



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2011

No. 19

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Eternal and gracious Lord, nothing escapes Your attention. You read the intentions of our minds and the true desires of our hearts.

May everything we do begin with Your holy inspiration, continue with Your sustaining grace, and reach Your divine purpose for the good of Your people, not just some people, but for the good of the entire Nation.

So both in word and deed, may we give You glory 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 gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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.

AMERICAN TEENAGERS MURDERED IN MEXICO

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Juarez, Mexico, is one of the most dangerous cities in the world, experiencing

a fierce turf war between drug cartels. More than 3,000 people were murdered there in 2010 alone. Three triple homicides occurred just this past weekend. Also, two American teenagers, Carlos Bermudez and Juan Echeverri, were brutally murdered in the weekend shootings.

Juarez, across from El Paso, Texas, as well as the rest of the border, is a lawless war zone controlled by the violent drug cartels. Despite the continued loss of American life, the United States Government refuses to admit that there is a war on the southern border. This violence is a lethal cancer and is spreading quickly into the United States. The narcoterrorists do not recognize international lines. This is a matter of national security, and it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to protect the border.

Meanwhile, the administration has proposed a whopping \$53 billion in high-speed rail subsidies. Instead of more choo-choo trains, that money should go to the national border security defense.

And that's just the way it is.

THE SPIRIT OF DETROIT

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago, during the Super Bowl, a TV ad was aired that highlighted the grit and spirited ingenuity of Metro Detroiters, which gives us the ability to make some of the greatest cars in the world.

Well, that spirit of Detroit is rooted in our American values of life, of liberty, of the pursuit of happiness; and it is that spirit that transformed Detroit in World War II into the arsenal of democracy that saved this country—that saved this world—from the threat of fascism.

Mr. Speaker, I believe today that that same spirit of Detroit will help build the new cars that will be powered by electricity; will help build new homes and offices which will be heated by the Sun; and will help manufacture the best products in the world.

You see, when you make it in Detroit, you help make it in America.

APPRECIATING DR. CHARLES B. JACKSON, SR.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as Americans recognize Black History Month, I am honored that this month in the midlands of South Carolina that history is being made by the Reverend Dr. Charles B. Jackson, Sr.

Dr. Jackson is being hailed on February 27 for serving a historic and extraordinary 40 years of dynamic leadership at Brookland Baptist Church in West Columbia. He began preaching at age 9, and at age 18 was installed as pastor, energizing one of the fastest-growing congregations in the Southeast. With great humility, he encouraged the church's 65 ministries.

Dr. Jackson promoted a new sanctuary that seats 2,300, followed by a 68,000-square foot community resource center. In 2008, Brookland acquired a 94,000-square foot educational facility, with 11 acres downtown, while employing over 160 dedicated personnel. A second location was launched in Richland Northeast, pastored by Dr. Christopher Leevy Johnson.

Dr. Jackson is married to the former Robin Hofer, and he is the father of two children, Rev. Charles B. Jackson, Jr., pastor of the New Laurel Street Baptist Church, and Candace Jackson, an associate attorney with Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough; along with his daughter-in-law, the former

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.

H517

Iva Gaymon; and four grandchildren, Kayla, Charles, III, Caleb, and Carter.

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

“DON’T TREAD ON ME”

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, the House will debate the extension of the Patriot Act.

I have here a report from the latimes.com that says that FBI intelligence investigations have compromised the civil liberties of American citizens far more frequently and to a greater extent than was previously assumed.

The report goes on to say that, in 2007, the Justice Department’s Inspector General told Congress the FBI may have violated the law or government policy as many as 3,000 times since 2003 in the course of secretly collecting telephone, bank and credit card records without warrants—instead, using so-called “national security” letters that give them the ability to demand this kind of information and get it.

The Patriot Act is a destructive undermining of the Constitution. We started this Congress off with a discussion about reading the Constitution. Many of us carry Constitutions with us in our pockets. How about today we take a stand for the Constitution to say that all Americans should be free from unreasonable searches and seizures and to make certain that the attempt to reauthorize the Patriot Act is beaten down.

It is time that we really remember the essence of what that motto “don’t tread on me” means. It means you protect your liberties; you stand for freedom.

HONORING RONALD REAGAN AND THE MIND ACT

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, on November 5, 1994, former President Ronald Reagan announced that he had been diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease. “I now begin the journey that will lead me into the sunset of my life,” he wrote in a letter.

At that time, 4 million Americans suffered with Alzheimer’s. Today, over 5 million now carry that diagnosis. For members of my generation, that number will double to 10 million.

President Reagan’s 100th birthday would have been this past Sunday. This week, I am introducing the MIND Act. If passed, it will establish the issuance of United States Alzheimer’s bonds to aid in the funding of Alzheimer’s research. Proceeds of bond sales would fund the program and would be avail-

able to the Director of the National Institutes of Health solely for Alzheimer’s research. The revenues generated by the sale of bonds would be funds for research in addition to, not instead of, regular appropriated funds.

In his letter, President Reagan said, “I know that for America there will always be a bright dawn ahead.”

I know he is correct.

There could be no more loving gift for members of my generation and of future generations than to provide additional non-Federal funding to help people who are afflicted or who will be diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease.

□ 1410

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, that any manifestations of approval or disapproval of the proceedings of this House is in violation of the rules of the House.

THE TIME HAS COME TO DENY ALL FEDERAL FUNDING TO PLANNED PARENTHOOD OF AMERICA

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, it comes as a surprise to most Americans to learn that the largest abortion provider in America is also the largest recipient of Federal funding under Title X. It is heartbreaking news this morning the Planned Parenthood of America has now been the subject of one more undercover video showing someone posing as a pimp being facilitated by employees at Planned Parenthood in how to secure secret abortions, STD testing, and contraception for child prostitutes.

You know, as a father of two teenage daughters, I see the video that came out this morning, I see the video that came out last week, and it is an outrage to me that employees of Planned Parenthood clinics across the country are facilitating the abuse of minor girls in this country. It should be a scandal to every American.

The time has come to deny all Federal funding to Planned Parenthood of America. I have authored the Title X Abortion Provider Prohibition Act, which would deny Title X funds to Planned Parenthood or any other abortion provider, and Congress must act and act now to move this important legislation. Pro-life Americans, and all Americans, should not be forced to subsidize America’s largest abortion provider or to continue to provide Federal taxpayer dollars to Title X clinics that engage in this abhorrent behavior.

CALLING FOR A SPECIAL ENVOY ON RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH CENTRAL ASIA

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

Mr. WOLF. In the wake of the devastating attacks targeting Christians in Iraq and Egypt last year, it is clear that religious minorities in the Middle East are facing a grave threat. There are even reports of Christian women who, having fled Iraq, are living in ghettos in Syria and have been driven to prostitution in a desperate attempt to provide for their families.

With the exception of Israel, the Bible contains more references to ancient Iraq than any other country: Abraham, Nineveh, Esther, Daniel, to name a few.

Iraq and Egypt are not an anomaly. A Christian mother of five in Pakistan remains in prison charged with blasphemy. If found guilty, she faces the death penalty.

In the face of these grim realities, I have introduced bipartisan legislation, H.R. 440, which would create a special envoy at the State Department to advocate on behalf of religious minorities in the Middle East and South Central Asia. I urge all colleagues who care about the persecution of Christians in Iraq and Pakistan and Egypt to co-sponsor my bill.

HONORING RONALD REAGAN ON HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, America came together to honor the 100th birthday of President Ronald Reagan.

President Reagan believed that personal accountability and hard work are the cornerstones of the American Dream. He understood America’s greatness and its exceptionalism. No American will ever forget how he touted America as a shining city on a hill and “built on rocks stronger than oceans, wind-swept, God-blessed, and teeming with people of all kinds living in harmony and peace.”

In these troubling economic times, we would be wise to follow Reagan’s lessons that limited government, low taxes, and free enterprise foster economic growth and job creation.

Reagan knew that freedom was America’s greatest export to the world, whether it was promoting freedom overseas against a Communist threat or at home through free markets.

President Reagan left an unparalleled legacy to his country, and we honor his extraordinary life on what would have been his 100th birthday.

CONFINE THE DEBATE TO THE PATRIOT ACT ON THE THREE EXPIRING PROVISIONS

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) called for not reauthorizing temporarily three expiring provisions of the Patriot Act, allegedly because the FBI had found civil liberties violations. In his 1-minute address, the gentleman from Ohio unfortunately missed the point. He used the law on national security letters to show abuses of the Patriot Act.

The Patriot Act did not authorize national security letters. Those letters were authorized in 1986 under legislation sponsored by the Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY, who opposes the Patriot Act and always has, but it was his national security letter authorization that the abuses were contained in.

I would hope as we debate the temporary reauthorization of three expiring provisions of the Patriot Act that we not paint that act with a broad brush, but if there are specific abuses of these three expiring provisions, we should confine the debate to them.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2011.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on January 26, 2011, at 3:55 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits a copy of a notice filed earlier with the Federal Register continuing the national emergency with respect to Cote d'Ivoire first declared by Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO COTE D'IVOIRE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112-8)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency, unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, with respect to the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire is to continue in effect beyond February 7, 2011.

The situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire, which has been addressed by the United Nations Security Council in Resolution 1572 of November 15, 2004, and subsequent resolutions, has resulted in the massacre of large numbers of civilians, widespread human rights abuses, significant political violence and unrest, and fatal attacks against international peacekeeping forces. In March 2007, the Ouagadougou Political Agreement was signed by the two primary protagonists in Côte d'Ivoire's conflict. As demonstrated by recent events surrounding the presidential election in Côte d'Ivoire, the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency and related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 26, 2011.

REMEMBERING JACK MURTHA

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 1-year anniversary of the passing of our dear colleague Congressman Jack Murtha of Pennsylvania. I rise to pay tribute to him. He was a giant of this Chamber, a legislator of unsurpassed talents, a soldier of extraordinary courage, a political servant, a public servant to the end. Those of us who served with him were honored to call him "colleague." Those of us in this body, many of us, were privileged to call him "friend." Colleague and friend.

The outpouring of accolades that came forward at his passing was something quite remarkable, and I hope that it was a comfort and has been a comfort to his family. Certainly to those of us who worked with him, who knew his love of his district, who remember the way he held court in the Pennsylvania corner and gave out his blessing and his advice, Jack Murtha's wisdom, counsel, and knowledge will continue to inspire us all.

To watch Jack Murtha legislate was to see a master at work. But more indicative of his character was to watch him communicate with our men and women in uniform, whether near the battlefield or at their bedside. He thanked them for their courage and listened to their concerns. He always answered their needs, responding to their calls for body armor, up-armored vehicles, and reliable radios, among other things. In those moments, he bonded with them based on his own personal military experiences. He was awarded the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart himself.

I will never forget the sparkle in Jack's eye when he would visit a wounded warrior, proudly standing by his bedside wearing a Steelers jersey, saluting him.

The Nation saw Jack's courage on the battlefield and in Congress as he spoke out against the war in Iraq. And in doing so, he made the distinction between the war and the warrior.

Always committed to our national defense, forever bound to the cause of our national security, Jack Murtha measured the strength of our country not only by the might of our military; he also measured it by the strength and well-being of our people.

A much-decorated champion on the battlefield, he was a hero in advancing scientific research to fight against breast cancer, prostate cancer, diabetes, as well as HIV and AIDS, to name a few.

Today we remember him, always thinking of "Semper Fi," the motto of the Marine Corps where Jack served proudly for 37 years, the motto of his life. To the end, he remained "always faithful" to God and country, to his hometown of Johnstown, and most of all to his wife, Joyce, his children, and his grandchildren.

Patriot. Champion. Hero. Giant. Jack Murtha. We will never see his likes again. Again, I hope it is a comfort to his family that this 1 year later so many of us remember Jack Murtha and pray for his family.

□ 1420

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2011.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 26, 2011 at 4:50 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 366.

Appointment:
Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, January 27, 2011.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 27, 2011 at 4:03 p.m.:

Appointment:
Congressional Budget Office.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 1, 2011.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 1, 2011 at 10:52 a.m.:

Appointments:
Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 2, 2011.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 2, 2011 at 12:00 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 188.
Appointments:
Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.
President's Export Council.
With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, February 3, 2011.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 3, 2011 at 10:33 a.m.:

Appointments:
Senate National Security Working Group.
Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University.
United States Holocaust Memorial Council.
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.
United States-China Interparliamentary Group conference.
United States-Japan Interparliamentary Group conference.
Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group conference.
United States-Russia Interparliamentary Group conference.
British-American Interparliamentary Group conference.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 4, 2011.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 4, 2011 at 11:52 a.m.:

Appointment:
Senate National Security Working Group.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Thursday, January 27, 2011:

H.R. 366, to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

EXTENDING COUNTERTERRORISM
AUTHORITIES

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 514) 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. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 514

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF SUNSETS OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO ACCESS TO BUSINESS RECORDS, INDIVIDUAL TERRORISTS AS AGENTS OF FOREIGN POWERS, AND ROVING WIRETAPS.

(a) USA PATRIOT IMPROVEMENT AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005.—Section 102(b)(1) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-177; 50 U.S.C. 1805 note, 50 U.S.C. 1861 note, and 50 U.S.C. 1862 note) is amended by striking “February 28, 2011” and inserting “December 8, 2011”.

(b) INTELLIGENCE REFORM AND TERRORISM PREVENTION ACT OF 2004.—Section 6001(b)(1) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-458; 118 Stat. 3742; 50 U.S.C. 1801 note) is amended by striking “February 28, 2011” and inserting “December 8, 2011”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 514 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Next September 11 will mark the 10-year anniversary of the worst terrorist attack on the U.S. in history. America is fortunate not to have suffered another attack of such magnitude in the past decade, but we must not take this relative security for granted or let our safety become complacency.

America is safe today not because terrorists and spies have given up their

goal to destroy our freedoms and our way of life. We are safe today because the men and women of our Armed Forces, our intelligence community, and our law enforcement agencies work every single day to protect us. And Congress must ensure that they are equipped with the resources they need to counteract continuing terrorist threats.

On February 28, three important provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act will expire. These provisions give investigators in national security cases the authority to conduct “roving” wiretaps, to seek certain business records, and to gather intelligence on lone terrorists who are not affiliated with a known terrorist group. These types of provisions have been used by domestic law enforcement agencies for years to apprehend typical criminals. It is common sense to give our national security investigators the same tools to fight terrorists that our police officers have to combat crime.

The ongoing threat from al Qaeda and other terrorist groups continues. In the last few years, terrorists have attempted to blow up a plane over Detroit; to bomb New York’s subway system; to destroy skyscrapers in Dallas, Texas, and Springfield, Illinois; and to detonate a car bomb in New York City’s Times Square. Most of these plots were thwarted thanks to the Patriot Act and other national security laws.

The Patriot Act works. It has proved effective in preventing terrorist attacks and protecting Americans. To let these provisions expire would leave every American less safe. We must continue these intelligence-gathering measures to win our fight against terrorists. And President Obama agrees.

In a letter to Congress last month, Director of National Intelligence Admiral Clapper and Attorney General Holder urged us to reauthorize the expiring provisions, noting that they are critical tools that “have been used in numerous highly sensitive intelligence collection operations.”

□ 1430

This bill reauthorizes the expiring provisions through December 8, 2011, the last day that the House of Representatives is scheduled to be in session. This extension serves two important functions. First, it ensures that these intelligence-gathering tools will remain available to national security investigators. And second, it provides Congress with the opportunity to engage in a thorough review of these provisions as we pursue and consider a longer reauthorization.

I urge my colleagues to support our ability to continue to protect Americans against terrorist plots and attacks.

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

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

I reluctantly rise in nonsupport of this provision to extend expiring provi-

sions of the Patriot Act because of section 215 of the Patriot Act, which I’d like to call to your attention. This is the act that allows a secret FISA court to authorize our government to collect business records or anything else, requiring that a person or business produce virtually any type record. We don’t think that that was right then. We don’t think it’s right now. And I feel obligated to oppose any extension of these expiring acts since we’ve had no hearings, no markup, no committee vote, nobody’s done anything about it. They’re saying, well, ex-chairman, just support this, and we’ll get to it afterward. Well, I can’t go along with that.

This provision is contrary to traditional notions of search and seizure which require the government to show reasonable suspicion or probable cause before undertaking an investigation that infringes upon a person’s privacy. And so I urge a “no” vote on the extension of these expiring provisions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), who is currently the chairman of the Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and who previously, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee itself, was responsible for writing the Patriot Act provisions.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, let me say I’m a little bit puzzled that my friend from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is opposing the extension of these three provisions of the Patriot Act today because last year, he called up a Senate bill that provided for a year’s extension of these three provisions, and managed the time and voted for it. And after hearing his comments, I’m wondering why he has changed his mind.

In 19 days, three national security laws will expire unless Congress votes to reauthorize them. H.R. 514 temporarily extends these laws—FISA business records, roving wiretaps, and the lone wolf definition—until December 8 of this year.

As chairman of the House Judiciary Committee in the last decade, I oversaw the enactment of the USA PATRIOT Act in response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Title II of the act addressed enhanced foreign intelligence and law enforcement surveillance authority. Sixteen sections of that title were originally set to expire on December 31, 2005. Also set to expire on that date was section 6001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, which is the lone wolf definition.

In 2005, I again spearheaded the effort to reauthorize the Patriot Act. Recognizing the significance of the act to America’s counterterrorism operations and the need for thorough oversight, the House Judiciary Committee held 9 subcommittee hearings, 3 days of full committee hearings, then a robust full committee markup reauthorizing legislation.

The USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 made permanent 14 of the 16 intelligence provisions. The act extended the sunset on section 206 FISA roving wiretaps, section 215 FISA business records, and the lone wolf definition until the end of 2009.

But the three remaining temporary provisions were not reauthorized before that deadline. Instead, the then-Democratic majority chose twice to extend the provisions, first for 2 months and then for a year, without ever bringing a reauthorization bill to the floor.

This Congress, things will be different. We must approve a temporary extension today to keep these critical national security tools in place. This extension will afford Congress sufficient time to hold hearings and markups, then adopt a permanent reauthorization of these provisions this year, which I intend to introduce soon.

The time for multiple temporary extensions is over. The terrorist threat has not subsided and will not expire, and neither should our national security laws.

It is equally important that Congress make permanent the lone wolf definition. This provision closes the gap in the FISA act and, if allowed to expire, could permit an individual terrorist to slip through the cracks and carry out his plot undetected. When FISA was originally enacted in 1978, terrorists were believed to be members of an identified group. That’s not the case today.

Today, more than ever, we are confronted with threats from loosely organized terrorist groups or individuals who may subscribe to a movement or certain beliefs but do not belong to or identify themselves with a specific terrorist group. Without the lone wolf definition, our surveillance tools will be powerless to act against this growing threat to America’s security.

Section 206 of the Patriot Act authorizes the use of roving or multipoint wiretaps for national security and intelligence investigations. This allows the government to use a single wiretap order to cover any communications device that the target uses or may use. Without roving wiretap authority, investigators would be forced to seek a new court order each time they need to change the location, phone, or computer that needs to be monitored.

Section 215 of the act allows the FISA court to issue orders granting the government access to business records in foreign intelligence, international terrorism, and clandestine intelligence cases. The 2005 act expanded the safeguards against potential abuse of section 215 authority and included additional congressional oversight, procedural protections, application requirements, and judicial review. Each of these provisions are integral to defending America’s national security and must be kept intact.

I urge my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 514.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York, JERROLD NADLER, who has been the chairman of the Constitution Subcommittee longer than any Member in the Congress.

□ 1440

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this extension of the expiring provisions of the Patriot Act and the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act.

I cannot support this extension when the House has done nothing to consider these provisions, or possible reforms, or even to hold a hearing or a markup. While in the past, Members have had the opportunity to receive classified briefings, we have dozens of new Members who have received no such briefings.

Section 215 authorizes the government to obtain “any tangible thing” relevant to a terrorism investigation, even if there is no showing that the “thing” pertains to suspected terrorists or terrorist activities. It is sweeping in scope, and the government is not required to show reasonable suspicion or probable cause before undertaking investigation that infringes upon a person’s privacy, including the records of what he has read in the library. Congress should either ensure that things collected with this power have a meaningful nexus to suspected terrorist activity or allow the provision to expire.

Section 206 provides for roving wiretaps which permit the government to obtain intelligence surveillance orders that identify neither the person nor the facility to be tapped. This is supposedly to update the law to deal with portable cell phones and the like and other modern technology, but it goes too far. Without the necessity to specify either the person or the facility to be tapped, this is, for all practical purposes, a general grant of authority to wiretap anyone and anywhere the government wants. There are almost no limits to this authority and no requirement that the government name a specific target. This is very akin to the old British general Writs of Assistance which engendered the first colonial outrage that led to the American Revolution.

Section 6001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, the so-called lone wolf provision, permits secret intelligence surveillance of non-U.S. persons whose are concededly not affiliated with a foreign government or organization. According to government testimony, this provision has never been used, yet it remains on the books. It has never been used because there is ample other authority to do that in any event.

Surveillance of an individual who is not working with a foreign government or organization is not what we normally understand as foreign intelligence. There may be many good reasons for government to keep tabs on

such people, but that is no reason to suspend all our laws under the pretext that this is a foreign intelligence operation.

While some have argued that each of these authorities remain necessary tools in the fight against terrorism and that they must be extended without any modifications, others have counseled careful review and modification. Some have even urged that we allow some or all of these authorities to sunset. I believe we should not miss the opportunity to review the act in its entirety, to examine how it is working, where it has been successful, where it has failed, where it goes too far, and where it may need improvement. That is the purpose of sunsets, and to extend it without review undermines that purpose.

I have also introduced the National Security Letters Reform Act, which would make vital improvements to the current law in order to better protect civil liberties while ensuring that NSLs remain a useful tool in national security investigations. I hope we can work to strike that balance in a responsible and effective manner, but the record of the abuse of the NSL authority is too great for the Congress to ignore.

I realize the majority has the votes to extend these provisions. I hope we will be able, after this vote, to examine carefully the way these provisions have been used or abused, and to look at ways to reform the law in light of experience. That was the purpose of sunsets, and I hope we can take advantage of that opportunity.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 12 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan has 15 minutes.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. RON PAUL.

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. I was opposed to the Patriot Act in 2001, and do not believe now that it is a good idea to extend it.

The Fourth Amendment is rather clear. It says that we should be secure in our papers, our persons, our homes, and our effects; and, that if warrants are to be issued, we have to do it with probable cause, and describe in particular the places, the people, and the things that we are going to look at.

I think what has happened, though, over the years has been that we have diluted the Fourth Amendment. It was greatly diluted in 2001, but it started a lot earlier than that. When the FISA law was originally written in 1978, that really introduced the notion that the Fourth Amendment was relative and not absolute. Later on, it was further

weakened in 1998, and then of course in 2001.

