considering today is a repeat of the disastrous Citizens United decision, which on January 21, 2010, unleashed massive corporate influence-buying expenditures in our national elections. In the face of the first anniversary of Citizens United, we know for a fact how essential it is to repair the Presidential public financing system and provide Presidential candidates with a viable alternative for financing their elections, as opposed to having to depend on influence-seeking big donors, lobbyists, bundlers, and corporate spenders. We cannot eliminate the corruption of our political system when we are eliminating a program that was created to try to do that.

Mr. Speaker, a vote for this legislation is a vote for big corporations and big private money to fund the election of their desired candidates. The Presidential public financing system needs repairs, but eliminating a program that works, that is voluntary, and that gives a voice to the American people is not the answer.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide that immediately after the House adopts this rule it will bring up the DISCLOSE Act, with the same text as H.R. 5175 from the 111th Congress, as it passed the House on June 24, 2010. This Republican proposal to eliminate voluntary public financing for Presidential elections is, in my view, a step in the wrong direction.

When Presidential campaigns stop receiving this clean money, they'll have to go after private contributions instead. That's going to mean more time spent talking to special interests and the powerful and less time spent talking with the voters and communities and groups that have good ideas and real problems to discuss but don't have multi-million dollars to donate to a campaign.

Is that really what we want for our constituents? I am confident that the answer is a resounding "no." Make no mistake, this will affect the quality of our campaigns and it will affect our democratic process.

We should be considering real campaign finance reform like the DISCLOSE Act. That bill would establish disclosure requirements for election-related spending by corporations, unions,

and other organizations. And I might add, Mr. Speaker, it was a measure, as offered in the previous Congress, that did go through regular order, did have substantial committee hearings, and was presented to the Rules Committee, as opposed to this measure that has had absolutely no hearings and just comes here direct to the floor under the rubric of a modified open rule. And it would require, this DISCLOSE measure, any person or organization making so-called "independent expenditures" over \$10,000 to disclose them within 24 hours. That's what we need after Citizens United, not politicians spending more time and energy to raise big money.

The DISCLOSE Act would put a check on donations by Federal contractors and prohibit contributions and expenditures by foreign-controlled domestic corporations. And among its other provisions, for example, is a prohibition on recipients of TARP funds from making contributions or expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so we can debate and pass real campaign finance reform today.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 54 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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 a bill consisting only of the text of H.R. 5175 of the 111th Congress as passed by the House. 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 Committee on House Administration. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill 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. 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. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2 of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy impli-

cations. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the previous question, rule, and underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas 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 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 178, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—234

Adams	Duncan (SC)	Johnson, Sam
Aderholt	Duncan (TN)	Jones
Akin	Ellmers	Jordan
Alexander	Farenthold	Kelly
Altmire	Fincher	King (IA)
Amash	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Austria	Flake	Kingston
Bachmann	Fleischmann	Kinzinger (IL)
Bachus	Fleming	Kline
Barletta	Flores	Labrador
Bartlett	Forbes	Lamborn
Barton (TX)	Fortenberry	Lance
Bass (NH)	Fox	Landry
Benishek	Franks (AZ)	Lankford
Berg	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Biggart	Galleghy	LaTourette
Bilbray	Gardner	Latta
Bilirakis	Garrett	Lee (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Blackburn	Gibbs	LoBiondo
Bonner	Gibson	Long
Boustany	Bono Mack	Lucas
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Brooks	Goodlatte	Lummis
Buchanan	Gosar	Lungren, Daniel
Buchson	Gowdy	E.
Buerkle	Granger	Mack
Burgess	Graves (GA)	Manzullo
Burton (IN)	Graves (MO)	Marchant
Calvert	Griffin (AR)	Marino
Camp	Griffith (VA)	McCarthy (CA)
Campbell	Grimm	McCauley
Canseco	Guinta	McClintock
Cantor	Guthrie	McCotter
Capito	Hall	McHenry
Carter	Hanna	McKeon
Cassidy	Harper	McKinley
Chabot	Harris	McMorris
Chaffetz	Hartzer	Rodgers
Coble	Hastings (WA)	Meehan
Coffman (CO)	Hayworth	Miller (FL)
Cole	Heck	Miller (MI)
Conaway	Heller	Miller, Gary
Cravaack	Hensarling	Mulvaney
Crawford	Herger	Murphy (PA)
Crenshaw	Herrera Beutler	Myrick
Culberson	Huelskamp	Neugebauer
Davis (KY)	Huizenga (MI)	Noem
Denham	Hultgren	Nugent
Dent	Hunter	Nunes
DesJarlais	Hurt	Nunnelee
Dold	Issa	Olson
Dreier	Jenkins	Palazzo
Duffy	Johnson (IL)	Paul
	Johnson (OH)	Paulsen

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

NAYS—178

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

NOT VOTING—22

Black	Garamendi	Pingree (ME)
Broun (GA)	Giffords	Pitts
Capuano	Hinchev	Rangel
Conyers	Hinojosa	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Honda	Rush
Doggett	Larson (CT)	Young (AK)
Emerson	Mica	
Frank (MA)	Petri	

□ 1131

Messrs. HOLT, GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 22, I was detained in committee. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 22, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 22 on H.R. 54, the button did not record my “no” vote as the gavel fell.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, on the bill we’re going to be considering shortly, the Presidential checkoff bill, there’s a requirement under the rules that the amendments be printed in the RECORD. Is that RECORD available?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the printed RECORD is not yet available.

Mr. WEINER. Further inquiry, does the Speaker have any guidance for the House on when that RECORD might be available so we can read what we’re going to be considering in a matter of minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not currently have that information. Under the terms of House Resolution 54, any issue would become ripe when the amendment process begins.

Mr. WEINER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 359.

ELIMINATING TAXPAYER FINANCING OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 54 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. 359.

□ 1134

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. 359) to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions, with Mr. LATOURETTE 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.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, last night, the President in this very Chamber issued us an invitation. In that invitation, there were several opportunities, but two of them I would like to highlight. One is, he said this: He said he is willing to eliminate whatever we can honestly afford to do without. I take the President at face value that he’s interested in doing that.

The thing that the President issued was an invitation where he said this: He said, in fact, the best thing we could do on taxes for all Americans is to simplify the Tax Code.

Well, the law of governing Presidential election campaign funds in the Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account is located in the Internal Revenue Code, which really inherently makes no sense.

And I think during the course of this debate, Mr. Chairman, we’re going to lay out the argument as to why the President’s first point can be greeted and agreed to, that first goal that this is simply something that we can do without.

Let me make a couple of quick points. I think it’s important to recognize the irony of the Statement of Administration Policy that was published on January 25, and I’m reading in the third paragraph, he says—the administration, in criticism of this effort, says, “Its effect would be to expand the power of corporations and special interests in the Nation’s elections to force many candidates into an endless cycle of fundraising at the expense of engagement with voters on the issues.”

How can that be, Mr. Chairman? President Obama, when he was a candidate in 2000 for the United States Presidency, declined to participate in this fund, both in his primary and in his general election. And if President Obama has been able to rise above that, I think other Americans can rise above that.

Also, I would just like to bring your attention to that same argument, and that is, a “Dear colleague” that was sent criticizing this bill said basically the same thing: By creating a viable alternative to private fundraising, the public financing system was designed to level the electoral playing field and ensure that candidates remain accountable to voters, not special interests.

So does that mean, implicitly, Mr. Chairman, that candidates who didn’t participate in the program are somehow not accountable to voters? I think President Obama would say he’s really accountable to voters.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1140

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this measure, which, along with the Supreme Court’s radical decision in Citizens United, takes our Nation’s campaign finance system in precisely the wrong direction: less transparency and less information for the voters.

Americans from across the political spectrum—Democrats, Republicans, Independents—want less special interest money in politics, not more. They want clean, transparent, and competitive elections; and campaigns where candidates—those of us in this room and Presidential candidates—rise and fall based on the quality of their ideas, the strength of their arguments, and their ability to attract support from the voters that they seek to represent.

What they don’t want are campaigns decided by how much secret money flows into an election from secret outside groups. And they will no longer tolerate, I believe, those politicians turning around and saying to those citizens: You have no right to know who is paying for what in our political campaigns; you have no right to know who is paying for those TV advertisements you’re watching.

Let’s remember what we are talking about here. The current Presidential financing system that this bill would eliminate arose from public outrage in the post-Watergate period. Rather than Presidential candidates trafficking in secret slush funds, our Nation decided that our democracy would be better served by a system of public disclosure, contribution limits, and emphasis on smaller-dollar contributions matched by the Presidential financing fund.

The system is voluntary, one line on our Tax Code, not complicated; and while not perfect, for most of its 36 years in existence, it has served this Nation well. Candidates from across the political spectrum, from Ronald Reagan to Jesse Jackson, have voluntarily participated in the Presidential financing system.

As my colleague on the other side of the aisle mentioned there is no doubt

that the current law needs to be modernized; it needs to be fixed. We saw that in the last Presidential election. But rather than throw out something that has served the country and the electorate well for 36 years, let's fix it. And the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and I and others have introduced legislation to do exactly that.

So rather than shielding an avalanche of unlimited special interest money from public view, we should shine a light on it. We should do it by modernizing the Presidential system, and we should also pass the DISCLOSE Act, which we could have brought up and voted on except for the previous question was just defeated.

Mr. Chairman, at the end of the day, our Nation's democracy doesn't belong to Presidents or Members of Congress; it belongs to the voters who send us here, and we have a solemn responsibility to safeguard it on their behalf and protect it for future generations from the lessons in corruption in history. Let's mend it. Let's fix it. Let's not throw it out.

The CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution honoring the service and sacrifice of Staff Sergeant Salvatore Giunta, a native of Hiawatha, Iowa, and the first living recipient of the Medal of Honor since the Vietnam War.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

ELIMINATING TAXPAYER FINANCING OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 359, which terminates the taxpayer financing of Presidential election campaigns and party conventions.

At the outset, I just want to mention in response to something that was said by the other side, this has absolutely nothing to do with the Citizens United case decided by the Supreme Court. That changed not one iota of campaign finance law. Corporations still cannot make contributions to campaigns or candidates. It does not change that.

Citizens United had to do with the question of whether or not one loses his or her First Amendment protections of free speech, particularly with respect to expressions of political nature, merely because they associate with another person. The Supreme

Court told us that you do not in fact lose your First Amendment rights because you happen to say it jointly with someone else. As a matter of fact, they pointed out that some people with the least amount of influence in a society actually expand their influence in the political debate by joining with others. And then the question that the Supreme Court answered was, if that association happens to be corporate in nature, happens to be a union, happens to be a for-profit, happens to be a not-for-profit, whether that changes the dynamic as contemplated by the First Amendment protections, and they told us it did not. So let's get rid of that canard here on the floor right away. This has absolutely nothing to do with that. This has absolutely nothing to do with corporate contributions to campaigns or foreign contributions to campaigns, both of which remain illegal, with criminal sanctions, under the law.

So let's get that out of the way to begin with so we don't have a lot of debate here that has nothing to do with the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, we find ourselves at a unique juncture in the longstanding debate over this issue; but, frankly, in reality, it is a juncture no longer. Taxpayer financing of Presidential elections and party conventions of the two major parties is simply no longer defensible.

The first tax liability contributions from American taxpayers to be diverted toward the funding of Presidential elections began 35 years ago in 1976. This new practice was, as we were told by the other side, supposed to raise the public's trust in their government as well as increase both the number of candidates and, thus, electoral competition and the financial footing between parties. I believe, Mr. Chairman, it has failed on all accounts.

It did allow us to have Lyndon LaRouche be a participant in the Presidential elections. I am not sure when we have had someone who had been subjected to a criminal conviction and actually conducted part of his campaign while still incarcerated, but that was brought to us by way of this fine law.

Since 1976, approximately \$1.5 billion has been spent on this system. As we speak, there is a balance of \$195 million sitting in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund at the U.S. Treasury Department. And yet this system of electoral subsidization has not changed the public's perception of our Presidential elections or our politics. According to one survey after another, Americans continue to harbor deep distrust of their elected officials. So does anyone think that our Presidential elections over the past 35 years have shown a virtuous progression toward more accuracy and more honesty?

Mr. Chairman, prominent Presidential candidates, candidates who even supposedly believe in this system, have opted out of this taxpayer financing scheme in recent years. In 2004 and

2008, several candidates declined public financing for their primary campaigns.

And as was mentioned by the gentleman from Illinois, during the most recent Presidential election, for the first time, a nominee of one of our two major political parties withdrew from the public financing during the general election and instead went on to raise record amounts of money for his campaign. And I recall when I thought we heard a pledge to participate in this program because of the virtuous nature of the program. Somehow that was lost along the campaign trail.

One of the things I would like to point out is this: There is this idea that somehow we are going to be able to suppress money that goes into politics. The fact of the matter is it is like a balloon, a water balloon. If you squeeze it on one side, it comes out on the other side. The question is: How do we get it within the system?

We should be talking about the idea of this silly demarcation between our parties and our candidates where we limit in extreme fashion the amount of money that can be transferred or coordinated, as if somehow that corrupts the candidate to have him or her identified with the very party they represent. We ought to be working towards those kinds of changes that will allow a greater responsibility on the party and the candidates to express their positions and to hold to their positions, be responsible for their positions. But no, we talk about these ways of how we are going to somehow reduce the impact of money in campaigns. It hasn't worked under this system. It hasn't worked.

□ 1150

In addition to Presidential primaries and general elections, if there is anything the American taxpayer should not be subsidizing, I would say—as much as I enjoy them—it is the week-long Presidential conventions. On our side of the aisle, in our party, I think we've had some indications of what I consider to be wasteful spending in preparation for our upcoming convention; and to say to the taxpayer that, in light of that, we ought to continue to subsidize the production of our Presidential conventions by the two major parties, it is very difficult to articulate and even to understand.

They are, as I say, grand fun, wonderful occasions—week-long party gatherings that are, unfortunately, in this day and age, largely symbolic. One can't even argue something important is being decided because, unfortunately, they ceased to have real significance sometime ago, and that was part of our effort to try and cleanse the system.

Rather than having people selected by these delegates that come to these conventions, we should move more and more to the primary operation and, of course, then earlier and earlier in the season so that somehow it becomes a 2-year event. I guess we're already in

that. Taxpayers would be shocked, if not outraged, to discover that they have been funding these extravagant photo ops.

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned, since 1976, approximately \$1.5 billion has been spent on publicly funding our Presidential primaries, our Presidential general elections, and our Presidential party conventions. The American taxpayer has paid enough for this unwise experiment. I think it should be ended and the balance in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund and the Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account returned to the Treasury to be used for deficit reduction. I think we'd actually have the American people cheering us for that. According to a 2010 Congressional Budget Office estimate, the elimination of this program will save American taxpayers \$617 million over the next 10 years.

Now, some could say, Well, that's your opinion. We have our opinion. Why change things?

Well, why don't we look to the opinion of the American people. Not a bad idea in this House. Simply put, this program does not have the support of the American people.

Taxpayer support has declined precipitously over time. I remember, years ago, I thought it was a good experiment. I thought it was a good idea. I checked off for some of my taxes to go to this program. I was in hopes that it would actually prove to be a good change. I, like most Americans, though, who contributed to that in the past, have given up on the program. We don't believe it gave us what we thought it might.

In 1980, for instance, the percentage of taxpayers participating through their tax form checkoffs was 28.7 percent. It was so popular that in 1985 it was 23 percent. It proved so successful that in 1990 it was 19.5 percent. Boy, it really proved itself by the year 1995, because then 12.9 percent of the American taxpayers decided they'd participate. In the year 2000, it dropped to 11.5 percent. In 2005, it was 9.1 percent. According to the IRS data obtained from the FEC, the checkoff rate in 2010 was 7.3 percent.

In other words, on a direct vote, a plebiscite taken by the taxpayers of America, 92.7 percent reject the notion. Now, where I come from, that's a landslide. I think even in Chicago it would be a landslide—even if you paid your taxes only once.

Mr. Chairman, this candidate and convention subsidy is obviously unpopular. To paraphrase one former member of the Federal Election Commission, "Any system of public financing must have popular support to succeed. Today's low taxpayer checkoff rates cast serious doubt on whether the public financing system has this support. When only one in 13 taxpayers are participating, it is very difficult to conclude that the public financing system has broad popular support."

Mr. Chairman, as we promised in the Pledge to America and as we have promised here on the floor during these initial weeks of the 112th Congress and as we have verified by our transparency-enhancing rules package, our bipartisan votes to trim Congress' budget and end excessive congressional printing, by our determination to return discretionary spending to fiscal year 2008 levels or less and now through this bill, the Republican majority is committed to fiscal stewardship, to having a relentless eye on waste and inefficiency, and to a continued commitment through this 112th Congress to reduce spending, to create private sector jobs, and to produce meaningful legislation that makes long-lasting reforms.

Mr. Chairman, if we, in fact, mean what we say when we say we are willing to look at those programs that already exist and to judge whether or not they have proven to be efficacious, or efficient or successful, in promoting the principles that underlie their passage in the first place, we ought to start with this. This is a program that almost 93 percent of the American people who pay taxes reject, and we're asking them to participate. Maybe we ought to listen to what they are saying and, instead, allow the savings garnered by this particular bill to go toward deficit reduction.

This bill, introduced by my colleague from Oklahoma, should garner overwhelming bipartisan support. We should thank him for introducing it—and I do—and for his commitment to a more responsible and efficient stewardship of taxpayer dollars. I would urge my colleagues to understand what this bill is and understand what it is not and to support H.R. 359.

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

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN), a distinguished member of the Committee on House Administration.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 359.

This bill will unnecessarily eliminate the \$3 checkoff box—it's voluntary—on tax returns to fund Presidential elections, and it could increase the influence of special interests in the funding of Presidential campaigns.

Now, the bill has been fast-tracked by the Republican leadership—without any hearings, no markups, no respect for the committee process. As a member of the House Administration Committee and as a former chair of the Subcommittee on Elections, I am very concerned by the end run around our committee and the lack of deference shown to the committee and its members.

Speaker BOEHNER promised 2 weeks ago, when he took the Speaker's gavel, more transparency in the legislative process and to focus on job creation.

Last week, the new majority fast-tracked a health care reform repeal bill. This week, they expedite the repeal of this voluntary program without the proper process. So I think the Speaker may need to revisit his statement about process and transparency.

In addition to the process concerns, I question the need for Congress to pass this bill at all. I was here as a young staffer when the Judiciary Committee took up the impeachment of President Nixon. It is worth remembering that the public finance system was created as a direct result of the Watergate scandal.

Remember Phillips Petroleum, which illegally contributed \$498,000 to the Nixon campaign; or Ruth Farkas, who told the Watergate grand jury that she gave \$300,000 to the Nixon campaign as an explicit exchange for an ambassadorship to Luxembourg; or the Nixon tapes that revealed that Secretary John Connally shook down dairy farmers for \$600,000 in contributions in exchange for raising milk price supports—to the detriment of children who needed milk around the country.

These incidents eroded public confidence, not only in the Nixon administration, but in the entire system. In response, pursuant to the General Welfare clause of the U.S. Constitution, Congress passed sweeping election reforms, including the Presidential checkoff system.

Now, I would not argue that this system is perfect at this time. I think it does need reform.

□ 1200

But I think mere elimination without a committee process is a huge mistake.

I would hope that the committee could convene, that we could sort through what the problems are with this current system and how do we fix them, work in a bipartisan way to create the fixes, and then come to this House for the solution.

I urge opposition to this bill.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, the author of the bill, Mr. COLE.

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I listen to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I would just urge them to read the bill. It's only three pages long.

