



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 2011

No. 39

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 15, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL R. TURNER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 2011

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the greatest threat to our democracy is unemployment. We all know the numbers. We all have far too many constituents who don't have jobs and can't provide for their families.

Too many Americans are without work, and more and more of them are losing hope. Unemployment benefits are running out. Fear is creeping in. But for some of the unemployed, their tireless job search has been coming up

empty because some employers won't even consider them for openings.

Recently, The New York Times reported that one employer listed a job that included the caveat: "No unemployed candidate will be considered at all," and a Texas electronics company said that it won't "consider/review anyone not currently employed, regardless of the reason." It is reminiscent of a time when signs read: Blacks need not apply, or Women need not apply.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's high time that we fix that. How are the unemployed supposed to find work if they don't even get considered for a job? How do we expect the unemployment rate to go down when the unemployed aren't even available or allowed to compete for a job?

Along with Congressman JOHN LEWIS, I'm introducing legislation that will amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to make it illegal for employers to discriminate against applicants because they are currently or were currently unemployed.

The Civil Rights Act of 2011 will not give a job to those who are unemployed, but it will give those who are unemployed through no fault of their own the opportunity to compete for a job on the merits of their ability.

Mr. Speaker, we talk in pleasantries and political correctness about "these difficult economic times." We debate policy and hold hearings on how to move America forward, but recently the Bureau of Labor Statistics had to modify its current population survey to be able to include responses reporting a duration of unemployment over 2 years.

We are making room for the reality of chronic unemployment in America in very real ways, while promising it will get better. I think we need to do more to make sure that people have opportunities.

Nearly 9 percent of Americans right now are unemployed. That's 13.9 mil-

lion Americans that we represent as Members of Congress who are looking for the opportunity to pursue the American Dream. They are looking for Washington and to Washington for leadership and to keep things from getting any worse.

They are writing our offices begging us to help them jump-start America. They are not just looking for a hand out. They are looking for a way out, just a chance so that they can take care of the rest. They are hoping that the next interview will mean a new start.

Mr. Speaker, the job market is troublesome; but we cannot allow companies to arbitrarily pick who will come out of the economic crisis by disqualifying unemployed workers. It should not be their right to discriminate this way.

We, as a Nation, face triumphs and challenges together. It seems to me that to allow such a practice is counterintuitive to everything that Congress is working towards. Why create jobs if those Americans currently without jobs are not eligible?

Just because an individual was unlucky to be laid off or had the misfortune to graduate into a jobless market does not mean that we should just cast them aside.

This employment practice adds insult to injury for Americans who are desperately looking for jobs, for college graduates who debate if their education was worth the cost, for families who are trying to make more on less.

Those who live on Main Street of America had very little to do with the onset of our economic crisis. In response, they are doing what generations before us have taught, carrying on, hoping that the darkness will give way to light.

Mr. Speaker, if we allow employers to block consideration for those who are unemployed, we let that light get a little dimmer. We allow the American

□ 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.

H1799

Dream to be tarnished. We send a message to the American people, those who are currently unemployed and those who are one bad break away from unemployment, that we will bail out banks but not support them as they fight to take care of their families.

The Civil Rights Act and the amendments that have followed demonstrate what makes America exceptional. Here, regardless of the color of your skin, the god you pray to, your ethnicity, your age or sex, you will be judged on your performance. We haven't always lived up to our principles, but it is the collective momentum towards these values that makes America great.

Discrimination against any American is an affront to the very idea of America. A new class of citizen now needs protection from the superficial bias that is not based on the ability to perform. Using current employment status as a requirement for application or consideration is shameful.

There are 13.9 million Americans currently unemployed; that means 13.9 million Americans are considered by some employers to be no longer viable for employment. They are dismissed out of hand.

But, Mr. Speaker, I refuse to believe that every unemployed individual is unqualified for a job. It is an arbitrary way of narrowing an applicant pool by finding a loophole that allows discrimination.

I ask each and every Member of Congress to stand with me and to say to those 13.9 million Americans who are unemployed, you are not forgotten, your chance has not passed. We should pass the Civil Rights Act of 2011. We should not allow the opportunities that all Americans deserve to be taken away. Current joblessness should not disqualify you from employment. Your ability is more valuable than any label ever placed upon you.

#### CUBAN AMERICAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED STATES

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and support the efforts under way throughout my wonderful State of Florida to honor the courage, the achievement, and the legacy of Cuban Americans in the United States.

The following cities, in addition to the Florida House of Representatives, have passed resolutions in support of designating a day to recognize the many valuable contributions of Cuban Americans to the United States. Hialeah Gardens, Hialeah, Doral, Florida City, West Miami, Miami Beach, the City of Miami, Pembroke Pines, Homestead and Key West.

Cuban Americans have had a profound and lasting influence on the history, values, and culture of the United

States since the arrival of the earliest Cuban settlers more than 400 years ago in St. Augustine, Florida.

According to the 2007 census survey, 251,000 Cuban American-owned businesses generated \$51 billion to our economy. Several local south Florida municipalities have recognized the important contributions that the Cuban American community has made to the economic and cultural development of our great Nation.

Cuban Americans have become dedicated public servants, having held posts at the highest levels of government.

Cubans settling in the United States look at this Nation, our wonderful United States of America, with gratitude; and many have risked life and limb to defend this bastion of freedom and democracy. Countless Cuban Americans have served bravely in all branches of the United States Armed Forces and have fought honorably in many wars.

One such hero is Armando Alejandro, who voluntarily enlisted in the United States Marine Corps and served two tours of duty in Vietnam. Armando was also a volunteer for the Brothers to the Rescue, a pro-democracy organization whose mission is to promote and support the efforts of the people of Cuba to free themselves from the Cuban dictatorship through the use of active non-violence.

While he and his fellow Brothers to the Rescue volunteers were carrying out such a humanitarian mission on February 24, 1996, the Cuban regime ordered Cuban military jets to shoot down their unarmed civilian aircraft.

□ 1010

The shoot-down resulted in the unjust killings of Carlos Costa, Armando Alejandro, Mario de la Pena, and Pablo Morales.

Last month, I wrote a letter to Secretary Clinton and Attorney General Holder asking the administration to take immediate action to indict Fidel and Raul Castro for their role in this horrible shoot-down. The United States must make it clear that we will not stand for the Cuban tyrannies, manipulation, and unapologetic crimes against the American people nor for its abuses against its own people of Cuba.

No matter how the regime and its enablers try to spin it, the Cuban tyranny remains as oppressive and uncompromising as ever. Its methodical release and exile of political prisoners is nothing but an attempt to curry favor with those with whom the regime seeks business.

This weekend's conviction and sentencing of U.S. citizen Alan Gross to 15 years in prison is a clear reminder of this. This deplorable act is another illustration of the regime's willingness to use human beings as political pawns to advance its destructive agenda. The United States and all responsible nations must demand the immediate release of Alan Gross and all prisoners

who remain wrongfully imprisoned in Castro's gulags.

I am proud to say that despite the challenges and the passing years, Cuban Americans remain undeterred in our fight for freedom, justice, and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I join in the support of these resolutions and again urge that a date be set to honor the courage, the achievements, and the legacy of Cuban Americans in the glorious United States.

#### THE COST OF THE ENERGY TAX PREVENTION ACT

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, Colstrip, Montana, is home to the second largest coal plant west of the Mississippi. One boxcar-full of coal is burned every 5 minutes.

The burning coal creates sodium, thallium, mercury, boron, aluminum, and arsenic, which is pumped out of the factory and into the air. The chemicals that are pumped into the air are caught in the factory's scrubbers and then dumped with coal ash into giant settling ponds. These ponds are shallow artificial lakes of concentrated toxicity which leach this poison into wells and aquifers.

The sludge flows into the surrounding towns and countryside, bubbling up against foundations and floorings, cracking the floor in Colstrip's local grocery store. Ranchers in eastern Montana are now suing the plant for damages; noxious water, they cite, is the only liquid that fill their wells and stock ponds.

James Jansen, a renowned climate scientist, says Colstrip itself will cause the extinction of 400 species. But Colstrip burns on. Why? Because we have no national energy plan, and because there are currently no Federal enforceable regulations specific to coal ash.

This lack of federally enforceable safeguards is exactly what led to the disaster in Tennessee, where a dam holding more than 1 billion gallons of toxic coal ash failed. The TVA disaster destroyed 300 acres, dozens of homes, killed fish and other wildlife, and poisoned the Emory and Clinch Rivers.

From Tennessee to Montana and across the Nation, the story is the same: We have no national conservation plan, no national energy policy, no regulatory enforcement authority.

What is worse, today we are faced with a bill, H.R. 910, the Energy Tax Prevention Act, which purports to protect citizens from taxation. In reality, this bill is a death sentence not only to our land, air, water, animals, and plants but to humans.

This bill overturns proven scientific findings that carbon pollution endangers the health of Americans. It repeals the greenhouse gas reporting rule and removes the Environmental Protection

Agency's authority to require energy efficiency at power plants and refineries. This bill simply says that science doesn't matter.

I stand here today to refute that claim and, further, to protect the integrity of science. It is this science, these facts and figures, that have led hundreds of scientists to confirm that global warming is real. In fact, over 200 peer-reviewed scientific studies have found that global warming is real and that man contributes to it. To this date, zero peer-reviewed studies have found otherwise.

It is this science that led the Supreme Court to rule that the Environmental Protection Agency 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, EPA will begin regulating greenhouse gases from certain emitters for the first time. These regulations have become hugely controversial and, sadly, political. These rules seek to 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 part of the world and is causing multiyear droughts and 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.

And still, here we are, ignoring cries from health and medical professionals who have asked us, as Members of this body, to fulfill the promise of clean, healthy air for all Americans to breathe.

Support full implementation of the Clean Air Act and resist any efforts to weaken, delay, or block progress toward a healthier future for all Americans.

Ignoring requests from former senior military officials who wrote just last week, "America's dependence on oil constitutes a clear and present danger to the security and welfare of the United States," and that, "As former senior military officials, we are concerned about congressional efforts to undermine the Environmental Protection Agency's regulatory authority that is critical to reducing our dependence on oil," Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford the costs of the Energy Tax Prevention Act: Lost and devastated ecosystems, lost jobs, and lost lives.

#### PASS A COMMONSENSE ENERGY PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) for 2 minutes.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, let me cut to the point. Gas prices have skyrocketed at the worst possible time, the economy is in a slump, and people are hurting. The administration and congressional Democrats are making the problem worse with their burdensome energy regulations that destroy jobs and drive up costs. Democrats and the White House are blocking commonsense reforms that would allow for more targeted energy exploration here at home, which would lead to lower gas prices and additional job creation and greater security.

Three weeks ago, I had the privilege of sitting in the office of Benjamin Netanyahu in Israel. He expressed great appreciation for America, but also ended by saying that he was greatly concerned that America was unwilling at this time to do what was necessary to make sure that we had an energy plan of independence from, as he called it, the earthquake zone of the Middle East. And I agree. So I am joining with my colleagues, my Republican colleagues, their common sense and pro-growth, in proposing an alternative.

I believe we should allow for more exploration in Alaska, so I cosponsored H.R. 49, the American Energy Independence and Price Reduction Act. I believe we should pass an all-of-the-above energy plan. So that is why I am becoming an original cosponsor of H.R. 909, A Road Map to America's Energy Future. And the government should stop the painfully slow permitting process for drilling in the gulf, so I joined with Representative SCALISE and others of my colleagues in the House to urge the President to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, the current energy policy is one of overregulation, and it is not working. We must work to change that now. I stand ready to work with my colleagues to create an energy policy that lowers energy prices and allows for more job creation. The people of my district and of this great country are demanding nothing less.

#### PUBLIC BROADCASTING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this morning thousands of people on Capitol Hill turned to NPR radio or the NPR Web site to find out the latest developments on the horrific situation in Japan, the potential nuclear meltdown, and with the fast-moving events in the Middle East. This is why the Pew survey revealed yesterday that, while media across the board is declining—broadcast television news, newspapers, radio—that we are watching a renaissance as far as public broadcasting, in particular NPR, which is increasing its audience, its revenues, and its reporting staff.

But the health and vitality of NPR is not a reason to slash the financial sup-

port for public broadcasting. First and foremost, it is a miniscule part of the budget, less than one half a cent per day for each American. But more important, this is the type of infrastructure America needs right now.

The public broadcasting support provides a unique service that is not available on commercial television. The education, culture, news, even the boring news, is an area where there is no commercial market. That is why you will search 500 stations in vain on cable and satellite to find that type of programming that is available for news and for educating our children, not selling them something.