I think our reaction to the horrors of 9/11—we can understand the concern and the fear that was developed, but I think the reaction took us in the wrong direction, because the assumption was made of course that we weren’t spending enough money on surveillance. Even though then our intelligence agencies received \$40 billion, that didn’t give us the right information. So now we are spending \$80 billion. But it also looks like the conclusion was that the American people had too much privacy, and if we undermine the American people’s privacy, somehow or another we are going to be safer.

I think another thing that has come up lately has been that the purpose of government is to make us perfectly safe. Now, it is good to be safe, but governments can’t make us safe. I question whether or not we have been made safer by the Patriot Act. But let’s say a law makes us somewhat safer. Is that a justification for the government to do anything they want?

For instance, if you want to be perfectly safe from child abuse and wife beating, the government could put a camera in every one of our houses and our bedrooms, and maybe there would be somebody made safer this way. But what would you be giving up?

So perfect safety is not the purpose of government. What we want from government is to enforce the law and to protect our liberties.

This, to me, has been, especially since 9/11, a classical example of sacrificing liberty for safety and security. Now, I didn’t invent those terms. They have been around a long time. And it is easily justified, and I can understand it, because I was here in 2001 when this came up, and people become frightened, and the American people want something done. But I think this is misdirected, and it doesn’t serve our benefits.

I think at this time we should really question why we are extending this. We are extending the three worst parts. Why were these sunsetted? Because people had concern about them. They weren’t sure they were good pieces and maybe they were overkill, and, therefore, they were saying we had better reassess it.

So what have we done? We have already extended it twice, and here we are going to do it again, with the intent, I think, in a year to reassess this. But this bill doesn’t make things worse, it doesn’t make anything better, but it does extend what I consider and others consider bad legislation. I ask for a “no” vote on this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak on this very important issue, the reauthorization of the Patriot Act. For a variety of reasons, we need to reauthorize this bill.

First and foremost, there are three provisions I think we are all very familiar with. It's the lone wolf provision, it's the roving wiretaps of course, which is something else that we very much need to do, and also the business records provision.

With respect to roving wiretaps, I believe it has already been stated on this floor, but it should be stated once again: Law enforcement has been using roving wiretaps for years against drug dealers and organized crime, I believe since 1986. Extending that roving wiretap provision to terrorists makes good sense. We have been doing it. We need to give law enforcement and our intelligence services the tools they need to take down these terror plots before they become operational. That is why this extension is needed.

The lone wolf provision, it should be noted, is also important. Many of the types of plots we are trying to foil now are being carried out by lone wolves. Major Hasan is a good example. Jihad Jane and others are lone wolves, and we need this capacity so that we can pursue these lone wolves just as we would individuals or terrorists who are part of a terrorist organization or an agent of a foreign power. So that is absolutely essential.

With respect to the issue of the business records, often people would say that we are somehow trying to examine one's library records, what books they are reading. That's really not the case. We know that 9/11 terrorists were using public library computers. We knew that they were also using university library computers to make plane reservations as well as to confirm those reservations. So the idea is to be able to access one's business records. That's what we are after, to make sure that we cannot only apprehend or go after that individual who is planning an attack but also that cell or that network of individuals with whom that individual may be working. That is why we need this issue of business records contained in this reauthorization.

In fact, I am not even certain that the word "library" appears anywhere in the Patriot Act. Nevertheless, this has been dubbed the library provision, which really it is not.

For all of these reasons, I think it is critically important that we continue to provide our law enforcement with the tools they need, our intelligence services with the tools they need to stop terrorism. We cannot tie the hands of local law enforcement. We are asking them to do more and more.

The critics of this legislation often say we need to let law enforcement fight these battles. This gives them the tools. I urge passage and support for this reauthorization of the Patriot Act.

□ 1450

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who has been the chair of

the Subcommittee on Crime in the Judiciary Committee for 4 years.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 514, which would extend for 1 year sweeping governmental intrusions into our lives and privacy that were authorized by the USA PATRIOT Act and the 2004 Intelligence Act. Without meaningful oversight demonstrating that these extraordinary powers are needed, we should not extend these provisions for one full year, or for any period of time, for that matter; and I therefore oppose the bill.

I am opposed because I simply do not accept the argument that in order to be safe, we necessarily have to sacrifice our rights and freedoms. I agree with Benjamin Franklin, who stated during the formation of our Nation that "they who give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety."

One of the provisions in the bill reauthorizes section 215 of the Patriot Act that gives the government power to secretly invade our private records, such as books we read at the library, by merely alleging that they are relevant to a terrorism investigation, but without having to show that the seized material is in connection with any specific suspected terrorists or terrorist activities. There is no requirement to show probable cause or even reasonable suspicion of being related to a specific act of terrorism, and therefore there is no meaningful standard to judge whether or not the material is in fact necessary.

Another provision of H.R. 514 is section 206 of the Patriot Act, which is referred to as the "roving John Doe wiretap provision." It gives the government the power to wiretap a phone conversation without having to show which phone will be used or even who will be using it and without requiring a court order for the specific roving tap.

The third provision is section 6001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, referred to as the "lone wolf" provision. It gives the government the power to spy on individuals in the United States who are not U.S. citizens or permanent resident aliens even though they are not agents of a foreign government or any terrorist organization. Unfortunately, this means that if those targeted have any interaction with an American citizen, then that U.S. citizen is spied upon as well.

We already allow spying on such non-citizens outside of the United States or even in the United States where there is probable cause that they are agents of a foreign government or members of a terrorist organization, but this is an extension of that power which could envelop anybody simply as a result of the occasion of interacting with a targeted person even while we are in the United States.

The three provisions give the government power to invade our privacy even when there is no probable cause nor

even reasonable suspicion or credible evidence of any wrongdoing and without allowing the kind of detached oversight such as a court warrant which is generally called upon when such power over individuals is extended.

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

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Absent these oversight protections, even after the fact in the case of emergencies, all three provisions should be allowed to expire, unless we demonstrate in hearings and oversight hearings that these powers are necessary and narrowly tailored to achieve a compelling national security interest. The freedoms and protections these provisions take away are the very core of our values and liberties, so these protections should not be legislated away without rigorous oversight to protect against abuse.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some criticism today that section 215, business records authority, gives national security agencies too much access to confidential records, but section 215 has more strict requirements than grand jury subpoenas used in criminal investigations. Unlike a grand jury subpoena, which is not issued by a judge, a 215 order can only be used by a FISA court judge. Section 215 only grants terrorism investigators the power to get records held by third parties, such as a hotel or car rental records.

Also there has been criticism that section 215 violates Fourth Amendment protections against unreasonable searches and seizures. However, a request for business records held by a third party is not a search under the Fourth Amendment. The target of an investigation does not own the records and therefore has no reasonable expectation of privacy in them. Section 215 cannot be used to acquire records of U.S. persons based solely on First Amendment protected activity.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, no one has worked more carefully on this matter than DENNIS KUCINICH, the distinguished gentleman from Cleveland.

I yield the gentleman 2½ minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. Thank you very much, Mr. CONYERS. I certainly appreciate that.

I will certainly never seek to impugn the feelings of those who say that we have to have the PATRIOT Act in order to protect our country. We are all patriots here, and we all want America to be protected; but we have to recognize our constitutional experience here and the reason why we have a Fourth Amendment that protects people not just from unreasonable search and seizure, but from unwarranted intrusion by the government into their lives.

When we look at our constitutional experience and all of the efforts that made it and built up to it, we didn't hear "give my liberty or give me a wiretap." We didn't hear "don't tread on me, but it is okay to spy." What we heard was a ringing declaration about freedom, and it was enshrined in the Constitution.

I stood on the floor of the House way back when the Patriot Act came forward, voted against it because I read it and understood that it opened up the door for a broad reach and possibilities of broad reach by the government into our daily lives.

The gentleman from Wisconsin, who is my friend, correctly pointed out earlier the difference between National Security Letters and the Patriot Act. But it also is true that section 505 of the Patriot Act gave the government the ability to greatly expand who could issue a national security letter, so much so that nearly 50,000 national security letters were issued by the FBI in 2006, I think the year was. They don't have to use section 215 of the Patriot Act. They can just invoke the national security letter authority and reach into people's financial records, their medical letters, their reading material.

What is happening to our country? Why are we giving up our basic liberties? We need to take a stand here, and this is as good a day as any to take a stand. Many Members of Congress, including those supported by my friends in the tea party, maintain their goal is to get rid of big government, get government out of their lives. Well, how about the Patriot Act, which has the broadest reach and the deepest reach of government into our daily lives? Shouldn't we be thinking about that?

Some want to get government out of health care. Some want to get government out of retirement security. How about getting government out of people's bedrooms, out of people's financial records, out of people's medical records?

Vote "no" on extending the Patriot Act.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot said about national security letters. The authority for them was made permanent in 2006. It is not a part of this bill, so we ought to completely forget about the complaints about national security letters.

What I will say is that in the 2006 reauthorization of the Patriot Act there were provisions in it to give recipients of a national security letter the right to obtain judicial review; and I am proud of that fact because I think whatever constitutional infirmities there were in this part of the Patriot Act, they were solved.

Now, we hear an awful lot about no oversight. The people on the other side of the aisle who are complaining about

this had the authority to have oversight hearings. There was only one of them in the last Congress. Compare that to the nine subcommittee hearings, three full committee hearings, and the full markup that we had in 2006 when this side of the aisle had the majority. The people who have been doing the oversight have been the Republicans, not the Democrats. The people who know this law is making Americans safer are the Republicans, and the Democrats once again are complaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

□ 1500

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the powers of intelligence and enforcement are among the most important powers of government, but also the most fearsome. They must be wielded very, very carefully. For decades, our government routinely has collected information on potential foreign threats through various forms of surveillance. These collection activities enjoy broad bipartisan support in our country because of their value in helping to protect American citizens and interests.

However, in the 1960s and 1970s, these collection capabilities were turned on the American people and executive branch agencies engaged in spying on the American public, sometimes even for political purposes. The ensuing public backlash triggered the adoption of legal reforms that gave us laws to help prevent a repeat of these abuses.

Subsequently, the tragedy of September 11, 2001, gave proponents of extended domestic surveillance a powerful political and rhetorical weapon, which they used to reduce constitutional protections against surveillance and seizures without appropriate warrants.

When the Congress passed the Patriot Act in March of 2006, it included sunset requirements of three provisions that you've heard about today. Since 2005, I've voted against extending these and other provisions because these provisions are overly broad and frequently abused while still not improving truly the security of the American people. My concerns are supported by the revelations of abuses of those authorities during hearings of the House Judiciary Committee in 2009 and in multiple reports issued by the Inspector General of the Department of Justice.

The bill before us today does nothing to fix these problems or prevent future abuses. This bill does not raise the standards for intelligence collection to ensure that the right people are targeted in the first place. The law was not meant to sunset so that we could periodically reauthorize it, unchanged. We're now on the verge of the third "temporary" extension, with no remedies for the flaws identified by this body and the Department of Justice Inspector General.

For all of these reasons, I urge Members to vote "no."

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud now to yield 2 minutes to a senior member of the committee from Houston, Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished chairman and the ranking member of this committee.

I want to remind my colleagues of a singly important moment when those of us who were Republican and Democrat came together after 9/11, and out of this Judiciary Committee came a singular initiative that dealt with the crisis which we are facing.

I have in my hand the Constitution; and I am reminded that when the Founding Fathers came together and declared that we all were created equal, they, too, were concerned about treason, spying, the undermining of government, and maybe even the threat of violence. As we well know how this country came into being, we had to fight a war; yet they had in this Constitution the rights of the Fourth Amendment that we would be protected against unreasonable search and seizure; a Fifth Amendment of due process; and they believed that Americans should be protected.

This bill, however, comes to the floor again without amendments. And I'm very proud to say that over the series of my tenure on the Judiciary Committee I have submitted very vital and important amendments to protect the civil liberties of Americans, as well as to recognize the responsibility of all of us to secure this Nation.

I'm a member of the Homeland Security Committee. I am not unmindful of the everyday threats that we receive, but this bill would extend provisions that were created in 2005, that also were included in the intelligence reform bill. It extends a provision that allows for a roving electronic surveillance authority and a provision revising the definition of an "agent of foreign power" to include any non-U.S. person who engages in international terrorism or preparatory activities, also known as the "lone wolf," without protections. As a member of Homeland Security, I recognize that that is vital, but there needs to be a variety of protections. The other provisions, of course, are ones that invade privacy and create a lack of recognition that we have a Constitution to abide by.

So I would ask my colleagues as we move on this legislation to remember it has not been amended; remember we have lived under a Constitution that protects civil liberties; and also remember it took a lawsuit to allow someone to say they had gotten a national security letter.

We must do things in a constitutional manner, Mr. Speaker; and I would argue we're not doing it in this legislative initiative. I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation; go back to the Judiciary Committee and abide by the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the H.R. 514, "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, and individual terrorists as agents."

This bill would extend provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005, and the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 through December 8, 2011. It extends a provision that allows a roving electronic surveillance authority, and a provision revising the definition of an "agent of a foreign power" to include any non-U.S. person who engages in international terrorism or preparatory activities, also known as the "lone wolf provision." It also grants government access to business records relating to a terrorist investigation.

As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I understand and appreciate the importance of national security, and the challenges we face as we strive to protect our nation from foreign threats. However, as an American citizen, I am deeply concerned when our Constitutional rights run the risk of being infringed upon in the name of national security.

To win the war on terror, the United States must remain true to the founding architects of this democracy who created a Constitution which enshrined an inalienable set of rights. These Bills of Rights guarantee certain fundamental freedoms that cannot be limited by the government. One of these freedoms, the Fourth Amendment, is the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures.

We do not circumvent the Fourth Amendment, or any other provision in the United States Constitution, merely because it is inconvenient. While the PATRIOT Act is intended to improve our ability to protect our nation, it needs to be revised and amended to reflect the democratic principles that make this country the crown jewel of democracy. The bill before us today, however, does not do that. In fact, even the manner by which are even considering this bill, only days after introduction without any oversight hearings of mark-ups, circumvents the process we have in place to allow for improvements and amendments to be made.

Furthermore, this bill was considered last year in the 111th Congress, and went through oversight hearings and two days of mark-up in the Judiciary Committee. Yet, none of those voted-on, bipartisan amendments that resulted from those hearings are included in this bill. In those hearings, multiple concerns were raised about the breadth of the PATRIOT Act and the leeway it gives to infringe upon an individual's privacy and civil liberties.

In the mark-up, I personally introduced amendments that would allow for greater transparency in the PATRIOT Act and enhanced protection against violation of individuals' civil liberties. None of my amendments, or those introduced by any of my colleagues, are included in this legislation. None of the privacy concerns or civil liberty infringement issues that were raised in those hearings have even been addressed. I am deeply concerned that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are considering overlooking the very valid concerns of the American people, without so much as a hearing.

We have been faced with this type of legislation before. On August 3, 2007, I stood before you on the House floor discussing the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, FISA, another piece of law essential to combating the war on terror, but one that was in need of improvements to protect Americans' constitutionally enshrined civil liberties. On that day, I said that, "we must ensure that our intelligence professionals have the tools that they need to protect our Nation, while also safeguarding the rights of law-abiding Americans," and I stand firmly behind that notion today.

When we were considering FISA, there were Fourth Amendment concerns around secret surveillance and secret searches, which were kept permanently secret from the Americans whose homes and conversations were targeted. There were also concerns such secret searches intended for non-U.S. citizens, could be used to target Americans.

I offered amendments to ensure that any surveillance of an American is done through established legal procedures pursuant to FISA and the FISA court authority, and to ensure that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court is indispensable and would play a meaningful role in ensuring compliance with our Constitution. I stand here today urging my colleagues to consider allowing similar amendments to the PATRIOT Act that better protect Americans' right to privacy before moving this legislation out of the House of Representatives and onto the other legislative body.

The three expiring provisions of the PATRIOT Act that H.R. 514 would extend overstep the bounds of the government investigative power set forth in the Constitution. One provision authorizes the government to obtain "any tangible thing" relevant to a terrorism investigation, even if there is no showing that the "thing" pertains to suspected terrorists or terrorist activities. This provision, which was addressed in the Judiciary Committee during the 111th Congress, runs afoul of the traditional notions of search and seizure, which require the government to show "reasonable suspicion" or "probable cause" before undertaking an investigation that infringes upon a person's privacy. Congress must ensure that things collected with this power have a meaningful nexus to suspected terrorist activity. If we do not take steps to improve this provision, then it should be allowed to expire.

Another provision, known commonly as the "roving John Doe wiretap," allows the government to obtain intelligence surveillance orders that identify neither the person nor the facility to be tapped. Like the first provision, this, too, was addressed in the Judiciary Committee during the last Congress, and is also contrary to traditional notions of search and seizure, which require government to state "with particularity" what it seeks to search or seize. If this provision were given the opportunity to be amended and improved, it should be done so to mirror similar and longstanding criminal laws that permit roving wiretaps, but require the naming of a specific target.

The third provision that H.R. 514 would extend is the "lone wolf" provision, which permits secret intelligence surveillance of non-U.S. persons who are not affiliated with a foreign organization. This type of authorization, which is only granted in secret courts, is subject to abuse, and threatens our longtime understandings of the limits of the government's in-

vestigatory powers within the borders of the United States. Moreover, according to government testimony, this provision has never been used. Because of the potential for abuse created by this provision, and the lack of need for its existence, it, too, should be allowed to expire.

All three of these provisions have been examined and amended in the past because they were in dire need of improvements to protect the rights of Americans. I was against these provisions, as written, in the past, and without amendments, I am still against them today.

Finally, H.R. 514 fails to amend other portions of the PATRIOT act in dire need of reform, specifically, those issues relating to the issuance and use of national security letters, NSLs. NSLs permit the government to obtain the communication, financial and credit records of anyone deemed relevant to a terrorism investigation even if that person is not suspected of unlawful behavior. I repeat, even if that person is not suspected of unlawful behavior.

As an American citizen, the security and safety of my constituency is pinnacle, but I will never stand for legislation that infringes on the basic rights afforded in our Constitution. When our founding fathers drafted the Constitution, after living under an oppressive regime in Britain, they ensured that the American people would never experience such subjugation. Where are the protective measures for our citizens in the PATRIOT act? Why are the measures addressed in the last Congress not included in the bill?

Instead of reauthorizing these provisions, Congress should conduct robust, public oversight of all surveillance tools and craft reforms that will better protect private communications from overbroad government surveillance.

There is nothing more important than providing the United States of America, especially our military and national security personnel, the right tools to protect our citizens and prevail in the global war on terror. Holding true to our fundamental constitutional principles is the only way to prove to the world that it is indeed possible to secure America while preserving our way of life.

Because of the negative privacy implications of extending all of these provisions, I ask my colleagues to please join me in opposing 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, and individual terrorists as agents.

[From the American Civil Liberties Union, Aug. 10, 2010]

NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER RECIPIENT CAN SPEAK OUT FOR FIRST TIME SINCE FBI DEMANDED CUSTOMER RECORDS FROM HIM

NEW YORK.—The FBI has partially lifted a gag it imposed on American Civil Liberties Union client Nicholas Merrill in 2004 that prevented him from disclosing to anyone that he received a national security letter (NSL) demanding private customer records. Merrill, who received the NSL as the president of an Internet service provider (ISP), can now reveal his identity and speak about his experience for the first time since receiving the NSL. The ACLU and New York Civil Liberties Union filed a lawsuit challenging the NSL statute and the gag order on behalf of Merrill (then called John Doe) in April

2004, which resulted in numerous court rulings finding the NSL statute unconstitutional. Merrill was the first person ever to challenge an NSL in court.

"After six long years of not being able to tell anyone at all what happened to me—not even my family—I'm grateful to finally be able to talk about my experience of being served with a national security letter," said Merrill. "Internet users do not give up their privacy rights when they log on, and the FBI should not have the power to secretly demand that ISPs turn over constitutionally protected information about their users without a court order. I hope my successful challenge to the FBI's NSL gag power will empower others who may have received NSLs to speak out."

NSLs are secret record demands the FBI issues to obtain access to personal customer records from ISPs, libraries, financial institutions and credit reporting agencies without court approval or even suspicion of wrongdoing. Because the FBI can gag NSL recipients to prohibit them from disclosing anything about the record demands they receive, the FBI's use and potential abuse of the NSL power has been shrouded in excessive secrecy.

While the NSL served on Merrill stated that he was prohibited from telling anyone about it, he decided to challenge the demand in court because he believed that the FBI was ordering him to turn over constitutionally protected information about one of his clients. Because of the FBI-imposed gag, Merrill was prohibited from talking about the NSL or revealing his identity and role in the lawsuit until today, even though the FBI abandoned its demand for records from Merrill more than three years ago.

In December 2008, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, ruling in Merrill's case, found that some of the NSL statute's gag provisions were unconstitutional because they wrongly placed the burden on NSL recipients to challenge gag orders, narrowly limited judicial review of gag orders and required courts to defer entirely to the executive branch. The appeals court sent the case back to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York and ordered the government to justify the constitutionality of the gag on Merrill. On July 30, the parties reached a settlement in the case. As part of that settlement, the FBI agreed that Merrill could now identify himself as the John Doe NSL recipient.

"We are thrilled that Nick will finally be able to speak out about why he took the courageous step of challenging the FBI's NSL power. Thanks to Nick's actions, courts have now recognized the need for judicial oversight of the government's dangerous NSL gag power," said Melissa Goodman, staff attorney with the ACLU National Security Project. "But even though this case has resulted in significant improvements to NSL procedures, innocent Americans' private records remain too vulnerable to secret and warrantless data collection by the FBI. At a minimum, the FBI should have to show individual suspicion before it issues an NSL for an individual's personal information and invades Americans' right to privacy and free speech on the Internet."

While misuse and abuse of the NSL power has been widely documented, the Obama administration is now seeking to expand the statute to allow the FBI to demand even more records without court approval. In July, the Obama administration proposed to expand the statute to allow the FBI to get Americans' Internet activity records without court approval or even suspicion of wrongdoing.

In 2009, Congressmen Jerrold Nadler (D-NY) and Jeff Flake (R-AZ) reintroduced the

National Security Letters Reform Act, aimed at reigning in abuse of the power. The ACLU has called on Congress to reform the remaining constitutional defects of the NSL gag power and reject Obama proposals to expand the NSL statute.

In addition to Goodman, attorneys on the case are Jameel Jaffer of the national ACLU and Arthur Eisenberg of the NYCLU.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 514, which would reauthorize expiring provisions of the Patriot Act without important modifications necessary to safeguard our civil liberties. While the threat of terrorism is real, and law enforcement must have the right tools to protect Americans, any counterterrorism measure must have a solid constitutional footing and respect the privacy and civil liberties of the American people.

This legislation fails to address shortcomings in the original Patriot Act legislation, and for that reason I will vote against it. One of the major problems with this bill is its failure to address the issuance and use of national security letters. These letters permit the government to obtain the communications of anyone deemed relevant to a terrorism investigation, even if that person is not suspected of unlawful behavior. If Congress reauthorizes these provisions with no changes, Americans will remain subject to warrantless intrusions into their personal affairs—a gross overreach of Federal investigative authority that could be abused. It's just not how we do things in this country.