Frankly, most of the things I've heard so far don't have anything to do with this legislation. This legislation doesn't raise the legal contribution limit for anybody. This legislation doesn't allow corporate contributions. This legislation keeps in place all the disclosure requirements for Presidential campaigns that we currently have. So those of you that are concerned about those things don't need to be concerned about this bill.

H.R. 359 is really a very simple piece of legislation. It does two things: It removes taxpayer funding for Presidential campaigns, and it eliminates

taxpayer funding for political party conventions by the two major parties.

Now, I have to say, if you look at whether or not these ideas have been popular, historically they, frankly, haven't. When this was put in in the 1970s, the idea was that it would spread. It hasn't. We don't fund any of our elections with taxpayer dollars, our colleagues in the other body with taxpayer dollars; and, frankly, as my friend Mr. LUNGREN pointed out, popular participation in this program has declined for almost 30 consecutive years, from a high of 28 percent in 1980 to barely 7 percent today. So there is not much indication that it's popular.

I need to say, for the record, that I philosophically have always been opposed to taxpayer dollars being used for political advocacy of any kind. Some of my friends on the other side have a very different point of view, and I respect that. We just have a philosophical difference. I think this is an inappropriate use of public money.

Having said that, as I think even my friends on the other side at least tactically acknowledge, this is a program that is broken beyond belief. And the current system didn't just begin to break down in 2008. I'd go back to 2000. President Bush didn't use this system during the primary campaign. He only used the public system during the general election. Four years later, neither President Bush nor Senator KERRY chose to use this system in the primary portion of the campaign.

Fast-forward another 4 years to 2008, neither President Obama nor now-Secretary Clinton chose to use this in the primary campaign. And the President, having committed to use it in the general, then chose not to use it in the general—certainly his right—but said at the time he still thought it was a great idea and that some day we ought to go back and fix it.

Now, I will say this for the President. Having said that, we haven't seen any action on that front. He has been in office for 2 years. There has not been a proposal from the White House to fix this system. In fact, as my friends on the other side of the aisle know, currently he is planning to run for reelection; he is setting up a campaign. There has been a lot of thought on how to raise the money and how to put together a campaign, but no proposal from the administration to actually fix the system that they purport to support and that they said years ago they were going to try and fix. That's not true, by the way, of every Member on the other side. There have been some that have, I think, genuinely tried to fix things, but let's recognize this system has been in decline and decay for a long time.

Now the estimates are that we could save \$612 million over a 10-year period. We all know in this Chamber we have a \$1.4 trillion deficit problem. Governing is choosing and prioritizing. This is \$612 million that doesn't feed a single

American, doesn't build a single mile of interstate highway or infrastructure, doesn't pay to defend the country; it simply goes to support a handful of politicians that want to run for President, many of whom are marginal.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROSKAM. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLE. So in an era where we have to make genuinely hard decisions, to me, this is a no-brainer. This is a lot less important than a lot of the things that we need to consider and a lot of the decisions that we will have to make.

There is leadership by lip service and there is leadership by example. If my friends on the other side think this is the appropriate thing—and certainly if the President thinks it, he ought to lead by example and participate in the system. If not, we ought to recognize it's broken, end it, save the money; and if somebody wants to rewrite a bill, then they ought to do that and let's introduce it and have that debate. But right now, this is money we can't afford to waste and this is a system that's broken.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 359. Let's get rid of this outdated system.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The short title of this bill ought to be "The White Flag of the United States Congress on Campaign Finance." My distinguished colleague from Oklahoma says, if it's broke, why don't we write a bill. That's exactly what the point is. There weren't very many people on this floor who were involved in politics when this whole thing blew up. You've forgotten 1972. We wrote a bill in the Congress—we didn't, but the Congress wrote a bill. Interestingly enough, they left themselves out of it, but they tried to control how much money went into a Presidential campaign. Now, if you don't index it for inflation or do some kind of mechanism, it's pretty clear that a law written with the limits of 1972 is going to be pretty out of date by 2012.

There are some things we could do to change this process and make it more in sync with what's going on in society financially. But by saying you repeal it with nothing to replace it, you simply are saying we don't care how much money is spent in the election of the President of the United States; it is of no concern to the Republican Party whatsoever.

It fits very nicely with the Citizens United lawsuit that allows corporate money to come in a variety of other ways. And the system is now so corrupt that what you heard my colleague from California say, that is, all the things that were uncovered as a result of Watergate and the investigation that followed and led to the ejection of the President from the White House, was because we didn't have any controls on anything.

Now, did we put the perfect controls in? No. Should we be amending this bill? Yes. Because I don't know what 2012 is going to cost—maybe \$1 billion on either side. Sarah Palin will have \$1 billion and Barack Obama will have \$1 billion, and that will be all right with everybody. But the problem with that is that the ordinary folks in this country don't have any opportunity to participate.

They also know that people don't give \$1 billion with no expectation of something coming back. That's what happened in 1972. People gave money and they expected something back. And that's where the real fallacy here is in simply wiping this out without trying to fix it. It's an admission that you do not care how much money gets spent in a Presidential campaign. And if that's your view of how the democracy works, I think we are in serious trouble.

I'm one of those who think there should be publicly financed campaigns. I think even my opponents against me—I get 84 percent, but I think my opponent ought to have an equal shot at me. But the Congress didn't put that in this bill because they didn't want that. Neither did the Senate want that. They wanted to put it on the President and say, well, we fixed it over there. We really need it for this House and the Senate as well as what's going on in the Presidential election. And to simply repeal this is bad public policy and it is an admission that we don't care.

I oppose the bill.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 359—TERMINATION OF PUBLIC FINANCING OF
PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS AND PARTY CON-
VENTIONS
(Rep. Cole, R-Oklahoma, and 18 cosponsors,
Jan. 25, 2011)

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 359 because it is critical that the Nation's Presidential election public financing system be fixed rather than dismantled.

The Presidential election public financing system was enacted in the aftermath of the Watergate scandal to free the Nation's elections from the influence of corporations and other wealthy special interests. Rather than candidates having to rely on raising large sums of private money in order to run, the system provides qualifying presidential candidates with the option of accepting matching funds in the primary and a public grant in the general election. It has done so at minimal cost to taxpayers, who fund it by voluntarily choosing to direct \$3 of their Federal taxes to this beneficial system. For many years, the system worked well and attracted wide participation. In time, however, it became clear that a system introduced in the 1970s was in need of modernization and repair. Beginning in the 2000 Presidential campaign, candidates began to opt out. Since that time, promising proposals for the strengthening of the system have been made.

H.R. 359 would kill the system, not strengthen it. Its effect would be to expand the power of corporations and special interests in the Nation's elections; to force many candidates into an endless cycle of fund-raising at the expense of engagement with voters on the issues; and to place a premium on access to large donor or special interest

support, narrowing the field of otherwise worthy candidates. After a year in which the Citizens United decision rolled back a century of law to allow corporate interests to spend vast sums in the Nation's elections and to do so without disclosing the true interests behind them, this is not the time to further empower the special interests or to obstruct the work of reform.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my time be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY).

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

There was no objection.

□ 1210

The CHAIR. The Chair would advise that there is now a single manager on the Democratic side of the aisle.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 19½ minutes, the gentleman from Illinois has 7½ minutes, and the gentleman from California has 3 minutes.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 359, a bill summarily repealing our system of public funding for Presidential elections.

The process by which this bill has been brought to the floor—no hearings, no committee consideration, no markup, no deliberation—is the opposite of responsible legislating. It contradicts everything the Republican majority committed to a mere 3 weeks ago.

The process is atrocious; the substance is even worse. This repeal bill would destroy one of the proudest and most successful examples of reform that followed the Watergate scandal. Have we forgotten what the Watergate scandal was about? The Committee to Re-Elect the President, fueled by huge quantities of corporate cash, paying for criminal acts and otherwise subverting the American electoral system.

The hallmark of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974—enacted in response to Watergate at a time when public confidence in the government was dangerously low—the hallmark was our voluntary program of public financing for Presidential elections. To this day, this innovative reform stands as the flagship of public financing systems used in the United States and one of the greatest steps we have taken to bring transparency and accountability to our electoral system.

The Supreme Court, in affirming the constitutionality of the system, noted its basic purposes: "To reduce the deleterious influence of large contributions on our political process, to facilitate communication by candidates with the electorate, and to free candidates from the rigors of fundraising."

Presidential public financing has worked remarkably well—being utilized in the general election by every Republican and Democratic Presidential nominee from 1976 through 2004

and by JOHN MCCAIN in 2008—although in recent years the need for modernization has become evident.

Perhaps the best example of this program's success is President Ronald Reagan, who participated in the Presidential public financing system in all three of his Presidential campaigns in 1976, 1980, and 1984.

In his 1976 primary campaign, Reagan had less than \$44,000 in campaign money at the end of January of 1976 while his opponent, incumbent President Gerald Ford, had fifteen times more cash on hand. The \$1 million in public funds that Reagan received in January and the \$1.2 million that he received in February were essential in allowing him to continue his campaign.

Reagan was once again short of cash at the end of March and was allowed to continue as a result of an infusion of public money, which matched small private contributions. This illuminates one way that public financing has worked in both parties. It has often benefited candidates who challenge the party establishment.

In later elections, due to his broad base of supporters throughout the Nation, Reagan was able to capitalize on his small-donor fund-raising capacity to accrue substantial amounts of public money. In fact, even in 1984 when he was seeking reelection without significant opposition from within his own party, President Reagan raised about 60 percent of his campaign funds from small donors and as a result received \$9.7 million in matching funds. This was the maximum amount of public money a primary candidate could receive in accordance with the law at that time. And to this day, President Reagan is the only candidate ever to reach that public funding primary campaign maximum.

My colleagues, the Reagan case is merely illustrative of the positive effects that public financing has had in both parties at both the primary and general election stages. It also highlights the system's focus on small donations, rather than big bucks from large contributors. This is no free ride. This is no willy-nilly spending program. All primary candidates must seek the support of thousands of small donors, and only then do they receive matching public funds.

Today one could wish not for this Republican juggernaut—flying in the face of the positive history of this program, flying in the face of prior Republican support, flying in the face of responsible legislating—but for a bipartisan effort to repair the system, to restore its effectiveness.

I don't know of any policy challenge that exemplifies the maxim "mend it; don't end it" better than this one.

Yesterday, Congressman VAN HOLLEN and I reintroduced a bill, H.R. 414, that would do just that. The White House has cooperated in formulating this bill. It would modernize the Presidential public financing system and again make it an attractive and bill would

bring available funds into line with the increased costs of campaigns, adjust the program to the front-loaded primary calendar, and enhance the role of small donors further. It also would remove public funding of political conventions, as their roles indeed have changed since the system was first instated. This bill has been carefully designed. It deserves deliberation and debate through the normal committee process in this body.

At a time when confidence in government is low and assumptions of government corruption are high, why is the new majority trying to return us to the dark days that preceded Watergate? Why would we even want to contemplate such a thing?

Let's, instead, restore and improve our public financing system and move on to real solutions to put our Nation's fiscal house in order.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Before I yield 1 minute to our majority leader, I'd like to take 15 seconds to say when I find myself on the floor listening to my colleagues on the other side declaring Ronald Reagan to be the patron saint of Democratic Party ideas, I am bemused a bit because I served here when Ronald Reagan was President, and I don't recall those same words at that time.

However, at this time I would like to yield 1 minute to the majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, over the past 2 years, the legislative schedule of this House was dominated by spending money, not cutting spending. But after the people voiced their displeasure in November, the discussion in this town is now focused on rolling back the unchecked growth of government and Federal expenditures.

Our majority is dedicated to cut and grow: cutting spending and job-destroying regulations; growing private sector jobs and the economy.

Yesterday, we directed the Budget Committee chairman to set spending levels so we return non-defense discretionary spending to 2008 levels or below.

Today, the American public, through the YouCut program, has put on the chopping block an example of unnecessary government waste. Specifically, this bill would eliminate the Presidential Election Campaign Fund, an outdated mechanism that provides Federal tax dollars to candidates in Presidential primaries in the form of matching funds and general elections and subsidies for the Democratic and Republican National Conventions.

Eliminating this program would save taxpayers \$617 million over 10 years and would require candidates and political parties to rely on private contributions rather than tax dollars.

In times when government has no choice but to do more with less, voting to end the Presidential Election Campaign Fund should be a no-brainer. I

urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this measure.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

□ 1220

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that the Republicans will accomplish with this legislation to upend the Presidential campaign finance system is to drown out the voice of the people and to give more power, not less, to their well-heeled special interests. Actually, this repeal bill is the beginning of the end of any hope for a system of public financing for all elections in this country.

So Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised. After all, the majority largely owe their unprecedented spending levels in the last election thanks to the Citizens United decision that turned on the spigot of anonymous, unaccountable corporate cash. And in keeping with the spirit of secrecy and lack of transparency, it's somehow fitting that this bill comes to the floor without any hearings, without any committee referral, without full debate or deliberation.

We have a deeply corrupt campaign system, Mr. Chairman. Special interest money is having a corrosive effect on our democracy, eating away at the people's confidence in their government and their elected Representatives. The one beacon of light in this system is the public financing of Presidential campaigns. It is, I would remind everyone, a voluntary system. Americans must choose to opt in on their tax returns. It has served the country well, at limited expense. It needs updating. It does not need to be dismantled. We need more public financing, in all of our Federal elections, not less. H.R. 359 goes in exactly the wrong direction.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Chairman, earlier this month I read articles about President Obama's reelection campaign plans on raising upwards of three-quarters of a billion dollars. There is no system of public financing for our Presidential elections that can accommodate anywhere near that level of spending. That is why I believe the President's strong opposition to legislation abolishing a system the President himself found unworkable in reality is profoundly hypocritical.

Putting out a statement of administration policy that states repealing the public financing system would, quote, "force many candidates into an endless cycle of fundraising at the expense of engaging with the voters on the issues; and to place a premium on access to large donors or special interest support, narrowing the field of otherwise worthy candidates"—what incredible audacity. This is like the proverbial arsonist child who kills his parents by setting their house on fire and then appeals for sympathy by exclaiming he is an orphan.

The President's statement is absolutely saying one thing while doing the opposite. A New York Times editorial on January 24 of this year said, "ERIC CANTOR is targeting for extinction the publicly subsidized Presidential campaign finance system adopted in the wake of the Watergate scandals." Wrong. It was President Obama who killed it and made a mockery of public financing of Presidential campaigns with his arrogant pressing of self-advantage, his unprecedented move to decline public financing for the first and only time since the adoption of this system.

In disparaging the majority leader, the Times went on to say that, "We suspect his real motive is to give an even bigger voice to big-money contributors in Presidential campaigns." Once again, the record needs correcting. No campaign in American history had more maximum donors, at \$30,400 per person, than Obama for America. Much has been made of that committee's legendary prowess in generating small donors over the Internet. But that committee also had a record-shattering haul among big donors, bundlers, and influence peddlers. But such is the right for Mr. Obama as a candidate in America.

However, when he alone has refused to participate in public financing of a general election for a Presidential campaign, his protestations ring rather hollow. No one has made more of the system operationally obsolete than Barack Obama. Actions do speak louder than words. And Barack Obama alone has refused to participate on the level playing field that existed in publicly financed Presidential general election campaigns in history.

It was not that the system was antiquated that forced Barack Obama to break a very sanctimonious campaign promise to participate in public financing. It was his decision to put expediency over his expressed support for the Democrat mantra of public financing. It was all about a ruthless pressing of self-advantage, despite a core campaign theme of promising to rise above self-interested politics.

Today, we will hear about on the floor measures to address the inadequacies of the system and the need to repair the system. First, I want to note an earlier New York Times editorial on June 20, 2008, which stated, "Senator Russ Feingold, the ranking authority on campaign finance reform, rightly points out that while the primary cycle's public matching subsidies are 'broken' and need updating for inflation, 'the system for the general election is not'."

Secondly, I ask my Democratic colleagues this: Have any of you received the specifics of what it would take to change the law that would cause President Barack Obama's campaign to abide by public spending limits in the general election for 2012? Because without those specifics, this debate is not grounded in the reality that the incum-

bent President has zero intention of giving up his gargantuan financial advantage in his reelection campaign by opting out of one of the most perfect systems of public financing we could possibly adopt.

I ask the supporters of public financing for Presidential campaigns, are you willing to adopt a system that makes it mandatory for all candidates to participate in the system? And can you unequivocally pledge that the President's reelection committee will agree to be bound by your new system? And if not, I would suggest you are preaching at the wrong end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

The CHAIR. The Chair would advise Members that the gentleman from Illinois has 2½ minutes, the gentleman from California 1¾ minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania 11½ minutes remaining.

The Chair would further advise that ascribing unworthy motivations or intentions to the President of the United States or another Member of the United States Congress is inappropriate.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is my honor to yield 1 minute to our Democratic leader, the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Thank you for your leadership, Mr. BRADY, and participating in this important discussion, as fundamental as our democracy, on the floor today.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to urge this Congress to focus on our number one priority, the creation of jobs. This is a priority for the American people and for this Congress. We should be focusing on it. That was the message we heard last night from President Obama on this floor, who called on us to out-educate, out-innovate, and out-build the rest of the world.

But instead of talking about job creation, this legislation we debate today will not create jobs, will not reduce the deficit, and will not strengthen the middle class. And those are the standards we should apply to any legislation that comes to the floor. Instead, it will put American elections more squarely into the hands of special interests.

One year ago, the Supreme Court decision in Citizens United opened the floodgates to unlimited, uninhibited, undisclosed special interest spending in our elections and unlimited special interest influence over our public policy debate. In response to the Citizens United ruling, Democrats worked to restore transparency, fairness, and accountability to our political process. Last Congress, with bipartisan support, the House passed the DISCLOSE Act to require corporations and donors to stand by your ad. Why are you running and hiding? And to keep foreign-owned entities from participating in our elections.

But Senate Republicans blocked DISCLOSE. Even though it came out of the

House with bipartisan support, Senate Republicans blocked DISCLOSE from even receiving an up-or-down vote, and now House Republicans are perpetuating a sneak attack on campaign finance reform.

The result was clear in the last election. Special interest groups spent tens of millions of dollars more in the 2010 election than ever before. Again, undisclosed, without identification. There is a reason they don't want it disclosed. First of all, if the public knew who was paying for those ads, they would realize that their own personal interests were not being served, but the special interests. That's our experience in California, where we had a special interest initiative placed on the ballot by outside oil companies. And the strongest statement against the initiative was to see the disclosure at the bottom of the ad as to who was funding it. That spoke more eloquently to the fact that it was not in the people's interest. And the initiative was defeated.

□ 1230

Eliminating the Presidential Election Fund, as this election would do, opens the door for foreign-owned entities and large corporations to enjoy an even greater role in the funding of political campaigns.

In the past, Members from both sides of the aisle have supported legislation to reform, not eliminate, the public financing system. We should come together to ensure that the American people are heard and that they are not drowned out by special interest dollars.

In our democracy—and God bless our Founders for establishing it—voters determine the outcome of our elections. That's the way it should be. Special interests should not be determining the outcome of our elections. One year after the Supreme Court's decision undermined that fundamental American value, let's come together to fight on behalf of the public interest, to preserve the integrity of our political campaigns; and, therefore, to strengthen our democracy. And maybe we could, instead of undermining it here today, strengthen our country by creating jobs, by reducing the deficit, by strengthening the middle class, none of which is being done by this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this effort to further empower the special interests over the people's interest.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, last night just a few seats down from where I stand, I listened to our President say that he would offer his support to eliminate whatever we can honestly afford to do without. I stand here today in this House Chamber feeling a little less like a freshman representative of the United States Congress and more like a guy presiding over the people's choice awards. There is no better program in

my judgment that is tailor-made for elimination than this program.