□ 1020

More significant, the amount of money that comes from Public Broadcasting to NPR is a tiny fraction of its budget. Most of the Public Broadcasting support that is provided by Congress goes to local stations, with particular emphasis on rural and small-town America.

Taking as an example my home State of Oregon with its award-winning Oregon Public Broadcasting, it costs 11 times more to broadcast to the far eastern reaches in Burns, Oregon, than it does in metropolitan Portland. That is a pattern that is repeated coast to coast. Rural and small-town America relies more heavily on Public Broadcasting. It doesn't have the population base to ever provide for itself.

Slashing Public Broadcasting funding is not going to stop Public Broadcasting in New York or Washington, DC., in Seattle or Los Angeles, or even Portland, Oregon. What it will do is make the programming less rich, and it will reduce the ability to provide those services in the outlying areas.

Even the most recent flap about the media ambush of a former NPR fundraiser, which produced an 11-minute video that appeared to be very damning as far as Public Broadcasting is concerned, well, it took NPR to do an in-depth study. It reviewed the entire 2-hour conversation captured on tape to find out that the edited 11-minute version was misleading, trying to portray the point of view of the ambush journalist. This is the same guy who was caught by law enforcement officials trying to illegally "bug" the office of Senator MARY LANDRIEU in Louisiana.

In the course of 2 hours, it was very clear, reviewing the entire record, that it had been inappropriately edited to suggest that there was an acceptance or that it was amusing that there was somehow an attempt to impose sharia law across the country. It ignored the fact that the NPR employee made it clear that there was a firewall between any contributions and influencing the editorial content.

That is why NPR and PBS are the most trusted names in broadcasting, and why 78 percent of Americans in a recent poll said they wanted Public Broadcasting support maintained or

even increased. And, indeed, two-thirds of the Republicans wanted support maintained and increased. I hope my Republican colleagues will listen to the public and support this vital resource.

**HONORING CORPORAL JONATHAN W. TAYLOR**

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life of Corporal Jonathan W. Taylor.

Four years to the day of his graduation from boot camp, Corporal Taylor died on February 22, 2011. At the age of 23, he bravely gave his life while conducting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan.

Growing up, Corporal Taylor always knew that he wanted to be a United States Marine. As a student at Lecanto High School, he was a member of the JROTC program. He was an active member of the Sea Cadet Program out of Yankeetown.

In October 2007, Corporal Taylor was deployed on his first combat tour in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Following that tour, he was deployed to support Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan three separate times. While his unit was not deployed during his second-to-last tour, Corporal Taylor bravely volunteered to go back to Afghanistan to continue the fight with his Marines.

Corporal Taylor was laid to rest today with honors in Arlington National Cemetery. Over his career, his awards included the Marine Corps Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Medal, the NATO Medal-ISAF Afghanistan, and the Purple Heart.

Now beside his fellow brothers in uniform, his parents, Mark and Debbie, have said they are proud to have seen their son off on his last and final deployment, his final tour of duty.

Corporal Taylor courageously made the ultimate sacrifice for his Marines and his fellow Americans. As a country, as a Nation, we owe our fallen heroes and their families a debt that can never be repaid. It is our duty to always remember that these sacrifices were made on behalf of all Americans, and that our brave young men and women in uniform are clear examples of what makes this Nation so great.

Today, I am humbled to have the opportunity to introduce this House to a true American hero. Corporal Jonathan W. Taylor, God bless you, and God bless your service to this Nation.

**OPPOSE THE U.S.-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT**

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the proposed South Korea trade deal is the

largest NAFTA-style trade agreement proposed in 15 years. Some people in Washington, including President Obama, support this agreement. Congress should not. Most importantly, this "NAFTA"-Korea deal will result in more job loss across countless communities in our country.

The U.S. International Trade Commission studied this agreement and determined that it will be a net job loser for our country, just like the NAFTA deal was, just like the China deal was, just like all the failed nonreciprocal trade deals our Nation has negotiated over the last 25 years. Yes, a handful of companies will come out ahead, and they have a lot of power in Washington, but, as a whole, our country loses.

We have heard a lot about deficits lately. This deal with the Koreans will only put us deeper in the hole. Why would Congress do this again to the American people and to the American economy? Last year, the United States ran up another half-trillion-dollar trade deficit with the world, and this past quarter, one of the largest in history. Both American and Korean estimates predict that this deal will only add to our deficit.

These NAFTA-type trade deals translate into net job loss. Even the President doesn't claim that the deal will create new jobs. That is because it won't. In fact, it will cost jobs.

America needs trade reciprocity. We need balance, at a minimum, where our exports balance our imports and more hopefully exceed our imports. We need to make goods in America again, not outsource more jobs. It is obvious to everyone we have a job crisis in America. Across our economy, the real rate of unemployment and underemployment is over 17 percent.

This agreement, again, will negatively impact employment. In my district alone, the agreement threatens thousands of jobs. Why would America do this again to our people? More outsourcing, more job loss.

My district is at the center of the automotive sector, and our companies supply manufacturers from Alabama to Detroit to New Jersey to California. This deal is bad for the entire U.S. automotive sector, yes, the entire automotive sector.

In December, the administration negotiated with the Korean government a supplemental agreement on the automotive sector, and this side deal was supposed to ensure fairness for our auto companies. But it simply leaves too many unresolved concerns still on the table. And it doesn't provide reciprocity. There is no threshold measure that if we take half a million Korean cars, which we already do, and they only take 6,000 of ours, which is what is going on right now, that they have any requirement at all to actually increase imports. We ought to fix what is wrong with the existing system, rather than trade away more of our economic substance.

There is also a strange logic that we somehow level the playing field by allowing the South Korean government to subject our cars to additional regulations within 4 year. And importantly, there is no threshold measure that we actually are balancing the huge trade deficit we already have with that nation.

□ 1030

There's another loophole. The cars don't really have to be made in South Korea. Nearly two-thirds of the actual content can come from, guess where? Communist China and other countries that are relentlessly engaged in predatory and illegal trading practices is not a prescription for liberty.

The automotive sector isn't the only industry that is at risk. Multiple sectors will be impacted, including textiles, electronics, and metal products. And that's just in manufacturing. Beef producers better pay attention because they're going to lose under this deal as well.

I look forward to the day when this President, or any President, submits a trade agreement that will actually create new employment opportunities across our country. We surely need the jobs. Yes, trade can help fuel economic growth, but we need agreements that yield reciprocity and put America on a level trade playing field. NAFTA-styled Korean free trade agreements simply don't meet that test. This deal is over 400 pages long—and that's without the annexes to the agreement. The American people should read it. And so should Congress.

America needs jobs here at home, not more job outsourcing. And surely not more trade deficits. We need reciprocity, and it would be the first time in a quarter century. That should be our target, not more job loss in America.

**HONORING MAYOR JOSEPH ESQUIVEL**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorable Joseph Esquivel for his 39 years of public service to the people of Lakewood, California. Joe began his service to Lakewood as a member of the Lakewood Recreation and Community Services Commission in 1972; and in 1990, he began the first of his five terms on the Lakewood City Council. After 21 productive years of service on the council, Joe is retiring from public service to spend more quality time with his family.

Joe and his wife, Pat, have called Lakewood home since 1963, raising three wonderful children and in the process becoming proud grandparents and great grandparents. As an active leader in his community, Joe had a hand in the founding of many local organizations such as the Lakewood

Youth Hall of Fame. Joe continues to be a member of the Hall of Fame Board of Electors, which is charged with recognizing Lakewood's young high school and collegiate standout athletes.

Throughout his time on the City Council and as Mayor, Joe made it his priority to ensure that Lakewood remains a safe, family friendly, and a thriving community. Joe was instrumental in bringing together the resources needed to make Lakewood's state-of-art Sheriff's Station a reality and was integral in developing several crime prevention programs that have made our community safer.

Over the past two decades, Joe has worked tirelessly to make certain Lakewood operates on firm financial footing and never outside of its fiscal means. While the struggling economy has impacted many cities throughout southern California, Lakewood has managed to maintain funding for all city services and capital improvement projects. In addition, Lakewood has managed to be a leading destination for businesses and new business development.

Joe's involvement in public service reaches far beyond the confines of the City's Council Chamber. Joe is a dedicated member of Lakewood's Rotary Club, having served for many years as the coordinator of the Rotary Club's annual Project Shepherd holiday assistance program for families in need. Under his leadership, Project Shepherd aided hundreds of families each year with the help of volunteers of all ages from Lakewood schools, churches, and youth organizations. He was named Rotarian of the Year in 1995. One of his joys as a Lakewood resident was serving as a volunteer coach of 8- and 9-year-old youngsters in basketball and football at Bolivar Park. He received the Mayor's Award for 11 consecutive seasons of volunteer coaching.

He has held various leadership positions, including president of the California Contract Cities Association, president of the Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District, and president of the Private Industry Council of Southeast Los Angeles County. Joe sits on the Lakewood Regional Medical Center and Lakewood Weingart Family YMCA Board of Directors. As a Navy veteran, Joe has been a proud member of American Legion Post 496 for the past 19 years.

From one public servant to another, I praise Mayor Joseph Esquivel for his service and dedication to the city of Lakewood and to the community. Lakewood would not be the community it is today without him. I want to thank him for his years of service and wish him the best of luck as he moves forward in new endeavors.

#### EARTHQUAKE AND TSUNAMI THAT HIT JAPAN

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, 4 days ago, a huge earthquake and tsunami hit Japan. I was sort of surprised last night when we came in and there was no resolution recognizing the problems of the Japanese people and the terror and the difficulties they are dealing with at this time. So I want to come today to rise in support of them as they cope with this tremendous tragedy and the challenges that both the earthquake and the tsunami have created for them.

For the last 10 years or so, I have been the chair of the Japanese American exchange between the Diet and the Congress, and I've gotten to know many Japanese members of the Diet very well. I was a member of this commission some years ago when Kobe had a huge earthquake and devastation that took a hundred billion dollars to recover from.

So I was sort of brought up short by what happened when I saw it on television, and thought of my friends. And I immediately started trying to call them. I couldn't find them. I only this morning got in touch with a friend of mine named Matsuda San. We've been friends for a long time. In fact, I have been to his home a very few miles from Sendai City, where the earthquake—the center of this whole event was. He's well. His family is well. He said his friends are also safe and his house is still standing. So for many people, they have escaped the terror of this. But there are thousands and thousands of people who are struggling with this.

The Japanese people have shown a resilience that is amazing. When the government said there's going to be rolling blackouts in Tokyo, we need to conserve electricity, the Japanese conserved electricity so quickly that they didn't have the rolling blackouts. That's how they came together in the interest of the common good in Japan.

Washington State, where I come from, has the third largest Japanese population in the United States. Only California and Hawaii have more. As I said, we have a sister city with Kobe. When that hit, it was shock for everyone in Seattle because we also live on the ring of fire around the Pacific Ocean that we've seen strike so recently not only in Japan, but in New Zealand. Sometimes you can't believe that you live in a place like that; you know it can happen any time, but you still go on with your life, sort of denying that it's real.

After the Japanese earthquake in Kobe some years ago, there was a lot of criticism of the government: you didn't plan enough. Well, they have been planning for this for the last 10 years. But nobody can plan for an 8.9 Richter scale earthquake. That's just too much. I think that it is important to remember the Japanese are not just good allies. They're good friends. To many of us, they are brothers, sisters, fathers, mothers. Some of them are among my very best friends.

This tragedy, as it continues to unfold, just think of what life is like for

those people who are alive and under the rubble, or the homeless. Imagine, you have a life; it's a nice life. You're working, going to school, you're kids are growing up. And, suddenly, you have no food, no heat, no water, and you're in the freezing cold.

The United States has responded. We have had military bases in Japan for a long time. Luckily, they were close by so they could immediately move some of the aircraft carriers and other ships in to deliver relief aid. It is at that time when you realize—in fact, their government has actually realized—that fighting about some of the things politically they fight about are not so important. What is really important is the basics of life being provided to everyone in the country.

This is a national disaster that has been complicated by another factor that we have to consider in the United States, and that's the whole question of nuclear power and what happens to nuclear power plants. We have nuclear power plants in this country that are sitting near earthquake zones. So this is not something that we can say, Well, that's over there in Japan; that's 9,000 miles and 12 hours away.

□ 1040

That is, in fact, very near to us here in this country. For the Japanese, the threat of nuclear contamination, of radiation, is a special horror because they suffered in Hiroshima and Nagasaki—the only use of nuclear weapons—and the fallout that followed that. Today, millions of Japanese are still trying to absorb what they are seeing and are valiantly fighting to control the damage.

Our thoughts and prayers go to the Japanese people.

#### THE BULLYING OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS: AN EPIDEMIC

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an epidemic that is flying too far under the radar: the bullying of children with special needs.