Rather than taking the time to craft reforms that will better protect private citizens' communications and privacy from overbroad government surveillance, the Republican majority simply wants to cram this bill through without providing any opportunity for anyone to offer amendments that improve the bill. We all acknowledge that law enforcement needs new tools to keep up with 21st century threats; but surely it is the responsibility of Congress to reexamine legislation that was hurriedly passed through Congress in the wake of 9/11 to make sure it lives up to our national ideals.

Because this bill fails to contain any checks and balances to prevent law enforcement abuse and protect civil liberties, I will be voting against it, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, extending the expiring provisions of the Patriot Act will ensure that America's law enforcement officials and intelligence agents are equipped to identify terrorist threats

and prevent terrorist acts. The Patriot Act is an effective tool in the war on terror. As terrorists show no signs of ending their plots, neither should our laws that stop them be allowed to sunset. This temporary extension will facilitate further review and reauthorization of these provisions.

Mr. Speaker, this extension is supported by the Obama administration. I urge my colleagues to support this extension as well.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again oppose the reauthorization of expiring provisions in the Patriot Act.

Last month, Republican leaders gave Members of Congress the chance to read the Constitution on the floor of the House. Perhaps we skipped over the Bill of Rights, because the provisions we're extending today are a direct infringement on Americans' constitutional rights.

This legislation grants the federal government sweeping authority to pry into the private lives of Americans. Federal authorities have the power to access private records like library records or credit card statements, even if it's not related to a terrorism investigation. Authorities can receive wiretapping permits without specifying who or what they're going to wiretap. Secret intelligence courts can authorize law enforcement to spy on foreigners who are not connected to terrorist groups.

Many of my colleagues were elected based on their rhetoric opposing more power to the federal government. Today's vote gives them a chance to put their money where their mouths are, and say no to giving government the power to violate Americans' civil liberties. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the PATRIOT Act in 2001, voted against its extension in 2005, and will again vote against it again today. The PATRIOT Act was sold as a measure to ensure the safety of the American people. Instead, the PATRIOT Act has served primarily to subvert fundamental rights afforded to American citizens.

A plain extension of the PATRIOT Act, without revisiting its many problems and abuses, is a huge mistake and missed opportunity to truly protect our country against terrorism and do so in the confines of the Constitution.

Freedom does not have to be compromised to defend liberty. Continuing to weaken fundamental American principles will not leave us more secure, but instead more vulnerable. Through mutual trust and fearlessness, we can progress together.

It is time to stop extending the PATRIOT Act and restore full American freedoms and liberty to our citizens.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 514.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the

Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1510

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, House Democratic Leader:

FEBRUARY 8, 2011.

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 955(b) note), I am pleased to re-appoint the Honorable Betty McCollum of Minnesota to the National Council on the Arts.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI, House Democratic Leader.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, House Democratic Leader:

NANCY PELOSI, DEMOCRATIC LEADER,

February 8, 2011.

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to Section 4404(c)(2) of the Congressional Hunger Fellows Act of 2002 (2 U.S.C) 1161, I am pleased to re-appoint Mr. James P. McGovern of Worcester, Massachusetts to the Board of Trustees of the Congressional Hunger Fellows Program.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI, House Democratic Leader.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, House Democratic Leader:

NANCY PELOSI, DEMOCRATIC LEADER,

February 8, 2011.

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to Section 4(b) of House Resolution 5, 111th Congress, I am pleased to appoint the following members to the House Democracy Partnership:

The Honorable David E. Price of North Carolina

The Honorable Lois Capps of California
The Honorable Rush D. Holt of New Jersey
The Honorable Allyson Y. Schwartz of Pennsylvania

The Honorable Donald M. Payne of New Jersey

The Honorable Sam Farr of California
The Honorable Keith Ellison of Minnesota

The Honorable Mazie K. Hirono of Hawaii
The Honorable Lucille Roybal-Allard of California

Thank you for your attention to these appointments.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI, House Democratic Leader.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, House Democratic Leader:

FEBRUARY 8, 2011.

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to Section 4 of the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 111-25), I am pleased to appoint the Honorable Silvestre Reyes of Texas to the commission.

Thank you for your consideration of this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI, House Democratic Leader.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

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

EXTENDING COUNTERTERRORISM AUTHORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 514) 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, nays 148, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—277

Ackerman	Gohmert	Noem
Adams	Goodlatte	Nugent
Aderholt	Gosar	Nunes
Akin	Gowdy	Nunnelee
Alexander	Granger	Olson
Altmire	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Austria	Griffin (AR)	Pascrell
Baca	Griffith (VA)	Paulsen
Bachmann	Grimm	Pearce
Bachus	Guinta	Pence
Barletta	Guthrie	Perlmutter
Barrow	Hall	Peters
Barton (TX)	Harman	Peterson
Bass (NH)	Harper	Petri
Benishek	Harris	Pitts
Berg	Hartzler	Platts
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Poe (TX)
Biggert	Hastings (WA)	Pompeo
Bilbray	Hayworth	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Heck	Quayle
Bishop (GA)	Heinrich	Quigley
Bishop (NY)	Hensarling	Rahall
Black	Herger	Reed
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Bonner	Higgins	Renacci
Bono Mack	Hinojosa	Reyes
Boren	Holden	Ribble
Boswell	Hoyer	Rigell
Boustany	Huelskamp	Rivera
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Brooks	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Inslee	Rogers (MI)
Buerkle	Israel	Rokita
Burgess	Issa	Rooney
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Ross (AR)
Canseco	Jordan	Ross (FL)
Cantor	Keating	Rothman (NJ)
Capito	Kelly	Royce
Cardoza	Kind	Runyan
Carnahan	King (IA)	Ruppersberger
Carney	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Cassidy	Kissell	Schiff
Castor (FL)	Kline	Schmidt
Chabot	Lance	Schock
Chaffetz	Landry	Schwartz
Chandler	Langevin	Scott (SC)
Coble	Lankford	Scott, Austin
Coffman (CO)	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cole	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	LaTourette	Sessions
Connolly (VA)	Latta	Sewell
Cooper	Lee (NY)	Shimkus
Costa	Levin	Shuler
Courtney	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Cravaack	Lipinski	Simpson
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Sires
Critz	Long	Smith (NE)
Cuellar	Lowey	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Davis (CA)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (WA)
Davis (KY)	Lummis	Southerland
Denham	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Dent	E.	Stivers
DesJarlais	Lynch	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	Manzullo	Sullivan
Dicks	Marino	Terry
Dold	Matheson	Thompson (PA)
Donnelly (IN)	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Dreier	McCarthy (NY)	Tiberi
Duffy	McCaul	Tipton
Duncan (SC)	McCotter	Tsongas
Ellmers	McHenry	Turner
Emerson	McIntyre	Upton
Farenthold	McKeon	Van Hollen
Fincher	McKinley	Walberg
Flake	McMorris	Walden
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Walsh (IL)
Fleming	McNerney	Webster
Flores	Meehan	West
Forbes	Mica	Westmoreland
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Fox	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (NC)	Wittman
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Gallely	Mulvaney	Womack
Gardner	Murphy (CT)	Yarmuth
Gerlach	Murphy (PA)	Yoder
Gibbs	Myrick	Young (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer	Young (IN)

NAYS—148

Amash	Graves (GA)	Paul
Andrews	Green, Al	Payne
Baldwin	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Bartlett	Grijalva	Pingree (ME)
Bass (CA)	Hanabusa	Polis
Becerra	Heller	Price (NC)
Berman	Himes	Rangel
Bishop (UT)	Hinchee	Rehberg
Blumenauer	Hirono	Richardson
Brady (PA)	Holt	Richmond
Braley (IA)	Honda	Roe (TN)
Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Brown (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Campbell	Jackson Lee	Rush
Capps	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Carson (IN)	Johnson (IL)	T.
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Jones	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schilling
Clay	Kingston	Schrader
Cleaver	Kucinich	Schweikert
Clyburn	Labrador	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Crowley	Loeb sack	Stark
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Lujan	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Mack	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Maloney	Tierney
DeLauro	Marchant	Tonko
Deutch	Markey	Towns
Dingell	Matsui	Velázquez
Doggett	McClintock	Visclosky
Doyle	McCollum	Walz (MN)
Duncan (TN)	McDermott	Wasserman
Edwards	McGovern	Schultz
Ellison	Meeks	Waters
Engel	Michaud	Watt
Eshoo	Miller, George	Waxman
Farr	Moore	Weiner
Fattah	Moran	Welch
Filner	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Fitzpatrick	Napolitano	Woodall
Frank (MA)	Neal	Woolsey
Fudge	Olver	Wu
Garamendi	Owens	Young (AK)
Gibson	Pallone	
Gonzalez	Pastor (AZ)	

NOT VOTING—9

Butterfield	Giffords	Lamborn
Crawford	Gutierrez	Posey
Garrett	Hanna	Speier

□ 1904

Messrs. BRALEY of Iowa, CLEAVER, CLYBURN, WAXMAN, GONZALEZ, NEAL, ANDREWS, KINGSTON, HELLER, DEUTCH, ROE of Tennessee, CLARKE of Michigan, KILDEE, HIMES, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. CAMPBELL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. GRIFFITH of Virginia, MULVANEY, DUNCAN of South Carolina, and SCOTT of South Carolina changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERMISSION TO SUBMIT COMMITTEE RULES FOR PUBLICATION

Mr. DREIER. I ask unanimous consent that, one, the chair of each committee be permitted to submit their respective committee rules for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and, two, that the chair of the Committee on the Budget be permitted to submit material related to the budget process for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?
There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION DIRECTING COMMITTEES TO REVIEW REGULATIONS FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-6) on the resolution (H. Res. 72) directing certain standing committees to inventory and review existing, pending, and proposed regulations and orders from agencies of the Federal Government, particularly with respect to their effect on jobs and economic growth, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 72, DIRECTING COMMITTEES TO REVIEW REGULATIONS FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-7) on the resolution (H. Res. 73) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 72) directing certain standing committees to inventory and review existing, pending, and proposed regulations and orders from agencies of the Federal Government, particularly with respect to their effect on jobs and economic growth, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, 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 Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:

Mr. SMITH, New Jersey, Chairman
Mr. PITTS, Pennsylvania
Mr. ADERHOLT, Alabama
Mr. GINGREY, Georgia

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO RONALD REAGAN CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4 of the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-25), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission:

Mr. SCHOCK, Illinois

LACKING A COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY PLAN

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, last week, at the same time that oil broke \$100 a barrel, the President traveled to the Fifth District of Pennsylvania, home of the first oil well 151 years ago and to the world's largest natural gas play. It was an honor to have President Obama visit the Commonwealth and highlight the research being done at Penn State on energy efficiency. I was hopeful the President would touch on the importance of domestic energy production, especially oil, coal, and natural gas—each just as critical to any credible energy plan.

Unfortunately, I remain convinced that America lacks a comprehensive plan to end our reliance on foreign oil. In too many instances, this administration has undermined America's path to a comprehensive plan. This administration has withdrawn oil and gas leases in the West, imposed a moratorium on drilling in the Gulf, placed huge portions of the Outer Continental Shelf off limits to new offshore drilling, and proposed billions in higher taxes on American energy. These actions will not help cease America's dangerous reliance on foreign oil.

Our Nation needs a low-cost energy supply for economic growth and security. I hope my colleagues—on both sides of the aisle—will join me in that effort.

□ 1910

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, as a follow-up to what was just said by my colleague from Pennsylvania, we all know about the problems in the Middle East. There's a real problem in Egypt. We don't know about that government, how it's going to turn out. There's problems in the gulf states, there's problems in other parts of the Middle East, and we get at least 30 percent of our energy from that area. We also get about 20 percent of our energy from Venezuela, and the President down there, Mr. Chavez, is no friend of ours.

If we don't move toward energy independence and there's a real problem in the Middle East, we've got problems here in this country. Can you imagine what would happen if we had 30 percent of our energy cut off because there was a blockage of the Suez Canal or the Straits of Hormuz in the Persian Gulf? We must move toward energy independence.

The President is blocking us from getting permits to drill in the gulf, we can't drill in the ANWR, we can't drill off the continental shelf, we can't use

coal shale to produce oil. We have enough energy in this country to move to energy independence in 10 years with natural gas and these other fossil fuels. But the President will not move.

We're not going to solve this problem with windmills and solar energy. We've got to solve it with the energy that we have before us right now. It's in our national security and our economic security that we ought to do this.

IMPORTED FROM DETROIT

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, during the Super Bowl, Chrysler aired an ad promoting the new Chrysler 200 that touched the hearts of America with its focus on redemption and the enduring spirit of a great American city—Detroit, Michigan.

The redemption of a city and a region that has made some mistakes but is also home to some of our Nation's greatest innovators, most skilled craftsman and best workforce.

The redemption of an industry that has also made some mistakes but is still the backbone of American manufacturing.

Redemption epitomized by the workers at Chrysler's Sterling Heights assembly plant in Sterling Heights, Michigan, which was slated to close during bankruptcy. But the workers fought and sacrificed and made the business case that they were the right people to build the Chrysler 200 featured in the ad.

In Detroit, we build things. That is what we do. And we do it better than anybody else in the world. We still have a long way to go, but the Detroit region is coming back and our story of redemption is distinctly American.

Mr. Speaker, to all Americans who are looking to buy a new car and who are considering imports, I have a simple message. If you want the best, you should buy it, imported from Detroit.

WAKE FOREST BASEBALL COACH DONATES KIDNEY TO OWN PLAYER

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I don't often talk about sports on the floor of the House, but sometimes a player, team or coach's actions are so exemplary that they must be recognized. Such is the case with Wake Forest University baseball coach Tom Walter. This week Coach Walter, in an act of profound personal sacrifice, donated one of his kidneys to Kevin Jordan, a freshman player on his team. Kevin Jordan suffered with failing kidneys and a donation was his only hope for a normal life. And before he even had a chance to swing his bat for Wake Forest, his

coach stepped up and changed his life by offering one of his own kidneys.

This is not your everyday "take one for the team" story. Rather, this is a story of a man of great character and generosity taking initiative to improve the life of a promising young man like Kevin Jordan.

I want to wish both Kevin and Coach Walter a speedy recovery from their transplant surgeries and hope to see them one day soon on the ball diamond, winning games for Wake Forest.

Coach Walter's example is more than inspirational—it is the very image of a life lived well, of putting others first. His family, his players, his friends and his community could not ask for a better man to call their own.

PATIENTS FREEDOM TO CHOOSE ACT

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, later this week, I plan on introducing legislation, the Patients Freedom to Choose Act, along with Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON from Texas. This legislation would repeal two provisions of the new health care law that limit a patient's choice in how to use their consumer-directed health care plans.

Beginning in 2013, contributions to flexible spending accounts will be limited by a new Federal cap of \$2,500. The new health care law will also prohibit individuals from using their health savings accounts and their flexible spending accounts to purchase over-the-counter medication without a prescription from their doctor.

Mr. Speaker, 10 million Americans now are enrolled in HSAs and over 35 million people have FSAs, while 85 percent of all large employers offer them as a benefit to their employees. This legislation is needed because these two provisions in the health care law will punish families at a cost of over \$5 billion.

Instead of limiting options as is happening under this new health care law, we should be empowering patients by giving them increased access to affordable, quality care.

PEPSI'S DEMEANING SUPER BOWL AD

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have a sense of humor and I believe in the First Amendment; and I truly believe that many Americans had a great time either participating at the Super Bowl or maybe fellowshipping with family members. It's a great opportunity to share information and to inspire.

That is why I'm so disappointed with the Pepsi advertisement that showed a demeaning role for African American

women, in an ad that showed a can being thrown and being utilized to wound someone else or hit someone else, and that individual fell to the ground.

In this month of African American history where we're trying to celebrate what is good and great, it certainly seems ridiculous that Pepsi would utilize this kind of humor. It was not humorous. It was demeaning—an African American woman throwing something at an African American male and winding up hitting a Caucasian woman.

I think that we can come together in a much better way, sell Pepsi, and as well talk about good nutrition. But, frankly, I consider this insulting, and so did many other women of all colors. It would be great to have a lot more women in ads at the Super Bowl and great to have more women involved, but it also would be great to have a sense of balance that will respect individuals for who they are and how they contribute—great women like the Honorable Barbara Jordan and the Honorable Shirley Chisholm. I think even though they probably had a great sense of humor, they would find this very offensive.

LISTENING TO THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to share the feedback that I received from my constituents during my past week in the district. At a town hall meeting on Thursday night, I asked those in attendance to raise their hand if they felt they had a better life than their parents. Nearly everyone raised their hand. But when I asked if they believed that their grandchildren could look forward to a more promising future, not one person raised their hand. Not one person. That is simply unacceptable.

While this House has taken positive steps to address the out-of-control spending habits of this government, my constituents strongly feel that the best way to create a brighter future for our children and grandchildren is to cut spending, end government waste, and allow our economy to have the freedom to grow and create jobs. I thank everyone who has shared their thoughts and opinions with me over the past week and month, and I look forward to continuing our constructive dialogue.

□ 1920

REAGAN CENTENNIAL

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemorating President Ronald Reagan's centennial.

President Reagan served as an inspiration for an entire generation of us to get involved in politics. I first had the

honor of meeting Ronald Reagan as a young student in California, and in fact, this meeting led to my getting active in Youth for Reagan. He had a powerful message of economic freedom and limited government. Yet it was his ability to translate powerful messages like this into real reforms that set him apart from past leaders.

At the heart of all of Reagan's policies, from supply-side economics to promoting democracy overseas, was the importance of the individual, not the collective. It was the importance of freedom, not statism. This great legacy is what we celebrate today.

I remember, following the Carter administration, our economy was in a state of economic malaise—high unemployment and high inflation. In fact, that legacy led to the creation of the concept of the misery index—inflation plus unemployment—and that reached an all-time high. But through the enactment of a pro-growth agenda, Reagan was able to cut that number in half in that era of stagflation and lead us into prosperity.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF PRESIDENT RONALD WILSON REAGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAVAACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time out this evening so that my colleagues and I might have the opportunity to talk about what took place the day before yesterday and the century that led up to it. I am referring, as did my friend from Fullerton, Mr. ROYCE, to the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ronald Wilson Reagan.

We know that Ronald Reagan is an individual who has provided inspiration to Democrats and Republicans alike, and there is a reason for that. The reason is that, while not everyone agreed with Ronald Reagan's policies, he was an individual who was able to provide encouragement; he was an individual who was able to provide inspiration; and I think most importantly, Mr. Speaker, he was an individual who was able to provide hope to so many people all over this country as well as across the globe.

Mrs. Reagan did an interview this past week leading up to February 6 in which she was asked the question: What do you most want your husband to be remembered for?

What she said was that she wanted him to be remembered for the fact that he instilled a sense of optimism for the American people. That great sense of optimism, which was not Pollyanna-like, because he was clearly very realistic, direct, had a great strength of character, an unwavering commitment to his principles, but at the same time, he was always able to encourage people to have hope for the future.

In fact, one of the great things that the Ronald Reagan Foundation has done, as we all know, Mr. Speaker—and we see it on a regular basis right down this hallway into the great rotunda of the Capitol—is there, due in large part, to the now distinguished chair of the Committee on Administration, Mr. LUNGREN, who worked on this statue, and I was honored that he consulted me on a few occasions as he was working on it. To me, the thing that is the most important part of the statue is inscribed at the base. Unfortunately, it's on the back, so you have to go through a little effort to see it, Mr. Speaker. But at the base of that statue, it has three of the great statements that Ronald Reagan was known for.

What were they?

They were, of course: "America's best days are yet to come." "Our proudest moments are yet to be." "Our most glorious achievements are just ahead."

Now, if that doesn't instill optimism and encouragement, I don't know what does. Those three statements, I believe, define Ronald Reagan.

He obviously was someone who enjoyed having a good time. In fact, Nancy said on Sunday, at the party, that her husband always enjoyed celebrating his birthday and that he would have loved the party that took place. And for those who may not have been there or seen it, you should know that the celebration continues.

It actually began at the end of last year. I was privileged to give an address up at the library, during which I was talking about the challenges that exist today and the way that Ronald Reagan dealt with many of the similar problems that we face today. Then on New Year's Day, the Rose Parade featured a float marking the 100th anniversary of Ronald Reagan's birth. Then again this past weekend, on February 5 and 6, there were great activities that took place at the library.

I should say, the weekend before, there was a wonderful opportunity for us to have the Members of Congress who were elected in 1980, with Ronald Reagan, three decades ago, to convene for a class reunion that the Ronald Reagan Foundation helped us put together. At the same time, the Heritage Foundation hosted its meeting, which included many of the newly elected Members of Congress. It was basically a 2½-day gathering.

Several Members have told me about the opportunity to have Members of that 97th class, the class of 1980 which came in with Ronald Reagan, share their experiences with the newly elected Members—87 strong, the largest turnover in three-quarters of a century. We were able to share those experiences, and Members have said that it was probably the highlight of that 2½-day gathering that we had at the Ronald Reagan Library.

I also have to say, Mr. Speaker, that just yesterday we saw the opening of the new Ronald Reagan Museum, and

that museum is an amazing facility. Now, remember, Air Force One, which is the aircraft that Ronald Reagan flew, including Marine One, are both there at the library. This museum, which has been renovated over the past year or so, was reopened. I said at one of the gatherings that anyone who had the opportunity to know Ronald Reagan, to work with Ronald Reagan would have had, clearly, at least one occasion as they went through the library to have a wonderful memory come back to the forefront—and even new experiences. In fact, I had a very moving experience when I went through the museum and saw something that I had not seen before.

The father of one of my closest family friends passed away just before he was born—in fact, 4 months before he was born. He was an only son, and obviously never knew his father. As I walked through the Reagan Museum, I was struck because I saw on the wall the discharge papers that were signed by Captain Ronald Reagan.

When I saw them, I took out my telephone, and called my friend, and said, Did you know that Ronald Reagan had signed your father's discharge papers? He said, no, he didn't know it, and was, needless to say, very emotional having just learned that at that moment as I went in.

Well, this man is on March 20 going to mark his 50th birthday, and his name is John Clark Gable. His father was the legendary actor Clark Gable, who had had his discharge papers signed by Captain Ronald Reagan.

As you look, there is the good and the bad, which are outlined in this museum, including the very tragic day in March of 1981 when an assassination attempt was launched against President Reagan, to lots of exciting and fun times that took place during that period of time. Of course we all know of Ronald Reagan's legendary, legendary sense of humor.

One of my stories—and I'm happy my friend from Huntington Beach, whom I met when he was working for Ronald Reagan shortly after we came to Washington together in the early 1980s, my friend Mr. ROHRBACHER, likes to take credit for many of President Reagan's funny lines. You know, there is a raging debate that he and I have on that on a regular basis. One story I know Ronald Reagan enjoyed but did not, in fact, get from DANA ROHRBACHER, I should say for the record, Mr. Speaker, was when we were dealing with one of the most challenging economic times that the United States of America has gone through. It was in the early 1980s.