In overwhelming fashion, the people of Arkansas and indeed the people of America spoke loud and clear last year about the need to reduce spending in this country. The gentleman from Oklahoma talked about the fact that this program does not educate anyone; it doesn't feed anyone; it doesn't produce a mile of interstate highway. The gentleman from California articulated the declining participation in this checkoff program. I don't think there's a better barometer out there for the overwhelming support that the people have for this particular measure.

I urge my colleagues to join me today and vote in favor of H.R. 359.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 359. Adopted in the shadow of the Watergate scandal, the public financing of Presidential elections eases the burden of fund-raising campaigns and lessens the impact of private donations by a small number of wealthy donors.

Since 1976, candidates from across the political spectrum have used the public financing program to run for President. Is the system perfect? Absolutely not. The system needs to be reformed, not repealed. I heard one of my colleagues on the floor mention that our President, President Obama, opted out of this program. That was his choice. I do not think we should be in a position to legislate the American people's choice. That's their choice, to opt out or to check that box. I don't think we have the right to do that, nor should we do that.

With the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United little over a year ago, we are already well on our way to elections brought to the American people by the highest corporate bidder. If this bill passes, there will be even more incentive for foreign controlled companies to secretly invest in political causes that could help move American jobs overseas. Companies that outsource jobs will have a very simple message to Presidential candidates—support our agenda, or face the consequences. This bill takes secret corporate dominance of our elections to the next level.

This bill is also being considered at the wrong time and under the wrong circumstances. Less than 3 weeks ago, the American people were promised an open Congress, a Congress that allowed for open debate, one that allows for open rules. The American people are still waiting. In consideration of this matter, the committee process was completely disregarded. There have been no hearings. No testimony from witnesses either for or against. No markup. No refining in the committee or input from experts. Zero. None. When we did the DISCLOSE Act, we had three hearings and 17 witnesses.

We learned from our witnesses. They gave us their opinion and they gave us their education on what they thought, pro and con. To bypass that, which we have never done before in our committee, I think is wrong. We should have had our hearings and let it happen.

There's no reason why we have to rush this thing over to the Senate. I would doubt very much if they're sitting there waiting for it. And we could have taken our time, done our hearings, which we do in a complete and nonpartisan way; and we could have had this thing thrashed out, we could have aired it out, people could have put their amendments in, they could have offered amendments at our committee level, we could have aired it out perfectly and gotten much more education and maybe had a chance to reform it for the better.

While reforming the Presidential financing system is an important effort which I support, the next Presidential election is 2 years away. This bill does not create or save a single job. Zero. None.

There is a time and a place for campaign reform. While here might be the place, now is certainly not the time. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and to get back to the important task of putting the American people back to work.

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

The CHAIR. The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Pennsylvania still has 8½ minutes. The majority side has a combined 3¼ minutes. The gentleman from Illinois is reserving; the gentleman from California is reserving.

The order of closing that the Chair would prefer in this instance would be that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would exhaust time on the minority side; we will then move to the gentlemen on the majority side for conclusion.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield as much time as he may consume to, in my opinion, an expert on this matter, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

I am pleased to close for our side with a plea to our colleagues that they not dismantle, in an irresponsible and summary fashion, one of the proudest achievements of post-Watergate political reform in this country.

I also can't let pass what the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) said about our President. Of course we want President Obama, we want all Presidential candidates, to opt into this system. We've made it about as clear as we possibly could that the bill that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and I have introduced is designed to make it feasible once again for candidates to participate in the public financing system.

But the gentleman from Illinois—talk about having it both ways—comes

onto this floor to condemn President Obama for opting out of the system, and then he proposes to abolish the system so that everybody has to opt out! Neither President Obama nor anyone else could participate. The logic of that is way beyond me.

Of course we want a system that works. We know the system needs to be adjusted. And we have constructive efforts under way to do just that. What we should be doing, instead of having this up-or-down exercise on the floor today, with no committee consideration, is actually undertaking that kind of discussion, that kind of reform, that kind of improvement.

There is a bipartisan history here. There is a bipartisan history of supporting this program; a bipartisan history of participating in the program. I assume that is out of fashion now for our Republican colleagues.

But under the pretense of achieving fiscal responsibility, to come to this chamber and abolish one of the proudest and most successful of our reform efforts—that does a disservice to the new majority and to this House. It also violates all the pledges we had 3 weeks ago—of hearings, committee consideration, markups. None of that has been done. This is simply an up-or-down vote, as I say, flying under the false colors of fiscal responsibility.

We have a chance to take on this challenge—to mend it, not end it—to make certain that we preserve this reform, but to adjust it to the realities of modern campaigning.

□ 1240

To simply abolish this, to once again turn over Presidential financing to big private and corporate interests, to overlook the abuses, the problems that led to this system in the first place, falls far short of what we should be about as responsible legislators looking out for our country's best interests.

I ask for Members to look at our legislation, to repair and rejuvenate the public funding system and in the meantime to reject this summary attempt to destroy one of the proudest achievements of reform.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1¾ minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. First of all, Mr. Chairman, the ranking member of our committee has been very fair in the proceedings that he had with us over the last number of years, and I appreciate that. We will continue that tradition.

We were unable to have any hearings or consideration of this matter before our committee until yesterday when we finally were told by the minority party as to who they wish to have on our committee.

We could not meet as a full committee until we had a complement of both Democrats and Republicans. We established our side several weeks ago.

I am sorry that happened. We will have plenty of hearings in the future on this and other issues.

What is the current system that we are hearing the other side defend? What has it given us? It has given us Lyndon LaRouche, but it would prevent Eugene McCarthy from being a successful Presidential candidate. That's what we don't hear.

The system works against some people like a Eugene McCarthy, who was a poor fundraiser but managed to have a number of people who supported him, who gave him large contributions.

And yet he was able to change the course of history, bringing down a sitting President and allow for—well, he was called the Pied Piper of the youth vote.

So let's understand the complexity of the history of this law. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, this law has failed us. It has failed the American people.

The American people have rendered their judgment. Nearly 93 percent of the American people who paid taxes have voted "no" to this system. That ought to give us good guidance as to where we could find savings to bring down our national debt.

As I understand it, we are going to have an amendment from the Democratic side of the aisle which causes any money saved here to go to bringing down the debt. I hope that it comes forward, and I will support it.

I hope we have the support of our colleagues for this bill.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 1¾ minutes.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, the minority leader was on the floor a couple of minutes ago—and I know the weather is urgent, I didn't want to prolong this drama—but it seemed to me to make the argument that this doesn't do anything as it relates to economic growth is just an incredible overstatement.

One of the things that we continue to hear, and the President's own debt commission spoke eloquently about the nature of debt and the stifling nature of debt on the economy and the stifling nature of spending on the economy. Here the Congressional Budget Office says, without ambiguity, the Congressional Budget Office says H.R. 359 would reduce direct spending by \$617 million over the 2011–2021 period.

This is an opportunity for us to take the admonition of the minority leader, to take the admonition of the President, to take the admonition of what the electorate told us in November and that is to concentrate on ways that we can trim this government, the burden on the taxpayer that adds absolutely no value.

There is not one Member on this House floor, Mr. Chairman, that has

defended the results of this system. I urge passage of this bill.

Ms. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 359.

This deeply flawed legislation would do away with a voluntary program that helps ensure transparency in our elections.

Created in the wake of Watergate, the presidential election public financing system—which this bill would eliminate—has helped stop corporate interests from buying elections with large anonymous donations.

While I'm disappointed that Republicans are playing political games with our election safeguards, I can't say that I'm surprised. H.R. 359 is just the latest effort by the new Majority to undermine our campaign finance laws in favor of Wall Street Banks and foreign corporations.

This political gimmick comes one year after the catastrophic Citizens United Supreme Court ruling that opened the floodgates to unlimited and anonymous special interest spending in our elections.

Last year my Democratic colleagues tried to repair some of the damage done by passing the DISCLOSE Act—a bill that would require corporations to stand by their advertisements and to keep foreign-owned entities from funding our elections.

Virtually all Republicans voted against this bill in the House, and their colleagues in the Senate blocked it from consideration.

Mr. Chair, this bill is nothing more than a thinly veiled attack on transparency in our elections that does absolutely nothing to create American jobs or encourage economic growth. In fact, by shifting our election system to favor big business, this legislation could strengthen the power of companies that ship American jobs overseas.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for an open and transparent election process, and vote no on this deeply flawed legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 359, which repeals nearly 40 years of reforms in how our Presidential election campaigns are funded. It is a great disservice to our democracy and to fundamental democratic processes.

As with the House vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act, this sweeping measure has been brought up for a vote without any hearing, without any testimony, without any documentation, and without any opportunity for those who support current law to state their case before the American people. The new Republican leadership pledged to be open, transparent, and fair in the workings of the House. These good principles are simply being ignored, once again.

I don't believe the American electorate wants to have even more corporate influence in Presidential elections. During the midterm election season, there was no call to scrap our public finance system, but there was a real sense of concern and a vigorous debate about the huge amounts of corporate funds that entered the campaign season as a result of the Supreme Court's ruling in Citizens United last year.

H.R. 359 would undermine processes that have been an essential part of our electoral system since the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974 were enacted in the wake of the greatest corruption scandal in modern American history, Watergate. Watergate was marked, in significant measure, by revelations of massive amounts of cash from

undisclosed sources being funneled into our presidential election campaigns and expended without proper accountability. Congress responded with significant reforms that restored the integrity of our Presidential elections.

For decades there has been a consensus that public funding of Presidential campaigns is preferable to special interest funding. Every Republican and Democratic Presidential nominee from 1976 through 2008, except for Barack Obama, used the public finance system for their general election campaigns. The system is contingent on support from private donors; there is a match of public funds, which are donated on a purely voluntary basis by Americans who want to promote honest elections. The system makes campaigns possible for candidates who initially do not have access to substantial funding. It encourages the broadest participation by candidates across the political spectrum. This strengthens our democracy and the vibrancy of political campaigns, thereby serving the interest of the American people.

Proposals have been introduced in recent Congresses to strengthen and improve the public finance system, which has had difficulty providing sufficient funding to meet the almost uncontrollable escalation in the costs of running for President. We should be considering legislation today to update and improve it, not to destroy it.

Although the public finance system runs on voluntary contributions, the Republican leadership has promised that getting rid of it will control the deficit. In reality it will only further lard Presidential campaigns with special interest money.

Like our vote on the Affordable Care Act last week, the Republicans can vote to repeal our landmark post-Watergate reforms without offering anything to replace them. Their indifference toward the public interest is a threat to the integrity of future elections.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 359, which would eliminate the presidential public campaign financing system. A year ago, the Supreme Court handed down one of its most devastating decisions in recent memory, ruling in *Citizens United vs. the FEC* that corporations could spend unlimited amounts in elections to argue for the election or defeat of a candidate. The ruling indeed opened the floodgates: corporate and special interests spent nearly \$300 million in the 2010 midterm elections, four times what was spent during the 2006 midterms.

Citizens United provided corporations like Exxon Mobile and Goldman Sachs the same free speech rights under the First Amendment as teachers, factory workers, and janitors. And yet, at a time when most Americans are fed up with the amount of special interest money flowing in Washington, the Republican party wants to make it easier for corporate voices to be heard. Moreover, these corporate donations can be funneled to tax-exempt organizations that do not have to disclose their donors, decreasing transparency when Americans want more of it.

Last year, the House passed a bipartisan bill to increase disclosure and transparency in federal elections. Unfortunately, the legislation died in the Senate. The last thing we need to counteract the harmful *Citizens United* decision is to eliminate the public campaign fi-

nance system established by Congress in the wake of Watergate which has helped candidates whose voices would not otherwise be heard to participate in federal elections.

Mr. Chair, we were promised more transparency and regular order from the new Republican majority. But we are considering this legislation six days after it was introduced, bypassing the committee process of hearings and mark-ups. I applaud the majority for allowing amendments; but, the truth is, this bill is so tightly written that few amendments are germane. And in the height of hypocrisy, the majority is using an estimate provided by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office to justify savings to taxpayers, the same agency which the majority party was decrying just last week when it reported that repeal of the health care reform law would add to the deficit.

Unlike my friends across the aisle, I will not dismiss the CBO's score of this legislation as somehow deceptive. However, the bill's savings over 10 years amounts to less money than is spent in 1 month on the war in Afghanistan. Mr. Chair, I agree that we need to find solutions to our deficit problems but this is not one of them. Rather, eliminating the public-financing system will cost us much more in the long term, requiring our elected officials to spend more time raising money to keep up with the corporate spending in elections than legislating.

Everyone agree that the presidential public campaign financing system must be fixed. Fewer Americans are checking the box on their tax forms to contribute to it. President Obama eschewed it in 2008 in favor of receiving small dollar donations via the Internet. Let us work together, in a bipartisan fashion, to reform the system and make it work for the 21st century. As the Washington Post editorial said, "fix the system—don't junk it."

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose H.R. 359. This bill terminates the Presidential Election Campaign Fund, which provides grants and matching funds during a presidential campaign for primary candidates, general election nominees, and party conventions.

Elections are not the problem in America. Our troubles don't stem from a case of too much non-special interest money.

Every year, nearly 40 million Americans voluntarily choose to support the public financing system by directing \$3 of their Federal taxes to the fund. This program, with little expense to the taxpayer, has played an important role of increasing transparency, ensuring that campaigns are funded at an appropriate and sustainable level, and strengthened the voice of small-donor Americans.

While I appreciate that this bill has been brought to the floor under a modified open rule, that does not excuse the fact H.R. 359 bypassed committee hearings, silencing a much-needed debate. In an era of half-a-billion dollar—and growing—presidential campaigns, public financing needs reform, not repeal.

This system was first used 35 years ago in the wake of Watergate to ease pressure on political candidates, enabling them to spend more time connecting with voters and less time securing large contributions.

Before costs outstripped financing, the system helped every candidate from 1976 to 2008, increased the number of viable contenders, and promoted competition in an oth-

erwise restrictive two-party dominated system. The system is broken and has not kept pace with the new campaign environment, but on the anniversary of *Citizens United*, a decision that upended a century of law that had brought transparency to our electoral process, the last thing we need are presidential campaigns more beholden to private donations.

This piecemeal approach of addressing this nation's fiscal woes is wrong and insufficient. You can't right-size the deficit through spending cuts alone. We must change the way we do business by addressing defense, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. Until this happens, we will have a very long and unproductive Congress that fails to address the long-term stability of our economy.

H.R. 359 will eliminate the system when we need—more than ever—to strengthen it. Getting rid of the public financing option in Presidential elections would close the path that leads back towards a better, more transparent democracy where the candidate can more clearly hear the voters, not large corporate interests.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 359, a bill that would terminate the public financing system for presidential election campaigns. The vast majority of Americans oppose the damage done to the integrity of the electoral system by the *Citizens United v. FEC*, which opened the floodgates for corporate spending in elections. According to a Washington Post poll, 80 percent of Americans oppose the ruling, with little difference reflected by party affiliation (85 percent of Democrats oppose it, 76 percent of Republicans, and 81 percent of independents). Yet, inexplicably, the majority is celebrating the one-year anniversary of that disastrous and poorly-reasoned decision by offering a bill that would make that damage vastly worse.

Frankly, I believe we would be moving just plain backwards if, instead of building upon the public financing system for presidential elections by updating it and adding to it a system of public financing for House and Senate races, instead, we remove the public financing system for presidential elections. So far, the new majority seem focused on undoing landmark legislative achievements rather than strengthening them.

I find two aspects of this bill particularly puzzling. First, it is being offered to "reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions." But nothing in the bill would specifically reduce either federal spending or federal borrowing. The Presidential Election Campaign Fund is funded exclusively by a check-off box on Americans' tax returns, stating that they want \$3 (\$6 for joint returns) of their tax liability to be deposited in the Fund. If that check-off box were removed, their tax liability would be the same, but the \$3 or \$6 would simply be allocated to something else. That is, the size of the revenue pie would be the same but the slice that would have been spent on presidential election campaigns would simply be spent on something else, and nothing in the bill would prevent additional borrowing to increase the size of the pie.

In addition, even if the entire existing balance of the fund were transferred to the Treasury, as called for by the bill, according to the fiscal year 2011 budget the unobligated

balance in the fund is approximately \$200 million. The national debt is more than \$14 trillion. So transferring \$200 million to the Treasury for the express purpose of debt reduction would only reduce the debt by one one-thousandth of one percent. The majority argue that this bill would save hundreds of millions of dollars in mandatory funding over the next decade, but the only thing it seems to do is keep those hundreds of millions of dollars out of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund.

That is how little would be gained. But what would be lost? That brings me to the second aspect of this bill that is puzzling. The Presidential Election Campaign Fund is a completely voluntary program. It only exists because people volunteer to participate in it. Although tax-payer designations have decreased in recent years, the American people voluntarily contributed the more than \$1.3 billion that presidential candidates and party committees have received under the program between 1976 and 2004. Why would the American people voluntarily contribute that much money to the program if they didn't prefer the neutrality of public money being used to finance elections to the bias and manipulative potential of private money being used for that purpose?

Similarly, virtually all American presidential candidates have voluntarily participated in the program since it was founded. With the exception of President Obama, every single Republican and Democratic presidential nominee since 1976 has used the public financing system to fund their general election campaigns. Why would the majority—with no real fiscal benefit ensured by this bill—terminate a program that both the citizens and the candidates have voluntarily supported for decades?

The Citizens United decision is drowning out the voice of the average citizen under a tidal wave of corporate spending. The Presidential Election Campaign Fund amplifies the voice of the average American as against the voice of corporate America. It is a critical and valuable program that we should be updating, enhancing and expanding, as a number of Members of this body have been seeking to do. For example, Representative PRICE of North Carolina and Representative VAN HOLLEN championed in the prior Congress, and reintroduced yesterday with my support, legislation that would increase the role of small donors and decrease the role of corporate spenders and other big donors in presidential campaigns. It would also eliminate spending limits, freeing up candidates to compete with the onslaught of corporate spending resulting from Citizens United. And it would increase the amount available in the fund by increasing the tax return check-off amount from \$3 to \$10 (and from \$6 to \$20 for joint filers). Representative LARSON and Representative JONES also championed legislation that would establish a program of public financing for House elections. I think these efforts are the ones we should be devoting our time to.

I want to reiterate—the check-off box for the Presidential Election Campaign Fund is a strictly voluntary funding mechanism. Keeping it does not constitute an appropriation. Eliminating it does not, in and of itself, reduce spending or borrowing. Eliminating it in this case would simply take away the only national program American citizens and presidential candidates have been able to use to help ensure that elections are as free as possible

from the manipulative force of wealthy and powerful special interests.

I strongly oppose this bill and, for the sake of preserving the voice of the American people in elections, I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 359, terminating voluntary taxpayer financing of presidential elections. This legislation seeks to end a 35-year-old program that uses money taxpayers choose to help pay for presidential campaigns and political conventions. The impetus for creating this public-financing system was the 1970s Watergate scandal and the desire to make fundraising for presidential elections more transparent. This bill would terminate the taxpayer option to designate a mere \$3 of income taxes to the financing of presidential campaigns, thereby also eliminating the Presidential Election Campaign Fund and the Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account.