Bullying has gotten a fair amount of attention in recent years. Our Nation was shocked by the story of Tyler Clementi, a gay Rutgers student who jumped off the George Washington Bridge after being bullied by his peers. Earlier this month, Dateline NBC ran a special called "My Kid Would Never Bully." In it, hidden cameras were used so parents could watch their children react to several different bullying situations set up by Dateline. The results were not great. Last week, the President and the First Lady held a White House conference on bullying.

What we haven't focused on is who gets bullied the most. You might be surprised by this: It's children with special needs. In fact, two times as many children with special needs are

taunted every day in schools as children who we say are “normal.”

Tomorrow, I will be cohosting a briefing with Congresswoman CATHY MCMORRIS ROGERS, herself a parent of a special needs child, to discuss the heart-breaking issue. We will be joined by Lauren Potter, an actress on the hit show “Glee,” who has Down syndrome and who will share her personal stories as well. We will be highlighting a report by AbilityPath.org, Best Buddies, and the Special Olympics. This report shines a bright light on this epidemic.

Here in Congress it seems there are as many reports as minutes in the day, but too often they end up collecting dust instead of inspiring action. In this case, we cannot allow that to happen. Bullying and harassment foster a climate of fear and disrespect that can seriously impair the physical and psychological health of its victims, and create conditions that negatively affect their learning.

For special needs children who already face tremendous challenges, adding this extra burden is simply unacceptable. Those with special needs are more likely to be targets, either because their differences single them out in the classroom or because they have difficulty in communicating and in reading social cues.

Let me share with you a story from the report. These are the words of a mother of an 11-year-old girl with Down syndrome:

“My daughter is a wonderful, adorable, sweet child with Down syndrome. The bullying she encountered started in elementary school and has followed her to middle school. Everyone makes a big deal about their children being bullied at school, and it is a big deal. However, it is always the ‘normal’ children that you hear about. Who stands up for the children who are like my daughter?”

It was this sense of helplessness that led James Jones, whose daughter suffers from cerebral palsy, to confront her school bullies on a Florida school bus in 2008. The video was unforgettable and shocking. The numbers are just as disturbing.

A study in the British Journal of Learning Support found that 60 percent of students with special needs reported being bullied compared to 25 percent of the general student population.

Researchers have discovered that students with disabilities are more worried about school safety and about being injured or harassed by other peers compared to students without disabilities.

The National Autistic Society reports that 40 percent of children with autism and 60 percent of those with Asperger’s syndrome have experienced bullying.

It is time for Congress to stand up and to speak up for these children and their families. In the coming weeks, I will be introducing legislation to tackle this issue head-on. Under this legislation, schools that receive Federal

funds will be required to report the number of incidents of bullying and whether the victims have special needs. In addition, Federal funds used for bullying programs will be required to include content that specifically addresses the bullying of those with special needs.

I hope we can begin a national conversation to ensure this epidemic remains silent no more.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o’clock and 46 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

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

#### PRAYER

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

Lord God, our Hope and our Salvation, 40 years is hardly a lifetime anymore. Yet Your people wandered in the desert until a whole generation passed, longing for Your promises to be fulfilled.

Now, 40 days seems far longer than a month’s time. Yet both Moses and Jesus withdrew from the people just that long to seek Your face on the holy mountain.

Be with this Nation and the Members of this House as long as it takes, Lord.

Allow Your people to repent and reflect on old patterns that have brought about present crisis. Grant them Your power to seek new patterns of behavior so free people will embrace laws with accountability and security will spontaneously give rise to self-discipline.

Lord, heal our wounded nature and bring us to the fullness of life You have promised both 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.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a

quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BACA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### HATE IN THE NAME OF RELIGION

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, they cry peace, peace, peace in the daylight, but, when darkness of the night comes, they murder the innocent. Such was the case over the weekend when suspected Palestinian radicals killed five Israeli members of the Fogel family living in the West Bank. The assassins slithered into the Fogel home and murdered Udi and his wife, Ruth, and brutally butchered three of their children, ages 11, 4, and 3 months.

These homicides are an act of terror against the Jews of Israel. They appear to be political murders by radicals who preach hate in the name of religion. Baby killers of any religion or political belief are the lowest forms of the human existence.

Israel has the absolute right to existence. But those that have the blood of babies on their hands refuse to let Israel exist.

The murder of the Fogel family is yet another example that Israel cannot have peace as long as their neighbors hypocritically preach peace in the daytime and practice murder in the nighttime.

And that’s just the way it is.

#### REPUBLICAN CR

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, we’ve just seen 12 straight months of private sector jobs growth and there is a 2-year low in the unemployment rate. Now is the time for us to give our economy another push forward with a smart budget that invests in critical needs and lowers the deficit with intelligent

spending cuts. But instead, what are we giving the American people? More uncertainty with another short-term extension.

This short-term continuing resolution must stop. The American people need jobs, not misguided plans that undermine the future of our Nation. Unfortunately, the Republican-passed budget would give pink slips to 7,000 American workers. And now, with a continued assault on mortgage relief programs, the Republicans are ready to start handing out foreclosure notices, too.

Let's stop this madness. Let's work together on a budget plan that create jobs, reduces the deficit, and keeps our families in their homes.

#### THEY JUST DON'T GET IT

(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, with a \$14 trillion national debt and a \$1.65 trillion deficit this year alone, our Federal Government is facing a fiscal crisis of unprecedented proportions. With the passage of H.R. 1, House Republicans took an important first step toward turning our national government back in the direction of fiscal discipline, defunding ObamaCare, and even restoring the sanctity of life to the center of the Federal budget. But it was rejected by liberals in the Senate. In fact, last week, the Senate majority leader called the Republican budget cuts mean spirited, reckless, and irresponsible, even defending Federal funding for a cowboy poetry festival. Seriously.

Is it reckless and irresponsible to ask for \$61 billion in cuts when the national debt is 230 times that size? The truth is, they just don't get it.

I think it's time to take a stand for taxpayers and for future generations. And I will not vote for the short-term continuing resolution that is coming to the floor of the House today, to make that statement.

Things don't change in Washington until they have to. It's time to pick a fight.

#### FOOD SAFETY BUDGET CUTS

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to make our way through the budget process, we must ensure that all funding reductions we make are done in a responsible manner.

While I strongly agree that we need to get our deficit under control, we cannot do it in a way that undermines public safety and job creation. For example, the Republican long-term CR will cut \$88 million in funding from the Food Safety and Inspection Service. This little-known cut will force food safety inspectors off the job for over 30 days, resulting in shutdowns of plants

across this Nation. The USDA has estimated that such cuts will result in an \$11 billion loss in productivity. Additionally, meat and poultry production is supposed to grow over the next year. If we decrease funding for food safety, there will be fewer inspectors to examine our food and make sure it's acceptable for consumption.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one example of how we need to dissect each cut and the impact that it will have in the real world. I hope this Chamber can come together and make sensible decisions when it comes to reducing our deficit.

#### WE MUST ACT TODAY

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Since the time President Obama took office in 2009, the price of gasoline has more than doubled, rising from \$1.53 a gallon to \$3.52. America has become more dependent on foreign oil, undermining our national security while forcing hardworking Americans to endure budget-busting gasoline prices.

When you fill up your car, it's not the oil companies you should be blaming; it's the White House. Excessive government regulation, the fact that offshore drilling in the Gulf of Mexico is all but shut down, and the attempt to end the tax incentives for oil exploration are all factors. The culture of "no" from the executive branch is killing us. Add to that the lack of any action in light of the deteriorating situation in the Middle East, Egypt, and Libya, in particular, and we have a failure of leadership at the top of this country.

Energy is key to our economy. Scores of jobs rely on it. And \$3.50 gasoline is unacceptable.

I call on the President to act today. Call off the EPA. Issue those leases and permits in the gulf. Open America's land for drilling. And quit demonizing the oil and gas industry.

□ 1210

#### THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, to my Republican colleagues, when you say that we have a fiscal house to get in order, you're right; but when your plan is to focus 100 percent of your firepower on 12 percent of the budget, I say you are designing a plan that will fail.

Why is it that we have added \$700 billion to the deficit by extending tax cuts for the top 2 percent?

Why is it that we will cut low-income heating assistance by \$2.5 billion and continue \$55 billion in tax breaks for oil companies when they're selling oil at \$100 a barrel and when they've made \$1 trillion in the past 10 years?

Why is it that we are now having a threat by the Republican majority to say "no" on extending the debt limit, having America default on paying its bills for past obligations incurred under Republican and Democratic administrations, and playing with fire as to the reputation of the American people, despite the clear damage that it will do to the economy, rather than acknowledging that we have an obligation to meet our obligations?

#### THE ATTITUDE OF "SO BE IT" CANNOT CONTINUE

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, the people of America are asking us: What are we doing? We're going to vote today on another continuing resolution that extends the budget for another couple of weeks. People are asking: What's the matter with all of you? Why can't you just get it done?

They're absolutely right.

Mr. Speaker, the attitude of "so be it" cannot continue. Yes, we all understand that there is a deficit, and we all want to work to stop that; but we also realize that you simply can't just cut, that you have to do it smartly, that you've got to make smart cuts so it doesn't hurt what we are all striving for, which is the creation of jobs. People want jobs, and they want us to get this fiscal house in order.

If you don't want to listen to us, Mr. Speaker, think about the military. Both sides of the aisle have always looked upon the military as something we share in common, and the military is saying a continuing resolution does not work.

#### THE DEFICIT

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I've had an opportunity to listen to two of my friends on the Republican side of the aisle. I just need to remind them, when you take a voluntary pay cut, when you subsidize and give tax cuts to millionaires and billionaires, when you prosecute a couple wars to the tune of \$1 trillion that you don't pay for and then when you let Wall Street run amuck without any police on Wall Street and you have a crash, you're going to have major debt.

So now they're complaining about a debt that they were instrumental in creating. All right. We've got to pay it, but you've got to get people back to work. The best way to reduce the deficit is to have people working. President Obama has reduced what we're spending in Iraq by \$100 billion. That's real money. You can't just focus on education. You can't just focus on energy efficiency. You've got to focus on tax cuts for oil companies and on tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires.

It's both sides of the ledger. It takes all of us working together to get this under control, and we Democrats intend to do that.

#### GAS PRICES

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, soaring gas prices are impacting Americans all over the country. With gas costing nearly \$4 a gallon, drivers are having to rethink how they get around. With families and businesses tightening their budgets, rising gas prices are exactly what they don't need exactly when they don't need it.

That's why I am calling on the IRS to increase the gas mileage deduction, like it did in 2005 and 2008, to ease the pain at the pump for taxpayers. Taxpayers want, need and deserve this fair, simple and commonsense solution: for us to tap America's homegrown energy resources right here, right now.

Call the White House. The number is 202-456-1414. Tell them to get with it.

#### HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF PRIVATE FIRST CLASS DAVID RICHARD FAHEY, JR.

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a sad duty: to honor the life and service of Private First Class David Richard Fahey, Junior, who was killed in the service of our Nation. He was born only 23 years ago in Norwalk, Connecticut. On February 28, his life was taken from us in Kandahar province, Afghanistan.

I never had the honor of meeting David Fahey, but I've read the remembrances of his family and friends as they mourn his passing and celebrate his life. I learned that he was a young man who was blessed with a singular sense of humor—David was always ready to cheer up others with a joke or a prank—and I learned that he was a man of faith who would spend hours comforting friends in need. David Fahey was a man who put the needs of others first, so it is no surprise that he chose to serve his country as a soldier and MP.

Today, on behalf of the people of Connecticut and the Nation, I thank PFC David Richard Fahey, Junior, and I offer our perpetual gratitude for his legacy of service and commitment to the defense of all that we cherish.

#### JOBS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with my colleagues to talk again about jobs.

In order to reduce the deficit, everyone in the Nation must work. But how can you work when you do not have a job? My constituents want to work. They are still hurting. Maybe we can't feel the hurt because we have jobs. I am still waiting to hear the Republican plan for jobs.

When are we going to help the people become whole again? They are losing their homes. Whole families are homeless and are not knowing what to do next. Their unemployment benefits have expired, and still they can't find work. Right now, over 50 percent of homeowners in the Miami housing market either owe more on their mortgages than their homes are worth or they're within 5 percent of that mark.

Instead of figuring out ways to help, tomorrow Congress will be voting on whether or not to end programs that offer hope to distressed homeowners. We talk about a deficit that took 8 years to create during the Bush administration. It will take us more than 2 years to peel away the layers of 8 years of bad judgment, generous tax exemptions to the rich, two wars, and a failed economy.

How can we cut so deeply, so fast, causing so many people to lose their jobs? If people can't work, they can't save their homes.