□ 1930

I was invited on a Saturday afternoon to a small party in Los Angeles. There were about 20 people gathered, and the people gathered were commiserating over the fact that we had at that point an unemployment rate that was well into double digits. We had an inflation rate that was sky high, and

interest rates were in excess of 15 percent, and so naturally everyone was focused on this.

President Reagan stood up after lunch and said, The other day, somebody asked me how I was doing, and he said, I've never been better. Well, needless to say, everyone at that lunch looked around like how in the world could he say that. He said the reason I say that is I'm reminded of this huge caravan of farm animals being driven through a countryside, and there is a terrible accident, these animals strewn all over the highway. And the sheriff came roaring up, and he looked to the side of the road and saw a horse with two broken legs, frothing at the mouth. So the sheriff pulled out his gun, put it to the horse's head, and put him out of the misery. And then he looked over and saw a dog, just about the same thing. This dog was shaking like there was no tomorrow, and so he put his gun to the dog's head and put him out of his misery. And then he looked over and saw the driver of one of the vehicles. This driver had at least one leg broken, badly bloodied and banged up, and the sheriff looked at the driver and said, And how are you feeling? And the driver responded by saying, I've never been better. And that, in fact, Mr. Speaker, demonstrated that great sense of optimism and hope that was always there for Ronald Reagan.

Now, his policies are something that are desperately needed today, and I'm so happy to see that as we have now won what would be a Reagan-like majority here in the House, that working together in a bipartisan way, which was a message that former Secretary of the Treasury, former Chief of Staff, former Secretary of State James Baker provided Sunday morning at the Reagan Library, working together in a bipartisan way to deal with our Nation's problems and the problems that we're dealing with around the globe is a very important thing.

And that's why as we look at the economic challenges, it seems to me that following what I like to describe as the Kennedy-Reagan economic model would be a great prescription for us to create jobs and get our economy back on track.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that as we look at where it is that we're going, making sure that we have tax rates that encourage job creation and economic growth are important. Thanks to the fact that Japan has just reduced its top rate on job creators, the United States of America today has the highest tax rate on job creators of any country in the world. We have the highest tax rate of any country in the world when it comes to those businesses that are trying to create jobs. We continue to hear and decry the flight of jobs outside of the United States to other parts of the world, and people get into so many other issues. We need to look at our policies that encourage the flight of those jobs outside of the country.

I will tell you that if Ronald Reagan were President of the United States, I have no doubt that he would be championing the notion of reducing that top corporate tax rate, and I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was very gratified right behind me just 10 days ago President Obama stood here and advocated a reduction of that top rate on those job creators. We know that he has recently, President Obama, read Lou Cannon's book on Ronald Reagan and understands how successful Ronald Reagan was.

Now, I have lots of things that I want to say, but I'm privileged to be joined by four great Californians who are here right now, and so I think that the most appropriate thing for me to do would be to go by both age and seniority. And so I think that my friend DAN LUNGREN, who has been an inspiration to me as Ronald Reagan was, has joined us, and I mentioned him earlier. He's the distinguished chair of the Committee on House Administration, something that we were never able to do during the Reagan years, that being have the majority, and I know that Ronald Reagan would be very proud to see his friend DAN LUNGREN in the position that he is today.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield to my friend.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman from California for taking this time and for yielding this time to me and I know to others as we come about this.

You and I have and the other gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER) were privileged to be in that crowd on Sunday where we celebrated Ronald Reagan's 100th birthday.

I was reminded that the last time I spoke with him was 20 years before on his birthday, his 80th birthday, when I was calling him from my office in Sacramento, and he was his usual open, affable, and interested individual who always had an expression of concern for the person he was speaking with and who didn't take himself too seriously but obviously took the job that he had very, very seriously.

One of the insights into President Reagan I think is seen in a film that was done about Ronald Reagan's life that I saw recently, and at the end of the film or close to the end of the film, they had an interview with the Secret Service man who continued to be with Ronald Reagan to the very end, and this Secret Service man was distinguished by the fact that he was a fellow equestrian. He rode with Ronald Reagan, and it was the last time Ronald Reagan rode a horse. He went out riding with him, and when he came back he went to Mrs. Reagan and said, the President didn't have a very good day on the horse today, and that was a nice way of saying maybe it's time that he not risk injury by horse riding. And everybody knew that Ronald Reagan loved to ride horses. Probably his third greatest passion—his passion for his wife, his passion for this coun-

try, and then his passion for riding horses. And Mrs. Reagan told the Secret Service man, well, I can't tell him; you've got to tell him. And it was very uncomfortable. And the agent went up to the President and said very, very quietly, Mr. President, we didn't have a good day riding today. And Ronald Reagan sensed exactly what he was going to say, and instead of protesting, he made every effort to put the Secret Service agent at ease, knowing that it was a difficult thing for him.

You have to understand that. He was being told that something that he loved almost as much as anything else in his life, his avocation, his—some people play golf; Ronald Reagan rode horses. He was being told he could no longer do that, and instead of thinking about himself and the pain it was going to cause him and the lack of opportunity to enjoy himself, his first concern was for the person who was delivering that message to him, and he wanted to put him at ease.

And that gives you a bit of an understanding of the character of the man who thought about what he was doing for others rather than what they were doing for him, or, excuse me, to put it this way: He thought more about what gratitude he had for what other people were doing for him, rather than accepting praise for what he was doing in that circumstance.

I remember the last great speech that I remember that Ronald Reagan gave. It was at the 1992 Republican convention in Houston, and some of you may remember it. You've seen film of it if you weren't there. He wore a suit or a sport coat and a shirt that, if we wore it, we would be told you don't wear those sorts of things when you're appearing at a political event. It was sort of a maroon or almost maroon to brown jacket, and I remember the shirt had a white collar and it had stripes that were of the same color as the coat.

And when he started to speak, and I was watching closely because my son, who at that time was in college, had gotten a pass to the floor of the convention, and I said, I want you to see the master speak, using that in quotation marks, because this may be the last great speech he ever gives. When Ronald Reagan got up, he looked every bit his age. In fact, he looked a little bit tired. As he started to speak, some young people in front of him began chanting his name and cheering him, and at first he couldn't hear very well. And then he realized what they were saying, and you saw that Ronald Reagan grin begin, and you saw him start to speak. And at the end of his speech, I guarantee you he was 20 years younger than when he started that speech.

And he gave that vibrancy to the entire assembled crowd there in that convention hall, and I was so happy that I had my son there to be able to see this remarkable man give this remarkable performance at the end of his career. But when you think about that, sometimes you think maybe we just think

about him as the communicator, and as we know in the final address he made to the Nation from the Oval Office, he said some people say that I'm a great communicator. It's not so much that I'm a great communicator, it's that I was able to communicate great things that came from this country.

That always remained with me. I always thought Ronald Reagan had spent his whole life reading, thinking, thinking about this Nation, thinking about the principles that made this Nation great.

□ 1940

And in my own mind, whenever I met with him with other Members of Congress or alone, you had this idea that he had developed this philosophical or political schematic.

If you were speaking to him about a subject, he would put that schematic over that discussion. And if, in fact, it fit within those principles he had developed over a lifetime, he would basically allow you to go do it. He would basically give you a charge, and he would be behind you—may not tell you the details, but he would be with you. And if you didn't, if you had something that was outside that philosophical political schematic that he had developed over a lifetime, he would in some ways gently tell you that, No, I don't think we're going to do that. And you knew at that point in time that he wasn't going to be with you on it; but he was, again, thinking a little bit about you and the reaction that you would receive when he would tell you "no."

One of the most difficult things I ever had to do was to tell him "no" on the phone. I was in my office. He was calling on a vote. And I can't even recall what the subject was.

Mr. DREIER. If I can reclaim my time, I will tell you exactly what the vote was because I remember it so vividly. It was the 1982 Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act. And I further yield to my friend.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. It may very well have been that.

He called me personally to talk to me about that. And I had the hardest time saying "no" to him, but I did. The remarkable thing about it was that he didn't pressure me anymore. He didn't make me feel bad. He didn't say, Well, you'll hear from us again, or if you want something in your district. All he said was, I understand. I'm sorry I couldn't convince you. I got off that phone. I thought I was right in the decision I had made, but I felt badly that I had to tell him "no," and I think that was it.

One of the highlights of my first 10 years in the Congress was going to my alma mater, the University of Notre Dame, on Air Force One with Ronald Reagan when he was going to unveil the stamp commemorating the 100th birthday of Knute Rockne—or as he said, "Ke-Nute" Rockne because that's what Knute Rockne's widow had told

him was the proper pronunciation. And we flew there, and it was a great day. A little bit of rain. We got in the Athletic and Convocation Center, and it was standing room only. They didn't have enough room for all the students. The overflow crowd was in another room that had a television.

There were four of us, graduates of the University of Notre Dame, who were Members of Congress at the time that he had with us and Dick Lyng who was the Californian who was the Secretary of Agriculture, also a Notre Dame grad. And in his speech, he said, "I want to introduce you to the new Four Horsemen of Notre Dame," and then mentioned each one of our names. I have that on tape, and that is one of my highlights of my life. And at some point in time, I will make sure I make copies and give it to my children and my grandchildren.

But he loved the fact that people remembered him for that role and for the spirit that he had there. And I am proud of the fact that after his recovery from that assassination attempt, the first public major address he made away from the Capitol was at the University of Notre Dame.

Ronald Reagan was a hero to many of us. He was an inspiration to many of us, but he was a real man. He had his weaknesses as well as his strengths. He had his shortcomings, and he would be the first one to admit it. But above all, he was that person who told us, as Republicans, that we should approach the future not only with confidence, not only with hope, but with a sense of joy, an idea that this country is the greatest country in the history of the world and gives us the greatest opportunity to succeed. And he always felt a sense of gratitude that he was here, that he was born here, that he was allowed to raise himself up. And he thought that ought to be the opportunity given to everybody.

When he came into a room, there was just a feeling there that was not there at any other time. And it's hard for some of us to realize that he has been gone for 6½ years now and that he would be 100 years old today. All we can say is, we're not looking backwards. We're trying to take the essence of the man, his commitment to the foundations of this country, his openness and his optimism, and utilize that at a time when we desperately need it.

I never thought that he looked at a person and thought, You're African American, you're Caucasian, you're Hispanic, you're Asian. He looked at you and said, You're an American; and therefore I'm going to expect the best out of you, and this country is going to give you the opportunity to be the very, very best.

So I thank the gentleman from California for this time. And this weekend was wonderful not only for us to reflect in our memories but also to bring the Ronald Reagan we know to the present people of America, particularly those young people who were not born when

he was President of the United States and let them have a sense of what it was that commanded this country, that led this country, that inspired this country.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for his very thoughtful comments. And let me say before yielding to whichever of my colleagues gets to their feet next, Mr. Speaker, I think that when one thinks of some of the great, great Reagan stories that are legendary, you can't help but recall that he had joy in sharing those stories with people. And I guess that had to have been his Irish blood that was flowing that brought that out. But all of those stories did provide so much encouragement.

One of his great lines, to me—and my friend just referred to it—was when he would look to Americans, regardless of what their background was, and say, You're an American. And I am reminded of his famous line where he said, You know, if you immigrate to France, you don't become a Frenchman. If you immigrate to China, you don't become Chinese. The United States of America is the only country in the world where if you immigrate to the United States of America, you become an American which, again, underscores what a melting pot the United States of America is and *e pluribus unum*, "out of many, one." That is what has made us as great as we are.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my friend from Huntington Beach, California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), the famous, legendary speechwriter of Ronald Reagan. We first met in the decade of the 1980s. We joined with Democrats and Republicans in both Houses of Congress to play a role in liberating the people of Afghanistan from the Soviet Union's horrendous control, and I'm sure he will seize this opportunity to get into that.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Thank you very much, DAVID. Just to expand a little bit on the last point you made, when we were writing for Ronald Reagan, he would insist that we don't talk about people as being—he wouldn't say Irish Americans or Mexican Americans or German Americans. He always insisted that we say "Americans of Irish descent," "Americans of Mexican descent," "Americans of German descent." Americans together, up front. So that's a little bit of wisdom. Just that little expression showed the wisdom of that man.

It was my honor to join with my two colleagues at the 100th celebration. DAN and DAVE and I, we have a special place in our lives for this man, Ronald Reagan. And I think that that birthday and that gathering that we had at the Reagan Library is one of the most memorable times that I will have, and I am just so grateful that I was able to share that with you.

I think the Reagan Library is doing a terrific job, and they will then be able to carry what we are talking about tonight so that younger people, people 100 years from now, will get a good picture of this man who saved America

and saved the world from tyranny. Also, the Young America's Foundation is doing a great job at restoring the Reagan ranch where Reagan spent so much of his time and got his inspiration, and is implementing some great educational activities up there.

I, of course, met Ronald Reagan so many years ago when I volunteered as a youth organizer for his first campaign for Governor. And I was in Youth for Reagan. I was the L.A. County High School chairman of Youth for Reagan, although I was a freshman at a junior college at the time.

There had been so much infighting going on—the Republicans almost enjoy fighting each other as much as they do fighting Democrats and everybody else. Well, it was true back then as well. And there was so much infighting going on in the Youth for Reagan, they were going to eliminate it. I got wind of this, and I had hundreds of kids out walking precincts. I thought this would be horrible for them. So I decided I had to talk to Ronald Reagan personally about this.

□ 1950

And I found out what his address was, and at 2 o'clock in the morning I hiked up this long driveway in Pacific Palisades up to his house. They didn't have a guard. Here's the guy, the candidate for Governor, and nobody is there guarding the gate. And so I camped out on his back lawn, and the next morning, about 6:30, 7:00, Nancy sticks her head out there, What are you doing? Who are you?

And I had a little sign that said, "Mr. Reagan, please speak to me." And I told her I was in the Youth for Reagan and I just needed 2 minutes, just 2 minutes with him, 120 seconds. And she said, Listen, if he comes out here, he's going to spend 20 minutes with you. He's either going to miss his breakfast or be late for the rest of the day. I can't permit that to happen. If you leave right now, I'll get you an appointment with the campaign manager.

Well, you know, that's the best I was going to get. So I was walking real slow down that long driveway dragging my sleeping bag. And behind me I hear, Wait a minute; wait a minute.

And there was Ronald Reagan chasing after me with shaving cream on his face; his shirt's wide open.

If you can spend the night on my back lawn, I can certainly spend a few moments with you. Now what's the problem, young man?

And, you know, he never let me down. I knew him for 40 years after that. He never let me down. He was the same caring, wonderful person.

And as my life went on and I was active in his campaigns, I was with him for 8 months from in the morning he got up till the time he went to bed during the '76 campaign, so I knew everything that was going on in his life. I never heard him say the "F" word. I never heard him say, as the door slammed behind after someone who had

been saying bad things about him, I never heard him say, "That SOB," or anything like that.

Ronald Reagan was centered. He was confident in himself, and he didn't feel threatened by people who disliked him. His way of doing things was always, be very strong for the things you believe, very principled. Be as strong an advocate as you can, but be very nice to people. Be very nice to people even if they're on the other side of the table arguing another case.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time and just interject one little story here as we have a discussion here. I'm reminded that one of his domestic policy advisors, Professor Roger Porter from Harvard, had told me that he remembered sitting in the Oval Office with President Reagan, and a group came in and began just maligning and ripping him up one side and down the other. And the President just sat there patiently—and obviously he was on the opposite side of where they were—and they left.

And Professor Porter looked to him and he said, Gosh. He said, Why in the world, Mr. President, would you not respond to those people? I mean, they were so horrible to you.

And President Reagan looked to him and said, Well, you know, I can't control how other people act. I can only control how I act.

And that was his response to that kind of attack.

And I am happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. And I think that that kindness and his personality is what was dictating how he would act.

So I went on after that, and I was a freshman in college when he was running in '66. By the time his administration was over, I was a journalist. I was actually a reporter in Los Angeles. I'd graduated from college.

And anyway, I was someone who was well known as going to the heart of the matter and asking the toughest question at all the press conferences, and he was now Governor, finishing up his last couple of years as Governor of the State. And I remember a press conference that I covered with Ronald Reagan. DAN LUNGREN would appreciate this because it was his commission on crime, and he was going to make this big announcement as to what his commission on crime was recommending.

And I got up and of course wanted to ask the toughest question, and the question was: Governor, you suggested, and many times have suggested in your speeches, that you are a Christian and that this is an important value to you; you base many of your judgments on your faith. How can you justify in Christian theology that you are taking someone, as the commission is suggesting that we expand the use of the death penalty, and that we take someone who is not at that moment a threat to another human being and is in cus-

tody and take that person's life? Isn't that contradictory to your Christian beliefs?

And Reagan, you could see that he really took it so seriously, and he just said, I've prayed about that so many times. I cannot tell you how much thought and prayer has gone into that very issue, and I sought religious help from people and guidance from various spiritual leaders, and I came to the conclusion, well, DANA, I came to the conclusion that if you're killing someone for vengeance, that is not consistent with what Jesus Christ has taught us. But if you realize you're taking that life to save the life of another because other murderers will be deterred from killing innocent victims, well, that's totally consistent.

And I tell you, my view of Ronald Reagan and my admiration for that man went right through the roof.

Well, what happened then, Evelle Younger, who was Attorney General of the State, grabs the microphone and says, Morality and religion have nothing to do with this. The people voted for the death penalty and they're going to get it.

Yeah, my opinion of Reagan was that high. And I would just note Evelle Younger ran for Governor and lost.

Well, this was the type of Ronald Reagan that I got to know, very principled person.

In '76, a year after that press conference, he ran for President. And I was about the only Republican that he could find in the press corps to hire as Lynn Nofsinger's Assistant Press Secretary, and I traveled with him, as I say, through '76 and '80 and then went to the White House with him after that.

And let me just note that when Ronald Reagan went to the White House, it has been again described so many times that our country was in such jeopardy. Freedom was in retreat. The Soviet Union was in the ascendancy. Tyranny, many of us felt in the late '70s that our country would lose the Cold War and that the world would be dominated by this Marxist, Leninist, totalitarian ideology. And of course our economy was near collapse and heading towards disaster.

Ronald Reagan, when he was a young person, was a lifeguard. He saved 77 lives. That was such a part of a self-image of being someone who was going to save the day. And I saw that at work. I saw that at work in the tough decisions.

And by the way, let me just note, I disagree with Jim Baker. I didn't see the bipartisanship that Jim Baker talked about. Maybe he did. But when I worked in the White House with Ronald Reagan, because I went with him there after he won the 1980 campaign, and I was one of his five principal speech writers for 7 years. All I noticed was at that stand right over there the Democrats, over and over again, from this body and from the Senate would do everything they could to defile and

to make it sound like Ronald Reagan was a warmonger because he wanted to make sure that the Soviets were not encouraged to go on further and expand their weapons by us freezing them into a position of superiority.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, I would just say to my friend, obviously that kind of partisan debate takes place regularly. But I think that what Secretary Baker was talking about was, first, the issue of Social Security, where President Reagan did work with Tip O'Neill to try and bring about an effort to save Social Security. In 1986, President Reagan worked with the then chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Dan Rostenkowski, on the 1986 Tax Reform Act.

And so it's true. I mean, in fact, I thank my friend for raising this issue, because the sense that somehow everyone at the end of the day loved each other during that period of the 1980s is a mischaracterization of the way it existed. But President Reagan, as Secretary Baker pointed out, did at the end of the day, when it came to these important issues of economic growth dealing with Social Security, and even on the issue of foreign policy and dealing with both Afghanistan and Central America, while not all Democrats joined, there were more than a few who, with his encouragement, did this. Because remember, were it not for bipartisan support, these policies would not have been implemented because we had 192 Republicans in the House of Representatives and were, in fact, in the minority.

So I am happy to further yield to my friend.

□ 2000

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I will have to admit, even some of the people who were most guilty of not being bipartisan have suggested that it was bipartisanship that ended the Cold War. But your examples that you have given with the Social Security, for example, people don't know that had we not been working together and had Ronald Reagan not been there to provide the leadership, Social Security would have been bankrupt by now easily. But I saw these majors events from inside the White House and watched him.

One note: I was there probably at the low point of the White House. That day was the day that 240 marines were blown to hell in Beirut. I remember my brother's best friend was the first name on that list of people who were killed.

Ronald Reagan felt that it was his worst mistake that he ever made, was sending those marines in there. When his advisers suggested to him that now is the time we've got to prove we're tough. Send in a whole marine division to make sure we kick those guys' butts who killed our people to prove they can't do this and get away with it. Ronald Reagan was wise enough not to go for vengeance, but instead to use his head and to do what was the right policy that would not put us in jeopardy and put us in a quagmire.

Ronald Reagan said, "No. We are going to get our butts out of there" and had he not done that and sent in 20,000 American troops, we would have been on the defensive for the rest of his administration. Instead, he reached out and found elements around the world who were fighting communist dictatorship, they called it the Reagan Doctrine, and he let the enemy of our enemies do the fighting. That was the Reagan Doctrine. That's what succeeded in Afghanistan and elsewhere. It drained the budget of the Soviet Union, and it collapsed.

One last story that I would like to tell, and that is, so many people who have tried to belittle President Reagan have tried to make him look—how many times have I heard this, Well, he's just an actor and he's just reading scripts. You guys are great script writers. First of all, let me note, I never wrote a speech for anybody until Ronald Reagan taught me how to write a speech.

We had a saying at the White House: If this guy wasn't President, he's a good enough writer to be the President's speechwriter. That's number one. But Ronald Reagan was not just reading lines and not just reading scripts, number one. It was his vision of the world we had to capture. But, more importantly, he was making very tough policy statements that would not have been made by other Presidents, and the best example of this is the Berlin Wall speech. As we noted at the 100th birthday, there is a chunk of the Berlin Wall, and the Soviet Union has disintegrated. And now in Russia, by the way, the churches are filled with people in Russia today. Back in those days, Christians and other people who believed in God were being repressed with all the other freedoms.

But Ronald Reagan was going to go to Berlin, and the speechwriters knew that the senior staff would do everything they could not to permit Ronald Reagan to say what he needed to say, which is, Tear down the wall. So we had to plan on it, and actually we underhandedly got the speech to Ronald Reagan. I won't describe the great details it went through, but it was an avenue that we knew once we used it once would be closed up to us.

Once Reagan saw the speech, it was, Oh, yes. This is exactly what I want to say. And then it wasn't the five speechwriters against all these senior advisers to the President. It was the speechwriters and the President. And George Schulz came in; and he was with us the other day, but during that time he was yelling at Ronald Reagan that he was trying to reignite the Cold War by saying, Tear down the wall. All of these people who now are very happy with Ronald Reagan and suggest that, Oh, I was in on it. In this particular case, and many others, they were telling Reagan not to do these things, especially, Don't say, Tear down the wall.