Currently, taxpayers can designate a \$3 contribution to the public-financing system by checking a box on their federal income tax form. The money comes from taxes paid to the U.S. Treasury and does not affect a person's tax refund or payment. Passing this legislation would do irreparable harm to our presidential election system by preventing everyday Americans from having their voices heard while opening the door for special interests and large corporations to dominate presidential elections even more. This legislation would prevent patriotic, tax-paying grandmothers who may not be technologically savvy enough to go to the Web site of a presidential campaign but who have for years and decades checked this box from expressing their civic right to support a presidential campaign. I think we should all stand up for grandmothers throughout this great Nation and oppose this legislation.

Furthermore, this attempt to fast-track a bill that will destroy the presidential public finance system and privatize election fundraising is highly irresponsible. This violates recent pledges by the GOP's leadership of increased transparency, accountability and debate in Congress. Not one hearing has been held on the legislation, nor has a single committee debated its merits at a markup. If it passes, this legislation will roll back more than 30 years of law born out of the Watergate scandal, eviscerating one of the few remaining protections stopping corporations from heavily influencing American elections even more. The Supreme Court already opened the floodgates to unrestricted special interest spending in our elections and over our public policy debate in the Citizens United case; this legislation would pave the way for special interest groups, large corporations, and other large donors to dominate the political landscape even more at the expense of everyday, hard-working, tax-paying Americans.

House Republicans' much-touted "Pledge to America" criticized Democrats for "limiting openness and debate" during the legislative process and vowed to "ensure that bills are debated and discussed in the public square." The pledge says the GOP "will fight to ensure transparency and accountability in Congress and throughout government." And in Speaker JOHN BOEHNER's first remarks after taking control of the House, he spoke of a greater emphasis on "real transparency" and "greater ac-

countability." He went on, "Above all else, we will welcome the battle of ideas, encourage it, and engage in it—openly, honestly, and respectfully." Bringing forth such sweeping legislation without committee hearings and mark-ups completely contradicts these promises.

Public financing of presidential campaigns provides matching tax dollars to the small donations received by candidates who agree to publicly finance their campaigns, instead of relying on private donations. The intent is to encourage small donations and the burden on taxpayers is not much: Americans can voluntarily contribute \$3 to the fund on their federal tax filings. The public finance system was created in the aftermath of the Watergate scandal in the mid-1970s. After President Richard Nixon's re-election campaign was found to have illegally accepted hundreds of thousands of dollars from big corporations, Congress created a public financing system so that candidates would not have to rely on corporations and deep pocketed donors to finance their campaigns.

Legislation to make presidential public financing more competitive has won support from both parties in the past. In 2003, Senators Russ Feingold and JOHN MCCAIN introduced a bill that would reform the public financing system; Reps. Christopher Shays and Marty Meehan filed a companion bill in the House. "The public financing system for presidential elections, which aims to allow candidates to run competitive campaigns without becoming overly dependent on private donors, is a system worth improving and preserving," the lawmakers said in a joint statement.

More recently, Rep. DAVID PRICE introduced the Presidential Fund Act, which would notably increase the funds available to candidates who opt in to public financing. In 2007, when PRICE introduced his bill, cosponsors included three Republicans—Reps. Mike Castle of Delaware, TODD PLATTS of Pennsylvania, and Shays. Rep. PRICE has offered the bill again in the 112th Congress with Rep. VAN HOLLEN.

Since 1976, every Democratic and Republican presidential candidate has used the public financing system except Barack Obama's 2008 campaign. The way reformers see it, the presidential public financing system needs repair, not repeal. This legislation has drawn sharp criticism from campaign-finance watchdog groups who argue that the program should be expanded, not eliminated, to reduce special-interest money in elections.

Meredith McGehee, policy director at the Campaign Legal Center, says the amount of public funds currently available to candidates is too small to be competitive in modern presidential races. She says lawmakers need to update the system to better emphasize small donations to candidates and raise the total amount of public funding available. "Imagine if you didn't make any changes to the tax code since 1976. Of course public financing is outdated. The issue, then, is not to get rid of, but how to fix."

Craig Holman from the public interest group Public Citizen says his organization and others like it will urge lawmakers to oppose the GOP's bill because it violates the GOP's transparency promises, both on the 2010 campaign trail and now as the House majority. "This just came out of the blue, has had no deliberation and no discussion within the Republican and Democratic conferences," Holman says. "They have just been seated and

they're already breaking the ground rules on how they'll do business."

This legislation is strongly opposed by Americans for Campaign Reform, the Brennan Center for Justice, Common Cause, Democracy 21, the League of Women Voters, People for the American Way, and U.S. PIRG, to name a few.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation, which would be damaging to our democracy.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, this past Thursday marked the one year anniversary of the United States Supreme Court's ruling on the case *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission*.

That is the day the liberty of the American Republic want on sale to the highest bidder.

And today, the House gathers to remove one of the few remaining tools the average American has to voluntarily participate in a presidential election—let me remind those in support of H.R. 359 that the average American is not a multi-national corporation with hundreds of millions of dollars at their disposal.

My friends on the other side have said that this bill has nothing to do with the *Citizens United* case; I respectfully disagree.

Because of the overreaching ruling in *Citizens United*, not only are large corporations now allowed to reach into their deep pockets to spend unlimited funds in support of those running for office. But they can pay for political advertisements in the days leading up to an election—a provision previously banned by the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act.

The winner in this case was not *Citizens United* and the loser was not the Federal Elections Commission. The winners are multi-national corporations and Wall Street. The loser is the liberty of the American people. For if money = free speech, then lack of money = lack of free speech.

Corporations have always had heavy influence in the U.S. government. But today, as a result of the Supreme Court's decision one year ago, we have entered a new era in the corporate ownership of America.

In this past mid-term election, the fallout of *Citizens United v. FEC* saw close to \$4 billion poured into the mid-term cycle. This was an all-time record.

It is frightening to imagine how much money will be spent during a presidential election year if public financing is stripped.

Four billion dollars—a record-breaking amount of money—was spent at a time when our country's unemployment hovers near 10 percent.

That gross amount of cash came from big business and Wall Street. To claim the *Citizens United* made no difference in the billions spent is absurd.

A few justices on the Supreme Court curiously decided that giant banks—which have already taken so much from the American people—are deserving of the same protection under the First Amendment of the Constitution as the very people they hurt.

Wall Street has stripped the average American of their retirement funds, their homes, and drown our society in debt; now the Supreme Court has stripped them clean of their Constitutional right to a free democracy.

This is unacceptable.

Those who benefit from the big money that is injected into elections by big business and

Wall Street banks have tried to stop legislative fixes. The Supreme Court has shown its willingness to overturn a century's worth of legislation designed to protect our electoral system. Now this Congress is about to vote to remove the voluntary public financing system put in place in the wake of the Watergate Scandal.

My friends in the new majority say that the system is broken, and I agree.

That is why I have introduced, year after year, a Constitutional amendment, H.J. Res. 6, to ensure that no corporation, no Wall Street bank, no big oil company, no deep pocket interest will be able to buy elections.

I believe, the only long-term solution is to amend the United States Constitution.

America's founders had the wisdom to know that as our young Republic matured, changes would need to be made.

That is why they wrote Article V of the United States Constitution, which allows for amendments to the Constitution.

The time has come to exercise this Constitutional right and fundamentally protect American liberty.

Additionally, H.J. Res. 8, another amendment I have introduced, will amend the Constitution to give Congress the authority to set limits on the amount of contributions that may be accepted by a candidate.

Congress cannot allow a tidal wave of big money to drown the integrity of our electoral system. *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission* was not a question of First Amendment rights; instead, it was an opportunity to protect the voices of average Americans who have been silenced by huge corporate bank accounts.

One year ago this free Republic suffered a staggering blow.

Today, we must be firm and resolute in our response.

I urge my colleagues to protect public funding, to vote in favor of the Polis amendment, and to vote NO on H.R. 359.

The freedom and liberty our founders envisioned truly is at stake.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule for a period not to exceed 5 hours and shall be considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 359

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

SECTION 1. TERMINATION OF TAXPAYER FINANCING OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS.

(a) **TERMINATION OF DESIGNATION OF INCOME TAX PAYMENTS.**—Section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **TERMINATION.**—This section shall not apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2009.”.

(b) **TERMINATION OF FUND AND ACCOUNT.**—

(1) **TERMINATION OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 95 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“**SEC. 9014. TERMINATION.**

“The provisions of this chapter shall not apply with respect to any presidential election (or any presidential nominating conven-

tion) after the date of the enactment of this section, or to any candidate in such an election.”.

(B) **TRANSFER OF EXCESS FUNDS TO GENERAL FUND.**—Section 9006 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **TRANSFER OF FUNDS REMAINING AFTER TERMINATION.**—The Secretary shall transfer all amounts in the fund after the date of the enactment of this section to the general fund of the Treasury.”.

(2) **TERMINATION OF ACCOUNT.**—Chapter 96 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“**SEC. 9043. TERMINATION.**

“The provisions of this chapter shall not apply to any candidate with respect to any presidential election after the date of the enactment of this section.”.

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) The table of sections for chapter 95 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 9014. Termination.”.

(2) The table of sections for chapter 96 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 9043. Termination.”.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate.

The Chair would advise, in light of the gentleman from New York's parliamentary inquiry earlier, that the printed RECORD is available.

Each amendment printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee and shall be considered as read.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

Mr. PETERS. 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 2, line 23, strike “Treasury.” and insert “Treasury, to be used only for reducing the deficit.”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, there is a strong bipartisan agreement that the long-term health of our economy necessitates confronting persistent budget deficits and the growing national debt.

Democrats and Republicans were able to work together to create balanced budgets in the 1990s and a similar attempt is needed now.

While I appreciate the efforts of the Republican leadership to put forward a specific budget cut, I have serious concerns with eliminating the public campaign financing system. However, if the House is going to vote on this, we owe it to the American people to ensure that the funds are actually used for deficit reduction and not for additional spending.

When I was reading the text of this legislation, I was surprised to find that the bill does not make specific provisions for using the remaining money in

the Presidential Election Campaign Fund to reduce the deficit. This is why I am putting forward my amendment that will ensure that the \$194 million in tax dollars currently sitting in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund will be used to reduce the deficit should this legislation become law.

As introduced, H.R. 359 would transfer this money to the Treasury's general fund where it could be dedicated to new spending or lent to government trust funds. My amendment would simply specify that upon transfer to the Treasury, these funds are to be used only, to be used only, for reducing the deficit.

This is about sending a message to taxpayers. If we are going to put deficit reduction in a bill's title, then we should make sure the deficit reduction is in the statutory language as well.

It is a matter of fact that the bill, as introduced, simply returns the \$194 million in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund to the Treasury's general fund and it is from this fund that most expenditures are made, as well as loans to a number of government trust funds. If we are going to pass a bill to reduce the deficit, let's make sure it actually does that.

It is not uncommon or unprecedented to specify funds being returned to the Treasury to be used for deficit reduction. In fact, I am proud to be a bipartisan cosponsor of two Republican bills introduced this session, one by my colleague from Michigan, Chairman CAMP, and Representative GINGREY, that would codify the requirements that unspent funds from the Members' representational allowances be used specifically for deficit reduction.

This amendment basically uses the same language as in both of those bills by Mr. CAMP and Mr. GINGREY. If Congress is going to send a message to taxpayers that cutting spending is a top priority, then let's make sure those recovered funds are actually used to reduce the deficit.

My amendment is a commonsense change that ensures that the stated purpose of this bill, deficit reduction, will actually be carried out.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. ROSKAM. I wholeheartedly agree and ask that it be passed.

I yield back the balance of my time. The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

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

Mr. PETERS. 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 Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, amend line 21 to read as follows: "to the Office of Justice Programs for local law enforcement for costs of providing security at Presidential nominating conventions."

□ 1250

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Castor amendment to safeguard the local government security funds that come from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund. I know a lot of the debate has been focused on public campaign financing of Presidential campaigns, but another important portion of that fund goes to local communities to help them with local security and local law enforcement costs when they host a political party convention.

And we're very proud in my hometown of Tampa to be the host of the 2012 Republican convention. It's no wonder that the Republicans selected Tampa; it's a wonderful place. We have beautiful beaches. We need the business and the jobs. So we're going to be a very welcoming community. We do conventions very well. And we're very happy that we're going to play host to the Republican convention.

But here are great warning flags going off because what I hear from my local law enforcement community is that the security costs, especially in the post-9/11 world, are very daunting. They are very concerned with the cost of providing security for the Republican convention, just like, I think, any host community would be for any party convention.

So what this amendment does is it says that, rather than completely do away with this fund, we will retain the portion that will cover local law enforcement security costs. We're going to need this help.

What I understand from my colleagues in Minneapolis after the last convention is that they received over \$16 million from this fund to help them cover the costs of security, yet that wasn't enough to fully cover all the cost. And let me tell you, in this economy right now, in an area where we were hard hit by the recession in 2007, early 2007, our local governments simply don't have the wherewithal to go this extra mile and cover all of these security costs.

So what I'm asking through this amendment, as we come together in a bipartisan way to cover those local law enforcement costs, is let's not throw out the entire fund. Let's retain this amount, or what's left in the fund, to go to cover these local security costs.

Let's face it, too, this is voluntary. This is the voluntary checkoff on your income tax form that taxpayers all across America can decide if they want to do this or not. This is not something that is mandatory upon all taxpayers across the country. And if folks around the country, if taxpayers want to say, voluntarily, We want to help keep big money out of campaigns and we want to help cover local security issues, then we should be following through with that commitment and not eliminating it, not giving them any choice at all.

Overall, if the majority will not accept this amendment, since you have raised the point of order, and it seems like you don't want to bring it up to a vote, I would urge everyone to vote "no" on H.R. 359 because it puts in danger dollars that can be used by the City of Tampa, the Tampa Bay area, and other communities for security, transportation, preparation, and other allowable purposes.

This amendment intends to replace the \$100 million we spend for security every 4 years with funding from this voluntary fund. If we kill this fund, we're going to be hurting many local communities such as my hometown of Tampa. The host committee will be way behind the eight ball. They're doing a good job but, boy, this was a commitment, this is the law, and you're going to really stick it to them by taking these security funds away.

So let's vote on making our communities safe when we rally a democracy under our political conventions.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, since the majority party has offered a point of order, it appears that they are not going to allow this amendment and probably the next one to come up for a vote. So because the majority has raised a point of order to prevent a vote on my amendment, I reluctantly ask unanimous consent to withdraw both of my amendments, which would have safeguarded our security funds for local law enforcement.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

Ms. TSONGAS. 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:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN AND LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.

With respect to Federal funds received by an entity, other than a natural person, it shall be unlawful for such entity to—

- (1) use such funds to advocate the election or defeat of a Presidential candidate;
- (2) use such funds to engage in any lobbying activity; or
- (3) donate such funds to any entity that advocates for the election or defeat of a Presidential candidate or engages in lobbying activities.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to withdraw, however reluctantly, the amendment. But I would like to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for giving me this opportunity to discuss what I believe is a critically important issue for our democracy.

My amendment is straightforward. Entities that received Federal funds may not use those funds, be they bailouts, earmarks, grants, or payments for contracts, toward the election or defeat of a Presidential candidate.

I understand what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle hope to accomplish with the underlying bill today. They want to protect taxpayer dollars. Saving taxpayer dollars is a noble goal, particularly in these tough economic times.

Unfortunately, this bill eliminates the voluntary fund that taxpayers elect to put toward campaign financing and does nothing about the much larger share of taxpayer dollars that can now go to campaign financing with no say from taxpayers. If we are truly serious about protecting taxpayer dollars, it is these dollars we should be concerned with. We should ensure that corporations and other entities receiving taxpayer money cannot turn around and use that same money to finance Presidential campaigns.

The Supreme Court, in *Citizens United*, allowed corporations to have unlimited influence in elections. It removed longstanding protections that prevented corporations from making large contributions to candidates and drowning out the voices of everyday Americans trying to participate in our democracy. In the wake of *Citizens United*, public financing of Presidential elections is all the more important to ensure a level playing field for candidates running for office and to preserve the voice of the American taxpayer. By eliminating the Presidential Campaign Fund, my colleagues across the aisle would increase the influence of special interests in the elections, leaving Presidential candidates beholden to large, private contributions.

If my colleagues insist on eliminating this important and completely voluntary fund, let us at least make sure that corporations receiving taxpayer money through bailouts, earmarks, and other Federal funds are not able to then use these taxpayer funds towards influencing Presidential elections. Let us level the playing field and protect all American voters by ensuring that these large, private contributions to political candidates aren't funded using taxpayer money.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

Ms. MOORE. 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:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. TAXPAYER OPTION TO CONTRIBUTE OWN FUNDS TO PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 6096. CONTRIBUTIONS OF OWN FUNDS BY INDIVIDUALS.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—Every taxpayer who makes a return of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for any taxable year may designate that \$3 (\$6 in the case of a joint return) in addition to any payment of tax for such taxable year shall be paid over to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 9006(a).

“(b) MANNER AND TIME OF DESIGNATION.—Any designation under subsection (a) for any taxable year—

“(1) shall be made at the time of filing the return of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such taxable year and in such manner as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe, except that such designation shall be made either on the first page of the return or on the page bearing the taxpayer's signature, and

“(2) shall be accompanied by a payment of the amount so designated.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 6096 in the table of sections for part VIII of subchapter A of chapter 61 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 6096. Contributions of own funds by individuals.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her amendment.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the Supreme Court ruling in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* created an uninhibited voice for special interest spending in our elections and unlimited corporate speech in our public policy debate.

Special interests were heard loud and clear this past election cycle to the tune of \$281.6 million, almost five times greater than the previous midterm election of 2006. By eliminating the Presidential Election Campaign Fund where everyday Americans can have their voices heard, special interest groups will be able to shout from the top of the mountain and dominate Presidential elections even more.

Currently, between 7 and 8 percent of Americans choose to direct \$3 of their tax liability to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund. My amendment is simple. Instead of directing that amount, that \$3 of their tax liability by checking that box, citizens would be

able to check that box and voluntarily make a donation in the same amount to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund.

What's important here is not whether a President uses the fund or doesn't use the fund. What's important is to preserve the opportunity for the average American to have that speech and the opportunity to say loud and clear that they support clean, good, and fair elections.

□ 1300

My amendment, instead of eliminating the entire program, lets Americans make a donation out of their own pockets. Good government groups are against the underlying bill, such as the League of Women Voters, Common Cause, Democracy 21, and Public Citizen. Rather than eliminating the public financing system, we should be working together in a bipartisan manner to reform it and improve it.

Now, I understand that a point of order is being reserved against my amendment because CBO has scored my amendment as saving only \$400 million over 10 years, while the underlying bill saves \$600 million. So I think given that my amendment does contribute to deficit reduction, we shouldn't throw the baby out with the bath water.

Understanding, Mr. Chairman, that a point of order has been reserved, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

Mr. POLIS. 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:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. VOLUNTARY FINANCING OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 6096. VOLUNTARY DESIGNATION BY INDIVIDUALS.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—Every taxpayer who makes a return of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for any taxable year may designate an amount shall be paid over to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 9006(a). The amount designated under the preceding sentence—

“(1) may not be less than \$1, and

“(2) shall be in addition to any payment of tax for the taxable year.

“(b) MANNER AND TIME OF DESIGNATION.—Any designation under subsection (a) for any taxable year—

“(1) shall be made at the time of filing the return of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such taxable year and in such manner as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe, except that such designation shall be made either on the first page of the return or on the page bearing the taxpayer's signature, and

“(2) shall be accompanied by a payment of the amount so designated.