Stay on task: jobs, jobs, jobs.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 48, ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AMENDMENTS, 2011

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 167 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 167

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 48) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 167 provides a closed rule for consideration of H.J. Res. 48. Keeping in line with the actions of the minority party and its CRs last year, this rule also provides for 1 hour of debate and a motion to recommit.

We are here again today dealing with the continuing resolution, Mr. Speaker, because H.R. 1 sits idly on the Senate side. As you will recall, H.R. 1 has been the singly most debated piece of legislation that we've had in this body this year. In fact, we considered more amendments on that spending bill in February than on all of the previous spending bills in the last two Congresses combined. Yet, even as the House has worked its will, even as, I think, we on both sides of the aisle identify that as one of the finest hours of this body, it sits in the Senate—unused, unexamined, undebated.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the middle of a debate on spending. It's not that we tax too little in this country. It's that we spend too much.

□ 1220

We're operating with \$1.4 trillion annual operating deficits, \$1.5 trillion, \$1.6 trillion, and now they're saying next year it could be \$1.7 trillion—spending that we do with money that we don't have.

We need to get to the big picture, Mr. Speaker. We need to have this debate about how do we move beyond what was last year's business and get on to what is this year's business. These things that we're working on, this three-week CR, Mr. Speaker, is not the real business. The real business is yet to come. I sit on the Budget Committee. If you want to talk about real business, look at the tough decisions that are coming down the pipe from the Budget Committee. Look at what it's going to take to get this budget back in balance. Look at what it's going to take to restore integrity to our fiscal system. Look at what it's going to take to inspire confidence in our foreign creditors. These are the real issues that we have to discuss, but we can't discuss them, Mr. Speaker, because we are still working on last year's business.

Now, I think we're frustrated on both sides of the aisle that we're still working on last year's business, and candidly, it may come as a surprise to you, Mr. Speaker, but I don't blame a soul on the other side. The other side of this body has been our partner in moving H.R. 1 to the Senate. They've been our partner in making the tough decisions that had to be had, and we had Republican amendments that succeeded and Republican amendments that failed. We had Democratic amendments that succeeded and Democratic amendments



that failed, and this body worked its will.

But the Senate has yet to take up the legislation, has yet to take up legislation passed in February, has yet to be taken up as we sit here in the middle of March. Now, I don't know how in the world we have negotiations, Mr. Speaker. We have done our work here in the House. I'm proud not only that we did it but I'm proud of the way in which we did it. But now we wait on the Senate to come to the table and lay down its vision for how we fund this government through September of this year.

We continue to wait, and hopefully, these 3 weeks, Mr. Speaker, will provide the time needed for the Senate to gear up and get going, because I will say it over and over and over again today, this is last year's business, and it is distracting us from the important business that needs to happen.

I'll tell you this. This CR for 3 weeks isn't what I would have liked to have seen. What I would like to see is H.R. 1 come back to this floor. What I would like to see is H.R. 1 go to the President's desk. What I would like to see are the tough, tough, tough decisions that we made and the difficult, difficult, difficult decisions that we had on this floor be translated into the law of the land as it sits on the President's desk and receives his signature. But we cannot move to that point until the Senate acts.

So I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to support this rule that will bring to the floor a continuing resolution that will give the Senate three more weeks to get its house in order to do the business that the American people sent the Senate here to do, to join us in doing the good work that we have done, and to move a bill to the President's desk so that we can get on to the rest of the business that the country has laid before us.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again, considering yet another short-term continuing resolution. The last CR was for 2 weeks. This is a 3-week bill. So I guess the good news is that we're heading in the right direction, but that's about the only good news, Mr. Speaker. This is no way to run a budget process. It is no way to run a government. It is like water torture: drip, drip, drip. How are governors and mayors and city councils supposed to plan if we keep passing these short-term bills? How are the financial markets supposed to have any certainty if we're passing bills that go only for 2 weeks or 3 weeks?

We all know what needs to happen. Democrats and Republicans in the House, the Senate, and the White House need to get together and figure out a sensible, bipartisan solution to this year's budget. And while it may,

you know, be convenient to blame the Senate, I should remind my colleagues here that the majority leader in the Senate tried to bring up a bill, but the Republicans voted to not allow the bill to be considered. So it's not like there aren't alternatives out there.

The time for rhetoric, Mr. Speaker, is past. The time for press releases and posturing is over. The time for finger-pointing must end, because despite what some on the other side of the aisle seem to believe, a government shutdown is not in our Nation's best interests.

I look at today's Politico, and one of the leading Republican spokesmen, Representative STEVE KING, is quoted extensively in an article saying that defunding is worth a shutdown. I think the last thing the American people want is for us to shut down the government.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I suppose we should also be grateful that the bill before us today does not include some of the policy changes that were in H.R. 1, such as blocking money for health care reform and Planned Parenthood, which they voted to eliminate in H.R. 1. H.R. 1, Mr. Speaker, took a meat ax to border security, to food safety, low-income heating assistance, medical research, and I could go on and on and on. And thankfully, thankfully the Senate rejected that approach last week.

But make no mistake: H.R. 1 is what my Republican colleagues not only want but are demanding. Their ideological and rigid loyalty to H.R. 1 is what is holding up these negotiations, and the cuts in H.R. 1, Mr. Speaker, are not only egregious but they are reckless and they are damaging. According to former JOHN MCCAIN economic adviser Mark Zandi, the bill had the potential to lead to 700,000 lost jobs, exactly the wrong prescription for our recovering economy.

And speaking of jobs, Mr. Speaker, where are the Republican jobs bills? Where is the legislation to encourage investment in new technology, in infrastructure, in education, and in medical research? It's been 11 weeks and we have seen nothing, not a thing from the other side of the aisle on jobs. Let me remind my colleagues that if you truly want to achieve deficit reduction focus on job creation. Put people back to work. We can help grow out of this deficit that we have.

Mr. Speaker, we can and we must do better, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this closed rule. I remind my colleagues that we have yet to have a truly open rule in this House. This is a closed rule. Oppose the closed rule and oppose the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say that we brought H.R. 1 to the floor under the single most open process this House has seen in 4 years—and I've only been on the job 65 days—the single most open process that this House has seen in 4 years. I'm proud of that. I'm proud of what we did together.

Are there other alternatives out there to H.R. 1? I don't know, Mr. Speaker, because I haven't seen one, haven't seen one come back from the Senate. Is the Senate over there debating things? Absolutely. Are they passing things? No, they're not, and I don't know where we go to move forward with that.

But a gentleman who might, Mr. Speaker, is my good friend, the president of the freshman class from the great State of Georgia.

And I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. To my colleague from Georgia, I want to thank you for your lead on this and for sharing your time with me.

Mr. Speaker, this past November the American people sent a clear message that they want and demand that representatives in Washington get our fiscal house in order. In fact, our very livelihoods as Americans and that of our future generations depend on it.

Now, Americans understand and we as Republicans understand that we cannot eliminate this deficit with one piece of legislation, but they do expect Congress to work continuously to reduce spending, excessive spending in all areas of the government.

Mr. Speaker, last week, it was announced that February's deficit reached a record \$223 billion. The House's continuing resolution simply cut \$100 billion, approximately 2 weeks' worth of February's deficit, and yet the Democrats refer to that as reckless cuts, 2 weeks worth of February's deficits that we attempted to reduce.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in voting for this continuing resolution, which will once again reduce the Federal budget deficit, this time by \$6 billion. No, it's not enough, but it is a step in the right direction.

House Republicans recognize that we need to do more to reduce the deficit. We also know that the country expects the President and Senator REID to accept their responsibility for this fiscal reality that they have helped create and to work with the House, the House as a whole, to reduce this deficit.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us are dedicated to eliminating excessive spending, wherever it may exist. The problem with H.R. 1 and the Republican approach is that all the tough choices and all the burden falls on the middle class and on the poor in this country.

The fact is that Donald Trump got his tax cut. We didn't touch that. Big Oil companies continue to get taxpayer subsidies. They wrote H.R. 1 in such a way so we couldn't get at those subsidies. Big agribusiness continues to get its subsidies, and I go on and on and on: No-bid defense contracts in the Defense Department.

□ 1230

All those special interests were protected. But they cut LIHEAP to help

people heat their homes this winter. They go after the National Institutes of Health. You want to find a way to make Medicare solvent, find a cure for Alzheimer's disease. You don't find a cure by cutting moneys to the National Institutes of Health.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on what my friend from Massachusetts said when he was talking about the cuts in H.R. 1 to research and development. We find in New Jersey, which is the third-largest State in the country for health care research and development, that every time the Federal Government spends a dollar, it creates five or six or seven private sector jobs. See, that's the problem here. The Republicans are not focusing on the issue, which is job creation. The problem with their continuing resolution—the long-term one that they adopted and they say that we should just pass in the Senate and send to the President—is that it actually destroys jobs. If you listen to the things that are actually being cut, these are the things that deal with investments in the future, R&D, research and development, infrastructure that allows commerce and allows us to fix our roads and provide for mass transit and fix our ports.

The gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned PETER KING from New York, who actually criticized H.R. 1 because he said that it really hurts port security. Well, how are we going to trade? How are we going to export products if we don't deepen our ports, if we don't provide for safe ports? And the same thing is true with education. H.R. 1 basically cuts back on education, on Pell Grants for students to go to college. All the investments that make sense because they actually create jobs are going to be eliminated with H.R. 1, with this Republican resolution. I mean, it is extremely shortsighted.

I feel like I was here 2 weeks ago with the same people, my colleague from Georgia on the Republican side. We just can't continue to go 2 weeks, 3 weeks at a time. You are actually going to go out of session and have a vacation or a break next week. Well, if you are really serious about this—because we know that the Senate basically couldn't get cloture on H.R. 1—why don't you, instead of going home next week, just spend the time here trying to work out something responsibly with the Senate so we can keep the government going? I mean, that's what we need to do. We need a consensus.

You have one point of view on the Republican side. The Democrats have another point of view. We have a Democratic President. We are never going to get through this budget year unless we actually sit down and have some consensus and some compromise. What I hear my colleague from Georgia

saying is, Take it or leave it. We voted on H.R. 1. That's our Republican bill. It has all of the cuts. The Democrats don't like it because we believe strongly it is going to kill jobs. But you say, Take it or leave it. It can't operate that way. I don't believe that our constituents in November expected us to just come down here and say, Take it or leave it. They want us to go to work. They don't want us to take next week off. They want us to create jobs.

And right now, the uncertainty with these 2- or 3-week short-term spending bills is creating a lot of havoc. I think eventually it's going to create havoc on the financial markets. It is already creating havoc within the Federal agencies because they don't know whether they are going to be operating from one week to the next. It's not good for the country. It's not good for the economy. You may disagree, but we need to work together.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I just couldn't agree with him more. The House spoke. It wasn't Republicans that spoke. It wasn't Democrats that spoke. The House spoke with H.R. 1. We need to get to the negotiating table.

Now I don't know when the Senate is going to act. I hope the Senate acts today. And I will stay here just as long as it takes to work through those things with the Senate. But we can't do it alone, as much as we'd like to. As much as we'd like to do it alone, we can't, and we are being held at bay by a Senate that refuses to move something forward. I think all of the gentleman's words would be useful to our friends on the Senate side.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am tremendously proud to yield 2 minutes to my good friend and a great American patriot, the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. STEVE KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. I tend to agree with all the Republicans from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I am here on the floor to speak to this issue of what frames this rule and the continuing resolution that flows behind it, Mr. Speaker. And I would remind the American people, I am here to talk about ObamaCare, about cutting off the funding to ObamaCare, and keeping our pledge. We have 87 new freshmen Republicans here in the House of Representatives. I believe all of them ran on the repeal of ObamaCare. I know all of them voted to repeal ObamaCare. And I know this House has the authority to cut off the funding to ObamaCare.

We passed H.R. 2, the repeal. Every Senate Republican voted to repeal ObamaCare, and H.R. 1 was the will of the House. We stood here, and we debated over 90 hours. And the components of that that affect the policy of this country within the rule of H.R. 1 are not part of the negotiations of this CR, not the 2-week CR that passed that we are operating on now, and not the 3-

week CR that is the subject of this rule that we are debating here, Mr. Speaker. So I lament that we don't have the will of the House reflected in this CR, and it is trying the patience of at least the Republicans in this House.