I cannot tell you how far it went. Colin Powell actually gave him a

speech and said, All your advisers except for speechwriters want this speech. And it was the same speech, except "tear down the wall," that page had been left out. And Reagan was, No. I think I'll use the one I've got, thank you.

Well, what happens is this: Reagan gets up, and he is courageous. He is being told not to do this, that this would create new Cold War animosities on the other side. He knew that this was a message to their leadership and to the people behind the Iron Curtain that we were serious about our advocacy of democracy and freedom and peace. He knew that. And he knew if he didn't say it, it would demoralize all of those people. It would change history for the worse if he didn't say it. And he got up there, and he made that strong statement.

The next day, of course, we were all watching to find out exactly what was going to be the reaction. And I don't know how, but somebody from the National Security Council had a copy of a verbatim transcript of Gorbachev's conversation with the senior staff. Now, I have no idea how we happened to get that into our possession, but Gorbachev was saying, This guy Reagan, once he gets his teeth into you, he's like a dog. He'll never let go. And we have got to find a way to bring down that wall and maintain our dignity. And sure enough, then all those other guys that we were talking about who fought this speech, and they did everything they could to get him not to say it, then they started claiming they had written the speech and they were for it all along of course.

Well, the one great thing about Ronald Reagan, he had it right on his desk, and it was, There is no limit to what a person can achieve if he doesn't care who gets the credit. Reagan wasn't looking for credit for the end of the war. He was looking to do great things for America. And I will tell you, he inspired all of us.

Do I have time for one more Reagan story?

Mr. DREIER. One more Reagan story. We want to hear from our two colleagues.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Everyone knows Ronald Reagan the politician. We can go on with all these lists of speeches and the bills and things, but I think the day I remember the most about Ronald Reagan was in North Carolina.

In 1976, Reagan was running and I was the assistant press secretary. And here he had probably 5,000, 10,000 people in this parking lot for a rally, and this lady comes up to me and says, You're with Governor Reagan? And I said, Yes, I am. She said, I have seven blind children here, and they can't get through the crowd. And I wonder if maybe after the speech we can bring them over here and Governor Reagan could shake hands with them. And I said, Let me clear it. Let me find out.

So I went behind the podium there with Mike Deaver. I said, Mike, there's

a lady here; she's got these blind children and they can't get through the crowd. They would really like to shake hands with Governor Reagan. And Reagan was two steps behind us. He hears me and he jumps right in between us and he says, Of course we're going to say hello to those children. But, DANA, we don't want this to be a press event. And you get all the reporters in the buses, and I'll come right over here and spend a couple minutes with those children.

So, sure enough, the reporters head to the buses, and the kids are brought back there behind the podium. And there's Reagan and he is talking to them. They are about 7, 8 years old. And this is the sense of this man. He says, You know, I know that you can't see me. But maybe you would like to touch my face so you can get a sense about who I am and what I look like. And of course they did.

Now, imagine this: there's Ronald Reagan, a candidate for President, with seven of these little kids, beautiful little kids touching his face. There is not a politician in the world that would not give millions of dollars to have a picture of that. They would be on the cover of all the magazines, and Reagan knew that. But he didn't want anyone, he didn't want those kids or anyone to think that he was exploiting blind children. And it's like us today. We've got to get a sense or feel about this man and who he really was. And I hope that the Reagan Library and what they are doing with the Young America's Foundation up at the ranch will help future generations get a good feel for this wonderful person.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend very much for his very thoughtful contributions. And his last two stories remind me very vividly of the fact that Ronald Reagan was in charge, whether it was ensuring that he penned the: "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall," or whether he jumped forward and said, Of course I'm going to meet with those young people. And it brought to mind that famous "Saturday Night Live" skit where you may recall where you saw Reagan come out. The perception of him was, as my friend said earlier, that he wasn't in charge and that he was scripted by everyone else but himself. What they did in the skit was he came out and he met with some young children and he shook hands with them and said, How are you doing? And was perceived as this guy who was a long way from being in charge. Then the moment they left, he went back and he said, Okay, fellas, let's get to work here now. So behind the curtain he was doing that. When, in fact, we do know that Ronald Reagan was in charge as he dealt with foreign policy and domestic policy as well.

And I'm very happy that we are joined by my colleague who came to the Congress during the last 2 years of the Reagan administration. He came here in 1986 and I know was inspired by President Reagan. He is a very, very

thoughtful, hardworking member of the Ways and Means Committee and a subcommittee chairman. I am happy to recognize him at this time, my friend, Mr. HERGER.

□ 2010

Mr. HERGER. I want to thank my good friend from California (Mr. DREIER). Particularly, I want to thank my good friend for leading us in this incredibly special, special time to remember an individual who, as we have heard from the speakers before me, individuals like Mr. DREIER who actually spent a lot of time with President Reagan, sharing with us the incredible person, an inspiration, that our 40th President, who we are celebrating this week the 100th anniversary of his birth, is to each of us.

As the gentleman mentioned, I did have the privilege of serving for his last 2 years as President, 1987 and 1988. But I think about what President Reagan meant to me, and when I think about what he meant to me, I know as I have listened to these speakers before me what he meant to so many of us in our Nation and the world today.

My friend Mr. DREIER mentioned in his early remarks what the country was like in 1980 when Ronald Reagan ran for President. We think what it is like today. We have over 9 percent unemployment. We have very low inflation. But in 1980, when President Reagan was running, we had not 9 percent unemployment, but 12 percent unemployment. We had something that we haven't had since the early days of President Reagan's administration, and that was inflation, inflation that was running 13 percent.

As a small businessman then, I remember what it was like. You did not know what to price your products at because you didn't know what you were going to be buying them for again, and it was an unbelievably challenging time. Plus, as a small businessperson, we had a prime interest rate that was 21.5 percent. We had home mortgages that were hitting 16 percent.

Now, those of us who can remember back at that time, talk about challenging times, those were challenging times. And to have someone who was the type of inspiration that Ronald Reagan was, who literally exemplified everything he believed, and we heard so much from our speakers before me, but to Ronald Reagan it was morning in America. He believed. He not only had confidence in himself, he had even more confidence in our Nation. He had confidence in those of us who were small business people, who were Americans. As was mentioned, it didn't matter whether you were immigrants, like my grandparents were from Switzerland, you were an American. He had not only confidence in this, but he could emulate this to all of those around us.

It was interesting, because back about 10 years ago in a Republican Conference of fellow Republicans in

Congress, someone asked a question, who among us, and there were, I don't know, about 150 or so, who among us were inspired by Ronald Reagan to run originally. And over half of us raised our hands. As a matter of fact, it was about three-quarters of us. It was Ronald Reagan who inspired us to leave our positions as a small businessman, as a family rancher or dairy person to run for office. So we see it today. We see those who ran this last time, a very similar time.

But God bless Ronald Reagan. God bless all that he inspired us with.

And, Mr. DREIER, I want to thank you for leading us. This is one of the greatest times of my life, to be able to participate along with you and Mr. LUNGREN and Mr. ROHRBACHER and others in remembering someone who I believe is one of the very greatest Americans ever to live, Ronald Reagan. Thank you.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend very much for his thoughtful remarks. I want to assure him that it didn't begin or end this evening, but we are in an entire year's celebration. In fact, tomorrow evening, our colleague who represents the Ronald Reagan Library, ELTON GALLEGLY, is going to be taking an hour out and talking about him as well.

To close out this evening, we are very pleased to have the newest Member who is here on the House floor, who has already become a veteran, one of the great champions of the conservative cause in our State of California, my good friend, Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank my friend for yielding, and I want to continue where my friend from California (Mr. HERGER) left off, talking about what kind of times brought Ronald Reagan here to Washington.

We are told today that we face the worst economy since the Great Depression. There are a lot of us that remember an even worse time, when we did have double-digit unemployment and double-digit inflation and mile-long lines around gas stations and interest rates that exceeded 20 percent. And, by the way, when we hear that our world is growing more dangerous by the day, I remember when an American Embassy could be seized with impunity, when an aggressive and expanding Soviet Union daily challenged American interests around the world, when communism went unchallenged in the Western Hemisphere, when the American military had been so badly weakened it couldn't even launch a successful rescue mission.

Perhaps we don't remember those days as vividly because they didn't last very long. At that dark hour in our Nation's history, the American people turned to Ronald Reagan, who diagnosed our country's problems very accurately. In this crisis, he said, government is not the solution to our problems; government is the problem. He said the Soviet Union is indeed an evil empire, and it was time, he said, that

America stopped apologizing for its interests and started asserting them.

At the time, the American left excoeriated Reagan. They warned his policies would lead the Nation to starvation and the world to conflagration. Instead, we enjoyed a period of American prosperity and world influence that was best described with the words "morning again in America." He reduced the tax and regulatory burdens that were crushing America's economy. He reduced government spending as a percentage of GDP. He restored America's military strength and reasserted American interests around the world. He stopped apologizing for America's greatness and started celebrating it.

It was recalled earlier that in his farewell address Reagan attributed his success not to being a great communicator, but to the fact he was communicating great ideas, the self-evident truths of the American founding. He did one other thing. He restored those self-evident truths as the foundation of our domestic and foreign policy, and as a result our Nation prospered and the world enjoyed a rebirth of freedom.

Unfortunately, Reagan's successors gradually abandoned his policies and Americans gradually let loose of those self-evident truths that inspired and animated those policies. But now as our Nation endures prolonged economic distress at home and increasing strife abroad, Americans are beginning to realize that our Nation hasn't been struck down by some mysterious act of God. What has happened to our country is because of specific acts of government, and, as Reagan knew, acts of government are fully within our power to change.

Reagan charted the road back. Our Nation followed him down that road and we discovered that, yes, it does indeed lead to a shining city on a hill. As we remember Ronald Reagan, all that he was and all that he stood for, let's also remember what he did and where he led us. It isn't too late to return to those policies and get back on that road.

Mr. Speaker, I want my children to know what morning again in America actually feels like. I want them to know the optimism that America's best days are yet ahead, and to know the pride and confidence of American exceptionalism. On this centennial of Ronald Reagan's birth, let's not just remember him; let's follow his example and get our Nation back on the road to freedom. And let those looking back on our generation say that just when it began to appear that our Nation had forgotten Ronald Reagan and squandered its wealth and abandoned its destiny and forsaken its founding principles, that this generation of Americans rediscovered, restored and revived the memory of Ronald Reagan and the promise of the American founding, and that from that moment in time, America began her next great era of expansion, prosperity and influence.

□ 2020

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his very thoughtful contribution and his dedication to the Reagan cause. As we think about where we are today, I said at the library the other night that I was privileged to be part of the Reagan revolution, having been elected with President Reagan in 1980. But thanks to the 87 newly elected Members who have joined us, I said what a privilege it is to be a part of the Reagan revolution, because I think that it does continue.

If we look at just foreign policy, again, the fact is that Ronald Reagan, in a very famous speech that he delivered in the early 1980s at Westminster talked about the need to develop the infrastructure, foster the infrastructure of democracy around the world. And he established the National Endowment for Democracy, which has made great strides in expanding the rule of law, political pluralism, the development of self-determination of democratic institutions around the world. And this is a war of ideas that will continue to this very day. It is a war of ideas that consists of that struggle. It's peace and prosperity through freedom and democracy versus oppression and poverty bred of violence and hatred.

And I believe that we can, in fact, win this war of ideas if we do get back to the core principles of Ronald Reagan. And, as I said, Mr. Speaker, the museum has reopened, and I want to encourage our colleagues to take the opportunity to visit this amazing, amazing facility, which I know will bring back memories for every single American who was alive during the Reagan years, and it clearly will be a model for future generations.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

CLEAR AIR ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TONKO. 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.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TONKO. This evening, Mr. Speaker, we will be joined by a number of colleagues in the House to discuss

the Clean Air Act and its impact on jobs, on public health, and our national security. It is interesting to note that we've had an outstanding 40-year record on behalf of the improvements that have come via the Clean Air Act, and now there are forces amongst us that would like to repeal important pollution control standards that are part of that Clean Air Act and roll backward the very progress that we have enjoyed, the impact that it has made. And they're being joined now, these forces, by big polluters, people who would choose to have us go backward and undo the tremendous standards that have brought about and enhanced quality of life.

Since 1970, the Clean Air Act has saved hundreds of thousands of lives and decreased air pollution by some 60 percent, at the same time having grown our economy by some 200 percent. So it is very important to note that there has been a high order of progress associated with the Clean Air Act, which came, by the way, through bipartisan vision that thought we could improve our situation here in America, and those visionaries were absolutely correct.

We now are at risk of endangering our children's health simply by attacking the health standards that the Clean Air Act promotes. We're also at risk of promoting ideas that will denounce innovation—innovation that has moved forward in breaking our gluttonous dependency on oil, oftentimes imported from unfriendly nations to the United States, and where also we will roll back the progress that has come with creating our own sense of innovation as we have responded to these cleanup measures here in the States. This is an important juncture. After a 40-year record, 40 years of success, we're now faced with the forces of big polluters hooking up with our colleagues in the majority in this House looking to roll back progress and denounce policies that have impacted us favorably.

We're joined this evening by a number of colleagues. We're joined by Representative QUIGLEY from the Fifth District of Illinois, who has thoughts that he wants to share with us. We'll be hearing from a number of colleagues from Virginia and Washington State as the hour continues to roll.

Representative QUIGLEY, thank you for joining us this evening on this very important topic and on this very important effort to hold back any efforts made to undo the law and weaken it and put our health standards at risk.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Well, I want to thank you so much for having me. I want to thank my colleague from New York for his efforts and everyone who's here tonight toward this end. This issue is critical not just to our health, our Nation's health, but also to our country's national security and our economy. Because I rise today to protect the integrity of all things of science because it is science that these facts and figures that have led hundreds of scientists to

confirm that global warming is real. It is this science that led the Supreme Court through jurisprudence to rule that the EPA does in fact have the authority to regulate greenhouse gases. And it is this science that led the Congress to pass the Clean Air Act, the act which designated the EPA as the body charged with overseeing, adapting, and implementing these regulations.

In the coming months, the EPA will begin regulating greenhouse gases from certain emitters for the first time. These regulations have become hugely controversial and, sadly, political. These rules combat man-made climate change—man-made climate change that is melting our polar ice caps, that is raising the level of our oceans, and that is modifying our seasonal temperatures; man-made climate change that is altering the duration of our growing season, that is flooding parts of the world and causing multi-year droughts on others; man-made climate change that is allowing particulate matters to infiltrate our children's lungs, making them suffer from lifelong asthma and making us die earlier.

But some would argue these rules, these new regulations, are burdensome; that they kill jobs, they imperil economic recovery, they are nonsensical, they aren't pragmatic. That is nonsensical.

Let's take EPA's proposed rule regarding toxic emission from industrial boilers, a seemingly innocuous rule, right? Wrong. This rule called for the cleanup of units that burn fuel onsite to provide electricity and heat. This action, this rule, would cut mercury particulate matter, carbon monoxide, and acid gases by requiring facilities to install equipment to clean up these toxic emissions. This so-called "job-killing rule" would, as predicted, save from 2,000 to 5,000 lives each year. The need to crack down on greenhouse gases is based on sound science, the results of hundreds of peer-reviewed scientific studies that say that global warming is real and that man contributes to it.

And if you're keeping score at home, there are zero peer-reviewed scientific studies that say that global warming is not real and that man does not contribute to it. But, more than that, the need to crack down on greenhouse gas emissions, the need to give EPA the tools to do its duty as mandated by Congress and deemed their responsibility by the Supreme Court. This issue certainly is lethal. It kills people. And my friends who oppose this radical fight against global warming, you can't work if you're dead.

December 31, 2010, marked the 40th anniversary of the Clean Air Act. The Clean Air Act has saved the lives of over 160,000 people, as conservatively estimated by the EPA. This issue then is a public health issue.

Chicago is my hometown. It is in the midst of a public health crisis. We are the morbidity and mortality capital of the United States for asthma. Having

two children who face this ailment, it strikes near and dear to home. We are dealing with skyrocketing rates of death due to asthma, but we're not the only city with this problem. A report released by the American Lung Association reported nearly 60 percent of Americans live in areas where air pollution has reached unhealthy levels that can and does make people sick.

□ 2030

Yet we are standing here on the House floor arguing against job preserving measures, measures that will keep us alive and able to work, measures that will create jobs in clean and green industrial areas.

As Al Gore said in 2005, "It is now clear that we face a deepening global climate crisis that requires us to act boldly, quickly and wisely." Attacks on the Clean Air Act and the EPA's ability to regulate greenhouse gases are a huge piece of the larger climate crisis, a crisis that has a hefty cost—our health and our lives.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative QUIGLEY, for presenting your perspective on this important discussion.

I think it's important to note when we talk about the statistics, when we talk about an attack on public health standards, which this is, it's done to enhance the opportunities—for lobbyists, for special interests, for deep pockets of the oil industry, where they want to avoid that sense of accountability and where they want to build their profit column at the expense of the health outcomes that we have generated to the good over the last 40 years. In fact, in 2010 alone, the stat is that some 160,000 lives plus were saved by this legislation, by this law that was produced 40 years ago. And when it comes to children, some 18 million cases over the last 20 years of children's bronchial or respiratory illnesses were prevented. So right there the proof is in the pudding. This is an attack on our public health, and I think it's important to state it for the record so that when these forces of negativity come into play, they're checked for their wanting to roll us backward.

I thank you for joining us this evening, Representative QUIGLEY.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Thank you for having me.

Mr. TONKO. We are joined by Representative GERRY CONNOLLY from the 11th District in Virginia. It is always good to hear from you, also, GERRY.

It is important, I think, that everyone share their perspective here this evening of what damage can be calculated here after 40 years of progress and where there is an attack on our health care standards and on job creation. Because, as we all know, innovation to respond to the efforts of this law, the intent purpose, produces jobs and produces a technical response that is unique and provides for America to dig deep into solutions.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. My friend from New York is absolutely

right. Let me thank him for his leadership in taking up this Special Order tonight on the all-important preservation of the Clean Air Act. I can't think frankly of a more reckless idea than repeal of all or parts of the Clean Air Act. It would transform the quality of life for all Americans.

Our colleague from Illinois' comments about having children who live in Chicago, the number one asthma affected municipality in the United States, really resonates with me. I also have a close relative here in the Nation's capital, I represent the suburbs of Washington, DC, and I can tell you that as a nonattainment region, we have significant health effects from our air pollution. We are a nonattainment region as measured by the Environmental Protection Agency, and cleaning up our air quality is critical to thousands of people and thousands of children whose health depends on the efficacy of the Clean Air Act and making sure it is fully implemented.

I wanted just to share with my friend from New York and my colleagues tonight some of the costs of repealing the Clean Air Act, because I think Americans need to focus on that. It's not cost-free to repeal this all-important environmental piece of legislation. Thanks to the Clean Air Act, Americans will see gas consumption of cars reduced by an average of 30 percent, saving the average car owner over \$2,000. That would be lost. Repealing the Clean Air Act would increase OPEC imports by 72 million barrels every year by 2020. Repealing the Clean Air Act will force Americans to spend \$9.9 billion each year to Libya and Venezuela and other OPEC countries, not all of which have America's best interests at heart. Repealing the Clean Air Act would forgo savings for Americans of 77 billion gallons of fuel over the life of the vehicles sold in those years, representing \$240 billion in benefits, including over \$182 billion in fuel savings.

In addition to undermining national security, repealing the Clean Air Act would cause thousands of premature deaths which my colleagues were referring to. For example, the proposed EPA boiler MACT standard would save from 2,000 to 5,100 lives each year. Those lives would not be saved with repeal of the Clean Air Act.

A report released by the American Lung Association recently reported that nearly 60 percent of all Americans live in areas where air pollution has reached unhealthy levels that can and do make people sick, including right here in the Nation's capital. Approximately 171,632 children and 544,013 adults have asthma in my home State of Virginia alone, according to the American Lung Association. Repealing EPA's authority to limit mercury, particulate matter, carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide pollution would increase those numbers significantly and would aggravate already existing respiratory conditions. We cannot afford to repeal the Clean Air Act when it

would imperil public health, undermine national security, countermand all of our goals in terms of energy independence, and set a dangerous precedent for repealing our most important public health law.

I thank my colleague from New York for leading us tonight and highlighting the risks involved, the very serious and real risks involved in this reckless action that is proposed.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative CONNOLLY. We will continue to banter here this evening about the merits of the Clean Air Act and the good that it has produced. But when we talk about some of this innovation, how we can drive our energy independence, our self-sufficiency, it goes well beyond the public health efforts that can be secured simply by that kind of work as we reduce the amount of emissions, but it also turns into an issue of national security, where we know sending these over \$400 billion a year to foreign sources for our oil importation is actually feeding the treasuries of some very unfriendly nations to the U.S., and then perhaps having those dollars used to train the troops that are fighting our troops in our efforts for peace in the Mideast. It is a never ending cycle of madness that has to be prevented, and I think the Clean Air Act, accompanied by other efforts that we can do to spur jobs and create an innovation economy are very important aspects. They are outcomes of sound progressive legislation that then achieves wonderful results and allows us to address public health standards in a way that is magnanimous.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. My colleague could not be more correct. And, of course, as he recalls, not only sound progressive legislation but sound environmental legislation that had broad bipartisan support and was signed into law by a Republican President.

Mr. TONKO. Right. And produced great benefits for every dollar invested. You, Representative CONNOLLY, and I serve on SEEC, which is a wonderful group of legislators, like-minded in producing a green agenda that reaches to a sustainable energy and environmental outcome. That SEEC coalition is what is driving that agenda here in the House. One of our cochairs is with us this evening, the gentleman from Washington State's First District, JAY INSLEE. Representative JAY INSLEE is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and is ranker on a subcommittee, I believe, that will have a very important hearing.

Representative INSLEE, thank you for joining us this evening to talk about this important topic.

Mr. INSLEE. Thank you. I can't think of anything more important.

Tomorrow we will have the first hearing in Congress on the Dirty Air Act. Of course the Dirty Air Act is the act that intends to gut Uncle Sam's ability to protect clean air for all of us to breathe—Republicans, Democrats and independents. This Dirty Air Act is

clearly bad for children with asthma. This Dirty Air Act is bad for senior men with respiratory problems. This Dirty Air Act is bad for senior American women with heart problems. This Dirty Air Act is bad for American workers who are going to lose the jobs that will be created in the innovative new industries that we're going to build so we can produce electricity and power for our cars in a clean way. This Dirty Air Act is one of the worst pieces of legislation I have seen in my time in the U.S. Congress and I will tell you why. It breaks faith with some of the values, at least two of the great works done by Republican Presidents. And it's really a tragedy that my colleagues across the aisle have fallen for the siren sound of the polluters, because it's the polluters who want to pass the Dirty Air Act, which by the way you could also call the Inhaler Enhancement Act of 2011, if you want to know what it does to children who have asthma.