“(c) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS DESIGNATED.—For purposes of this title, the amount designated by any taxpayer under subsection (a) shall be treated as a contribution made by such taxpayer to the United States on the last date prescribed for filing the return of tax imposed by chapter 1 (determined without regard to extensions) or, if later, the date the return is filed.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 6096 in the table of sections for part VIII of subchapter A of chapter 61 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 6096. Voluntary designation by individuals.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to discuss an amendment that can maintain our commitment to true democracy and reduce the corrupting influence of Big Money in Presidential campaigns, but will also allow for fiscal responsibility and the savings that Members of both parties believe so strongly about.

Rather than end the program, as has been proposed in the Republican bill to fund Presidential elections and reduce the influence of Big Money on our political system, this amendment would make the source of the voluntary individual donations to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund. It can be structured in such a way where the same amount of money is saved because rather than, and when I looked into this matter, like many Americans, I thought and many people thought that the \$3 check-off was actually additional money you pay. On the tax form, it looks like it is and you check it off. Most people think it is additional; it is not actually an additional \$3. It comes out of the money you already pay.

So what this amendment would do is say it would be an optional amount on top of the other amount that you pay. So it would be an additional \$3 or \$5 or \$10. We actually leave it open and allow people themselves to designate how much money they would like to apply to fighting Big Money in politics.

So with this approach, we can separate these two issues. One is an issue of fiscal responsibility with which I think there is strong bipartisan support for making cuts, even cuts of programs that we hold dear. Frankly, I am a supporter of public financing and am a co-sponsor of the Fair Elections Act. I support more public financing, but I am also fiscally responsible, and I would make cuts elsewhere. Let's separate that out and say we can save the \$520 million we need to save, but allow the program of public financing to continue as a program that individuals themselves can choose how much to fund when they are filling out their

taxes. I think that is a very critical component with regard to this.

By not capping the amount of voluntary donations, the amount of the fund could even be improved. It could remain solvent and strong because some taxpayers might dedicate \$30, \$100, or \$500. We would make it easy by empowering taxpayers.

I do have a technical fix for the amendment that I would like to offer. This is all happening so quickly, I will get that amendment to you in a moment. But effectively what this would do is, as you know, as it is now structured, all of the money you save going forward and the existing money from the fund is returned to Treasury.

Certainly the intent of my amendment was to do the same thing, but there is some ambiguity about whether the existing money in the fund would be returned to Treasury, which is the intent of the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to modify for a technical correction the copy of the amendment I am sending to the desk.

The CHAIR. If the gentleman would send the modification to the desk.

Mr. POLIS. I withdraw the request to modify my amendment so I can continue with my time. How much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. So again, with regard to this amendment, it is designed to save the same amount of money because it does, obviously. It simply allocates the money both in the fund; and I offer in terms of a clarification on legislative intent that it is the intent. There is certainly nothing in the language of the amendment that precludes it, as well as any future funds that come in under the regular taxes that are paid. It allows the fund in the future to be funded out of voluntary contributions.

I think if opponents of the Presidential campaign fund want to end the program for budgetary purposes, my amendment gives a reason to maintain the fund. We can, if you believe in the mission of public financing and fighting Big Money interests, also be fiscally responsible by maintaining the fund. Eliminating the fund would continue the trend of shutting out the public's voice in Federal campaigns.

Again, I sympathize with the need to save \$520 million, and I support the need to save \$520 million; and that is a beginning. That is a small beginning for what we need to cut, but we can do so in a way that will allow this concept that was created in the wake of Watergate to continue to exist and work.

I worry about the fate of our democracy with regard to the impact of Big Money on elections, and to get rid of public financing in Presidential campaigns would inflict greater damage on our campaigns and on our democracy.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Does the gentleman from Illinois insist on his point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I must insist on the point of order. I raise a point of order against the amendment because it violates clause 10 of rule XXI, known as the CutGo rule. The amendment proposed increased mandatory spending without an equal or great reduction in existing mandatory spending relative to the underlying bill in violation of the rule.

The CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. POLIS. Yes, I do.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. POLIS. The point of order is legitimate in the sense that there is an ambiguity with regard to what happens to the money. I would press the point that the legislative intent is to allow the money that exists in the fund to be returned to the Department of the Treasury. We would be happy to work with the gentleman on a technical fix to the amendment that would make that clear. I would argue that it is already clear enough in the sense that certainly nothing is prohibited in terms of returning that money. The formal scoring came back as saving at least, I believe, \$422 million, which is all of the money going forward.

So this is a question of the \$100 million or so that is now in the fund. The legislative intent is to return that to the Treasury which would, therefore, result in identical savings. And we would be happy, to the gentleman's satisfaction and during the course of debate before the votes are called, to clarify that through a technical fix.

The CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. On the most recent clarification by the gentleman from Colorado, the intent of our legislation is to stop this program. Not only would the funds be returned that are already in there, but the program would not go forward.

□ 1310

So, therefore, the administrative costs to the IRS would be eliminated. The gentleman, by continuing the program, increases the net cost because you will continue having the administrative costs that otherwise would be no longer in effect as a result of the underlying bill; and therefore, the point of order would still be appropriate.

The CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado violates clause 10 of rule XXI by proposing an increase in mandatory spending over a relevant period of time.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XXI and clause 4 of rule XXIX, the Chair is authoritatively guided by estimates from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the net effect of the provisions in the amendment would increase

mandatory spending over a relevant period as compared to the bill.

Accordingly, the point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on the amendment on which further proceedings were postponed.

The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 396, noes 7, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

AYES—396

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Benishkek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cansaco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot

Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Crawaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culbertson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox

Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
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)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hirono
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultz (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)

Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Loeb
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney

Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling

Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 23 I was absent because I was having a root canal.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained on January 26, 2011 and missed rollcall vote No. 23 on the amendment to H.R. 359 offered by Representative PETERS. If I had been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 23.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 23, had I been present, I would have "aye."

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chair, earlier today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No. 23. If present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote No. 23.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, 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. 359) to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions, and, pursuant to House Resolution 54, reported the bill back to the House with an 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. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Walz of Minnesota moves to recommit the bill H.R. 359 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT.

(a) DISQUALIFIED ENTITY.—Section 9003 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) DISQUALIFIED ENTITY.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘disqualified entity’ means any entity that has not entered into a campaign disclosure agreement with the Department of the Treasury.

“(2) CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT.—The term ‘campaign disclosure agreement’

NOES—7

Clarke (NY)
Edwards
Holt
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Lee (CA)

Nadler
Waters

NOT VOTING—31

Baca
Becerra
Bilirakis
Buchanan
Capps
Capuano
Carter
Cooper
Costa
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Emerson
Engel
Frank (MA)
Garamendi
Giffords
Heinrich
Hinche
Hinojosa
Holden
Larson (CT)

Lummis
Lynch
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Ribble
Ros-Lehtinen
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Speier

□ 1335

Messrs. HOLT, NADLER, Ms. WALTERS, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. CLARKE of New York changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

means an agreement in which the entity agrees—

“(A) to file disclosure statements with the Internal Revenue Service at such times, and covering such periods, as are required under section 527(j)(2),

“(B) with respect to its receipt of payment for electioneering communications from covered persons on or after January 1, 2013, to include within those disclosure statements—

“(i) the amount, date, and purpose of each payment and the name and address of the covered person making the payment, and

“(ii) the name and address of each disqualified contributor making a payment on or after January 1, 2013, to the covered person (including the occupation and name of employer of such individual) and the amount and date of each payment, and

“(C) to pay damages to the Secretary for failure to comply with these disclosure requirements in an amount equal to 35 percent of the amount that was required to be disclosed.

“(3) DISQUALIFIED CONTRIBUTOR.—The term ‘disqualified contributor’ means—

“(A) any person who makes payments (directly or indirectly) of more than \$100,000 to the covered person during the calendar year, and

“(B) any foreign individual, foreign corporation, or foreign country who makes any payment (directly or indirectly) to the covered person during the calendar year.

A payment that is deposited into an account of a covered person that is not available for electioneering communications shall not be taken into account for purposes of the preceding sentence.

“(4) ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATION.—The term ‘electioneering communication’ means a communication that—

“(A) refers to a clearly identified candidate for any Federal public office,

“(B) reflects a view on such candidate or on the record of such candidate, and

“(C) is made within 30 days of a general election or a primary election.

“(5) COVERED PERSON.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘covered person’ means any of the following persons:

“(i) Any foreign individual, corporation, partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, trust or similar entity or foreign country.

“(ii) Any domestic corporation, partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, trust or similar entity.

“(iii) Any person described in section 501(c) and exempt from tax under section 501(a).

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any person if the aggregate payments for electioneering communications during the calendar year by such person does not exceed \$25,000.”

(b) CONDITION.—Subsection (a) of section 9003 of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting “, and”, and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) agree to not make any payment to a disqualified entity for print, broadcast, cable, or satellite communications.”

(c) PRESERVATION OF FUNDS FOR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES.—Subsection (b) of section 9006 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(b) PAYMENTS FROM THE FUND.—Amounts in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, solely for making expenditures to eligible candidates of a political party. No expenditures may be made from such fund unless the Secretary of the Treasury has receipt of a certification from the Commission under section 9005.”

(d) PRESERVATION OF FUND FOR PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES.—Subsection (b) of section 9037 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(b) PAYMENTS FROM THE MATCHING PAYMENT ACCOUNT.—Amounts in the Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, solely for making transfers to the candidate. No amount may be transferred from the account unless the Secretary has receipt of a certification from the Commission under section 9036, but not before the beginning of the matching payment period. In making such transfers to candidates of the same political party, the Secretary shall seek to achieve an equitable distribution of funds available under subsection (a), and the Secretary shall take into account, in seeking to achieve an equitable distribution, the sequence in which such certifications are received.”

(e) PRESERVATION OF FUNDS FOR NATIONAL COMMITTEE.—Paragraph (3) of section 9008(b) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(3) PAYMENTS.—Amounts in the appropriate account maintained under subsection (a) shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, solely for making expenditures to the national committee of a major party or minor party which elects to receive its entitlement under this subsection. Such payments shall be available for use by such committee in accordance with the provisions of subsection (c). No expenditures may be made from such fund unless the Secretary of the Treasury has receipt of a certification from the Commission under subsection (g).”

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota (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 Minnesota?

Mr. ROSKAM. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

□ 1340

Mr. ROSKAM (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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), a true champion of transparency and openness in government and our elections.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague and thank him for offering this motion because it's very simple. What this does is allow the American public to finally know who is funding the political ads that they're watching financed by a lot of these shadowy groups.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today our Republican colleagues rejected the idea of having broad transparency by adopting the DISCLOSE Act. What this does is target it in one very important area, an area that the American public de-

serves to know, and that is when commercials, TV commercials, are paid for by special interests, Big Money special interests, including foreign corporations, and corporations that are owned or controlled by foreign governments, whether they be China, Iran, Venezuela, whoever it may be, that the American public has a right to know who is paying for those ads.

It's simple, it's transparent, and in fact our Republican colleagues even recently said they were in favor of more transparency. Speaker BOEHNER said on Meet the Press, and I quote: “I think what we ought to do is we ought to have full disclosure, full disclosure of all the money we raise and how it is spent. I think sunlight is the best disinfectant.” I would hope that would also be true about foreign-controlled corporations trying to secretly finance ads in this country.

Majority Leader CANTOR told Newsweek, and I quote: “Anything that moves us back toward the notion of transparency, real-time reporting of donations and contributions would be helpful toward restoring confidence of the voters.”

Mr. Speaker, this motion is very simple. Let's let the American public know when you have these Big Money special interests, including foreign-controlled corporations, spending this money to influence their vote. Eighty percent of the American people, Democrats, Republicans, and independents, say they want to know. A vote against this motion is a vote to keep the American public in the dark, to continue to allow those shadowy groups, including those controlled by foreign interests, to continue to try and influence the elections in this country without telling a single person. That's wrong. It violates the kind of pledge towards transparency and greater accountability that we heard a lot in this last election.

So I urge my colleagues to act on a bipartisan basis to simply give the public the right to know when those kinds of organizations, including foreign-controlled corporations, are spending gobs of money on TV and not telling the American people who they are or who is financing them.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman. And on the morning after the night we sat here together and listened to the President talk about us working together, we have got a motion to recommit that I think we can all agree upon. As the gentleman spoke about something very uniquely American in our election process, it is that humble idea of someone like myself, a school teacher, football coach, and soldier, with no political connections and no personal wealth, can actually get their friends together and win elections to Congress.

The idea that we should have our elections be influenced by undisclosed foreign money runs counter to everything in this Nation's history. This piece of legislation was a bipartisan piece of legislation that was meant to

curb the excesses in the post-Watergate era. It has been used by every President, including Ronald Reagan, to make sure that our election processes were fair.

So we offer this motion to recommit in the spirit of last night's speech, something we can agree upon together, that foreign corporations should not buy our elections, that any American wishing to run for office should do so on merit and should do so with transparency and the knowledge of the American public.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, support this very simple motion to recommit to keep our elections fair, to keep the American people informed, and to keep this democracy in our hands, not foreign corporations.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, there is really no sense of irony here, is there, that the proponents, the self-described proponents of transparency and openness, in the twinkling of an eye before a vote on an adjournment day come over and say there's your motion to recommit?

This was posted online, Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week. The proponents—and this is a modified open rule—the proponents had an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, on Friday to file an amendment, on Monday to file an amendment, on Tuesday to file an amendment. But the very described people who are now cloaking themselves in a mantle of openness and transparency say, "There you go"—moments ago. Okay, that's the program. I get the program.

What is this ultimately all about? There is a sincere effort on the part of this majority, and I think some folks on the minority as well, to take the President up. There is a real attempt on the part of the proponents of this bill, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, to try and save money, to look out over the entire course of this budget and all of these challenges. And Mr. COLE and the folks that are behind H.R. 359, the underlying bill, are ultimately saying we can save \$617 million over a 10-year period. Mr. Speaker, that's according to the CBO.

So it comes down to a very simple thing. If you want to save the money, you defeat the amendment. If you want to play games on the day that we're all heading out, trying to act like you are full of transparency and openness, support the amendment.

I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Please state your parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Does the underlying bill cut spending? Does the motion cut spending?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot respond to inquiries regarding the content of a pending proposition.

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.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 173, nays 228, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—173

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

NAYS—228

Adams	Altmire	Bachus
Aderholt	Amash	Barletta
Akin	Austria	Bartlett
Alexander	Bachmann	Barton (TX)

Bass (NH)	Graves (MO)	Paulsen
Benishke	Griffin (AR)	Pearce
Berg	Griffith (VA)	Pence
Biggert	Grimm	Petri
Bilbray	Guinta	Pitts
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Hall	Poe (TX)
Black	Hanna	Pompeo
Blackburn	Harper	Posey
Bonner	Harris	Price (GA)
Bono Mack	Hartzler	Quayle
Boustany	Hastings (WA)	Reed
Brady (TX)	Hayworth	Rehberg
Brooks	Heck	Reichert
Broun (GA)	Heller	Renacci
Buchanan	Hensarling	Ribble
Bucshon	Herger	Rigell
Buerkle	Herrera Beutler	Rivera
Burgess	Huelskamp	Roby
Burton (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Calvert	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Camp	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Campbell	Hurt	Rogers (MI)
Canseco	Issa	Rohrabacher
Cantor	Jenkins	Rokita
Capito	Johnson (IL)	Rooney
Carter	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Cassidy	Johnson, Sam	Ross (FL)
Chabot	Kelly	Royce
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Runyan
Coble	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Coffman (CO)	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Cole	Kiame	Schilling
Conaway	Labrador	Schmidt
Cravaack	Lamborn	Schock
Crawford	Lance	Schweikert
Crenshaw	Landry	Scott (SC)
Culberson	Lankford	Scott, Austin
Davis (KY)	LaTourrette	Sensenbrenner
Denham	Latta	Sessions
Dent	Lee (NY)	Shimkus
DesJarlais	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Dold	LoBiondo	Simpson
Dreier	Long	Smith (NE)
Duffy	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Duncan (TN)	Lungren, Daniel	Southerland
Ellmers	E.	Stearns
Farenthold	Mack	Stivers
Fincher	Marchant	Stutzman
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Sullivan
Flake	McCaul	Terry
Fleischmann	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
Fleming	McCotter	Thornberry
Flores	McHenry	Tiberi
Forbes	McKeon	Turner
Fortenberry	McKinley	Upton
Sarbanes	McMorris	Walberg
Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	Walden
Frelinghuysen	Meehan	Walsh (IL)
Gallely	Mica	Webster
Gardner	Miller (FL)	West
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Gerlach	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Gibson	Myrick	Wolf
Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer	Womack
Gohmert	Noem	Woodall
Goodlatte	Nugent	Yoder
Gosar	Nunnelee	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Olson	Young (FL)
Granger	Palazzo	Young (IN)
Graves (GA)	Paul	

NOT VOTING—33

Baca	Garamendi	Loeb sack
Boswell	Giffords	Lummis
Capps	Heinrich	Manzullo
Capuano	Hinchey	McCarthy (CA)
Cooper	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
Costa	Holden	Nunes
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Doggett	King (IA)	Speier
Doyle	Larsen (WA)	Tipton
Emerson	Larson (CT)	Welch
Frank (MA)	Latham	Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1406

Ms. GRANGER changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WAXMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 24, I missed the vote inadvertently due to a constituent meeting in my office. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 24, because I was having a root canal, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 24, I was with a Medal of Honor winner. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 160, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—239

Adams	Dold	Johnson (OH)
Aderholt	Donnelly (IN)	Johnson, Sam
Akin	Dreier	Jordan
Alexander	Duffy	Kelly
Altmire	Duncan (SC)	King (NY)
Amash	Duncan (TN)	Kingston
Austria	Ellmers	Kinzinger (IL)
Bachmann	Farenthold	Kline
Bachus	Fincher	Labrador
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn
Bartlett	Flake	Lance
Barton (TX)	Fleischmann	Landry
Bass (NH)	Fleming	Lankford
Benishek	Flores	LaTourette
Berg	Forbes	Latta
Biggert	Fortenberry	Lee (NY)
Billray	Fox	Lewis (CA)
Bilirakis	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Bishop (UT)	Frelinghuysen	Long
Black	Galleghy	Lucas
Blackburn	Gardner	Luetkemeyer
Bonner	Garrett	Lummis
Bono Mack	Gerlach	Lungren, Daniel
Boren	Gibbs	E.
Boustany	Gibson	Mack
Brady (TX)	Greigey (GA)	Marchant
Brooks	Gohmert	Marino
Broun (GA)	Goodlatte	Matheson
Buchanan	Gosar	McCaul
Buschon	Gowdy	McClintock
Buerkle	Granger	McCotter
Burgess	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Burton (IN)	Graves (MO)	McKeon
Calvert	Griffin (AR)	McKinley
Camp	Griffith (VA)	McMorris
Campbell	Grimm	Rodgers
Canseco	Guinta	Meehan
Cantor	Guthrie	Mica
Capito	Hall	Miller (FL)
Carter	Hanna	Miller (MI)
Cassidy	Harper	Mulvaney
Chabot	Harris	Murphy (PA)
Chaffetz	Hartzler	Myrick
Chandler	Hastings (WA)	Neugebauer
Coble	Hayworth	Noem
Coffman (CO)	Heck	Nugent
Cole	Heller	Nunnelee
Conaway	Hensarling	Olson
Cravaack	Herrera Beutler	Palazzo
Crawford	Huelskamp	Paul
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Paulsen
Cuellar	Hultgren	Pearce
Culberson	Hunter	Pence
Davis (KY)	Hurt	Petri
Denham	Issa	Pitts
Dent	Jenkins	Platts
DesJarlais	Johnson (IL)	Poe (TX)