A growing number have said that they are not willing to vote for another temporary spending measure in order to bridge it over until we get some kind of resolution. But the House can draw the line. There is not a dime that can be spent by this Federal government without the approval of the House. And my position that was reflected by the gentleman from Massachusetts is this: I'm willing to face the President because if we're not willing to face the President, he will get exactly everything he is willing to fight for. That means we have to confront the idea of the President eventually shutting the government down or giving him what he wants. It is more important that we stand on the Constitution and fiscal responsibility than it is to hand over to the President of the United States, who has the audacity to send us a budget with a \$1.65 trillion deficit, and that level of irresponsibility, to just capitulate his demands. We must shut off the funding to ObamaCare, and I am ready to do that. I will vote "no" on the bill but not the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Well, there you have it. That is the difference between Democrats and Republicans in terms of how we approach this issue. They want to shut the government down. You know, what happens to Social Security checks and veterans' benefits and National Parks, and I could go on and on and on? There are consequences to being so rigid and being so ideological.

I am going to say to my colleague from Georgia, he said H.R. 1 was not the will of Republicans; the House spoke. The House didn't speak. Three Democrats voted for H.R. 1. We have 192 Democrats in the House. It was not the House speaking. It was what Republicans wanted. So H.R. 1 is wholly owned by my friends on the Republican side. And I again will say that that bill represents some of the most reckless and heartless cuts that I have seen since I have come to Congress.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Reckless and heartless is exactly the debate that we are going to have to have. Is it reckless to pass on \$14 trillion in debt to our children with no end in sight? I would say to you that it is. Is it heartless to saddle our children with that burden that is going to drain their economy dry? I would say to you that it is. Is it reckless to treat the world credit markets as if they will forever feed our voracious appetite? And I say to you that it is. We have to take these steps today.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend and colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. I appreciate my good friend from Georgia yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of House Resolution 167 and the underlying resolution, House Joint Resolution 48. This resolution provides us with a rule so that we can consider a bill that continues to fund the Federal Government for the next 3 weeks. I want to thank the Appropriations Committee for the hard work they have done and their ability to compromise. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle can follow their example.

□ 1240

Although I support this continuing resolution, and I hope my colleagues will support it as well, I don't want to keep coming back to this issue every 2 or 3 weeks. Funding the government a few weeks at a time is unacceptable.

Although my fellow freshmen and I have been here for over 2 months now, we're still cleaning up the mess that was left behind by the previous Congress. As I see it, they've kept kicking the can down the road, refusing to make hard decisions as relates to spending. Now it's up to us to say enough's enough, Mr. Speaker, with the out-of-control spending.

The House has been at the table for 2 months. We're offering solutions. The Senate and President have been sitting on the sidelines offering none.

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

What is reckless and heartless about H.R. 1 is that it attempts to balance the budget on the most vulnerable in our country, making deep cuts in the low income energy fuel assistance program to help keep people warm in the wintertime; cutting WIC, the Women, Infants and Children program to help keep pregnant women healthy so they can deliver healthy babies which, by the way, in the long run saves us money.

What is heartless and reckless are the cuts in nutrition programs and the National Institutes of Health, medical research, trying to find cures to diabetes and Alzheimer's and cancer.

And what's protected are taxpayer subsidies for oil companies. What's protected is Donald Trump's tax cut. What's protected are our subsidies to big agri-businesses. And what's not even talked about is the fact that we are fighting two wars and we're not paying for it. Everybody wants to go to war in this Chamber, but no one wants to pay for it. It is wrong and unconscionable, and that is adding considerably to our deficit.

And what's also adding to our deficit are tax cuts that are not paid for. So what's heartless about H.R. 1 is that it goes after the people who need government the most, and it leaves people who don't need any government or taxpayer subsidies alone.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, there are 15 million unemployed Americans as we meet this afternoon, and this is the 11th consecutive week that the majority has not brought to the floor a bill for us to work together to create an environment where small businesses and entrepreneurs could create jobs for our country.

Now, I do agree with the proposition that one of the ways that we could have jobs created by small businesses and entrepreneurs is to improve the country's fiscal standing and give us low long-term interest rates in the long run; and reducing our deficit is a key part of doing that. So I think the issue is not if we reduce spending; it's how we reduce spending.

And I do think we should stop sending money to the Brazilian Cotton Institute. I think we shouldn't spend \$1.5 billion for the Police Department in Baghdad when American cities are laying police officers off around our country.

And I certainly don't think we should be giving \$40 billion in subsidies to the oil companies that made \$77 billion in profit last year and are raising gasoline to four or five bucks at the pump. I think those are areas we ought to agree on and get this budget done.

But 11 consecutive weeks without a bill that helps small businesses and entrepreneurs create jobs is 11 weeks too many.

I do, however, Mr. Speaker want to compliment the majority on a good decision I think they've made in this bill. There's an argument in this country about whether to repeal the health care bill or not. We think that would be a surrender to the insurance industry and hurt the American people, and we're against that repeal.

And there's an argument in this country about whether Planned Parenthood should continue to get funding for women's health services. Most of us think it should, and many on the other side think it should not.

These are legitimate debates. They are not debates that should result in a shutdown of the Federal Government, however. The right thing to do is to agree on the budget and then agree to disagree on repealing the health care bill and funding for Planned Parenthood later down the road.

And I would commend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the chairman of the Rules Committee for putting on the floor this afternoon an extension that does not defund the health care bill, that leaves it in place, and an extension that does not defund Planned Parenthood, that leaves the funding for that in place.

I think that's the result that we should have in the long run. I think the budget that we adopt between now and September 30 should continue to fund the health care bill, as this bill does, and should continue to fund Planned Parenthood, as this bill does.

But I commend the majority for its decision to leave those issues out of this bill so that these issues are not wrapped up in this.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman.

Look, there is a significant national debate about whether insurance companies should be able to deny someone health coverage because they have leukemia or diabetes. We think they shouldn't be able to do that because of preexisting conditions. Others disagree with us.

We think that if a young woman needs counseling and services on her gynecological health, that there should be a Planned Parenthood clinic available to her. Others disagree with that, and we respect that debate.

But to tie up the operation of the Marine Corps and the FBI and the other aspects of this government over those social policy disputes is a big mistake. It's a mistake the majority has avoided in this resolution that's before us today, and I think that's a wise choice. I hope that the majority continues to avoid that choice.

Let's agree on a budget that creates the conditions to help small businesses and entrepreneurs put America back to work, and let's leave the political debates out.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning, these little short-term continuing resolutions are no way to run our government. And beyond the social debates that we're having here on a variety of issues, the fact of the matter is that this 2-week, 3-week continuing resolution puts an incredible burden on our local communities and our States and on our Federal agencies. They can't proceed with initiatives that they thought they had the money for. They're not sure whether next week we might cut an entire program or the following week we might cut it or sometime down the road. So there's uncertainty, and that uncertainty is having an adverse impact on our economy, and it's having an adverse impact on economic development all across this country. And so we need to get serious about negotiating a compromise with the Senate and with the White House and get this year's business done.

And, again, the United States Senate has put a number of offers on the table. The one that majority leader REID put on the table the Republicans wouldn't let come to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, one of my chief concerns about H.R. 1, which is, basically, the Republican continuing resolution, is that it has created a climate in Washington that makes it unfashionable to worry about the poor and the most vulnerable. Turning our

backs on the most vulnerable in our country doesn't make them go away. There is a cost, and all of us pay that cost.

We need to get serious about job creation, putting people back to work. That's the way you reduce the deficit. That's how we grow out of this economic crisis that we're in.

And yet, here we are in March and nobody's talking about jobs. I mean, we've talked about everything else; but the Republicans have refused to talk about jobs or bring a jobs bill to the floor.

And I would suggest to my Republican friends, rather than this ideological rigidity, this allegiance to this bill, H.R. 1, which is filled with reckless and heartless cuts, I would suggest to my colleagues that they understand that to get a deal here it requires some compromise. And I think I would urge them to get about that business.

I would also echo what Mr. PALLONE said earlier. We're going on vacation next week. Rather than a vacation, maybe we should finish the work of this year. Rather than having Members go back and go on CODELS overseas or go on vacations, let's finish the business of this year. Let's provide some certainty to our mayors and to our city managers, to our city councils and our boards of selectmen all across this country. Let us provide some certainty that some funding that they're depending on will be there.

□ 1250

Having said all that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, I would urge them to vote "no" on this closed rule, and I would also urge them to vote "no" on the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say there are really a number of things that we agree on across this body. The gentleman from Massachusetts has very strong feelings about paying for the bills that we create today. I share his passion, and I look forward to getting into the business of paying for those bills.

What I do know is that we are not paying for the bills today.

What I do know is that when I showed up for Congress on January 3 of this year, that there was no spending plan to get us past March 4. No spending plan.

Just to be clear, I showed up as a brand new Member of Congress in January to learn that getting about the business means putting together a funding bill before March 4 because the previous Congress didn't take care of business.

Now, I know my friend from Massachusetts wasn't in charge of the other side of the aisle last year. He certainly wasn't in charge of the Senate, although we all wish that we could be in charge of the Senate. But the business didn't get done, and that is why we are

here today. That is the first reason why we are here today, to take care of business that didn't get done last year.

But the second reason, Mr. Speaker, and the more important reason that we are here today, is because we said when we took over this body on January 5 that we would not go along with business as usual. It would have been a nothing to pass a bill that the President would sign that would say, hey, just keep on funding the government the way you've been funding it. Keep on racking up those trillion-dollar deficits the way you've been racking them up. Don't change a thing. Fiddle while Rome burns.

It would have been easy. Except for my conscience, except for the conscience of the folks who were elected with me in November, except for our principles, it would have been easy.

We chose the road less traveled that said, no, we're not going to put it off. There is always a reason to wait Mr. Speaker. There is always a reason to wait. And we said, no, we are going to begin making the tough decisions today. Today. Now, that today was back in February, and we are still waiting for the Senate to get to the table so that we can have some of those negotiations.

But I will say to my friend from New Jersey, who was so terribly pleased that the riders were not included on this bill: If you think for a minute that I am done fighting for life, you're mistaken. If you think for a minute that I am done working to defund Planned Parenthood and its work that it is doing with Federal dollars, you're mistaken. If you think for a minute that I have given up on ripping every nickel out of the budget that belongs to ObamaCare and the nationalization of our health care system, you are mistaken. And if you think for a minute that I am going to stop trying to repeal every single one of the job-killing, energy price-hiking regulations that the EPA is promulgating across this country chaining our small businesses down, you are mistaken.

That fight might not be today. Today is about cutting \$6 billion out of a budget that our children are not going to have to repay. Today is about keeping the government open for 3 more short weeks to give our friends in the Senate a chance to come to the table. But, Mr. Speaker, that day of reckoning is coming. The day of reckoning is coming because these are ideals that deserve the attention of this body. These are decisions that cannot be kicked down the road even further. These are decisions of principle on which compromise is often not an option. Sometimes you just have to take the vote, and somebody's going to win and somebody's going to lose.

I rise in strong support of this rule, and I rise in strong support of the underlying bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

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

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 30

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

That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, March 17, 2011, Friday, March 18, 2011, or Saturday, March 19, 2011, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, March 29, 2011, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, March 17, 2011, through Friday, March 25, 2011, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, March 28, 2011, or such time on that day as may be specified in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Majority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 1 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 1 p.m.