We just spent an hour talking about the optimism of President Ronald Reagan, which was manifest and appreciated by Democrats and Republicans alike. And those of us who stand against this Dirty Air Act believe we ought to have optimism that we can create electricity in clean ways. We can do it in solar energy created and powered by Americans. We can do it with electric cars made by Americans. The GM Volt was just the car of the year made by Americans, General Motors; a plug-in electric hybrid car.

□ 2040

We can do it with wind. We can do it, perhaps, with advanced forms of nuclear power.

The point is that that sense of optimism has now been shucked overboard because the polluters have come up to Washington, DC, with their lobbyist friends, and have convinced our friends and colleagues to throw aside 40 years of Republican success. This thing was started by Richard Nixon with a good assist by William Ruckelshaus, who is now a citizen of Seattle, Washington. It was a Republican who recognized our ability to innovate in a way that would grow jobs and reduce air pollution.

I want to leave you with one statistic—and Richard Nixon was right in this regard. He was wrong on some other things, but he was right on this.

He said the polluting industry resisted the Clean Air Act when it started 40 years ago, but what he believed—and it turned out to be accurate—was that we could innovate our way to create new technologies to produce energy. That's why we have reduced air pollution by 60 percent since 1970. It is because of the Clean Air Act. Yet our economy has grown by 200 percent—a 200 percent growth at the time the polluters said this was going to wreck the U.S. economy. That's the same thing we can do now in using the innovative talents so we can start making electric cars here and ship them to China, so we

can start making solar panels here, with jobs in America, so we can ship those to China.

I'll just part with one statement.

There ought not to be any debate about the health care impacts here either. Congress has received a letter signed by 2,505 American scientists, calling on Congress to resist and defeat the Republicans' dirty air act, because, it says, the Clean Air Act is a science-based law that has prevented 400,000 premature deaths and hundreds of millions of cases of respiratory and cardiovascular disease during the 40 years since it was first passed, all without diminishing economic growth.

Those are from American scientists, who understand American innovation, who understand American asthma, who understand the American ability to keep moving forward and to not go backwards. Heaven help those who would support the dirty air act and who would support to repeal clean air protections for Americans.

Mr. TONKO. Representative INSLEE, you talk about the jobs effect. Obviously, there are those who would suggest that this kills jobs when, in fact, we have data from 2007 that shows the air pollution control equipment industry was generating some \$18.3 billion with \$3 billion of that in terms of exporting that is done.

So this spurs innovation. It puts into working order the science and tech community that creates sustainable-type jobs that really make an impact on our quality of life and on our public health standards. I think those facts are missing here when those forces of lobbyists, deep pocket sorts, and oil voices join with our partners on the other side of the aisle to kill this legislation.

Mr. INSLEE. If the gentleman would yield for a moment, I have a little story about how I've seen this firsthand.

I went to the coolest event a few weeks ago that I've ever gone to as a public official. It was in Woodinville, Washington, at the Woodinville Wooden Cross Church. I got to participate in the benediction, in the dedication, of the very first electric car charging station at a church in America. It was great. It was, you know, let there be light and there was light. Let there be power and there was power. More importantly, there were jobs, because every time we put in one of these charging stations, there are five American jobs created due to these investments.

If the Republicans get their way, what will happen is they will repeal the Clean Air Act, which will affect carbon and methane and ozone—very dangerous gasses in a lot of different ways. Instead of the investment going to create new energy industries, those investments are going to go to China, and it's China that is going to make the electric cars and the solar power and the advanced systems of maybe finding ways to burn coal cleanly.

We don't want to give that competitive advantage up. This is the pedal to the metal, this Clean Air Act, which drives the investment which has made America the leading producer of scrubbing equipment in the world today to clean up these stacks today. This is what makes us competitive. So I think this is a job killer to pass the dirty air act, and we've got to get in this race with China.

Mr. TONKO. You know, I think, too, it taps into the pioneer spirit of America—the ingenuity, the creative genius that has always guided us, that is nurtured simply by our open system of government and capitalist style of opportunity. We have been able to go forward with so many advances. In this case, as we address health-threatening, life-threatening situations because of toxic poisoning, it produces jobs that are of a very sustainable quality and that are really tapping into the cerebral power of this country. I don't know why anyone would want to disrupt that progress as there is no higher priority than jobs, jobs, jobs in our society today.

At the same time, if we can create stronger public health standards—as you said, address women of senior age varieties and children of all types and working middle-aged couples around this country—everyone in every age demographic will be protected and helped by the Clean Air Act. There is 40 years of documented success that ought to guide us here and tell us this is a move in the wrong direction.

We are so happy that so many people are offering their thoughts here this evening in this Special Order, in this 1-hour's worth of info exchange. We are joined by a great Representative from New Jersey, who is, again, a very thoughtful scientist of types—a physicist, I believe—from New Jersey's 12th Congressional District, Representative RUSH HOLT.

Thank you so much, Representative HOLT, for joining us this evening.

Mr. HOLT. I would like to add a comment to Mr. INSLEE's point and just repeat: Pollution is costly. It's costly in lives and it's costly in dollars, and one of the best instruments that has existed in the world over the past 40 years is the Clean Air Act.

The Clean Air Act has decreased lead emissions by 95 percent. In using the Clean Air Act, the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, has reduced emissions from diesel engines by almost 90 percent, and that is saving lives and saving dollars. By phasing out ozone-depleting chemicals and working through international agreements, the EPA is cutting non-melanoma skin cancer by hundreds of millions, and reducing smog and soot reduces premature deaths. This is successful legislation.

My colleague, Mr. INSLEE, what do we call it? You were calling it the “dirty air act.”

Mr. INSLEE. I think it's simply fair to call it the “dirty air act” because

that's what you get if this legislation passes. You get dirty air. If you pass a dirty air act, you get dirty air. I think it's a fair assessment of what it does.

Mr. HOLT. Undoing the Clean Air Act makes the air less clean. The Clean Air Act has been successful in reducing into the atmosphere the emissions of pollutants/chemicals that kill people. The Clean Air Act has been successful.

And what do we have before us?

Well, tomorrow, as you say, there will be a hearing on legislation not yet in final form—let's hope that it never finds its way into final form. It is legislation that would gut the Clean Air Act. It would prevent the Clean Air Act from keeping up with the times. It would prevent the Clean Air Act from continuing to protect Americans by removing dangerous chemicals from the atmosphere. This is really a matter of public health, and it is also a matter of economics.

The cost of clean air safeguards has been exaggerated over the years. I remember—and I think my colleagues are old enough to remember. I certainly am—when the Clean Air Act was passed. At the time, they said, Oh, this is going to be terrible. It's going to ruin industry. You know, claims about the cost of sulphur dioxide standards were exaggerated by factors of—I don't know—5 or 10.

□ 2050

You know, we've seen from the market price of the sulfur dioxide allowances that the actual market is much less than the estimated cost of complying with the sulfur dioxide regulations. So, again and again, these have been exaggerated, and by implementing the Clean Air Act, we have saved lives and, by association, by extension, saved dollars.

Furthermore, if the Clean Air Act is allowed to continue to look after the air that you and I breathe, it will lead to further efficiency and all of the burgeoning industries that you, my colleague from New York, and you, my colleague from Washington, have talked about. This is going to be very good for the United States to be able to sell these environmentally attractive technologies to the rest of the world rather than to buy them.

So, for all sorts of reasons, we simply cannot afford the proposal of what's coming from the majority on the other side of the aisle that would increase our dependence on foreign oil, that would leave the air less breathable, that would aggravate asthma and heart disease, and would end up undoing the Clean Air Act. What Congress should be doing is making it possible for the Clean Air Act to continue to protect Americans' health and lives, not undoing it.

Mr. INSLEE. Would the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. HOLT. I'd be happy to.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. HOLT made a really important point that we need to discuss. He made a strong statement that

this dirty air act that the Republicans have introduced would gut the Clean Air Act. That is a strong statement, and it is entirely accurate.

Mr. HOLT. If I may explain, the Clean Air Act is based on science.

Mr. INSLEE. Yeah.

Mr. HOLT. And the Clean Air Act, as the years have gone by, has used the best science to find the best ways to remove the worst pollutants from our air, and this is a very unscientific approach that they're saying. They're saying because of politics we are not going to listen to science; because of politics, we're going to say the Clean Air Act stops here.

Mr. INSLEE. What I want to make clear to the public is that when we say gut, we mean gut the Clean Air Act because the Republican dirty air act doesn't just reduce protections by 10 percent to children with asthma. It doesn't reduce it by 50 percent. It entirely eliminates the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to provide kids with asthma any protection whatsoever for these listed emissions from polluting industries.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. And you know, I think that our goal, gentlemen, should be to strengthen the public health standards. When we think of the reduced amount of impacts on children, for instance, those 18 million cases that were prevented of respiratory diseases for children, those are important steps. That ought to drive us.

But you know, Representative HOLT talked about the cost of the program and the associated benefits. Well, right now the average has been for every dollar of investment there is a \$13 benefit. That's a tremendous, powerful outcome. Why would we not want to continue that sort of benefit that befalls the American public and produces jobs at the same time? This whole session of Congress that preceded this 112th and now this Congress, this session of Congress to date is all about jobs, and why would we walk away from the jobs potential and the public health improvements for the sake of politics? And by the way, those benefits are projected by the year 2020 to rise to \$20 trillion, which is a 30:1 ratio. For every dollar invested, \$30 of benefits will be produced. This is an awesome track record, and one that really, again, speaks to the well-being, the general health of the American public and produces jobs.

By the way, the American manufacturing teams that work on air pollution reduction technology are the kingpins in that global market. They are producing and exporting. Now, everywhere we go we're looking for American industry to be bolstered, for manufacturing to come back. We in this House have adopted the mantra, Make it in America, Make it in America again. Here we are, we're achieving and exporting, exporting, which is the goal here, so that we can bulk up the American economy, and getting good results from it.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman would yield on that very point.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Mr. HOLT. The rest of the world is not backing down. The rest of the world is not moving toward dirtier atmosphere, toward more atmospheric admissions. They understand that this is deadly and costly, and as I said a few moments ago, wouldn't it be better if we Americans were selling the technologies to the rest of the world? Many of these technologies were developed here in the United States. Many of the opportunities for more energy efficiency and less atmospheric admissions can be developed here in the United States. Wouldn't it be better if we developed them here and sold them to the rest of the world instead of someday having to buy them?

Mr. TONKO. There's a point that comes to mind, Representative HOLT, when you talk about building it here and developing the technology and having that think-tank quality in this country. That also has to be nurtured by the next generation of workers. We have to pull from the students in the classroom today their experience or their awareness of science, technology, engineering, and math. We must enable them to explore those areas as a career path.

What sort of message are we offering out there? What is the message that resonates from this sort of approach? If I'm a youngster in a classroom, I'm thinking science and technology has no value in our society. We're able to clean up, but we don't want to clean up. We're able to produce jobs through air pollution reduction technology that requires some sort of research and development concept—we don't care about that.

We're sending a message to young people that these careers don't matter, and oh, by the way, your health doesn't matter because all of those young people, say from asthma or say from some sort of respiratory ailment, just don't matter. That is a terrible statement to offer our young people, I would think. And Representative INSLEE, you have something to say?

Mr. HOLT. I would urge you to put your comment in the conditional. This is not going to happen. We are not going to let it happen. It would be so unwise to say we're not going to follow the science. It would be so unwise to say to the young people, we're going to turn away from this innovative challenge. It would be so unwise to say to families with asthma, we're not going to make the atmosphere better.

Mr. TONKO. Just following on the heels of—

Mr. HOLT. It's not going to happen but, we are here to say we won't let it happen.

Mr. TONKO. Just following on the heels of the President saying right from the podium, right in the State of the Union, it's time to celebrate the science bowl as much as we celebrate the Super Bowl. Here he is trying to

draw the innovation economy into the classroom to give students a sense of vision, partake in a creative venture out there that will make the world better, and now we're rolling back technology. What a terrible message to leave our young people.

Representative INSLEE.

Mr. INSLEE. You just may be thinking, President Obama gave a State of the Union. He talked about celebrating winning the science bowl, about using the Chinese advances, and how clean energy is our Sputnik moment, so that we would be called to have a new Apollo energy project, and we know we can do in clean energy what our, you know, ancestors did in space, which is to lead the world in clean energy. We know this can be the American destiny, and the reason we know that is because our vision is one based on optimism and confidence. Our vision is that we know we can invent new forms of energy so that we don't cause additional asthma problems in our children.

□ 2100

Now this is a difference between us and the Republicans who want to pass this dirty air act. We realize two things about our children. Number one, when polluters pollute and expose them to dangerous levels of ozone and increase—dramatic increases—in asthma attacks and respiratory problems in senior citizens, those kids don't have anywhere to run and hide. You know, an oil company can go around places in the world. A kid is stuck where he lives, and there's nowhere to hide from dirty air. That's why I'm not very happy about this effort to put more of our kids in the way of dirty air, number one.

And number two, we realized that this is real when it comes to new technology. You know, when we passed the bill to create an investment in lithium ion battery manufacturing plants this year, some of our Republican colleagues scoffed at that effort. They thought, This is never going to happen. Well, in Holland, Michigan, we have laid-off American auto workers now making lithium ion batteries, or shortly, for sale all around the world to power electric cars.

We know there are jobs to make that happen. We know in Seattle, Washington, we've got the leaders in the discovery of location for wind power. We know those jobs can be made to happen. In Moses Lake, Washington, we have one of the largest manufacturers of silicone, a part of solar panels, to be shipped around the world. We know those jobs can be made to happen. At the Boeing Company, we are making airplanes—or shortly will—that can burn biofuels so we don't put out CO₂ emission and pollution. We know those jobs can happen.

Now we want our Republican colleagues to join us in this sense of optimism, because the rule that the EPA has proposed is really pretty modest. Now we're having a full-throated dis-

cussion here, debate, and we'll have a big debate tomorrow about this. But the rule is pretty modest. Let me tell you how modest it is. It simply requires essentially known efficiency standards at very, very large power plants, over 100,000 tons of emissions a year. Now, a lot of small businesses are going to be told, this is going to shut down restaurants and dry cleaners, et cetera. That's bunk. This rule is only proposing to deal with very, very large emitters, like large coal plants. This is a very modest first step in an approach to try to rein in some of these dangerous gases like carbon dioxide and ozone and toxins like that. It is a reasonable first step.

Mr. TONKO. And people have asked, they said, Well, what are these emissions? What are these particulates that may be harmful to us or our children? And when you start talking, Representative INSLEE, about mercury poisoning, when you start talking about carbon emission, when there is the talk about arsenic and lead poisoning, people begin to see it as something very real, something they've heard of, that they know people have been impacted by. So of course people want to protect their children. They are our most sacred commodity. They are a precious commodity. And with so much track record here, 40 years of success, of strong public health standards, it's very difficult to imagine that someone wants to take that backward.

I think of the innovation that I saw when I served as the leader of NYSERDA, the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, which was my last workstation before entering the House. I saw what R&D and basic research, research and development can mean in the new shelf opportunities that come our way that are science and tech associated. You know, people said when you went to the catalytic converter for automobiles, it was going to kill the auto industry, and we're going to have no jobs here. It didn't happen. People understood that this catalytic converter can now clean us of that pollution, that emission.

You know, we were told of all sorts of things that would happen when we were addressing the emissions in some smokestacks. People came about and found ways to make it happen. The industries many times are painted—many out there that are part of this concern—have really come forward and said, This is a reasonable approach. Many have said that. They want predictability. They want some sort of plan, and they'll engage their operation into that plan and its outcome. There are many groups, like Energy, Constellation Energy, NextEra Energy, National Grid, PSE&G, and one in my home base, the New York State Power Authority, all of whom have said that this is a reasonable approach, that they are willing to be those partners out there to make the world, the environment, the air that we breathe a better quality.

So the proof is in the pudding here. There is an outstanding 40-year track record. There are children who breathe freely, and there are lives that have been saved. Just 160,000, if that matters, last year alone. But people need to look at the facts here and not be so connected to those deep pockets, special interests, friends from the oil industry that want to come here and partner with colleagues in the House and say, We're going to undo this, and we're going to kill jobs. Job-killing, life-threatening, health-threatening, toxic poisoning that can take place if we allow it to. And we will stop this, I'm convinced.

Mr. INSLEE. And I hope we will be successful and believe that we will because there are multiple reasons for this. And this really is an issue about democracy, about who is going to make a decision about the air we breathe and the air our children breathe. Is it going to be scientists and physicians at the American Lung Association and scientists who base their decision on science and health? Or is it going to be lobbyists for polluting industries?

Now we say it should be the scientists. We say we should follow the science. When we go to doctors, we get medical advice, it's based on science. When we want health advice, we don't go to lobbyists for polluting industries. We let a health decision be made by scientists. And unfortunately, the dirty air act that my Republican colleagues want to pass, they want to take that decision away from scientists and away from physicians and away from health practitioners and give it to the folks who lobby up here for special breaks. That's wrong.

And I will just make a closing comment, if I can. We are going to fight the dirty air act on behalf of the health of our kids. We are going to fight the dirty air act on behalf of our senior citizens with their health problems. And we are going to fight the dirty air act so that we can grow millions of clean energy jobs right here in this country and not ship them off to China.

Mr. TONKO. Well, I can't help but think too of the Citizens United case, where special interests now are able to open the corporate checkbook and just write sizable checks. The sky is the limit, according to the Supreme Court decision. And that can bring about special interest flavor into campaigns that are waged and into candidates that are produced into the House. And when we look at special interests like that, we then begin to see what the real agenda is, and it's counterproductive. It is kicking back progress that has been achieved for 40 years, celebrations of life that were allowed to breathe freely because of this legislation. And the introduction of innovation and technology.

So these deep-rooted power plays are perhaps going to be more prevalent as we go forward in time, and I think that it's setting a dangerous precedent. I

think that what we have here is an opportunity to say "yes" to sound public health standards, "yes" to job creation, "yes" to innovation. I know that from the work that's being done—even in the auto industry, GE is putting together an advanced battery manufacturing facility that will be available for heavy fleets. We have those who are working on all sorts of alternative fuels. We are looking at renewables to cut the kind of pollution that has been allowed to continue because of our gluttonous dependency on oil imported from unfriendly nations to the U.S. And 60 percent of that demand is met simply by those oil imports. So there is an awful lot of progressive perspective that is associated with what the Clean Air Act has achieved. We have to go forward with this one.

Mr. INSLEE. I would just note in closing that if we are successful in asking Republicans to stand with us against the dirty air act, we will celebrate a Republican achievement of 40 years ago that we will have preserved, the Clean Air Act. And we will argue that the next electric vehicle should be called the Nixon. We want to honor a Republican President. Thanks very much.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative INSLEE.

You know, the efforts made here tonight were to inform people as to the impact that could be felt if we rolled back the progress of the Clean Air Act, one that has had this 40-year record of achievement, one that has given a big boost to innovation in our economy. Our President, this President, President Obama, has indicated that this is the sort of sustainable restructuring of our economy that can drive us forward.

□ 2110

If we invest in the intellect of this great American society, if we encourage education and higher education to be pronounced in the lives of individuals, if we can pull from them their interests in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, we can then have this hopeful opportunity of job creation that comes simply through ideas, ideas that are produced perhaps in that education experience that we can provide for our young people and by public policy that drives initiatives, that drives a series of goals to in this case clean the air quality that has enabled us to go forward with the soundness in the manufacturing sector that has retrofitted, has modernized, has adjusted, retooled that industry, those industries in the manufacturing realm to respond in a way that is much more sensitive to public health standards. This is the sort of progress that we can achieve in this country simply by moving forward with soundness of policy.

And so, I thank all of our colleagues this evening who have joined us in the efforts to speak to the soundness of clean air, what it means not only in public health standards but certainly in the efforts to create jobs and to sus-

tain the economy in a way that will continue to strive to build on the progress that we have achieved over these last four decades, and continue to explore new eras of job creation that will provide the soundness in our economy that will be the strength of this country in many, many decades and generations to come.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TONKO. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I was listening with interest to the gentleman's remarks and especially taking into interest the importance of the Clean Air Act, and I want to commend the gentleman for raising these issues not only with our colleagues, but the importance of why we have to make sure that this part of the element of our current laws are being sustained and upheld.

I think the question also is raised here in terms of this is not a new issue. This is really an issue that has been ongoing for years and years in terms of development versus conservation and the environment. I think the challenge for us as legislators is to see if we can find a sense of balance.

Currently, we have to import well over \$700 billion worth of oil from foreign countries. I don't think our Republican friends think that we're antidevelopment. I think we are for development and in doing it in such a way that the sciences are there and in such a way that it provides safety and, at the same time, provides the kind of resources that are really needful to meet the needs of the American people.

And I want to again commend the gentleman for raising this issue, and I hope that in the coming weeks and months we will continue the dialogue and debate on this very important matter.

Mr. TONKO. Well, Representative FALEOMAVAEGA, thank you for joining us this evening.

But during the course of this hour we have all talked about innovation that we see happening right in our very own districts. I have a global center on renewables that is conducted through the auspices of GE. We talked about their advanced battery manufacturing facility. I talked about the nanoscience that has been promoted in the 21st Congressional District of New York. We witness every day the semiconductor work that is done and work in the biotech and infotech and nanotech communities, all of which are critically important to providing the workforce of the future and the workplace of the future. This is what I think policy like this can initiate.

And I'm certain within the realm of your own district or in the region that you represent or the State that you call home, within that whole context there are those stories of success and innovation. And that, I think, is the outcome here that we want to preserve, and not only preserve but enhance, so that we can continue to grow those

jobs and provide a better quality of life for the people that we represent.

Mr. FALEOMAVEGA. I hope that in the coming weeks and months we will continue to discuss this issue and, hopefully, our friends on the other side will understand our concerns.

Again, it's the challenge of establishing a balance between development and the environment and the conservation, and I think the American people are looking for answers to those issues and those problems.

Mr. TONKO. Built on 40 years of success then, we want to defend people of all ages from the most young to the most senior in our society. They have experienced and lived the benefits of soundness of policy that came via the Clean Air Act, a bipartisan effort that was initiated by a Republican President. And so it defies logic to move forward with a plan that will take us backward. So we have to thwart that effort and call it for what it is, check it at the door and say, Look, it is a life-threatening, health-threatening, toxic-poisoning situation that would reduce jobs, denounce innovation in our society, in our economy, and really take us backward.

I think this House ought to be about moving us forward, creating jobs, enhancing the public health standards and embracing the quality of innovation in our society that really builds the magic in our economy, that digs deep into the pioneer spirit that is uniquely American. And we can make it happen simply by saying "no" to those agents that want to roll back progress and defeat us with their dirty air act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back and thank you for the opportunity for all of us to express our concerns about those who are advancing a dirty air act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protect the Clean Air Act. Since the passage of the legislation our skies have become cleaner and our economy has become stronger. Thanks to the Clean Air Act, the United States has made significant gains in public health, a cleaner environment and a stronger more sustainable economy.

Air pollution is costly. It increases asthma attacks, heart attacks, strokes, respiratory diseases, and lung cancer, and causes premature deaths, hurting our families and burdening our economy. The dangers from air pollution are particularly acute for children and seniors.