Pompeo	Ryan (WI)
Posey	Scalise
Price (GA)	Schiff
Quayle	Schilling
Rahall	Schmidt
Reed	Schock
Rehberg	Schweikert
Reichert	Scott (SC)
Renacci	Scott, Austin
Ribble	Sensenbrenner
Rigell	Sessions
Rivera	Shimkus
Roby	Shuler
Roe (TN)	Shuster
Rogers (AL)	Simpson
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)
Rokita	Southerland
Rooney	Stearns
Ross (AR)	Stivers
Ross (FL)	Stutzman
Royce	Sullivan
Runyan	Terry

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

NAYS—160

Ackerman	Harman
Andrews	Hastings (FL)
Baldwin	Himes
Barrow	Hirono
Bass (CA)	Holt
Becerra	Honda
Berkley	Hoyer
Berman	Inslee
Bishop (GA)	Israel
Bishop (NY)	Jackson (IL)
Blumenauer	Jackson Lee
Brady (PA)	(TX)
Brown (FL)	Johnson (GA)
Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.
Cardoza	Jones
Carnahan	Kaptur
Carney	Keating
Carson (IN)	Kildee
Castor (FL)	Kind
Chu	Kissell
Cicilline	Kucinich
Clarke (MI)	Langevin
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)
Clay	Lee (CA)
Cleaver	Levin
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)
Cohen	Lipinski
Connolly (VA)	Lofgren, Zoe
Conyers	Lowe
Costello	Lujan
Courtney	Lynch
Critz	Maloney
Crowley	Markey
Cummings	Matsui
Davis (CA)	McCarthy (NY)
Davis (IL)	McCollum
DeGette	McDermott
DeLauro	McGovern
Deutch	McIntyre
Dicks	McNerney
Dingell	Meeks
Edwards	Michaud
Ellison	Miller (NC)
Engel	Miller, George
Eshoo	Moore
Farr	Moran
Fattah	Murphy (CT)
Filner	Nadler
Fudge	Napolitano
Gonzalez	Neal
Green, Al	Olver
Green, Gene	Pallone
Grijalva	Pascrell
Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)
Hanabusa	Payne

NOT VOTING—35

Baca	Frank (MA)
Boswell	Garamendi
Braley (IA)	Giffords
Capps	Heinrich
Capuano	Herger
Cooper	Higgins
Costa	Hinche
DeFazio	Hinojosa
Diaz-Balart	Holden
Doggett	King (IA)
Doyle	Larson (CT)
Emerson	Latham

Pelosi	Perlmutter
Peters	Pingree (ME)
Polis	Price (NC)
Quigley	Rangel
Reyes	Richardson
Richardson	Richmond
Rothman (NJ)	Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger	Rush
Ryan (OH)	Sánchez, Linda
Sánchez, Loretta	T.
Sarbanes	Schakowsky
Schakowsky	Schrader
Schwartz	Scott (VA)
Scott (VA)	Scott, David
Serrano	Sewell
Sherman	Sires
Slaughter	Smith (WA)
Stark	Sutton
Thompson (CA)	Thompson (MS)
Tierney	Tonko
Towns	Tsongas
Velázquez	Visclosky
Walz (MN)	Wasserman
Schultz	Waters
Watt	Waxman
Weiner	Weiner
Wilson (FL)	Woolsey
Wu	Yarmuth

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 25, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I regret missing a floor vote on Wednesday, January 26, 2011 due to a ceremony honoring Staff Sergeant Salvatore Guinta. Had I registered my vote, I would have voted: "nay" on rollcall 25, on final passage of H.R. 359—To reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I missed two votes today because of weather-related conditions. If I had been here, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 24 and "yea" on rollcall No. 25.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, 2011 I missed rollcall votes 22 and 23, due to a family emergency. Had I been present on rollcall vote 22, I would have voted "no" or "nay". Had I been present on rollcall vote 23, I would have voted "yes" or "aye." Had I been present on rollcall vote 24, I would have voted "yes" or "aye." Had I been present on rollcall vote 25, I would have voted "no" or "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for several votes taken on the House floor earlier today. As a result, I missed rollcall Votes Nos 23, 24, and 25. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: rollcall No. 23: "yea"; rollcall No. 24: "yea"; rollcall No. 25: "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following rollcall votes on January 26, 2011 and would like the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 23: "yes"; rollcall No. 24: "yes"; rollcall No. 25: "no."

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.J. RES. 22

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove all cosponsors of H.J. Res. 22.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Ethics:

JANUARY 26, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC 20515.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: This letter is to notify you that as of close of business today I am resigning as the Ranking Member of the Committee on Ethics.

Sincerely,

ZOE LOFGREN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
Washington, DC, January 26, 2011.

Speaker of the House JOHN BOEHNER,
U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: This letter is to advise you that, effective today, I am taking a leave of absence from the Committee on Small Business until my tenure on the Committee on the Budget is completed. It is my understanding from Clause C of Rule 19 of the Democratic Caucus rules (referenced below) that I will continue to accrue seniority during the leave of absence, at the same rate as if I had continued to serve on the Committee on Small Business.

Rule 19, Clause C: "Any Member of the Committee on the Budget shall be entitled to take a leave of absence from service on any committee or subcommittee during the period he or she serves on the Budget Committee and seniority rights of such Member on such committee and on each subcommittee to which such Member was assigned at the time shall be fully protected as if such Member had continued to so serve during the period of the leave of absence."

Accompanying this letter is a letter from the Democratic Leader verifying that my seniority on the Committee on Small Business will continue to accrue during my absence.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

HEATH SHULER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 62

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON ETHICS.—Ms. Linda T. Sánchez of California, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Yarmuth, Ms. Edwards, and Mr. Pierluisi.

(2) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Mr. Peters, Mr. Owens, and Mr. Keating.

(3) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Mr. Donnelly of Indiana, Mr. Walz of Minnesota, Mr. Barrow, and Mr. Carnahan.

Mr. BECERRA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
Mr. THOMPSON, California
Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Illinois
Mr. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
Mr. SCHIFF, California
Mr. BOREN, Oklahoma
Mr. GUTIERREZ, Illinois
Mr. CHANDLER, Kentucky

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to sections 5580 and 5581 of the revised statutes (20 U.S.C. 42-43), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution:

Mr. JOHNSON, Texas
Mr. LATOURETTE, Ohio

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. TURNER, Ohio, Chairman
Mr. SHIMKUS, Illinois
Mr. SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
Mr. MILLER, Florida
Mrs. EMERSON, Missouri
Ms. GRANGER, Texas
Mr. BILIRAKIS, Florida

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE DEMOCRACY PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of

the following Members of the House to the House Democracy Partnership:

Mr. DREIER, California, Chairman
Mr. FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
Mrs. BIGGERT, Illinois
Mr. CONAWAY, Texas
Mr. BUCHANAN, Florida
Mr. BOUSTANY, Louisiana
Mr. WILSON, South Carolina
Mr. ROSKAM, Illinois
Mr. CRENSHAW, Florida
Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Florida

APPOINTMENT AS DIRECTOR OF CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 201(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 601), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces that the Speaker and President pro tempore of the Senate hereby jointly appoint Dr. Douglas W. Elmendorf as Director of the Congressional Budget Office for the term expiring January 3, 2015.

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week, January 23 to 29, is National School Choice Week. Earlier this week in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, students, parents, and legislators from both parties and varying walks of life, from across the commonwealth, gather to rally for school choice in the State capitol.

Every day, tens of thousands of children attend schools where quality education is not being offered. Meanwhile, those that defend the status quo claim that, if we just do more of the same, at some point schools will improve. Throughout the laboratories of democracy in this great Nation, concerned parents are moving forward with a different vision which is better for our children.

So as we continue in this new 112th Congress, let's make a commitment for America's parents that they will not be forced to send their children to low-quality schools without other choices. Let's provide parents with options, whether they are public, private, charter, home, or cyber schools, for the education that is the best fit for their children.

Children don't have the luxury of waiting for change. For today's students, reform only works if it takes place while they are still in school.

I commend those back home that are standing up for our children. And I will do in my part here in Washington to support their efforts, not just this week, but always, in order to ensure that each child has the opportunity to live up to his or her individual learning potential.

□ 1420

A PLAN FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago, this House voted to eliminate one of the anchors of democracy: allowing Americans to check off on their IRS filing form \$3—just \$3—to promote and support the democratic process of electing the President of the United States, all in the name of deficit reduction.

But deficit reduction doesn't work without a plan. It doesn't work without thinking about the many State Departments of Transportation that can no longer fix the highways and freeways in your community; or that can promote rail mobility in order to take cars off the road; or that can, in fact, keep the doors of community colleges open; or that can support primary education while State legislatures are struggling to find resources to provide for teachers and students.

So let me say this: I want to work with you on deficit reduction. In fact, I've done it before but not without a plan. I believe that investing in the infrastructure of America is a plan that will allow jobs to be created. That's the serious way of dealing with moving America forward and allowing for the genius of America—having a plan that responds to building America and not making false projections about saving money.

HONORING SHERIFF JAMES A. ALDERDEN

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sheriff James A. Alderden. Sheriff Alderden served as Sheriff of Larimer County in my congressional district from January, 1999, until his recent retirement on January 10, 2011.

Sheriff Alderden served the State of Colorado in various capacities prior to becoming Sheriff of Larimer County. His resume includes periods of work for the Colorado Bureau of Investigations, the Colorado State University Police Department, as well as the Steamboat Springs Police Department. His career is a shining example of dedication to the State of Colorado.

In addition to having a great sense of humor, he is a leader. He has great respect and gives his colleagues great respect. Sheriff Alderden would incorporate all employees into the decision-making process by giving them the respect and authority they deserve to identify problems and to correct them.

As his lasting legacy, he implemented the police department's motto of serving with the acronym PRIDE, which stands for Professionalism, Respect, Integrity, Duty, and Empowerment. Sheriff Alderden embodied these

virtues throughout his career. He also personifies these virtues on a personal level.

It is my great honor to stand here on the House floor honoring Sheriff Jim Alderden and thanking him for his service.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. BRADY, Texas, Chairman
Mr. BURGESS, Texas
Mr. CAMPBELL, California
Mr. DUFFY, Wisconsin
Mr. AMASH, Michigan
Mr. MULVANEY, South Carolina

HONORING HOUSE STAFFER MIKE WIEHE FOR HIS PUBLIC SERVICE

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, as elected officials, all of us who serve in this Chamber have the honor of representing our constituents in public service. And as elected officials, we are also fortunate that some of our best and most able Americans choose to serve their Nation and their communities by working in our offices as congressional staffers.

In my office, I have a staffer who is leaving who I want to recognize here today.

Mike Wiehe first began working for me when I served as Mayor of Dayton and has continued to work for me and for the best interests of his community for the greater part of 12 years now.

Mike is a native of Celina, Ohio, and is a graduate of Celina Senior High School and of Wright State University. He has held literally almost every single position in my office: serving as scheduler, communications director, legislative assistant, military legislative assistant, legislative director, acting chief of staff, and finally, as district director and director of military affairs. He has excelled in each of these roles by always performing his job well and by leading his fellow staffers by example.

Mike's last day in my office will be January 31. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Mike for his tremendous service and for the huge sacrifices that he has made over the years in pursuit of public service.

Mike, we wish you all the best in all your future endeavors.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

THE "RIDE PAST THE WRECKAGE" IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, President Obama gave a stirring speech last night, most of which I agreed with, especially the calls for defense cuts; the investments in innovation, education, and infrastructure; and the elimination of oil company subsidies.

But given the sacrifice endured by the American people, I thought Afghanistan got short shrift—a mere two paragraphs.

The American Prospect magazine described the State of the Union as a "ride past the wreckage." I think that was because it applies to the State of the Union's treatment of Afghanistan.

The fact is that the training of Afghan security forces has been slow and ineffective. The inspector general for Afghanistan reconstruction said as much this very week. The Taliban remains a vital force in many pockets of Afghanistan, and the head of the Afghan NGO safety office reports a very precarious security situation.

The President was correct when he said that Afghanistan will need to provide better governance, but it's hard to see that happening with President Karzai regularly lashing out at us and, at one point, saying he would choose the Taliban over the United States and the international community.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are tired of being talked down to about this war, tired of being told everything is fine and under control, tired of being urged to stay the course, tired of talk about progress that seems to be little more than an illusion.

The President reiterated last night that we will begin to bring our troops home in July, but there's plenty of evidence to suggest we're ramping up this war instead of winding it down.

Earlier this month, for example, 1,400 additional marine combat forces were deployed, with the possibility of additional mini-surges during the spring, that would push our troop levels in Afghanistan to the 100,000 mark.

We're also using heavily armored tanks for the first time, and there are reports that we're considering expanding the war across the border in an unprecedented way, with risky and dangerous special operations ground raids into Pakistan.

Does this sound like a war that's drawing to a close?

Then in a trip to Afghanistan a few weeks ago, the Vice President suggested to his hosts that the occupation

could extend beyond 2014. "We're not leaving if you don't want us to leave," he said. He should check out recent polling that indicates the Afghan people's deep skepticism, if not downright hostility, regarding the United States' military presence in their country.

Besides, what about what the American people believe? When are we going to respect their point of view? They're the ones paying for this war in blood and treasure, and clear majorities believe that this war has outlived its usefulness and that it's not worth fighting.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, to listen to the American people. There is only one sensible and humane solution: That is to bring our troops home and bring them home now.

□ 1430

**POLICE OFFICER ANN NONETTE
O'DONNELL, UNIT 429**

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Christmas Eve, 2010, about 1 month ago, most Americans were with their families and their friends enjoying the holiday season, the joy and happiness of being together at that special time of the year. But holidays do not come for peace officers; they work all the time, especially on holidays. One such officer was Ann O'Donnell. She was a University of Houston police officer. She liked to call herself "Unit 429." She was on patrol December 24, 2010, about 1 o'clock in the morning. She was the first to respond to a possible kidnapping in the Houston area. She sped to the scene, but her vehicle went out of control and she crashed and was killed.

This is a photograph of Officer Ann O'Donnell, 24 years of age. Her father, Jim O'Donnell, who was close to his daughter, normally talked to his daughter sometime between 2 o'clock and 4 o'clock in the morning those nights that she worked. On this day, this Christmas Eve, he received no such phone call from his daughter.

Ann was a resident of Houston, Texas, and Galveston, Texas. She had been a peace officer for only 13 months. She loved being a Texas police officer, and Mr. Speaker, she was good at it. She is the daughter of Nonette and Jim O'Donnell. Her father, Jim, said about his daughter, "Ann will never experience the joys of marriage, having her own children to cherish and to grow by her example." As a father of four kids, three of them daughters, three of them about the same age as Ann, I understand the close relationship between a father and a daughter. That is a special relationship. But no parent wants to lose their child before their time.

Ann was a compassionate police officer. She not only arrested the bad guys; once she arrested an underage

minor for an alcohol offense. Rather than send this child to detention, she called the parents and got the parents involved in this child's life. She was from Ball High School in Galveston, Texas. She went to the University of Houston and Galveston College. In her youth, she learned from the Galveston County police officers about being a peace officer. She wanted not only to capture outlaws, but to help the good people of our community.

Mr. Speaker, police officers are the last strand of wire in the fence between the fox and the chickens, and Officer O'Donnell was one of those officers. They, like Ann, do society's dirty work, and they go and serve and are first responders to public safety. Ann was such a person.

Ann was the 252nd female police officer killed in the line of duty in this country since 1796. Already this year, in 2011, 14 police officers in our country have given their lives for the rest of us. Ann died protecting and serving the people of Texas, and at Ann's funeral 500 police officers paid her honor in the rain. Harvey Rice of the Houston Chronicle said it best about her funeral, "Officers filed out of the church while the bells tolled 'Hark The Herald Angels Sing.'" The officers re-formed ranks and stood at attention again in the rain as the casket was carried down the steps and placed in a black hearse. At the cemetery, the rain-drenched officers again gathered as a riderless horse followed the casket to the grave site and bagpipes played "Amazing Grace." Officers fired a 21-gun salute, and two buglers played "Taps."

Amazing person, this Officer Ann O'Donnell. We admire her and thank her for being a Texas peace officer, and for her life that she gave for the people. We mourn her loss, but Mr. Speaker, we are grateful that such a person as Officer O'Donnell ever lived.

And that's just the way it is.

**SLAIN MIAMI-DADE POLICE
OFFICERS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to also honor our first responders killed in the line of duty, two brave south Florida police officers shot and killed just this past week. Miami-Dade County veteran detectives 41-year-old Roger Castillo and 44-year-old Amanda Haworth died last Thursday while protecting the community they love.

As part of a fugitive task force working with the U.S. Marshals Service, Officers Castillo and Haworth were members of a professional elite unit whose mission is to go after violent career criminals. Last week, they were attempting to arrest one such violent criminal. They were hunting a fugitive suspected of murdering another man simply for raising his voice with the

suspect. When police knocked on the door of a home where he was believed to be, the suspect opened fire, killing Officers Castillo and Haworth and injuring Officer Diedra Beecher.

Combined, Officers Castillo and Haworth dedicated 44 years to servicing the citizens of south Florida. They put their lives on the line every day to make us safer. And last Thursday, these two heroes made the ultimate sacrifice. We lost them to a senseless act of violence by someone with a total disregard for the lives of others. We grieve their loss not only to the community they served, but to the families and loved ones they leave behind.

A 21-year veteran on the force, family members say Detective Roger Castillo loved two things in this world, his family and his job. His wife of 15 years, Debbie, also works as a police officer. Officer Castillo leaves behind his three sons, 14-year-old Anthony, 11-year-old Michael, and 9-year-old Brian. A dedicated father, neighbors said that he was the kind of dad you would see on the front lawn tossing around a football with his boys.

Amanda Haworth spent 23 years on the force. A neighbor said the only thing she loved more than her job was her 13-year-old son, Austin. A single mom, Amanda Haworth would never miss her son's baseball games and would often practice with him in their backyard. Amanda Haworth was the first female detective ever killed in the line of duty in Miami-Dade County.

While I did not have the good fortune of knowing these two detectives, I know this: I know these were two exceptional individuals taken from us and lost too soon. These were incredible parents, ripped from their families before their time. They were excellent public servants trying to make our community a better place to live. We send our thoughts and prayers to heal their families.

To their families and loved ones, I struggle to find words that can offer solace and comfort in your time of distress. The great poet William Wordsworth once said, "Not without hope we suffer and we mourn." Perhaps he meant that we find hope in the belief that our thoughts and prayers will in time heal their families, and in the hope and belief that the children of Officers Castillo and Haworth will grow up knowing that their parents made this sacrifice to make their world and our world a better place. In the meantime, we will suffer and mourn.

After going through our own senseless tragedy with our colleague, GABBY GIFFORDS, we share in the pain of senseless loss and inexplicable violence. Officers Castillo and Haworth will be forever in the hearts of our community.

HOW THE 20-YEAR WAR STARTED

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, how did the 20-year war get started? It had been long assumed that the United States Government, shortly before Iraq invaded Kuwait in August of 1990, gave Saddam Hussein a green light to attack. A State Department cable recently published by WikiLeaks confirmed that U.S. Ambassador April Glaspie did indeed have a conversation with Saddam Hussein one week prior to Iraq's August 1, 1990, invasion of Kuwait. Amazingly, the released cable was entitled, "Saddam's Message of Friendship to President Bush." In it, Ambassador Glaspie affirmed to Saddam that "the President had instructed her to broaden and deepen our relations with Iraq." As Saddam Hussein outlined Iraq's ongoing border dispute with Kuwait, Ambassador Glaspie was quite clear that, "we took no position on these Arab affairs."