□ 1301

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: adoption of House Resolution 167, by the yeas and nays; and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 48, ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AMENDMENTS, 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 167) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 48) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 181, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

YEAS—241

Adams Cassidy Gerlach  
 Aderholt Chabot Gibbs  
 Akin Chaffetz Gibson  
 Alexander Coble Gingrey (GA)  
 Amash Coffman (CO) Gohmert  
 Austria Cole Goodlatte  
 Bachmann Conaway Gosar  
 Bachus Costa Gowdy  
 Barletta Cravaack Granger  
 Bartlett Crawford Graves (GA)  
 Barton (TX) Crenshaw Graves (MO)  
 Bass (NH) Culberson Griffin (AR)  
 Benishek Davis (KY) Griffith (VA)  
 Berg Denham Grimm  
 Biggert Dent Guinta  
 Bilbray DesJarlais Guthrie  
 Bilirakis Diaz-Balart Hall  
 Bishop (UT) Dold Hanna  
 Black Dreier Harper  
 Blackburn Duffy Harris  
 Bonner Duncan (SC) Hartzler  
 Bono Mack Duncan (TN) Hastings (WA)  
 Boustany Ellmers Hayworth  
 Brady (TX) Emerson Heck  
 Brooks Farenthold Heller  
 Broun (GA) Fincher Hensarling  
 Buchanan Fitzpatrick Herger  
 Buechhon Flake Herrera Beutler  
 Buerkle Fleischmann Huelskamp  
 Burgess Fleming Hultgren  
 Burton (IN) Flores Hunter  
 Calvert Forbes Hurt  
 Camp Fortenberry Issa  
 Campbell Foxx Jenkins  
 Canseco Franks (AZ) Johnson (IL)  
 Cantor Frelinghuysen Johnson (OH)  
 Capito Gallegly Johnson, Sam  
 Cardoza Gardner Jones  
 Carter Garrett Jordan

Kelly Murphy (PA)  
 King (IA) Myrick  
 King (NY) Neugebauer  
 Kingston Nunes  
 Kinzinger (IL) Nunnelee  
 Kissell Olson  
 Kline Palazzo Paulsen  
 Labrador Paulsen  
 Lamborn Pearce  
 Lance Pence  
 Landry Peters  
 Lankford Petri  
 Latham Pitts  
 LaTourette Platts  
 Latta Poe (TX)  
 Lewis (CA) Pompeo  
 LoBiondo Posey  
 Long Price (GA)  
 Lucas Quayle  
 Luetkemeyer Reed  
 Lummis Rehberg  
 Lungren, Daniel E. Reichert  
 Mack Renacci  
 Manzullo Ribble  
 Marchant Rigell  
 Marino Rivera  
 McCarthy (CA) Roe (TN)  
 McCaul Rogers (AL)  
 McClintock Rogers (KY)  
 McCotter Rogers (MI)  
 McHenry Rohrabacher  
 McKeon Rokita  
 McKinley Rooney  
 McMorris Ros-Lehtinen  
 Rodgers Roskam  
 Meehan Ross (FL)  
 Mica Royce  
 Miller (FL) Runyan  
 Miller (MI) Ryan (WI)  
 Miller, Gary Scallise  
 Mulvaney Schilling

NAYS—181

Ackerman Eshoo McGovern  
 Altmire Farr McIntyre  
 Andrews Fattah McNERNEY  
 Baca Filner Meeks  
 Baldwin Frank (MA)  
 Barrow Fudge Michaud  
 Bass (CA) Garamendi Miller (NC)  
 Becerra Gonzalez Moore  
 Berkley Green, Al Moran  
 Berman Green, Gene Murphy (CT)  
 Bishop (GA) Grijalva Nadler  
 Bishop (NY) Gutierrez Napolitano  
 Blumenauer Hanabusa Neal  
 Boren Hastings (FL) Oliver  
 Boswell Heinrich Owens  
 Brady (PA) Higgins Pallone  
 Braley (IA) Himes Pascrell  
 Brown (FL) Hinchey Pastor (AZ)  
 Butterfield Hinojosa Payne  
 Capps Hirono Pelosi  
 Capuano Holden Perlmutter  
 Carnahan Holt Peterson  
 Carney Honda Pingree (ME)  
 Carson (IN) Hoyer Poliss  
 Castor (FL) Inslee Price (NC)  
 Chandler Israel Quigley  
 Chu Jackson (IL) Rahall  
 Cicilline Jackson Lee Reyes  
 Clarke (MI) (TX) Richardson  
 Clarke (NY) Johnson (GA) Richmond  
 Clay Johnson, E. B. Ross (AR)  
 Cleaver Kaptur Rothman (NJ)  
 Clyburn Keating Roybal-Allard  
 Cohen Kildee Ruppertsberger  
 Connolly (VA) Kind Rush  
 Conyers Kucinich Ryan (OH)  
 Cooper Langevin Sánchez, Linda  
 Costello Larsen (WA) T.  
 Courtney Larson (CT) Tarbanes  
 Critz Lee (CA) Schakowsky  
 Crowley Levin Schiff  
 Cuellar Lewis (GA) Schrader  
 Cummings Lipinski Schwartz  
 Davis (CA) Loebsock Scott (VA)  
 DeFazio Lofgren, Zoe Scott, David  
 DeGette Lowey Serrano  
 DeLauro Luján Sewell  
 Deutch Lynch Sherman  
 Dicks Maloney Sires  
 Dingell Markey Slaughter  
 Doggett Matheson Smith (WA)  
 Donnelly (IN) Matsui Speier  
 Doyle McCarthy (NY) Stark  
 Edwards McCollum Sutton  
 Ellison McDermott Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS) Walz (MN) Welch  
 Tonko Wasserman Wilson (FL)  
 Towns Schultz Woolsey  
 Tsongas Waters Wu  
 Van Hollen Watt Yarmuth  
 Velázquez Waxman  
 Visclosky Weiner

NOT VOTING—10

Davis (IL) Noem Sanchez, Loretta  
 Engel Nugent Tierney  
 Giffords Paul  
 Huizenga (MI) Rangel

□ 1325

Ms. RICHARDSON, Messrs. KILDEE, MEEKS, GUTIERREZ, and LARSON of Connecticut changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for: Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 177, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AMENDMENTS, 2011

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 48) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 48

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 111-242) is further amended—*

(1) by striking the date specified in section 106(3) and inserting “April 8, 2011”; and

(2) by adding after section 226, as added by the Further Continuing Appropriations Amendments, 2011 (Public Law 112-4), the following new sections:

“SEC. 227. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Agricultural Programs—Agricultural Research Service—Salaries and Expenses’ at a rate for operations of \$1,135,501,000.

“SEC. 228. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Agricultural Programs—Agricultural Research Service—Buildings and Facilities’ at a rate for operations of \$0.

“SEC. 229. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Agricultural Programs—National Institute of Food and Agriculture—Research and Education Activities’ at a rate for operations of \$665,345,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such

heading in Public Law 111-80 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$89,029,000' and '\$11,253,000' for '\$45,122,000'.

"SEC. 230. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Agricultural Programs—National Institute of Food and Agriculture—Extension Activities' at a rate for operations of \$483,092,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in Public Law 111-80 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$8,565,000' for '\$20,396,000'.

"SEC. 231. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Agricultural Programs—Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service—Salaries and Expenses' at a rate for operations of \$880,543,000.

"SEC. 232. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Conservation Programs—Natural Resources Conservation Service—Conservation Operations' at a rate for operations of \$850,247,000.

"SEC. 233. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Conservation Programs—Natural Resources Conservation Service—Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations' at a rate for operations of \$0: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in Public Law 111-80 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$12,000,000'.

"SEC. 234. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Rural Development Programs—Rural Housing Service—Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account' for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans, at a rate for operations of \$70,200,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in Public Law 111-80 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$70,200,000' for '\$40,710,000' in the case of direct loans and '\$0' for '\$172,800,000' in the case of unsubsidized guaranteed loans.

"SEC. 235. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Rural Development Programs—Rural Business-Cooperative Service—Rural Cooperative Development Grants' at a rate for operations of \$31,754,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in Public Law 111-80 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$300,000' and '\$0' for '\$2,800,000'.

"SEC. 236. Sections 718, 723, 727, 728, and 738 of Public Law 111-80 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for each of the dollar amounts specified in those sections.

"SEC. 237. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Commerce—International Trade Administration—Operations and Administration' at a rate for operations of \$450,989,000: *Provided*, That the sixth proviso under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 238. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Commerce—Minority Business Development Agency—Minority Business Development' at a rate for operations of \$30,400,000: *Provided*, That the first proviso under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 239. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Commerce—National Institute of Standards and Technology—Scientific and Technical Research and Services' at a rate for operations of \$504,500,000: *Provided*, That the second proviso under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 240. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Commerce—National Institute of Standards

and Technology—Construction of Research Facilities' at a rate for operations of \$100,000,000: *Provided*, That the first proviso under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 241. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Operations, Research, and Facilities' at a rate for operations of \$3,205,883,000: *Provided*, That the sixth proviso under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 242. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Procurement, Acquisition and Construction' at a rate for operations of \$1,340,353,000: *Provided*, That the sixth proviso under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 243. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Justice—Office of Justice Programs—State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance' at a rate for operations of \$1,349,500,000: *Provided*, That the amount included in paragraph (4) under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$185,268,000'.

"SEC. 244. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Justice—Office of Justice Programs—Juvenile Justice Programs' at a rate for operations of \$332,500,000: *Provided*, That the amount included in paragraph (2) under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$91,095,000'.

"SEC. 245. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Justice—Community Oriented Policing Services' at a rate for operations of \$597,500,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act as follows: in paragraph (2), by substituting '\$15,000,000' for '\$40,385,000' and by substituting '\$0' for '\$25,385,000'; and in paragraph (3), by substituting '\$1,500,000' for '\$170,223,000' and by substituting '\$0' for '\$168,723,000'.

"SEC. 246. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'National Aeronautics and Space Administration—Cross Agency Support' at a rate for operations of \$3,131,000,000: *Provided*, That the third proviso under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 247. Of the funds made available for 'Department of Commerce—Bureau of the Census—Periodic Censuses and Programs' in division B of Public Law 111-117, \$1,740,000,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 248. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Commerce—National Telecommunications and Information Administration—Public Telecommunications Facilities, Planning and Construction' at a rate for operations of \$0.

"SEC. 249. Of the unobligated balances available for 'Emergency Steel, Oil, and Gas Guaranteed Loan Program Account', \$48,000,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 250. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Treasury—Community Development Financial Institutions Fund Program Account' at a rate for operations of \$243,600,000, and the funding designation of \$3,150,000 for an additional pilot project grant under such heading in division C of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 251. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President—Office of National Drug Control Policy—Other Federal Drug Control Programs' at a rate for operations of \$152,150,000, and the matter under such heading in division C of Public Law 111-117 relating to the National Drug Court Institute and the National Alliance for Model State Drug Laws shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 252. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'District of Columbia—Federal Funds—Federal Payment to the Office of the Chief Financial Officer for the District of Columbia' at a rate for operations of \$0.

"SEC. 253. Notwithstanding section 101, the aggregate amount of new obligational authority provided under the heading 'General Services Administration—Real Property Activities—Federal Buildings Fund—Limitations on Availability of Revenue' for Federal buildings and courthouses and other purposes of the Fund shall be available at a rate for operations of \$7,519,772,000, of which: (1) \$0 is for 'Construction and Acquisition'; and (2) \$284,000,000 is for 'Repairs and Alterations' for Special Emphasis Programs and Basic Repairs and Alterations.

"SEC. 254. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'General Services Administration—General Activities—Operating Expenses' at a rate for operations of \$71,881,000, and the matter relating to the amount of \$1,000,000 under such heading in division C of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 255. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'National Archives and Records Administration—Repairs and Restoration' at a rate for operations of \$11,848,000.

"SEC. 256. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for section 523 of division C of Public Law 111-117 at a rate for operations of \$0.

"SEC. 257. Of the unobligated balances available for 'Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Construction and Facilities Management' for construction projects, \$106,556,000 is rescinded: *Provided*, That the amounts rescinded under this section shall be limited to amounts available for Border Patrol projects and facilities: *Provided further*, That no amounts in this section may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

"SEC. 258. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—Bureau of Land Management—Management of Lands and Resources' at a rate for operations of \$957,971,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting "\$957,951,000" for "\$959,571,000" the second place it appears.

"SEC. 259. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—Bureau of Land Management—Construction' at a rate for operations of \$6,626,000.

"SEC. 260. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—Bureau of Land Management—Land Acquisition' at a rate for operations of \$26,650,000: *Provided*, That the proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 261. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the

Interior—United States Fish and Wildlife Service—Resource Management' at a rate for operations of \$1,257,356,000.

"SEC. 262. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—United States Fish and Wildlife Service—Construction' at a rate for operations of \$27,139,000.

"SEC. 263. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—United States Fish and Wildlife Service—Land Acquisition' at a rate for operations of \$63,890,000.

"SEC. 264. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—National Park Service—National Recreation and Preservation' at a rate for operations of \$57,986,000, of which \$0 shall be for projects authorized by section 7302 of Public Law 111-11.

"SEC. 265. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—National Park Service—Historic Preservation Fund' at a rate for operations of \$54,500,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting "\$0" for "\$25,000,000": *Provided further*, That the proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 266. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—National Park Service—Construction' at a rate for operations of \$185,066,000: *Provided*, That the last proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act: *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances available under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 and prior appropriation Acts, \$25,000,000 is rescinded, including \$1,000,000 from amounts made available for the (now completed) project at Cape Hatteras National Seashore, North Carolina, and \$1,000,000 from amounts made available for the (now completed) project at Blue Ridge Parkway, North Carolina.

"SEC. 267. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—National Park Service—Land Acquisition and State Assistance' at a rate for operations of \$108,846,000.

"SEC. 268. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—United States Geological Survey—Surveys, Investigations, and Research' at a rate for operations of \$1,094,344,000.

"SEC. 269. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—Bureau of Indian Affairs—Operation of Indian Programs' at a rate for operations of \$2,334,515,000.

"SEC. 270. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—Departmental Offices—Insular Affairs—Assistance to Territories' at a rate for operations of \$84,295,000.