It is well established that cleaner air and a healthier population go hand in hand. In fact, according to the American Lung Association, in 2010 alone, the Clean Air Act saved over 160,000 lives.

Cleaner air also helps build a stronger economy. In addition to keeping workers on the job, cleaning up air pollution can create new jobs—in designing and manufacturing pollution controls, installing and operating new equipment, and building cleaner facilities.

The draft bill from Representative UPTON would return us to a Dirty Air Economy, an economy dominated by big polluters willing to pour pollution into our communities in order to help their companies. Erasing the Clean Air

Act may be good for corporate profits but it's bad for our national interest.

The truth is that we can have clean air and a strong economy at the same time. The last 30 years have proved it. Since the passage of the Clean Air Act, the United States has reduced key air pollutants by 60 percent, while growing our economy by over 200 percent. The legislation, in conjunction with additional protections passed by both parties, has made our country a healthier, cleaner place to live.

A new study by scientists at the University of Rochester Medical Center and Clarkson University found that the air quality in Rochester, New York improved markedly in recent years and that public health may well improve as a result. Falling levels of air pollutants given off by cars, trucks and power plants has resulted in far fewer irritants in the air that could worsen asthma and lead to serious respiratory disease. The decline is in part due to the tighter federal rules on diesel fuel and engines that went into effect in 2006 under a Republican Administration. Like others have pointed out before, clean air standards have always been, and should continue to be, a bipartisan concern.

I have the privilege to represent the good people living in Tonawanda, New York—a city that has a staggering and urgent air pollution problem. These hard working Americans are surrounded by facilities that make up the highest concentration of air polluters in the state of New York. In 2007, a study found that the people of Tonawanda's risk of developing cancer are 100 times that of the New York State guideline.

During my time serving the 28th District of New York, I have received multiple letters from the people of Tonawanda telling me about how their family and loved ones have developed cancer, asthma and other illnesses due to the extremely poor air quality in their community.

Today, I would like to share the story of Ann, a woman who has lived in Tonawanda for 16 years. Ann's mother and father moved to the city to fulfill the American dream of owning their own home. Ann's mother cultivated her own garden in her yard, spending her free time outside gardening and breathing in what she thought was fresh, New York air.

Sadly, Ann lost her mother to cancer at the young age of 67, just nine years after moving to Tonawanda and breathing the dirty air. Ann can't help to think that if only her family knew what toxic, cancerous chemicals the local facilities were pumping into the air, they could have protected the health of their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of upholding the Clean Air Act and supporting the Environmental Protection Act in doing its work to protect the American people against dangerous corporate polluters. I rise in support of improving our national health and economy, while reducing our dependence on oil. And I rise in support of Ann and the people of Tonawanda who are facing the devastating consequences of air pollution every day.

The choice is simple. When it was passed in 1970, the Clean Air Act was enacted with strong bipartisan support. Like today, we had a divided government, with both parties coming together to enact a law that would protect public health and the environment, as well as our economy.

We must reject any effort to repeal our valuable protections, and recommit our pledge to

the American people to work toward a cleaner, healthier, more prosperous future.

ROLL CALL OF THE PEACE CORPS VICTIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for half the time remaining before 10 p.m., which is roughly 22 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to address an important issue that has come to light recently. It has to do with the wonderful group of volunteers that serve in the United States Peace Corps.

The Peace Corps was the idea of John F. Kennedy. He went to the University of Michigan way back in 1960, and he started encouraging those college students to get involved in other countries and helping those countries in their social development and their cultural development in the name of peace. A wonderful idea.

When he became President in 1961, President Kennedy signed an Executive order establishing the now important Peace Corps. By 1966, there were over 15,000 young Americans, all volunteers, that were working in the Peace Corps throughout the world.

Since those early days of the Peace Corps, 200,000 Americans, mostly young people, 60 percent female, have volunteered for their 2-year service in the Peace Corps to work in Third World countries on everything from health to farming to small business, just helping other people throughout the world in a way that not only benefits them personally but benefits the recipients in these foreign countries. They really are, in my opinion, along with our United States military, the greatest ambassadors we have from our country to show that we are concerned about the welfare of other nations. And they help build a better life for not only the people that they come in contact with, but their generations and the children that they have as well. I think they are really volunteer angels.

The work that a Peace Corps volunteer does is hard work. It's important, but it's very difficult. They're in a place far from home, sometimes very remote and primitive areas, and yet they, on a daily basis, are working to improve the lives of these individuals.

Like I said, I think it's one of the best things that we do in this country as ambassadors are those young people in the Peace Corps. It's tough work. It's hard work. I wouldn't do it. It's so difficult. And you know, there are people in our country, a lot of them mainly young people who choose that as a calling to help other people in other countries.

I've got four kids, and they're all kind of wanting to save the world, too. They've been to Mexico and lived in orphanages in Trinidad. They've been to Honduras. They've been to Africa and

Zambia, all with that mentality of helping other people.

But the Peace Corps volunteers are people like that who spend at least 2 years in service to their country. And sometimes when they are in those foreign countries, they stick out. They are noticeable by the people who live in that country.

□ 2120

Because of that, occasionally, more often than it should be, they attract crimes that occur against them. That is the issue, Mr. Speaker, I want to address tonight.

Over the last 10 years, 1,000 Americans, mainly women, have been sexually assaulted, raped or assaulted in some other way, in a foreign country representing the United States in the Peace Corps.

Between 2000 and 2009, the Peace Corps themselves say there were over 221 rapes and attempted rapes, almost 150 major sexual attacks, and 700 other sexual assaults. Sexual assault is anything from groping to fondling to conduct that is offensive to that Peace Corps volunteer. Once again, 1,000 crimes against Peace Corps volunteers. Recently, the Peace Corps has announced that there is an average of 22 rapes a year against American Peace Corps volunteers.

This is not acceptable, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about real people. They are real stories and they are real victims, and I want to mention just a few of those tonight in the limited time that I have.

The first of those is a person that I have gotten to know personally. A wonderful person, Jess Smoczek.

She joined the Peace Corps in 2004. On her first day as a Peace Corps volunteer in Bangladesh, a group of men started sexually groping her as she was just walking to the home that she was supposed to live in, but no one really did anything. She told the Peace Corps staff over and over again that she felt unsafe in Bangladesh in the situation she was in, but nobody did anything.

Months later, she came in contact with some men who kidnapped her. They beat her and they sexually assaulted her, but they weren't through. They abandoned her and threw her in a back alley somewhere in Bangladesh.

According to Jess, the Peace Corps did everything they could to cover this up because they seemed to be more worried about the officials in Bangladesh and what they thought might happen to their relationship with the United States than they did about caring for this victim of crime. Jess says that the Peace Corps blamed her for the conduct of others. They blamed her for being a sexual-assault victim.

Mr. Speaker, a rape victim is never to blame for the crime that is committed against her. It is the offender that is always to blame. And we need to understand that these precious people who go overseas and represent us, when a crime is committed against

them, we take their side. And we don't assume they did anything wrong, because they didn't. They were just a victim of crime, and the criminal is the one that should be held accountable for that conduct. Rape is never the fault of the victim. It's always the fault of the perpetrator.

But Jess got no satisfaction from the Peace Corps, according to her. When she got home, she was told to tell other people that she was coming back to the United States for medical reasons, to have her wisdom teeth pulled out.

Her case and a few others were brought to light recently by "ABC News" and "20/20," bringing her story and others. There are more, and I will try to cover as many as I can in the time that I have.

Laurel Jackson was sent to Romania, a Peace Corps volunteer. She was constantly harassed, both physically and verbally. She couldn't walk to her house where she was staying without verbal assaults and things being thrown at her. She was spit on, she was punched, and rocks were thrown at her and her life was threatened several times. This took place on a weekly basis. They told her that a young American with blonde hair would stand out, and that she was going to continue to be a victim.

She was fondled over 10 times when she tried to ride public transportation. So she quit riding public transportation in Romania, and she started walking, to help these folks in Romania. She said that the Peace Corps knew that these crimes were happening against her, but she says they didn't take it seriously and no legal recourse was offered. She was exposed to young men who exposed themselves; and she was told, Well, don't be around those people. No one did anything, and no one cared.

When she was followed home by some men, she did talk to the police and they gave her some bodyguards. She requested a new location, but she was turned down and her transfer was denied.

When she returned home, she tried to get counseling, but she received no counseling for the crimes committed against her. And here is what she has to say. She said, I would have liked the Peace Corps to have never put me there. They knew it was unsafe for me. They should have communicated with the police and the school in their own investigation. I would have liked them to take me more seriously when I reported these crimes. I would have liked to have had counseling when I returned. But once again, Mr. Speaker, no one did anything.

When she left Romania, she told the Peace Corps not to send anybody else over there, but they did. And the person who replaced her was also racially abused with swastikas drawn on her residence because she was a Jewish American.

The next individual, I'm not going to use her real name because she doesn't

want us to know her true identity, but she grew up on a ranch. She now lives in Texas, and she went to Lesotho in May of 1996 to convince farmers to plant trees and show them how to do that. But Mary Jo, as I will call her, stuck out the 2 years in this location, even though it was difficult. She lived in a small village in a string of villages that were about 80 miles south of Maseru.

She had arranged her ticket back to the United States when she was attacked because she felt unsafe. But here is what happened to her.

On an evening in 1999, Mary Jo and her neighbor left a village shop and were headed down a dirt path to their home. Her neighbor's ex-boyfriend followed and after a confrontation struck Mary Jo with a rock. The blow knocked out six of her teeth, destroyed her eye socket, and left a palm-sized crater in her face. The rock had crushed the bones in her face, and blood had started coming down the back into her throat. She ended up alone in a deserted section of the hospital when she was finally found. She says, It was dark, I was scared, and I didn't know where anyone was.

Taxis only ran from her village at night, and so she couldn't really reach the Peace Corps. So some neighbors found someone to drive her 20 miles to a local hospital. She remembers a young woman stitching her up and she remembers being, once again, left alone, abandoned. She felt abandoned by her own country.

The next day, she was moved to another hospital in South Africa, where a surgeon installed a metal plate to hold the bones together around her left eye and her chin and cheeks and nose.

The Peace Corps brought her back to her home base, but she said they didn't help her in her recovery. Mary Jo and her sister, who had flown in from the United States, had to sleep in a hotel because the agency wouldn't let them stay in a transit house, and they had difficulty getting back to the United States. She even had to beg the staff to take her to the airport. At no time, according to her, did the Peace Corps ask her what they could do to help. She said, It was terrible. I was so messed up. She has had 10 operations in 2½ years, and surgeons put metal plates in her face and she also has false teeth.

Mary Jo, being the remarkable person she is, she wasn't really angry at the Peace Corps because she was attacked in this village by villagers. She was angry because nobody in the agency seemed to care. Once again, no one did anything.

"It was like I was never in the Peace Corps," she said. And when she got home, no one contacted her from the Peace Corps to check on her to see how this victim of crime was doing. The attacker went to jail for 3 weeks, but he was later released because Mary Jo had come back to the United States.

Kate Puzey was another angel from America who had gone to help a country that most of us have never heard of

or would be able to locate on a map, Benin, where she went in 2007. She was a teacher at a local school. She formed a girls' club to help empower the young women that were in this school.

It's hard to be a girl in that part of the world, according to Kate's cousin, Ms. Jacobs. And the girls started speaking about some of the issues they were facing, and they were starting to communicate that to Kate. Before long, the girls began to tell Kate about another person who worked for the Peace Corps but wasn't an American. He was a citizen of Benin who was paid by the Peace Corps to help work with the Peace Corps. His name was Constant Bio, and these girls had said that this person was sexually assaulting these young girls.

□ 2130

She had started hearing that he had been sleeping with some of the girls, he had gotten some of them pregnant, and some of them had been raped.

At the request of several teachers, Kate sent an email to the Peace Corps in Benin's capital recommending that this person be fired from the Peace Corps. She said, "Please believe me, I'm not someone who likes to create problems, but this has been weighing on me heavily." This was in an email that she sent that was found later and turned over to ABC News. "This man is not someone I want representing the Peace Corps to this community."

Bio's brother worked as a manager in the Peace Corps office, and she asked her role to be kept secret because she didn't want this criminal, this rapist of young girls, in this country, to know that she had reported him. But he found out about it anyway. And so when he found out about it, this is what happened: on March 11, 2009, the day after the Peace Corps authorities had fired this criminal, Bio, and just 2 months short of completing her 2-year commitment to the Peace Corps, Kate was found dead on her front porch with her throat slit.

The Puzey family says the Peace Corps was insensitive in its treatment of them until officials had learned about the ABC News report, and then they got more involved. Unfortunately, it was too late. Unfortunately, no one did anything or paid attention.

Before the news reported this murder, this homicide, the Puzey family believes and states that the Peace Corps did little to show compassion or interest. Kate's father Harry says this: She was my hero. I thought maybe a representative would come to the house to talk to us, or at least a letter in the mail. But that did not happen, because just a box showed up with my daughter's belongings that came by deliveryman. This is disrespectful, Mr. Speaker, to the life of this wonderful person and to her family.

Now the Peace Corps has changed some of their procedures, and we will get to that in just a minute.

The fifth example I want to talk about is Jill Hoxmeier. She was a

Peace Corps volunteer in Guyana, which is in South America. She was a volunteer, and she had created ways to help young women combat and understand the disease of HIV/AIDS and other functions and other diseases. She was teaching them life-skill courses and wanted to help build stronger relationships between the mothers there and their daughters.

In 2007, a year into her service, she was riding her bike home from work when she was assaulted, dragged in the bushes and sexually assaulted by a man who had been following her for some time. He choked her so hard she couldn't breathe or even scream.

She believes the Peace Corps needs to do more to help victims cut through the bureaucratic red tape and get the care they need. "It was too hard to navigate the problems that I had been going through all by myself." Once again, insensitivity, and nothing seemed to happen.

Jess and other victims who are members of the Peace Corps who have been victims have formed an organization, a support group, but it is going to be a group that is going to be active. They call it the First Response Action Group, and we will see more of them hopefully here on the Hill.

Today, I met with the Director of the Peace Corps, Aaron Williams, who happened to be in the Peace Corps years ago. He is now the director. I explained to him and talked to him about these issues and other cases that have come to light, and he and I discussed this problem. We are going to have, hopefully, a Foreign Affairs Committee hearing on this very issue, the Peace Corps and the relationship it has with its volunteers throughout the world, how to make them safe, how to take care of them once a crime is committed against them and how to take care of them after that crime has been committed against them.

The Peace Corps Director, Mr. Williams, assures me that they are going to develop a victim advocate program and hire a victim advocate. They are going to help these victims of crime get counseling services. They are going to help them medically, even after they have been discharged from the Peace Corps. Unfortunately, the Bureau of Labor has issues in dealing with these Peace Corps volunteers who are no longer in Peace Corps service who still have issues that they need to be taken care of, and the Peace Corps is going to work with the Department of Labor to work out this bureaucratic nonsense.

Every victim, he says, is going to have access to medical counseling and legal services; and when a crime is committed against an American in the Peace Corps overseas, the ambassador of that country is going to contact the highest ranking official in that country to let them know that America wants some results and wants to take care of the victim, but also wants the perpetrator held accountable.

One of the most important things that Director Williams has agreed to do is to set up a victims advocacy program, a victims advocacy advisory board made up of different groups like RAINN and other NGOs to give advice to the Peace Corps on how to take care of victims of crime. So we are not going to let this issue die. We are going to continue to promote and understand the Peace Corps.

But we want these wonderful people in the Peace Corps, who have in the past been harmed and had crimes committed against them, we want to rescue them as a nation. We want to take care of them, and the Director of the Peace Corps says we will go back and help those people. We want to take care of Peace Corps volunteers now that are being assaulted. Twenty-two a year, that is 22 too many. We don't want it to happen to anybody. But we want to take care of them, and we want to have procedures to make sure the Peace Corps is listening and takes care of victims of crime as well.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I spent most of my life at the court house in Houston. I was a prosecutor and criminal court judge for 30 years. I saw many of these victims of crime. Sexual assault, rape, to me is the worst crime that can be committed against a person. You can understand why people steal; you can understand some crimes. But that crime of sexual assault is a crime not of sex, but a crime of power; but it is also an attempt by the perpetrator to destroy the inner soul of the victim. We need to understand that, and we need to take these people, these victims, these wonderful volunteers of America, and take care of them.

We are doing a better job as a Nation in taking care of our wounded warriors in the military, another great group of ambassadors that represents the rest of us. They come home with all kinds of injuries, and we are finally taking care of them. We need to understand that these Peace Corps volunteers are just as precious and take care of them as well.

People cry "peace, peace," but there can be no peace as long as there is one American Peace Corps volunteer that has no peace.

And that's just the way it is.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must remind members of the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

CALLING FOR PEACEFUL SOLUTION TO EASTER ISLAND CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) is

recognized for the time remaining before 10 p.m., which is roughly 22 minutes.

Mr. FALCOMA. Mr. Speaker, I generally don't come into the well to give speeches, and I realize our Nation is confronted with very serious issues in different regions of the world, for example, the current crisis in Egypt and the Middle East, our involvement in Afghanistan and Pakistan and Iraq, the problem of nuclear proliferation on the Korean peninsula, the global economic recession, and many other issues that are now before us.

This evening, however, Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues and the American people a particular issue that is now brewing in the Pacific region. It is the current crisis now happening between the Government of Chile and the people of Easter Island.

Mr. Speaker, Easter Island is a province of Chile, also known as Rapa Nui among its native people. Located some 3,800 miles east of Tahiti and some 2,300 miles from Santiago, Chile, Easter Island is one of the most isolated pieces of land on the entire planet, as you can see there with the arrow pointing. It is also the southeastern point of the Polynesian triangle, from the State of Hawaii north and as far south as New Zealand, with several other islands in between, including the Samoan Islands.

On Easter day in 1722, the Dutch explorer Jacob Roggeveen landed on the island and thus named it Easter Island. Today, Easter Island is best known throughout the world for its massive stone statues of ancient days. There are some 877 of these huge, humongous stone statues throughout the island.

□ 2140

They stand an average of some 13 feet in height with an average weight of some 13 tons. The largest statue measures nearly 72 feet in height and weighs approximately 145 to 165 tons.

Given that Easter Island is a remote location, many people throughout the world mistakenly considered the island to be uninhabited. However, Easter Island is a home with a population of roughly 5,000 people, but approximately half of those people are indigenous of Rapa Nui, or what was then known in ancient times, the island was known as Rapa Nui.

Mr. Speaker, Rapa Nui, the people of Easter Island are small in number, yet they carry a very vibrant culture dating back centuries before the arrival of Europeans. Their means of preparing food and living off of the land and their respect for family and nature are all ways of life dating back to the time when the first Polynesians settled the Pacific Islands on double-hulled canoes. Because all Polynesians are connected in this way, the people of Rapa Nui are very similar to that of other Polynesian people, such as the native Hawaiians, the Samoans, the Tongans, the Tahitians, and the Maoris of Aotearoa or New Zealand. For example, there's a strong connection between

the older and younger generation and therefore a deep sense of respect for elders.

This is an example of a photo that shows a young man wearing traditional body painting which is used for ritual celebrations. This practice, which is characteristic of the Rapa Nui people, was passed down to him from generation to generation. The link between the old and young is further perpetuated through the study of genealogy. In the same way that the American historians study the founding documents of this Nation, the Polynesian people, including the Rapa Nui people, treasure and study their genealogy, which goes back centuries before, again, the arrival of Europeans. The point I hope to make is that the people of Rapa Nui, Mr. Speaker, their culture is still vibrant, and this is not a mysterious, uninhabited island as it has been thought of for all these years.

Like many other islands in the Pacific, Easter Island has had its sovereignty determined by more powerful outside influences. In 1888, the Chilean Government signed a disputed treaty with the leaders of Rapa Nui, and the treaty was organized in two columns. One side, written in Spanish, reads like a deed of cession. The other column, a phonetic transliteration of the native language, which did not even have a written form at that time, reads as a treaty of friendship and protection.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the poor people of Rapa Nui could not read nor do they understand the Spanish language, and therefore this so-called treaty of 1888 is highly questionable in terms of its substance. Decades after the signing of the treaty, in the early 1900s, the Chilean Government forced all the native people of Rapa Nui to live in one square mile on the island, thereby transferring the lands for shepherding, and all such lands were deemed as property of the state. The island was later annexed by Chile in 1933 and, again, without any consultation with the people of Rapa Nui or Easter Island. This annexation was considered terra nullius, which means "No Man's Land." On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, Rapa Nui was known as the "Te Pito te Henua" or "The navel of the Earth." And as far as the people of Rapa Nui are concerned, there were people living on the island before, during, and even after the arrival of Europeans.

Mr. Speaker, Chile's current relationship with Easter Island and the treatment of the native people posed many legal, policy, and human rights problems. With the annexation of Easter Island in 1933, the Government of Chile unilaterally developed and adopted laws regarding the ancestral lands of the people, and the enforcement of these laws continue to reflect the nature of Chile's initial treaty and subsequent annexation—disputed, unclear, and still highly questionable in terms of the rights of these native people to their ancestral lands.

The Chilean law, also known as the "Easter Island Law," is the current governing law for the property rights in Easter Island. This law provides for the authorization to grant land titles in favor of the people of Rapa Nui. It also prohibits transfers of real property to persons not of Rapa Nui ancestry. However, despite this clearly stated law, the administering authority on the island has conducted land transfers that directly contradict the law itself. To further emphasize how this action has disenfranchised the people of Rapa Nui, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that Chile continues to violate this law within the meager square mile of land called "Hanga Roa" that the native Rapa Nui people have been confined to since the early 1900s.

In addition to the serious land right disputes, there are several other issues that threaten the livelihood of the people of Rapa Nui. For instance, the people of Rapa Nui have no voice when it comes to residency and immigration to their own island. Each year, an increased number of Chilean nationals travel to and remain on Easter Island. Some roughly 50,000 tourists visit each year to see the ancient Moai statues. Despite the influx of tourists, Easter Island is also prohibited from having a television and Internet signal. The influx of travelers and residents have given way to massive unemployment among the native people, exploitation of natural resources, and increased pollution. Sustainability of natural resources is further threatened by foreign fishing boats which are allowed to fish around the island.

The parliament of Rapa Nui, clan leaders, and members have reached out to the Chilean Government through peaceful and diplomatic means to resolve the serious issues at hand. However, Chile has responded with efforts to create "task forces" and "working tables." Despite these efforts, the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that there are many commissions that have not resulted in concrete resolutions, and the people—who have patiently withstood this treatment for decades—are no longer willing to tolerate it.

In July and August of last year, the clans among the Rapa Nui people wrote several letters to the President of the Republic of Chile voicing their concerns. They called for an end to colonialism so the Rapa Nui people can return to the people they were. The people of Rapa Nui also wrote to the Governor of Easter Island requesting permission for a peaceful demonstration. In the same time period, the clans also began to peacefully reoccupy their ancestral lands as a means to call attention to the need for serious constructive dialogue with the Government of Chile.