There would have been no reason for Saddam Hussein not to take this assurance at face value. The U.S. was quite supportive of his invasion and war of aggression against Iran in the 1980s. With this approval from the U.S. Government, it wasn't surprising that the invasion occurred. The shock and surprise was how quickly the tables were turned and our friend, Saddam Hussein, all of a sudden became Hitler personified.

The document was classified, supposedly to protect national security, yet this information in no way jeopardized our security. Instead, it served to keep the truth from the American people about an event leading up to our initial military involvement in Iraq and the region that continues to today.

□ 1440

The secrecy of the memo was designed to hide the truth from the American people and keep our government from being embarrassed.

This was the initial event that had led to so much death and destruction—not to mention the financial costs—these past 20 years. Our response and persistent militarism toward Iraq was directly related to 9/11, as our presence on the Arabian Peninsula—and in particular Saudi Arabia—was listed by al Qaeda as a major grievance that outraged the radicals who carried out the heinous attacks against New York and Washington on that fateful day.

Today, the conflict has spread through the Middle East and Central Asia with no end in sight.

The reason this information is so important is that if Congress and the American people had known about this green light incident 20 years ago, they would have been a lot more reluctant to give a green light to our government to pursue the current war—a war that is ongoing and expanding to this very day.

The tough question that remains is was this done deliberately to create the justification to redesign the Middle East, as many neo-conservatives desired, and to secure oil supplies for the West; or was it just a diplomatic blunder followed up by many more strategic military blunders? Regardless, we have blundered into a war that no one seems willing to end.

Julian Assange, the publisher of the WikiLeaks memo, is now considered an enemy of the state. Politicians are calling for drastic punishment and even assassination; and, sadly, the majority of the American people seem to support such moves.

But why should we so fear the truth? Why should our government's lies and mistakes be hidden from the American people in the name of patriotism? Once it becomes acceptable to equate truth with treason, we can no longer call ourselves a free society.

MAKING AMERICA FIRST

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the President for his message last night, and I especially would like to focus on one aspect of the message.

The President indicated to us that sitting together was important. It has great symbolism, and it's a positive thing; but he also indicated to us that this is not the final step in the process. Sitting together can never, never replace working together. So it is what we do today—last night he said tomorrow—sitting together tonight, he indicated, but working together tomorrow; this is where we have to focus our energies and efforts. We must work together. And if we're going to work together to fulfill what I believe is a great challenge—and that is America first, to make America number one—if we're going to make America first, America number one, we absolutely have to focus on education.

Education is important because the jobs, as we go forward, will require much more education than we have been allowed to have and have good jobs in the past. We must focus on education to have the good jobs that we want. And jobs are a priority for all of us.

Some statistical information is available to help us better understand why we need to focus on education.

Currently, about 25 percent of our students are completing high school. Over the next 10 years, half of all new jobs will require more than a high school education. If we compare our 15-year-olds to 15-year-olds around the world, we find that we are 20 when it comes to science literacy; China is number 13; Korea 3. The U.S. is number 28 when it comes to mathematics literacy among our 15-year-olds; China is number 1; Korea number 3. The U.S. is

ranked 16 when it comes to reading literacy among 15-year-olds, China is number 1, Korea number 2.

We must focus on and maintain an educated workforce. An educated workforce requires that we understand that we have to have quality teachers and that we are going to have to make sure that these teachers will invest in education themselves because they see it as a means by which they can have a livelihood.

I understand that most teachers don't teach simply because they want money. They teach because they want to be with children, and they want to see children learn. This is important. But teachers have to feed their families, too. I support making sure that teachers get a decent day's pay for a hard day's work. I support teachers and making sure that the teachers are available to educate our children.

If we're going to have America first, we have to have a first-rate health care system. We had a great sickness-care system. We were among the best when it came to sickness care. We spent a hundred billion dollars a year treating persons in emergency rooms, in facilities outside of primary care facilities.

But if we're going to be number one, we had to move away from the \$2.5 trillion that we were spending annually on health care, which translates into \$79,000 a second—17.6 percent of GDP—and by 2018 it would have become \$4.4 trillion per year—more than 20 percent of GDP—\$139,000 a second.

To have America first, we've got to educate our people and we've got to have them receive quality health care. Quality health care can never be underestimated because of the way it impacts the workplace.

America can be first. I stand for America first. I love America. And I stand here today to say to my colleagues across the aisle that I am willing and ready to reach out and work with you to help make America first because if America is first, not only is the United States a better place, but the world would be a better place because of the values that we hold so near and dear to us.

We believe in liberty and justice for all. We believe in government of the people, by the people, for the people. We believe that every person ought to succeed on his merits or fail on his demerits. That's what America gives to the world—the notion that there is a fair system that allows anyone to rise to the top, to reach the zenith of life, the best that life can offer. We take this to the world, and I want America to be first so that the world can benefit from what America has to offer.

Thank you, Mr. President, for your message. And I assure you I have taken the challenge that you have accorded us. I will work with others to make sure that we get beyond the symbolism of sitting together and move to working together which will make the difference in the lives of the people in this country and, indirectly, the people around the world.

God bless you, Mr. President, and God bless the United States of America.

TRIBUTE TO CORPORAL ERIC M. TORBERT, JR., U.S. MARINE CORPS, OF LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to remember and honor Corporal Eric M. Torbert, Jr., of Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

On December 18, 2010, Eric was killed by an explosion while conducting combat operations in the Helmand Province of Afghanistan.

In 2007, Eric displayed his willingness and enthusiasm to serve and defend his country by enlisting in the United States Marine Corps at Parris Island, South Carolina. He was then assigned to the 1st Combat Engineer Battalion, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, California. He deployed to Afghanistan in October in 2010.

Eric understood what it means to live a life with purpose. He served a cause greater than himself. He served the cause of liberty. Eric gave his life to bring hope to all freedom-loving people as did many marines before him in the 1st Marine Division.

Activated aboard the battleship Texas on February 1, 1941, the 1st Marine Division is the oldest, largest, and most decorated division in the United States Marine Corps with nine Presidential Unit Citations. Eric has joined this storied tradition of service and excellence.

Before deploying to Afghanistan, Eric married Marcelle L. Sebastian on June 12, 2010. Marcelle supported Eric when he joined the Marine Corps in 2007 and throughout his entire career. Her steadfast care and sacrificial love for Eric and our Nation deserve our sincerest gratitude.

□ 1450

Eric was a leader. He was a caring husband, a friend, a son, a brother, and a devoted member of a local band. He leaves behind family and friends proud of his service and his distinguished career in the military.

Eric earned a number of awards during his service in the Marine Corps, which demonstrates his commitment to our Nation and his professionalism as a marine. His personal service awards include the Purple Heart, Combat Action Ribbon, National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, and the Sea Service Deployment Ribbon.

May God grant to Eric's family the peace that surpasses all understanding. We grieve their loss. Our prayers and most heartfelt gratitude go out to them, and I offer them my deepest con-

dolences. I am humbled by the dedicated service and sacrifice of their loved one.

Eric's valor and service cost him his life, but his sacrifice will live on forever among the many dedicated heroes this Nation has called to defend freedom. He joins the revered ranks of the many thousands of men and women throughout American history who have given their lives to secure the freedom of the people of the United States of America and the freedom-loving people around the world. He is an inspiration to us all. *Semper Fidelis.*

SUPPORT BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, last night the President spoke to Congress and to the Nation about the need for increased funding for biomedical research, both to improve the quality of life of our Nation's citizens, and to generate new economic investment. He is right, and we must heed his call on this initiative.

Cancer research is a vital part of our Nation's biomedical research enterprise, but our Federal commitment to this promising field has not kept up with the rapid pace of scientific innovation. In fact, when you take into account medical inflation, our funding commitment to the National Cancer Institute and the National Institutes of Health has actually been cut over the past 7 years. We can, and must, do better.

We will only see new, promising cancer therapies that increase survival and life quality through a sustained, multi-year commitment of Federal funding for cancer research. There is only one failure in cancer research. It's when you quit or you're forced to quit because of lack of funding. When Federal cancer funding is cut or not sustained over the long term, we lose not only promising cancer research, but we also lose talented cancer researchers.

President Nixon recognized this 40 years ago when he signed the National Cancer Act. At that time, less than 50 percent of cancer patients lived 5 years beyond their diagnosis. Today, with advances in early detection, healthy lifestyles, and new cancer therapies, the survival rate is 65 percent for adults and 80 percent for kids. That would not have happened without a significant investment in Federal research funding. The National Cancer Act led to a continued, sustained investment in cancer research that funded the research community to develop a new generation of smart drugs that help thousands of cancer patients every single day.

Smart drugs are highly targeted to attack fast-growing cancer cells without damaging healthy cells. Drugs like herceptin for breast cancer, avastin for lung cancer, gleevec for gastrointestinal stromal tumors inhibit or

block cancer cell growth. In fact, less than 10 percent of cancer deaths are attributed to the original tumor. It's when cancer metastasizes, when it grows, when it advances to a vital organ the cancer becomes lethal.

All this could not be more important to the community that I serve in western New York. Buffalo, New York, gave the Nation and the world cancer research when the New York State Cancer Laboratory was first established by Dr. Roswell Park in 1897. Roswell Park Cancer Institute continues that mission today. And the research put out by doctors has led to many breakthroughs that alleviate suffering due to cancer every single day.

Roswell Park is one of 40 National Cancer Institute-designated comprehensive cancer centers around the country that are the engine for our Nation's war on cancer. An important part of Buffalo and western New York's future relies upon the success of research completed at Roswell and companies at the Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus coming to market, creating new small businesses, and high-quality jobs. If we don't have a sustained investment in cancer research moving forward, the promise of that research and the jobs it will create will be lost. The time to act is now. Cancer is estimated to cost our Nation \$263 billion in 2010 alone, according to the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support a renewed commitment to cancer research because there is no better time than now. Alleviating suffering and death due to cancer in our lifetime should not only be Congress's goal; it should be America's goal. And we should insist on a huge Federal investment toward that goal.

CITY OF HOPE 10,000TH BONE MARROW TRANSPLANT

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to City of Hope, a renowned biomedical research and treatment center in my district. On January 13, City of Hope reached a milestone few in the world have ever achieved. Doctors performed their 10,000th bone marrow transplant, 34 years after they completed one of the most successful transplants ever, and it was the first.

But this is more than just another milestone. This is a time to remember the thousands of children and adults who have benefited from City of Hope. Patients like Rodrigo Nunez, a Mexican immigrant who, at the age of 17, became ill. After a transplant and the kindness of the community, he graduated from college. He has proudly spent over two decades as a nurse at City of Hope.

Please join me in congratulating City of Hope for their achievement and wish them luck on the next 10,000.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HIGGINS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PITTS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROYCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. CHU, for 5 minutes, today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 2 p.m.

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 1 p.m.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

Concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent Resolution honoring the service and sacrifice of Staff Sergeant Salvatore Giunta, a native of Hiawatha, Iowa, and the first living recipient of the Medal of Honor since the Vietnam War; the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, 112th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 8, 2011, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

226. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Organizational Conflicts of Interest in Major Defense

Acquisition Programs (DFARS Case 2009-D015) (RIN: 0750-AG63) received January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

227. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

228. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

229. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman for External Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations (RIN: 3064-AD68) received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

230. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman for External Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations (RIN:3064-AD60) received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

231. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Withdrawal of Regulatory Guide 1.154, "Format and Content of Plant-Specific Pressurized Thermal Shock Safety Analysis Reports for Pressurized Water Reactors" [NRC-2011-XXXX] [7590-01-P] received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

232. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-113, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

233. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser 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.

234. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inmate Discipline Program/Special Housing Units: Subpart Revision and Clarification [Docket No.: BOP-1118-F] (RIN: 1120-AB18) received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

235. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 737-600, -700, -700C, -800, and -900 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0913; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-101-AD; Amendment 39-16545; AD 2010-26-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

236. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Model FU24-954 and FU24A-954 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1021; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-053-AD; Amendment 39-16541; AD 2010-26-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to

the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

237. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 747-100, 747-100B, 747-100B SUD, 747-200B, 747-200C, 747-200F, 747-300, 747SR, and 747SP Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1098; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-108-AD; Amendment 39-16532; AD 2010-24-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

238. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 747 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0674; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-012-AD; Amendment 39-16546; AD 2010-26-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

239. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hawker Beechcraft Corporation Models B200, B200GT, B300, and B300C Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1242; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-062-AD; Amendment 39-16542; AD 2010-26-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

240. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Models BR700-710A1-10; BR700-710A2-20; and BR700-710C4-11 Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0614; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-24-AD; Amendment 39-16538; AD 2010-25-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

241. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 747-200C, -200F, -400, -400D, and -400F Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0232; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-032-AD; Amendment 39-16549; AD 2010-26-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

242. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 767 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2010-0127; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-242-AD; Amendment 39-16547; AD 2010-26-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

243. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A321-211, -212, -231, and -232 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1201; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-081-AD; Amendment 39-16551; AD 2010-26-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

244. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Model S76A, B, and C Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1250; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-075-AD; Amendment 39-16548; AD 2010-26-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

245. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — DASSAULT AVIATION Model Falcon 10 Airplanes; Model FAN JET FALCON, FAN JET FALCON SERIES C, D, E, F, and G Airplanes; Model MYSTERE-FALCON 200 Airplanes; Model MYSTERE-FALCON 20-C5, 20-D5, 20-E5, and 20-F5 Airplanes; Model FALCON 2000 and FALCON 2000EX Airplanes; and Model MYSTERE-FALCON 50 and MYSTERE-FALCON 900 Airplanes, and FALCON 900EX Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0864; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-202-AD; Amendment 39-16544; AD 2010-26-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

246. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 777-200 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0430; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-148-AD; Amendment 39-16540; AD 2010-26-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

247. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Adjustment of Monetary Threshold for Reporting Rail Equipment Accidents/Incidents for Calendar Year 2011 [FRA-2008-0136, Notice No. 3] (RIN: 2130-ZA04) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

248. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Emergency Relief Dockets and Procedures for Handling Petitions for Emergency Waiver of Safety Regulations [Docket No.: FRA-2006-24838] (RIN: 2130-AB79) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

249. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Portland, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0719; Airspace Docket No. 10-ANM-8], pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

250. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30762; Amdt. 3407] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

251. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Feathering Propeller Systems for Light-Sport Aircraft Powered Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0812; Amendment No. 1-66] (RIN: 2120-AJ81) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

252. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Adjustment of Monetary Threshold for Reporting Rail Equipment Accidents/Incidents for Calendar year 2010 [FRA-2008-0136, Notice No. 1] (RIN: 2130-ZA02) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

253. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury,

transmitting the Department's final rule — Yamhill-Carlton Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2010-0002; T.D. TTB-87; Re: Notice No. 104] (RIN: 1513-AB65) received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

254. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Expansion of the Santa Maria Valley Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2010-0001; T.D. TTB-88; Re: Notice No. 103] (RIN: 1513-AB31) received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

255. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Supersession of Rev. Proc. 2008-52 and Modification of Rev. Proc. 97-27, Procedures for Automatic and non-Automatic Changes in Method of Accounting (Rev. Proc. 2011-14) received January 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

256. A letter from the Deputy Chief Counsel, Regulations and Security Standards, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Air Cargo Security Requirements; Compliance Dates; Amendment [Docket No.: TSA-2004-19515; Amendment Nos. 1544-7, 1546-4, and 1548-4] (RIN: 1625-AA52) received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

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 Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 447. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Small Business Innovation Research Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on 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. HIRONO:

H.R. 448. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on 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. HIRONO:

H.R. 449. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 450. A bill to repeal limitations imposed by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act on health-related tax benefits under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and to treat high deductible health plans as qualified health plans under such Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Com-

merce, 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. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 451. A bill to ensure that patients receive accurate health care information by prohibiting misleading and deceptive advertising or representation in the provision of health care services, and to require the identification of the license of health care professionals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JONES, Mr. LONG, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HALL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. COBLE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 452. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Energy and Commerce, 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 (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BACA, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BOREN, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 453. A bill to prohibit States from carrying out more than one Congressional redistricting after a decennial census and apportionment, to require States to conduct such redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 454. A bill to authorize the United States Capitol Police to reimburse local law enforcement agencies for protective services provided at official public Congressional events, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BOREN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. TERRY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HALL, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FLORES, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. NUGENT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CANSECO, and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 455. A bill to protect 10th Amendment rights by providing special standing for State government officials to challenge proposed regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 456. A bill to require the establishment of a Consumer Price Index for Elderly Consumers to compute cost-of-living increases for Social Security benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; 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. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 457. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to remove the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency's authority to disapprove after a permit has been issued by the Secretary of the Army under section 404 of such Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

H.R. 458. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct certain coeducational elementary and secondary schools to make available information on equality in school athletic programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. POSEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. REED, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. REHBERG, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 459. A bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States before the end of 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 460. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 461. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system to the South Utah Valley Electric Service District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THORNBERY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 462. A bill to terminate the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MACK, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 463. A bill to apply the Freedom of Information Act to the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation during any period that such entities are in conservatorship or receivership; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 464. A bill to prohibit United States contributions to the International Fund for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 465. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a pilot project on the use of educational assistance under programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs to defray training costs associated with the purchase of certain franchise enterprises; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 466. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 467. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for the travel expenses of a taxpayer's spouse who accompanies the taxpayer on business travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 468. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the reduction in the deductible portion of expenses for business meals and entertainment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. POLIS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 469. A bill to promote minimum State requirements for the prevention and treatment of concussions caused by participation in school sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BACA, and Mr. DREIER):

H.R. 470. A bill to further allocate and expand the availability of hydroelectric power generated at Hoover Dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOEHNER (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 471. A bill to reauthorize the DC opportunity scholarship program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 472. A bill to reauthorize the Impact Aid Program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 473. A bill to provide for the conveyance of approximately 140 acres of land in the Ouachita National Forest in Oklahoma to the Indian Nations Council, Inc., of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 474. A bill to prohibit the importation for sale of foreign-made flags of the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 475. A bill to take certain property in McIntosh County, Oklahoma, into trust for the benefit of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself,

Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. ADAMS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HELLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COOPER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction of State and local general sales taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 477. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exemption

from employer Social Security taxes with respect to previously unemployed individuals, and to extend the credit for the retention of such individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 478. A bill to require that all foreign terrorists with links to terrorist networks who attack the United States or its Government be considered enemy combatants to be tried by military tribunals instead of civilian courts; to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 479. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of George Henry White; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 480. A bill to establish programs to aid in the economic, environmental, and public health recovery of the Gulf States from the damage and harm caused by the blowout of the mobile offshore drilling unit Deepwater Horizon and the resulting degradation of the Gulf over time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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 Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 481. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for qualified conservation contributions which include National Scenic Trails; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 482. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide a uniform efficiency descriptor for covered water heaters; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H.R. 483. A bill to create an electronic employment eligibility verification system to ensure that all workers in the United States are legally able to work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, 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. DEUTCH (for himself and Mr. GRJALVA):

H.R. 484. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the personal privacy exemption in the Freedom of Information Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 485. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit which is dependent on enactment of State qualified scholarship tax credits and which is

allowed against the Federal income tax for charitable contributions to education investment organizations that provide assistance for elementary and secondary education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 486. A bill to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. HOLDEN):

H.R. 487. A bill to require 100 percent domestic content in green technologies purchased by Federal agencies or by States with Federal funds and in property eligible for the renewable energy production or investment tax credits; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DENT, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. KELLY, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 488. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 489. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the C.C. Cragin Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

H.R. 490. A bill to modify the boundaries of Cibola National Forest in the State of New Mexico, to transfer certain Bureau of Land Management land for inclusion in the Manzano Mountain Wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