"SEC. 271. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Environmental Protection Agency—Science and Technology' at a rate for operations of \$840,349,000, of which \$0 shall be for the purposes specified in 'Research/National Priorities' under the heading 'Science and Technology' in the joint explanatory statement of the managers accompanying Public Law 111-88.

"SEC. 272. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Environmental Protection Agency—Environmental Programs and Management' at a rate for operations of \$2,963,263,000: *Provided*, That of the amounts provided by this Act for such account, amounts are provided for the Geographic Programs specified in the joint explanatory statement of the managers accom-

panying Public Law 111-88 at a rate for operations of \$599,875,000: *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided by this Act for such account, \$0 shall be for cap and trade technical assistance and \$0 shall be for the program specified in 'Environmental Protection/National Priorities' under the heading 'Environmental Programs and Management' in the joint explanatory statement of the managers accompanying Public Law 111-88.

"SEC. 273. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Environmental Protection Agency—Buildings and Facilities' at a rate for operations of \$36,501,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting "\$0" for "\$500,000".

"SEC. 274. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Environmental Protection Agency—State and Tribal Assistance Grants' at a rate for operations of \$4,777,946,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act as follows: by substituting '\$14,500,000' for '\$17,000,000'; by substituting '\$10,000,000' for '\$13,000,000'; by substituting '\$0' for '\$156,777,000'; by substituting '\$0' for '\$20,000,000'; and by substituting '\$1,106,446,000' for '\$1,116,446,000".

"SEC. 275. The matter pertaining to competitive grants to communities to develop plans and demonstrate and implement projects which reduce greenhouse gas emissions under the heading 'Environmental Protection Agency—State and Tribal Assistance Grants' in division A of Public Law 111-88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 276. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Forest and Rangeland Research' at a rate for operations of \$311,612,000.

"SEC. 277. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—State and Private Forestry' at a rate for operations of \$301,611,000.

"SEC. 278. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—National Forest System' at a rate for operations of \$1,550,089,000.

"SEC. 279. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Capital Improvement and Maintenance' at a rate for operations of \$548,962,000.

"SEC. 280. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Land Acquisition' at a rate for operations of \$33,184,000.

"SEC. 281. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Wildland Fire Management' at a rate for operations of \$2,097,387,000: *Provided*, That of the unobligated balances available under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 and prior appropriation Acts, \$200,000,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 282. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for section 415 of division A of Public Law 111-88 at a rate for operations of \$0.

"SEC. 283. Notwithstanding section 101 and section 200, amounts are provided for 'Department of Labor—Employment and Training Administration—Training and Employment Services' at a rate for operations of \$3,654,641,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included in paragraph (3)(E) under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting "\$0" for '\$125,000,000' and by substituting "\$0" for '\$65,000,000".

"SEC. 284. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of

Labor—Employment and Training Administration—Community Service Employment for Older Americans' at a rate for operations of \$600,425,000: *Provided*, That for purposes of funds appropriated by this Act, the amounts included under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied by substituting "\$0" for '\$225,000,000' in the first place it appears, and the first and second provisos under such heading in such division shall not apply.

"SEC. 285. Notwithstanding sections 101 and 203, amounts are provided for 'Department of Health and Human Services—Health Resources and Services Administration—Health Resources and Services' at a rate for operations of \$7,001,520,000: *Provided*, That the eighteenth, nineteenth, twenty-second, and twenty-fifth provisos under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 286. Notwithstanding section 101, in addition to amounts otherwise made available by section 130, amounts are provided for 'Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund' at a rate for operations of \$731,109,000, of which \$65,578,000 shall be for expenses necessary to prepare for and respond to an influenza pandemic (none of which shall be available past September 30, 2011) and \$35,000,000 shall be for expenses necessary for fit-out and other costs related to a competitive lease procurement to renovate or replace the existing headquarters building for Public Health Service agencies and other components of the Department of Health and Human Services.

"SEC. 287. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Corporation for Public Broadcasting' at a rate for operations of \$36,000,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$25,000,000' each place it appears.

"SEC. 288. Of the funds appropriated for 'Social Security Administration—Limitation on Administrative Expenses' for fiscal years 2010 and prior years (other than funds appropriated in Public Law 111-5) for investment in information technology and telecommunications hardware and software infrastructure, \$200,000,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 289. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'House of Representatives—Salaries and Expenses' at a rate for operations of \$1,367,525,000.

"SEC. 290. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'House of Representatives—Salaries, Officers and Employees' at a rate for operations of \$196,801,000, of which \$129,282,000 shall be for the operations of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

"SEC. 291. Notwithstanding section 101 and section 221, amounts are provided for 'Library of Congress—Salaries and Expenses' at a rate for operations of \$445,201,000, of which \$0 shall be for the operations described in the fifth and seventh provisos under such heading in Public Law 111-68.

"SEC. 292. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Bilateral Economic Assistance—Funds Appropriated to the President—International Fund for Ireland' at a rate for operations of \$0.

"SEC. 293. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Brownfields Redevelopment' at a rate for operations of \$0.

"SEC. 294. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Transportation—Federal Railroad Administration—Railroad Safety Technology Program' at a rate for operations of \$0."

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Additional Continuing Appropriations Amendments, 2011".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Pursuant to House Resolution 167, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

□ 1330

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 48, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to support H.J. Res. 48, the fiscal year 2011 further continuing appropriations resolution. This temporary CR will allow us to avoid a government shutdown that could otherwise occur on March 18, while cutting spending by \$6 billion to control our Nation's staggering deficits and to facilitate the continued recovery of our Nation's economy.

We've made it clear that a government shutdown is not an option, period. We will not allow this to happen on our watch.

This bill funds the government for an additional 3 weeks, until April 8, maintaining the critical support the government provides to the American people and allowing for the necessary time to complete negotiations on a final long-term agreement for the remainder of this year.

While funding the essential government agencies and programs, this CR makes \$6 billion in spending cuts, trimming \$2 billion for every week, to continue our efforts to rein in spending and put a dent in our massive and unsustainable deficit. Together with the \$4 billion that we cut 2 weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, along with the \$6 billion we cut in this bill, we will have cut \$10 billion from current year spending. That makes it the largest rescission in American history, and so it is working.

H.J. Res. 48 reduces or terminates a total of 25 programs for a savings of \$3.5 billion. These cuts include funding rescissions, reductions, and program terminations. It also eliminates earmark accounts within the Agriculture; Commerce, Justice and Science; Financial Services; General Government; and Interior subcommittee jurisdictions, saving the American taxpayers \$2.6 billion in earmark spending, which the President and both Houses of Congress have agreed they do not support.

These cuts are the tough, but necessary, legwork required to help bal-

ance our budgets and halt the dangerous downward spiral of skyrocketing deficits. While short-term funding measures such as this are not the preferable way to fund the government, at this point, it's vital.

The budget for fiscal 2011, which was passed to us by the previous Congress, is long, long overdue. I agree with many of my colleagues that we must get down to business and come to a final agreement as quickly as possible. Our economy must not be threatened by perpetual government shutdowns, which create uncertainty and a loss of confidence for job creators across the country.

This continuing resolution provides us with an appropriate length of time for negotiations, makes good on our promise to the American people to cut spending, provides certainty and stability, and allows essential Federal programs to continue while these negotiations ensue.

I'm hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that this continuing resolution can be passed swiftly so we can turn our attention to the realities of our debt and deficit crisis and begin to put the Nation on the right path for the next fiscal year, 2012.

Our constituents have asked us to whip our spending into shape, to provide solutions that help our economy grow, and to help our citizens get jobs. This CR addresses their expectations responsibly over the short term and is just one of the set of bills that we intend to produce over the next year that will continue to put the Nation's budget back into balance and help our economy continue on the road to recovery.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, today, the House is considering the fifth continuing resolution for FY 2011 to keep the Federal Government running. Here we are, in the middle of March, considering yet another short-term bill that is supposed to buy us time to negotiate funding for the remainder of the fiscal year, and I hope that proves to be true. We need to bring this to a conclusion.

The extension reduces spending in FY 2011 by \$45 billion below the President's request. It adds another \$6 billion in "common ground" spending reductions. In total, the measure cuts \$51 billion below the President's request.

The idea behind the 3-week extension is to provide an opportunity for the House, Senate, and White House to settle all outstanding issues on fiscal year 2011 appropriations. I remain hopeful that negotiations will succeed and we will be able to give our agencies some amount of certainty for what little remains of fiscal year 2011.

Today, in The New York Times, there was a long article showing what kind of disruption occurs in Federal agencies, including Defense and Social Security and others, Head Start for example, because we haven't gotten these bills enacted, but I must remind my colleagues that if this CR is extended

for the remainder of the year, we would be cutting spending at historic levels, \$51 billion below the President's request. I am worried that cutting deeper will threaten a fragile economic recovery. Most economists see cuts in H.R. 1 as a drag on economic growth leading to the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs, as Fed Chairman Bernanke projects. Moody's Mark Zandi estimates 400,000 jobs lost for the remainder of this year and 700,000 more next year if H.R. 1 is enacted. Goldman Sachs think it would be as high as 2.4 million jobs lost. In yesterday's ABC News-Washington Post poll, the American people believe that the Republican proposed cuts in H.R. 1 will hurt the economic recovery.

I am relieved that Chairman ROGERS crafted a bill that relies on previously identified reductions, a significant portion of which were old earmarks. And while I know my colleagues will not agree with, and may not be able to support, some of the specific program cuts included in this package, I appreciate that there was a genuine attempt to engage the Senate and White House before they were chosen.

Most importantly, I am tremendously relieved the chairman has stayed away from controversial riders in this stopgap measure. He knows, as I do, that these riders would almost guarantee a veto by the administration, which would almost guarantee a government shutdown. An appropriations bill is not the place to decide enormously complex and controversial policy issues.

I am not pleased to be here today with yet another short-term bill. I sincerely hope that we will use this 3-week period of time judiciously so the next time we consider a bill for fiscal year 2011 it will be the last and for the remaining 6 months of this year.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, a new member of our committee, Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of things that are really not debatable. I think the American people understand, and I think everybody understands, that we are on an unsustainable path. We're on an unsustainable path as far as unemployment. The unemployment numbers are still frighteningly high. We are on an unsustainable path as far as borrowing and as far as spending.

So, frankly, we have a couple of options here. We can continue that unsustainable path, which is borrowing more and spending more, or we could change the way we're doing and try to get our fiscal act and our fiscal house in order.

□ 1340

I commend the chairman, Chairman ROGERS, for bringing forward a CR, an



extension, that does just that, that brings some sanity to this process, that reduces the size, the scope, and the amount of spending, that does so responsibly after reviewing programs and reviewing funding and reviewing what the Federal Government is doing. And that's exactly what we have in front of us today.

Yes, we wish that we could have not just an extension but that we could go through the entire year. The reason, by the way, that we are even talking about this right now is because the Democrats failed to pass it. So now we are forced to do so. We already passed a CR for the remaining part of the year; but, unfortunately, the Senate has not been able or has not been willing to do their part. So we are forced, once again, to do an extension. This is a real extension that reduces cost, that reduces expenses, that does so responsibly, and takes us off this unsustainable path. This does so by borrowing less, by spending less. And, yes, it will have the effect, Mr. Speaker, of getting our fiscal house in order and once again allowing this country to start creating jobs in a real way, not just in a piecemeal way.

So I urge our colleagues to support this responsible CR.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California, BARBARA LEE, a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to oppose this continuing resolution. Once again, the majority is reading from a very familiar script that imposes budgetary pain on vulnerable communities that can least endure these budget cuts. For a third consecutive time now, the majority is presenting a temporary spending bill totaling \$6 billion in spending cuts and \$2.6 billion in earmark cuts to very meaningful programs. And once again, this CR does nothing to promote job creation. The majority pledged to develop jobs when they regained control of the House, but they continue to renege on their promise.

It is important to emphasize that the proposed cuts will hit communities that can least afford these hits. The loss of \$185 million in State and local law enforcement assistance provided by Byrne grants will further squeeze tight police budgets. With these cuts, communities will be struggling to find funding to support vital police functions. At a time when methamphetamine drug use and drug trafficking is on the rise, this CR includes cuts to COPS to combat the spread of meth use and distribution.

Rather than continue to fund vital programs at the community level that work, we are witnessing budgeting through biweekly CRs. And these cuts will further harm highly vulnerable communities that rely greatly on COPS policing services and technology grants.

Now, also, my constituents regularly call my office asking what source of

funding is going to replace the earmarks that historically have supported jobs, small businesses, schools, nonprofits. Also, I continue to press administration witnesses in budget justification hearings regarding the impact of the elimination of earmarks and what alternative resources will replace them.