Mr. Speaker, Chile somewhat has made an effort to solve these issues diplomatically. In August of last year, the Minister of Interior visited Rapa Nui to announce the creation of "working tables" to address these issues. The

project was given 60 days for its outcome. However, despite this attempt, the very same month a squadron of Chilean armed police, or “carabineros,” arrived on Easter Island, signaling the beginning of a 6-month-long violent conflict between the local inhabitants and the police forces that the Chilean Government sent to Easter Island.

On September 7, the troops forcibly evicted the Hito clan from the Hotel Hanga Roa grounds. The evictions that took place on September 7 are well documented. And I must say, Mr. Speaker, not a very pleasant experience in reading some of the experiences of some of these young people. For example, these four children, ages 9, 7, 5, and 3; Mr. Eddie Hito, the father. And the children stated, “My family was all sleeping at 5 in the morning when I heard a loud noise. Then 20 armed policemen entered into our room and held both my wife and I at gunpoint. I heard one officer radio that there were children, but his superior radioed back to proceed on with no mercy. In jail, they made us register all the children and forced us to sign forms.”

Another testimony. A nine-year old daughter said that when she awoke, police were aiming their guns at her and her younger brother. “They overturned my mattress where I was sleeping with my brother, making me hit my head. The police threw me from the bed. They pulled my arm and threw me outside into their truck.”

The mother stated, “The police didn’t even give me a chance to dress the children nor myself. In that little time I took the two little ones. And without shoes, we were rushed and thrown into the police trucks and taken to the jails.”

□ 2150

“Only 2 weeks prior to this, the police had come to the children’s school to present themselves as helpers and protectors. Now my kids are presented with the complete opposite. They see it as the police abusing their family. Now they don’t want to go back to school or even to leave their homes. They don’t want to go to school. They are worried. Every night they ask me if everything is locked up because they are afraid that the police will break in again and hurt them.”

Another testimony from Mr. Claudio Hito with his two children, ages 12 and 8 months. The mother made this statement:

“There were at least three policemen holding us at gunpoint. Claudio took the baby, and they still held us at gunpoint. My boy was at the other end of the room. The police were shining a light in his face and hitting his chest with their beating stick. They hit him until he woke up. He woke up disoriented and they ordered him to hurry up.

“The police physically threw us out, while threatening us. I had to change the baby in the police truck. I was

using my cell phone light to change her, and they started to yell at me to turn off my phone, so I had to use the little light that seeped through the doors. And through the crack in the door I saw tons of policemen gathered outside.”

After the September 7 incident of last year, more evictions were conducted. The picture here is showing a man with a forehead wound.

Susan Hito made this statement in terms with her children, the same thing, being physically abused and physically assaulted by the police. These natives, Rapa Nuians, were completely taken by surprise in terms of the action taken by the police forces of the Chilean Government.

Mr. Speaker, this past Thursday, last week, Senator DANIEL AKAKA and I issued a joint letter to the President of Chile, Mr. Sebastian Pinera, expressing our concern over the situation unfolding in Rapa Nui or Easter Island, citing the failure of the Ministry of the Interior to seriously consider the legitimate land ownership claims of the people of Rapa Nui; the criminal prosecutions of Rapa Nui political leaders for their involvement in peaceful demonstration; and the ongoing disproportionate use of force by Chilean Special Forces against the people of Rapa Nui.

Mr. Speaker, the point is this: This is the year 2011, and this type of treatment should not be happening. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it is happening. As I stated before, Chile’s current relationship with Easter Island is disputed, unclear, and highly questionable. However, there is a choice to be made in how to address the many legal, policy and human rights issues that have stemmed from this unfortunate relationship.

I appeal to the Government of Chile to begin a dialogue for ways to help the Rapa Nui people achieve self-determination, economic self-sufficiency, and preservation of culture. We can learn, for example, how the Government of Nicaragua treated its people, the indigenous people of the Miskito tribe. We can learn from government-to-government relations how our own government has treated some 600 tribes here in the United States and in the same way that we ought to learn how we could better treat the people of Rapa Nui.

Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, the President of the United States, Barack Obama, gave the State of the Union message in which he mentioned Chile twice. First of all, he mentioned the efforts of an American who owned a small company that helped develop a special machine that helped save the lives of these 33 Chileans who were stuck in the mines. This man used his skills to save a group of people whom he had never met. In fact, even to the time when these 33 Chileans came out of mine, he took off for the United States, never bothered wanting to be recognized. President Obama also mentioned that in an effort to strengthen

our ties with Latin America, he will visit three countries next month to discuss business relations and trade, one of which is Chile. This effort on the part of President Obama in Chile is geared towards strengthening our Nation’s relationship with Latin America, and particularly our bilateral relations with Chile.

I appeal to President Pinera to advocate for a more positive approach for partnership and dialogue with the indigenous people of Easter Island or Rapa Nui. The Rapa Nui people are in danger of being exterminated from their own lands.

Mr. Speaker, this seemingly peaceful island, which is known throughout the world for its mysterious moai stone statues, is no longer so peaceful. Let me conclude my remarks by making this special appeal, personal appeal to the Minister of Interior, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Chile and more especially to the Honorable President of Chile, His Excellency Sebastian Pinera, to address the problems affecting the people of Easter Island or Rapa Nui.

It is my honest belief that the indigenous people of Easter Island do not wish to do any harm against the some 17 million people living in Chile. In fact, there are only 2,500 Easter Islanders who remain on the island. Nor is there ever a possibility that the people of Easter Island will ever pose a threat to the military and strategic or national security interests of the Chilean Government or its people.

So, Mr. Speaker, I make this personal appeal to President Pinera. I ask for a true demonstration of his leadership and capacity to exercise fair judgment and above all show common decency towards the safety and welfare of probably the most helpless people who currently live on this planet, a people who centuries ago were among the greatest in the world as navigators and voyagers of the Pacific region, a people whom scientists today can still marvel at their ability to build statues cut from stones weighing hundreds of tons, a people who only ask to be treated as any other human being would like to be treated.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CRAWFORD (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of family medical reasons.

Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of inclement weather.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 366. An act to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on January 28, 2011 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 366. To provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 9, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the fourth quarter of 2010 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NORWAY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 8 AND DEC. 12, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	12/10	12/12	Norway		2,134.00		(³)				2,134.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	12/10	12/12	Norway		1,963.00		(³)				1,963.00
Hon. Brian Monahan	12/10	12/12	Norway		1,318.00		(³)				1,318.00
Stacey Bako	12/09	12/12	Norway		1,999.00			4,896.00			6,895.00
Bridget Fallon	12/09	12/12	Norway		2,680.00			4,896.00			7,576.00
Kate Knudson	12/10	12/12	Norway		1,453.00		(³)				1,453.00
Jonathan Stivers	12/10	12/12	Norway		1,453.00		(³)				1,453.00
Andrew Hammill	12/10	12/12	Norway		1,453.00		(³)				1,453.00
Committee totals					14,453.00			9,792.00			24,245.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House, Jan. 18, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. PAUL RYAN, Jan. 19, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NICK J. RAHAL II, Jan. 2, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Joseph Donnelly	12/10	12/13	Dubai							11,327.10	11,327.10
Committee total										11,327.10	11,327.10

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BOB FILNER, Jan. 12, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DAVE CAMP, Jan. 13, 2011.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

257. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-Propenoic Acid, Methyl Ester, Polymer with Ethenyl Acetate, Hydrolyzed, Sodium Salts; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0603 FRL-8114-9] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

258. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Shareholder Approval of Executive Compensation and Golden Parachute Compensation [Release Nos.: 33-9178; 34-63768; File No. S7-31-10] (RIN: 3235-AK68) received January 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

259. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Safety Standards for Full-Sized Baby Cribs and Non-Full-Size Baby Cribs; Final Rule received January 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

260. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — EPAAR Prescription and Solicitation Provision — EPA Green Meetings and Conferences [EPA-HQ-OARM-2007-0102; FRL-8297-8] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

261. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-653, "Sustainable Energy Utility Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

262. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-652, "Corrupt Election Practices Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

263. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-684, "Transportation Infrastructure Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

264. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-685, "Returning Citizen Public Employment Inclusion Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

265. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-702, "Residential Housing Tax Abatement Clarification Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

266. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-701, "Anti-SLAPP Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

267. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-700, "Open Meetings Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

268. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-683, "Adams

Morgan Main Street Group Clarification Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

269. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-682, "Health and Safety 911 Abuse Prevention Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

270. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-681, "Private Fire Hydrant Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

271. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-679, "Prohibition on Government Employee Engagement in Political Activity Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

272. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-696, "Residential Tranquility Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

273. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-691, "Southeast Federal Center/Yards Non-Discriminatory Grocery Store Temporary Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

274. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-692, "Rent Administrator Hearing Authority Second Temporary Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

275. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-697, "Lead Hazard Prevention and Elimination Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

276. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-698, "Green Building Technical Corrections, Clarification, and Revision Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

277. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-686, "Ballpark Fee Clarification Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

278. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-687, "Perry Street Affordable Housing Tax Exemption and Relief Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

279. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-688, "Kelsey Gardens Redevelopment Project Real Property Limited Tax Abatement Assistance Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

280. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-689, "Rhode Island Avenue Metro Plaza Revenue Bonds Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

281. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-680, "Human and Environmental Health Protection Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

282. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-651, "Closing and Dedication of Portions of a Public Alley in

Square 5260, S.O. 10-13494, Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

283. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-699, "Disorderly Conduct Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

284. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-655, "Closing of Public Streets, Dedication of Land for Street Purposes, and the Elimination of Highway Plan Encumbrances, in and abutting Squares 3655, 3656, and 3657, S.O. 09-10589, Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

285. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-654, "Thelma Jones Way Designation Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

286. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; "Contagion" Movie Filming, Calumet River, Chicago, Illinois [Docket No.: USCG-2010-1013] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

287. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bridge Demolition; Illinois River, Seneca, Illinois [Docket No.: USCG-2010-1043] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

288. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Limited Services Domestic Voyage Load Lines for River Barges on Lake Michigan [Docket No.: USCG-1998-4623] (RIN: 1625-AA17) received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

289. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; U.S. Coast Guard BSU Seattle, Pier 36, Seattle, WA; Correction [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0021] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

290. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class D and E Airspace, and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Flagstaff, AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0784; Airspace Docket No. 10-AWP-5] received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

291. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rules of Practice: Direct Final Rulemaking Procedures [Docket No.: 2006-24141, Notice No. 2] (RIN: 2130-AB77) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

292. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of the Process for Requesting a Waiver of the Mandatory Separation Age of 56 for Air Traffic Control Specialists [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0567; Amendment No. 65-55] (RIN: 2120-AJ66) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

293. A letter from the Senior Program Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30761; Amdt. No. 3406] received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

294. 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.: 30759; Amdt. No. 3405] received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

295. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Important Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological Material Originating in Italy and Representing the Pre-Classical, Classical, and Imperial Roman Periods [CBP Dec. 11-03] (RIN: 1515-AD72) received January 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

296. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for the Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Wage Methodology for the temporary Non-agricultural Employment H-2B Program (RIN: 1205-AB61) received January 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Education and the Workforce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 72. Resolution directing certain standing committees to inventory and review existing, pending, and proposed regulations and orders from agencies of the Federal Government, particularly with respect to their effect on jobs and economic growth (Rept. 112-6). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 73. Resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 72) directing certain standing committees to inventory and review existing, pending, and proposed regulations and orders from agencies of the Federal Government, particularly with respect to their effect on jobs and economic growth (Rept. 112-7). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 519. A bill to secure the return to the United States the \$179 million overpaid into the United Nations Tax Equalization Fund as of December 31, 2009, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. WU, Mr. JONES, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. STARK, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 520. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require labeling

of genetically engineered fish; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. WU, Mr. JONES, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. STARK, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 521. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prevent the approval of genetically engineered fish; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. BARROW, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 522. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to issue an interim occupational safety and health standard regarding worker exposure to combustible dust, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GONZÁLEZ:

H.R. 523. A bill to make the United States exclusively liable for certain claims of liability to the extent such liability is a claim for damages resulting from, or aggravated by, the inclusion of ethanol in transportation fuel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUAYLE:

H.R. 524. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that limit distributions from medical-related tax-preferred accounts for medicines only if the medicines are prescribed drugs or insulin and to repeal the increase in additional tax on distributions from health savings accounts and Archer MSAs not used for qualified medical expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 525. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance and increase the number of veterinarians trained in veterinary public health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H.R. 526. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish and collect a fee based on the fair market value of articles imported into the United States and articles exported from the United States in commerce and to use amounts collected from the fee to make grants to carry out certain transportation projects in the transportation trade corridors for which the fee is collected, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and 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. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 527. A bill to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 528. A bill to require the submission of a report to the Congress on parasitic disease among poor Americans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself, Mr. KIND, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr.

YARMUTH, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 529. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat computer technology and equipment as eligible higher education expenses for 529 plans, to allow certain individuals a credit against income tax for contributions to 529 plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 530. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to remove the ineligibility of individuals who participate in a strike; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 531. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a Frontline Providers Loan Repayment Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. HALL, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 532. A bill to eliminate certain provisions relating to Texas and the Education Jobs Fund; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BACA, and Mrs. BONO MACK):

H.R. 533. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of Natural Resources Conservation Service property in Riverside, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 534. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 217 West King Street, Martinsburg, West Virginia, as the "W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CIELLINE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 535. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand the matters covered by pre-separation counseling provided to members of the Armed Forces and their spouses; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Ms. FOX, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 536. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to revise and extend that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and 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. CONNOLLY of Virginia (for himself, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. LATHAM):

H.R. 537. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act with respect to the qualification of the director of food services of a Medicare skilled nursing facility or a Medicaid nursing facility; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. CUELLAR:

H.R. 538. A bill to require the establishment of customer service standards for Federal agencies; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. CRITZ):

H.R. 539. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, to provide for cash relief for years for which annual COLAs do not take effect under certain cash benefit programs, and to provide for Social Security benefit protection; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Rules, Transportation and Infrastructure, and 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 Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 540. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to issue a medal to honor veterans of the Armed Forces who died after their service in the Vietnam War, but whose deaths were a direct result of their service in the Vietnam War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 541. A bill to amend section 1011 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-173) to make permanent the program of Federal reimbursement of emergency health services furnished to undocumented aliens; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 542. A bill to eliminate the learned intermediary defense to tort claims based on product liability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 543. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for payments in lieu of taxes for certain Department of Homeland Security land; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 544. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to permanently extend the period of protections for servicemembers against mortgage foreclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 545. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to reimburse certain volunteers who provide funeral honors details at the funerals of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself, Mr.

BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. RIGELL, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. FOX, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 546. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to designate the Honor and Remember Flag created by Honor and Remember, Inc., as an official symbol to recognize and honor members of the Armed Forces who died in the line of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BURTON of Indi-

ana, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 547. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the alternative minimum tax on individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 548. A bill to repeal a rule of the National Mediation Board relating to representation election procedures; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself and Mr. BARROW):

H.R. 549. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to establish and carry out a program to safely and feasibly address piston engine aircraft emissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. REYES, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 550. A bill to amend the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 to authorize additional projects and activities under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 551. A bill to allow a State to contribute State funds to Federal agencies, State agencies, or Indian tribes participating in an environmental review process under section 139 of title 23, United States Code, to support activities that directly and meaningfully contribute to expediting and improving transportation project planning and delivery for projects in that State; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 552. A bill to encourage States and units of general local government to use amounts received under the community development block grant program and the community mental health services and substance abuse block grant programs to provide housing counseling and financial counseling for individuals before their release from inpatient or residential institutions for individuals with mental illness and periodic evaluation of the appropriateness of such counseling after such release; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 553. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act regarding an endocrine disruptor screening program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McCOTTER:

H.R. 554. A bill to withdraw normal trade relations treatment from the products of foreign countries that do not maintain acceptable standards of religious freedom and worker rights; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. OLVER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. LEE of Cali-

fornia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. NEAL, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FILNER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. HIRONO):

H.R. 555. A bill to assist States in establishing a universal prekindergarten program to ensure that all children 3, 4, and 5 years old have access to a high-quality full-day, full-calendar-year prekindergarten education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. McCOTTER:

H.R. 556. A bill to repeal certain provisions in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act related to patient centered outcomes research and rescind unobligated appropriations related to such provisions and to repeal certain health care-related provisions in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 and rescind unobligated appropriations related to such provisions for purposes of reducing the national debt; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Appropriations, Ways and Means, Science, Space, and Technology, and 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. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 557. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to move the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection into the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 558. A bill to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Big Spring, Texas, as the George H. O'Brien, Jr., Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 559. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional year for the extension of the placed in service date for the low-income housing credit rules applicable to the GO Zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 560. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to ensure proportional representation of rural interests on the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission and the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, and to provide for greater transparency in proceedings of those Commissions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 561. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity tax credit with respect to veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 562. A bill to amend the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act to improve the Alaska pipeline construction training program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 563. A bill to authorize issuance of certificates of documentation authorizing

certain vessels to engage in coastwise trade in the carriage of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.J. Res. 23. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that the Federal budget be balanced; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.J. Res. 24. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUAYLE:

H. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that non-defense, non-security, non-veterans discretionary spending should be reduced by 20 percent; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. Res. 72. A resolution directing certain standing committees to inventory and review existing, pending, and proposed regulations and orders from agencies of the Federal Government, particularly with respect to their effect on jobs and economic growth; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H. Res. 74. A resolution urging the Federal courts to expedite disposition of actions challenging the constitutionality of provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, and Mrs. CAPPAS):

H. Res. 75. A resolution recognizing National Nurses Week on May 8 through May 14, 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H. Res. 76. A resolution urging the Federal courts to expedite disposition of actions challenging the constitutionality of provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK (for himself and Mr. MEEKS):

H. Res. 77. A resolution expressing the solidarity of the House of Representatives with the families of the victims and those displaced by the heavy rains and widespread flooding in Colombia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 564. A bill for the relief of Rigoberto Padilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 565. A bill for the relief of Angela Stefanova Boneva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 519.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, including Clause 18 of that Section.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 520.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 521.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 522.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 and 18 of Section 8, Article I, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GONZÁLEZ:

H.R. 523.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; Article I, Section 9, Clause 7.

By Mr. QUAYLE:

H.R. 524.
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 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

H.R. 525.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 526.
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 and Clause 18.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 527.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution; Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, including, but not limited to, Clauses 1, 3 and 18 of Section 8; Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution; and the Sixteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 528.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 529.
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 and Amendment XVI to the United States Constitution.

Description: The first is "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises . . ."; and the second grants Congress the 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. BACA:

H.R. 530.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 531.
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. BURGESS:

H.R. 532.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached bill is constitutional under Article I, Section IX, "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law".

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 533.
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 and Clause 18, and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 534.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 535.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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 Mr. COLE:

H.R. 536.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I, Clause 2 of Section 2 of Article II.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 537.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 538.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause: the U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8: Powers of Congress, Clause 18.

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 539.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 as interpreted by *Steward Machine Company v. Davis* and by *Helvering v. Davis* ("general welfare" and general taxation).

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 540.

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 (Clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), 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; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper to execute these powers.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 541.

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 (Clauses 1, 3, 14, and 18), which grant Congress the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States; to regulate Commerce among the several States; to make rules for the Government; and to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 542.

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 (Clauses 1, 3, 14, and 18), which grant Congress the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States; to regulate Commerce among the several States; to make rules for the Government; and to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 543.

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 (Clauses 1, 3, 14, 17, and 18), which grant Congress the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States; to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States; to make rules for the Government; To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over . . . other needful Buildings; and to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 544.

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

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 545.

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 (Clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), 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; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper to execute these powers.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 546.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 13; Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 547.

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

In accordance clause 7(c) of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives (relating to Constitutional Authority), I state that the power granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact this bill is derived from Article I of the Constitution, Section 8 ("The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises . . ."), and from the 16th Amendment to the Constitution.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 548.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, Congress has the authority "to regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 549.

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

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, of the United States Constitution, Congress shall have the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among several States, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 550.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

Texas:

H.R. 551.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have the Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

Texas:

H.R. 552.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 553.

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

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MCCOTTER:

H.R. 554.

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. KUCINICH:

H.R. 555.

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. MCCOTTER:

H.R. 556.

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. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 557.

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

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

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 558.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 559.

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

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 560.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is pursuant to the following:

(1) Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

(2) Article I, Section 1—All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 561.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1—the taxing and spending clause.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 562.

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. 563.

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 Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 564.

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 (Clause 4), which grants Congress

the power to establish a Uniform rule of Naturalization throughout the United States.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 565.

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 (Clause 4), which grants Congress the power to establish a Uniform rule of Naturalization throughout the United States.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.J. Res. 23.

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

Article 5 of the Constitution states: The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.J. Res. 24.

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

Article V: The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 3: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. THORBERRY, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 4: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. QUILLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 5: Mr. DENT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PRICE of

Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HERGER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. WOLF, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MARINO, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 21: Mr. GOWDY and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 23: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 25: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 38: Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 85: Ms. NORTON and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 97: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. YODER, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. LANDRY.

H.R. 98: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 100: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 104: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 111: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 114: Mr. JONES and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 116: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 118: Mr. JONES and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 120: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 121: Mr. WEST, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 122: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 140: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 149: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 153: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 154: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. HECK, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 177: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. YODER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 192: Mr. FILNER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. CHU, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 198: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 199: Mr. CRITZ.

H.R. 217: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. YODER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 218: Mr. REYES and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 219: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 234: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 261: Mr. CLAY and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 263: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 280: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 282: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 290: Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. KLINE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 300: Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 302: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HECK, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 305: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 314: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 317: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 326: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 327: Mr. MORAN, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 328: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 332: Ms. NORTON and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 333: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 340: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 361: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. JONES, Mr. AKIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 363: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 365: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 372: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. WEST, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 374: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 389: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. JONES, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. REED, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. WEST.

H.R. 401: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 412: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 413: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 415: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 416: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 417: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CHU, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 430: Mr. ROSS of Florida and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 432: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 436: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DOLD, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H.R. 440: Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 458: Mr. SIREs, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 459: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. AMASH, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 469: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 471: Mr. PENCE, Mr. WEBSTER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. HARPER, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HECK, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. AKIN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 481: Ms. NORTON and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 492: Mr. POLIS, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 495: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 501: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 509: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 513: Mr. LONG, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. MILLER of Flor-

ida, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. POSEY.

H.Con. Res. 11: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.Con. Res. 12: Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. HOLT.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H. Res. 11: Mr. FALBOMVAEGA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. REYES.

H. Res. 19: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. HIRONO.

H. Res. 20: Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 21: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 23: Mr. ROKITA.

H. Res. 40: Mr. KLINE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H. Res. 41: Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 44: Mr. SCHOCK.

H. Res. 46: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 51: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H. Res. 57: Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. LANCE.

H. Res. 60: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H. Res. 61: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CALVERT.