H.R. 491. A bill to modify the boundaries of Cibola National Forest in the State of New Mexico, to transfer certain Bureau of Land Management land for inclusion in the national forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRJALVA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 492. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to require responsible parties to pay the full cost of offshore oil spills, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 493. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for forgiveness of certain overpayments of retired pay paid to deceased retired members of the Armed Forces following their death; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 494. A bill to authorize the President to reestablish the Civilian Conservation Corps as a means of providing gainful employment to unemployed and underemployed citizens of the United States through the performance of useful public work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGRON of California, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MARINO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 495. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide immunity for reports of suspected terrorist activity or suspicious behavior and response; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 496. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the carrying of a firearm near a place where a senior Federal official is holding an official public event or carrying out an official or representational duty, or where any person is campaigning for Federal elective office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. JONES, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGRON of California, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. BUERKLE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 497. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Ronald Wilson Reagan, the 40th President of the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 498. A bill to amend section 1502 of title 5, United States Code, to permit law enforcement officers to be candidates for sheriff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. ROSS of Florida):

H.R. 499. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the standard charitable mileage rate for delivery of meals to elderly, disabled, frail and at risk individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 500. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the manufacturer limitation on the number of new qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicles eligible for credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HOLT, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 501. A bill to provide for the implementation of the recommendations of the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling, 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 Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 502. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Fund to assist United States businesses with exporting clean energy technology products and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 503. A bill to provide whistleblower protections to certain workers in the offshore oil and gas industry; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 504. A bill to provide immunity from civil liability to first responders engaged in lawful efforts to prevent acts of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 505. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to place limitations on the possession, sale, and other disposition of a firearm by persons convicted of misdemeanor sex offenses against children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 506. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to eliminate Congressional review of newly-passed District laws; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. PETRI (for himself and Mr. WU):

H.R. 507. A bill to increase assessment accuracy to better measure student achievement and provide States with greater flexibility on assessment design; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 508. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the child tax credit and to allow for adjustments for inflation with respect to the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REHBERG (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. HELLER, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 509. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that Act shall not apply to the gray wolf (*canis lupus*); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. REHBERG (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. LABRADOR):

H.R. 510. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to prohibit treatment of gray wolves in Idaho and Montana as endangered species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 511. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation of

various injurious species of constrictor snakes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 512. A bill to encourage students from American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and the United States Virgin Islands to become civically engaged through local and Federal government fellowships; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. WALSH of Illinois):

H.R. 513. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to transfer individuals detained by the United States at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and certain other enemy belligerents to the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan):

H.R. 514. A bill to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 relating to access to business records, individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers, and roving wiretaps until December 8, 2011; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 515. A bill to reauthorize the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, 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. WOLF (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 516. A bill to establish a strategy to encourage manufacturing in the United States and for the repatriation of manufacturing jobs off-shored to other countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, the Judiciary, Ways and Means, 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 Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia):

H.R. 517. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to eliminate the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to deny or restrict the use of a defined area as a dredged or fill material disposal site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Indian tribes to re-

ceive charitable contributions of apparently wholesome food; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KLINE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution reaffirming "In God We Trust" as the official motto of the United States and supporting and encouraging the public display of the national motto in all public buildings, public schools, and other government institutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BONO MACK:

H. Res. 57. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nations and other international governmental organizations shall not be allowed to exercise control over the Internet; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Res. 58. A resolution expressing support for designation of the first Saturday in January after Congress reconvenes as "National Congress on your Corner Day"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. WEINER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. RUSH):

H. Res. 59. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the democratic Constitution of the Republic of India and United States-India relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. DICKS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CHU, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H. Res. 60. A resolution urging the Secretary of State to remove the People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran from the Department of State's list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. REED, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BACA, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H. Res. 61. A resolution supporting the contributions of Catholic schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H. Res. 62. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H. Res. 63. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Student Financial Aid Awareness Month to raise awareness of student financial aid; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr.

FARR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Res. 64. A resolution honoring the life and work of Robert Sargent Shriver; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H. Res. 65. A resolution recognizing the 16th anniversary of the Future Leaders Exchange (FLEX) program, a program funded by the Government of the United States to provide an opportunity for high school students from the countries of the former Soviet Union to study and live in the United States in order to promote democratic values and institutions in Eurasia, and supporting the mission, goals, and accomplishments of the FLEX program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H. Res. 66. A resolution supporting the establishment and full funding of a staff exchange program between the House of Representatives and the Parliament of Ukraine, the Verkhovna Rada, as soon as possible; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr.

POLIS, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. GARDNER):

H. Res. 67. A resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit bills and joint resolutions from containing more than one subject; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H. Res. 68. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Hockey is For Everyone Month"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' 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 Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LOEBBACH, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. SUTTON):

H. Res. 69. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of February 7 through February 11, 2011, as "National School Counseling Week"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H. Res. 70. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of any bill or joint resolution carrying more than one subject; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H. Res. 71. A resolution honoring the life of Dr. D. James Kennedy; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

tives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 447.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 8.

By Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 448.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 8.

By Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 449.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 8.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 450.

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, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 451.

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. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 452.

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

The repeal of this provision is consistent with the powers that are reserved to the States and to the people as expressed in Amendment X to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SHULER:

H.R. 453.

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

Article I, Section 4, of the Constitution expressly provides Congress with the power to enact laws governing the time, place, and manner of elections for Members of the House of Representatives. This express grant of power would appear to permit Congress to limit the number of times states can conduct congressional districting and to prescribe how such districting is conducted.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 454.

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

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7, which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 455.

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

This bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the people, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 9, Clause 6 which prohibits the regulation of commerce which favors one state over another.

This bill is enacted pursuant to Amendment IX of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 456.

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. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 457.

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

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 458.

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

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 459.

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

This legislation is authorized by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: "To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures" and "To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States".

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 460.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 2.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 461.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the 10th Amendment.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 462.

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

Clause 1 Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 463.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 2; and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 464.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 2.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 465.

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

Clause 1, Section 8, Article 1 of the Constitution, which states, "The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the common

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representa-

Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . .”

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 466.

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

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

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 467.

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

Article I, § 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 468.

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

Article I, § 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 469.

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

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 470.

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

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H.R. 471.

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

Clause 1 and Clause 17 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 472.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 473.

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

Clause II, Section III, Article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 474.

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

Clause III, Section VIII, Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 475.

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

Clause I, Section VIII, Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 476.

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

Article I, Section 7: “All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives . . .”

Article I, Section 8: “The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises. . .”

Amendment XVI (16th Amendment): “The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.”

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 477.

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

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

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 478.

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

The constitutional authority on which this resolution rests is the power of Congress as enumerated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 479.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 480.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause (1) and Clause (3).

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 481.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 482.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to its authority under Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution to regulate commerce among the several states.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 483.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 484.

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

The First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 485.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 486.

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

Article I, Section 8:

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

“To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

“To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

“To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

“To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

“To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

“To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

“To constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

“To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations;

“To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

“To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

“To provide and maintain a Navy;

“To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

“To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

“To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

“To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 487.

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

Article 1—The Legislative Branch, Section 8—Powers of Congress:

“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;

“To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

“To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

“To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

“To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

“To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

“To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

“To constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

“To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations;

“To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

“To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

“To provide and maintain a Navy;

“To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

“To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

“To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing

such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

“To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 488.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 489.

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

Article I, Sec. 8, to exercise exclusive legislation over federal lands in addition to the Congressional power to control obstructions to navigable waters, including dams, and the historical doctrine recognizing that the States possess dominion over the beds of all navigable streams within their borders, and the servitude that Congress' power to regulate commerce imposes upon such streams. *United States v. Chandler-Dunbar Co.*, 229 U.S. 53, 73 (U.S. 1913) (recognizing Congressional authority over dams obstructing navigable waters and the re-sale of hydroelectric water power). See also *Arizona v. California*, 283 U.S. 423 (U.S. 1931) (Court deferred to Congress for establishment of the Boulder Canyon Project Act and reasoning that “As the river is navigable and the means which the Act provides are not unrelated to the control of navigation . . . the erection and maintenance of such dam and reservoir are clearly within the powers conferred upon Congress. . . . And the fact that purposes other than navigation will also be served could not invalidate the exercise of the authority conferred, even if those other purposes would not alone have justified an exercise of congressional power.” Finally, the Court has construed Congressional regulation over navigable waters broadly concluding that “that authority is as broad as the needs of commerce. *United States v. Appalachian Power Co.*, 311 U.S., 407, 409-410 (U.S. 1940).

By Mr. HEINRICH:

H.R. 490.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

H.R. 491.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 492.

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

Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 493.

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 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 494.

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, specifically Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States), Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate commerce among the several states), and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 495.

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.”

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: “The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 496.

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. LATTA:

H.R. 497.

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

Clause 6, Section 8, Article 1, which states “The Congress shall have the power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.”

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 498.

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

Amendment I to the United States Constitution, which states “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 499.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which states “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.”

Amendment XVI to the United States Constitution, which states “The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.”

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 500.

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

This bill makes changes to existing law relating to Article 1, Section 7 which provides that “All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.”

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 501.

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

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

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 502.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 503.

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

Clauses 3 and 18 of Section 8, Article I, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 504.

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

The U.S. Constitution—Article 1, Section 8—“The Congress shall . . . provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States . . .”

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 505.

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

Clauses 3 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 506.

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

Clause 17 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 507.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 508.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 509.

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

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: “The Congress shall have

Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

The specific Constitutional Authority cited here is not intended and should not be construed to be exclusive of any other general or specific Constitutional Authority that is otherwise applicable.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 510.

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

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: “The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

The specific Constitutional Authority cited here is not intended and should not be construed to be exclusive of any other general or specific Constitutional Authority that is otherwise applicable.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 511.

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

Article 1 Section 8: “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes;”

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 512.

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

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 513.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 and Article I, Section 9 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 514.

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

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 515.

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

The constitutional authorities on which this bill rests are those given in Article I, Section 5, Clause 2; Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; Article I, Section 8, Clause 4; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 516.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate foreign and interstate commerce, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 517.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulate commerce, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 518.

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

Article I: Section 8: “The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes . . .

[and] to regulate Commerce . . . among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 4: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 10: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LONG, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. WEBSTER.

H.R. 21: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 24: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 27: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PAYNE, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 97: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. AUSTRIA, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 100: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 110: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 127: Mr. WOODALL, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FORBES, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 153: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 177: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 178: Mr. WU, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 181: Mr. WU, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 190: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 191: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 192: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 198: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 263: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 300: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 306: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 308: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 317: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 321: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 333: Mr. LANCE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BACA, and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 337: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. KELLY.

H.R. 343: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 358: Mr. HARPER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 365: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. DENT, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 371: Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 372: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. RIVERA, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 389: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LONG, and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 397: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 402: Mr. RUSH, Mr. FARR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

H.R. 410: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 412: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 413: Mr. POLIS, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 414: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 416: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. WEINER, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 417: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 431: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 440: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 445: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.J. Res. 4: Mr. TIPTON.

H.J. Res. 10: Mr. ALTMIRE.

H. Res. 19: Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 20: Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Res. 21: Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 40: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. BUERKLE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. LATTA, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. GARRETT.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. AKIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HALL, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MICA, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS

of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WEST-MORELAND, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 359

OFFERED BY: MR. WALZ OF MINNESOTA

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Mr. Walz of Minnesota moves to recommit the bill H.R. 359 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT.

(a) DISQUALIFIED ENTITY.—Section 9003 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) DISQUALIFIED ENTITY.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘disqualified entity’ means any entity that has not entered into a campaign disclosure agreement with the Department of the Treasury.

“(2) CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT.—The term ‘campaign disclosure agreement’ means an agreement in which the entity agrees—

“(A) to file disclosure statements with the Internal Revenue Service at such times, and covering such periods, as are required under section 527(j)(2),

“(B) with respect to its receipt of payment for electioneering communications from covered persons on or after January 1, 2013, to include within those disclosure statements—

“(i) the amount, date, and purpose of each payment and the name and address of the covered person making the payment, and

“(ii) the name and address of each disqualified contributor making a payment on or after January 1, 2013, to the covered person (including the occupation and name of employer of such individual) and the amount and date of each payment, and

“(C) to pay damages to the Secretary for failure to comply with these disclosure requirements in an amount equal to 35 percent of the amount that was required to be disclosed.

“(3) DISQUALIFIED CONTRIBUTOR.—The term ‘disqualified contributor’ means—

“(A) any person who makes payments (directly or indirectly) of more than \$100,000 to the covered person during the calendar year, and

“(B) any foreign individual, foreign corporation, or foreign country who makes any payment (directly or indirectly) to the covered person during the calendar year.

A payment that is deposited into an account of a covered person that is not available for electioneering communications shall not be taken into account for purposes of the preceding sentence.

“(4) ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATION.—The term ‘electioneering communication’ means a communication that—

“(A) refers to a clearly identified candidate for any Federal public office,

“(B) reflects a view on such candidate or on the record of such candidate, and

“(C) is made within 30 days of a general election or a primary election.

“(5) COVERED PERSON.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘covered person’ means any of the following persons:

“(i) Any foreign individual, corporation, partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, trust or similar entity or foreign country.

“(ii) Any domestic corporation, partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, trust or similar entity.

“(iii) Any person described in section 501(c) and exempt from tax under section 501(a).

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any person if the aggregate payments for electioneering communications during the calendar year by such person does not exceed \$25,000.”

(b) CONDITION.—Subsection (a) of section 9003 of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting “, and”, and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) agree to not make any payment to a disqualified entity for print, broadcast, cable, or satellite communications.”

(c) PRESERVATION OF FUNDS FOR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES.—Subsection (b) of section 9006 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(b) PAYMENTS FROM THE FUND.—Amounts in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, solely for making expenditures to eligible candidates of a political party. No expenditures may be made from such fund unless the Secretary of the Treasury has receipt of a certification from the Commission under section 9005.”

(d) PRESERVATION OF FUND FOR PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES.—Subsection (b) of section 9037 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(b) PAYMENTS FROM THE MATCHING PAYMENT ACCOUNT.—Amounts in the Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, solely for making transfers to the candidate. No amount may be transferred from the account unless the Secretary has receipt of a certification from the Commission under section 9036, but not before the beginning of the matching payment period. In making such transfers to candidates of the same political party, the Secretary shall seek to achieve an equitable distribution of funds available under subsection (a), and the Secretary shall take into account, in seeking to achieve an equitable distribution, the sequence in which such certifications are received.”

(e) PRESERVATION OF FUNDS FOR NATIONAL COMMITTEE.—Paragraph (3) of section 9008(b) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(3) PAYMENTS.—Amounts in the appropriate account maintained under subsection (a) shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, solely for making expenditures to the national committee of a major party or minor party which elects to receive its entitlement under this subsection. Such payments shall be available for use by such committee in accordance with the provisions of subsection (c). No expenditures may be made from such fund unless the Secretary of the Treasury has receipt of a certification from the Commission under subsection (g).”

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE 111TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION AND FOLLOWING PUBLI- CATION OF THE FINAL EDITION OF THE CON- GRESSIONAL RECORD OF THE 111TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION

HOUSE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE AD- JOURNMENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

December 29, 2010:

H.R. 6398. An Act to require the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to fully insure interest on Lawyers Trust Accounts.

H.R. 6517. An Act to extend trade adjustment assistance and certain trade preference programs, to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, and for other purposes.

January 2, 2011:

H.R. 847. An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and improve protections and services to individuals directly impacted by the terrorist attack in New York City on September 11, 2001, and for other purposes.

January 4, 2011:

H.R. 81. An Act to amend the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to improve the conservation of sharks.

H.R. 628. An Act to establish a pilot program in certain United States district courts to encourage enhancement of expertise in patent cases among district judges.

H.R. 1107. An Act to enact certain laws relating to public contracts as title 41, United States Code, "Public Contracts".

H.R. 1746. An Act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to reauthorize the pre-disaster mitigation program of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

H.R. 2142. An Act to require quarterly performance assessments of Government programs for purposes of assessing agency performance and improvement, and to establish agency performance improvement officers and the Performance Improvement Council.

H.R. 2751. An Act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the safety of the food supply.

H.R. 4445. An Act to amend Public Law 95-232 to repeal a restriction on treating as Indian country certain lands held in trust for Indian pueblos in New Mexico.

H.R. 4602. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1332 Sharon Copley Road in Sharon Center, Ohio, as the "Emil Bolas Post Office".

H.R. 4748. An Act to amend the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 to require a northern border counternarcotics strategy, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4973. An Act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize volunteer programs and community partnerships for national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5116. An Act to invest in innovation through research and development, to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5133. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 331 1st Street in Carlstadt, New Jersey, as the "Staff Sergeant Frank T. Carvill and Lance Corporal Michael A. Schwarz Post Office Building".

H.R. 5470. An Act to exclude an external power supply for certain security or life safety alarms and surveillance system components from the application of certain energy efficiency standards under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

H.R. 5605. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 47 East Fayette Street in Uniontown, Pennsylvania, as the "George C. Marshall Post Office".

H.R. 5606. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 47 South 7th Street in Indiana, Pennsylvania, as the "James M. 'Jimmy' Stewart Post Office Building".

H.R. 5655. An Act to designate the Little River Branch facility of the United States Postal Service located at 140 NE 84th Street in Miami, Florida, as the "Jesse J. McCrary, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 5809. An Act to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to reauthorize and modify provisions relating to the diesel emissions reduction program.

H.R. 5877. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 655 Centre Street in Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts, as the "Lance Corporal Alexander Scott Arredondo, United States Marine Corps Post Office Building".

H.R. 5901. An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to authorize the tax court to appoint employees.

H.R. 6392. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5003 Westfields Boulevard in Centreville, Virginia, as the "Colonel George Juskalian Post Office Building".

H.R. 6400. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located

at 111 North 6th Street in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Earl Wilson, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 6412. An Act to amend title 28, United States Code, to require the Attorney General to share criminal records with State sentencing commissions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6510. An Act to direct the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in Houston, Texas, to the Military Museum of Texas, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6533. An Act to implement the recommendations of the Federal Communications Commission report to the Congress regarding low-power FM service, and for other purposes.

January 7, 2011:

H.R. 6523. An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE AD- JOURNMENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills of the Senate of the following titles:

December 29, 2010:

S. 4058. An Act to extend certain expiring provisions providing enhanced protections for servicemembers relating to mortgage and mortgage foreclosure.

January 4, 2011:

S. 118. An Act to amend section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, to improve the program under such section for supportive housing for the elderly, and for other purposes.

S. 841. An Act to direct the Secretary of Transportation to study and establish a motor vehicle safety standard that provides for a means of alerting blind and other pedestrians of motor vehicle operation.

S. 1481. An Act to amend section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to improve the program under such section for supportive housing for persons with disabilities.

S. 3036. An Act to establish the National Alzheimer's Project.

S. 3243. An Act to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to administer polygraph

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

examinations to all applicants for law enforcement positions with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to initiate all periodic background reinvestigations of certain law enforcement personnel, and for other purposes.

S. 3447. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve educational assistance for veterans who served in the Armed

Forces after September 11, 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 3481. An Act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Federal responsibility for stormwater pollution.

S. 3592. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Commerce Drive in Tyrone, Georgia, as the "First Lieutenant Robert Wilson Collins Post Office Building".

S. 3874. An Act to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to reduce lead in drinking water.

S. 3903. An Act to authorize leases of up to 99 years for lands held in trust for Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo.

S. 4036. An Act to clarify the National Credit Union Administration authority to make stabilization fund expenditures without borrowing from the Treasury.