I hope we vote "no" on the CR.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), the chairman of the Transportation, HUD, and Related Agencies Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of this joint resolution. It's not because I want to, but because it is necessary to support it today. It is necessary because we are stuck in a situation that results from the previous majority's lack of completing its work last year. I think we need to step back and just look at the situation that we were handed this year.

For the first time since the Budget Act of 1974, Mr. Speaker, the House failed to pass a budget last year. The House also failed—except for two occasions—to pass appropriation bills. The Senate did nothing. So what we are left with today is this mess that we are in with no fiscal year 2011 budget, no appropriation bills passed last year, nothing done. So we are given this mess today to clean up. And what we need is a little more time.

But in the meantime, we are going to cut spending, \$6 billion of cuts, \$2 billion a week for the 3 weeks that this bill will be in place. It's not enough. We have got to look at the overall problem that we have in this country: \$14.3 trillion of debt, an annual 1-year deficit of \$1.65 trillion.

Now, while this just scratches the surface, we have got to address long-term spending here in Washington, DC. We have got to look at not just the discretionary side, which this bill does, but look at all the entitlements. We are only addressing about 15 percent of the whole budget in this bill. We have got to make sure that we look at the other 85 percent which is mandatory, which is the other spending that is out there that has caused this explosion of debt that we have. This is a very good first step of going forward to really get a handle on the spending.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the White House finally get involved and show some leadership as far as trying to get our fiscal house in order.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), who is the ranking member on the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee and is also the former chairman of that committee.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the very distinguished Member from Washington and thank him for his leadership. But he knows, as well as I trust all of the

Members do, that this is no way to run a government, lurching back and forth like a drunken sailor, the agencies not knowing when or whether they are going to get their money. Actually, I should take that back because the Navy would never conduct operations like this. And the distinguished chairman from Kentucky well knows that this is not the way we want to be doing business; yet here we are with another CR for 3 short weeks this time.

We just had a hearing this week with the Forest Service. As the Members know, they hire hundreds, sometimes thousands, of temporary seasonal workers to fight fires in our Nation's forests. They can't do that. They don't know how much money they are going to have. And the folks that they would hire seasonally as a result can't take those jobs, don't know what they are going to do. This unconscionable delay in funding disrupts people's lives, hundreds of thousands of people's lives, directly; millions of people's lives indirectly.

As I say, this is no way to run a government. But why are we doing it? Because we can't agree on H.R. 1, and we shouldn't agree to H.R. 1, as passed by the House.

So many riders that should have gone through legislative committees were put in the bill with 10 minutes of debate in the wee hours of the morning, stripping language from the authorizing legislation that had been subject to months, if not years, of careful deliberation. That's no way to run a government.

And beyond those riders, there are thousands of programs that are being cut willy nilly. One such program, for example, is the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. They provided the early warning to people on the west coast and Hawaii when they detected the recent tsunami.

□ 1350

And yet, we are told by NOAA, that the 30 percent cut in this bill, excuse me, 28 percent, cut in this bill for NOAA would dismantle our early warning system to save a few million dollars. That's just wrong.

There was just an article in the Washington Post that people are beginning to realize other essential things that are cut in this program to save a few dollars. Now, \$285 million is not a few dollars, but consider what happens when you cut \$285 million out of the program integrity section of the Internal Revenue Service. They collect \$10 for every dollar we spend. And so you cut out \$285 million, and it costs you about \$3 billion in revenue that should be collected.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. MORAN. The point that I started by suggesting, and I'm sure it's not in contention, is that this is no way to

run a government. We have a responsibility on the Appropriations Committee to fund these agencies, to determine our priorities, to reflect the interests and the will of the American people. This process does not do that. The bill, H.R. 1, does not do that.

The American people deserve better. They deserve careful deliberation. We need to cut, but we need to cut responsibly, using a scalpel, not a sledgehammer.

This bill will pass, but this should be the last CR. Let's get a full-year appropriations bill passed as soon as possible.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. There is an article today in the Washington Post how House GOP spending cuts would add up to more spending later. This is what we worry about here.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield an additional minute.

And one of the things that I'm most concerned about is the women and infant care program, WIC, which provides nutrition to an expectant mother, who's probably on Medicaid, and help her and the baby to be born in a more healthy way. And we find out that the hospitals in this country provide \$26 billion of health care for these same babies who are born premature. So it's pay me now or pay me later. And in this case, it would be a lot more.

The IRS is another example. NOAA weather satellites is another example. In the middle of this tsunami and earthquake, we need to be doing more in these areas. And the American people understand this. They want us to make reasonable judgments. And I hope we can make reasonable judgments.

I happen to be the ranking on Defense. We can cut some money out of defense. We cut \$15 billion. We can do a little bit more in that area. But I think we've got to be careful. And when this final package comes together, we've got to talk out the ones that would be revenue raisers.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentleman from Virginia says that the public deserves that we pass appropriations bills, and I could not agree with him more. His majority last year failed to enact a single bill out of the 12 that we were supposed to pass. That's why we're here. We're trying to clean up the mess that the gentleman from Virginia's party left us when we took office in January.

Yes, it's a terrible way to do business. And this should be the last CR extension that we pass before we have an agreement with the other body and the White House on the rest of this year. However, Mr. Speaker, again, the gentleman's party in the Senate refuses to

pass a bill and lay something on the table. We are going to the conference table to negotiate, and we're sitting there by ourselves. The other body will not come forward with a proposition. Until that time, I don't know what we do.

I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is another necessary step in addressing the national imperative of reducing our debt while also keeping the government operating. Essential funds like homeland security are sustained under this bill and sustained in a fiscally responsible way.

Within the more than \$6 billion of spending reductions contained in this bill is a rescission of \$107 million to Customs and Border Protection, a rescission of unobligated balances requested by the administration for FY11, supported by a minority, passed by this body as part of H.R. 1, and also included in the Senate Appropriations Committee's recently reported bill.

But this bill also sends a very clear signal to the White House and to the Senate. As the Speaker and Chairman ROGERS have clearly stated, no one wants a government shutdown. The only people that are talking about a shutdown of the government are those who are avoiding the tough decisions and seeking to shift blame from their own failure to act.

Instead of excuses, the American people want results: less spending and a leaner, more effective government. And that's exactly what this temporary stopgap bill delivers.

I couldn't agree more with what the chairman just stated just a couple of minutes ago. Congress didn't get its work done, and the Senate has yet to provide a viable alternative to the House-passed H.R. 1, a bill that stands as the only year-long spending measure for FY11 passed by either Chamber of Congress. So complaints about a short-term stopgap bill like this CR ring hollow when the House-passed solution has been on the negotiating table for almost a month.

The President's proposed spending level for FY11 is no longer a viable option, a fact acknowledged by not only the administration itself, but also by both parties in both Chambers of Congress. So the time to get to work and fulfill our duty to the American people is long overdue.

Congress needs to deliver what the American people have so resoundingly demanded. I can only hope that the administration and the Senate will also acknowledge the reality of our Nation's fiscal crisis, demonstrate the resolve to reduce spending significantly below the current FY10 level, and come to the table with a viable budget for the remainder of this year.

The American people demand no less.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. You know, it was stated a moment ago by a gentleman on the other side that this CR cuts NOAA and the tsunami prediction monies. That is not so. The only thing in this bill that cuts money from NOAA are the earmarks, and, yes, we cut the earmarks, but they had nothing to do with tsunami warning.

Mr. DICKS. I yield myself 15 seconds.

I want to correct the record. I was referring to H.R. 1, not to the CR.

The gentleman from Kentucky is absolutely correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. H.R. 1 doesn't cut tsunami warning monies nor weather service monies.

Mr. DICKS. There are some things that I think NOAA thinks would have an effect on their weather forecasting.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Well, NOAA's wrong.

Mr. DICKS. Okay. Well, we'll check that out.

I yield 2 minutes to the Delegate from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Look, the majority has chosen to run the government, the Federal Government, from CR to CR. But the majority has no right to inflict this operational outrage on the local funds of a local jurisdiction, the District of Columbia.

The majority may want to incur for the Federal Government the operational difficulties. After all, the District of Columbia delivers services to Federal officials, including the President, Federal buildings, foreign embassies, and the like. But does the majority really want to risk, to put the District and its operations at risk or to place, what Wall Street almost surely will do, a risk premium on the District due to the uncertainty that we are at bay from CR to CR?

This is a fragile economy for every big city, but D.C.'s local budget was approved a year ago in the city and last summer by the Appropriations Committees. Yet the District of Columbia is being held hostage to a Federal fight, although the District of Columbia can do nothing to free itself from this Federal fight.

I have tried to get the District on successive CRs so that we could spend our own money all year. There is no disapproval of that here. I wager that very few Members even know that the District would close down if the Federal Government closed down; would be perplexed by it; would have no objection to our spending our own local money all year long.

We raise and manage \$8 billion. We have a right to spend our local funds without being dragged into a Federal fight.

□ 1400

You can't run a big city from CR to CR. I ask you to find a way between

now and 3 weeks to free D.C. to run its own city for the rest of the fiscal year.

Let my people go.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a new member of our committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. I rise in support of H.J. Res. 48.

As has been stated, this legislation cuts \$6 billion in funding. They are responsible cuts. This is \$2 billion per week. It should be noted, too, there is broad bipartisanship agreement to nearly all the cuts contained in this legislation. Basically everything that is in this legislation was also contained in H.R. 1.

We should also note, too, that if this legislation is enacted, this legislation would represent the largest spending cut in domestic discretionary programs in history, when you combine this with what was cut 2 weeks ago, the \$4 billion. Again, if enacted, this will represent the largest spending cut in domestic discretionary programs in American history, should we enact this legislation.

Now, I know that some people around here think that this bill really doesn't go far enough, but it certainly does represent a very big step forward.

The cuts that are contained in here, we are eliminating \$2.6 billion in earmark funding from Agriculture, CJS, Financial Services, and Interior. The cuts include rescissions, reductions, and program terminations.

I think we all understand, too, that if we pass this, this will prevent a government shutdown, and we need to prevent that while these negotiations can continue. We need to come to some type of agreement for the balance of this fiscal year. But in the meantime, this represents responsible cuts and broad bipartisan agreement.

I say, let's cut spending, let's cut it now, and let's cut it today. Take yes for an answer. Don't snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. This is the right thing to do, and the American people will appreciate it.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Democratic whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am not sure whether I rise for or against this, very frankly, because I think this process is not the process that we ought to be pursuing. I think in that context I speak for the chairman and for the ranking member and for most Members in this body.

I was going to wait a while, but then I heard Mr. DENT of Pennsylvania speak and I want to reiterate this point that he made, because I made it last week in my colloquy with the majority leader.

I made the point that we are about to make the largest single reduction in discretionary spending that we have made, the gentleman said in history; I was more modest and said in the 30

years that I have been here. But in any event, this is not an insubstantial cut.

The problem those of us have on this side of the aisle is it is not enough for a large number of your folks, and they have said so, and the Heritage Foundation has said so, and the Family Research Council has said so, and some of your Members have said so.

Now, the fact of the matter is this is a lousy way to run a railroad. We are trying to run the largest enterprise in the world in 2-week segments. It is costly to the private sector, it is extraordinarily inefficient for the public sector, and it is demoralizing for the private sector who deals with the government and for the public employees we have asked to perform the services that we have set forth as policy. And so I say at this juncture, this ought to be the last of this type. We need to reach agreement.

Now I say to my friend from Pennsylvania, because it is the largest cut, we think we've come a long way. You said you wanted to cut \$100 billion. Now, you're not cutting the \$41 billion that we cut. You were using the 2011 baseline. That's how you got your \$100 billion. \$41 billion, we have all agreed, is gone. We're going to freeze at 2010 and go below that. So we have come \$41 billion away, and we agree on that.

Now, you used the 2011. That wasn't our figure first. You used it September; we used it in December. So my view is we have agreed on \$41 billion. You don't say that. You say we're between zero and 60. I understand your rationale. But it's your figure, it's your baseline that you used in September in your Pledge to America.

If we have gone 41 and we are now going to go another 10 or 15, what I ask of you is, in light of the fact, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania points out, we've already done the deepest cut under Republicans, under Democrats, under any of us, it is time to hear from you, what is your alternative to make a deal?

Now, "compromise" is a prettier word, but we need to come to agreement. If we're going to serve our country, and those who serve our country, then we need to come to agreement, because they elected all of us. None of us has any greater superiority. We're all the same. And we need to come to agreement.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Would the gentleman talk to his colleagues over in the other body and tell them to pass something we can begin to negotiate on?

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, 435 of us have tried to talk to the people in the other body. But I will tell you, under the Constitution of the United States, we have the responsibility of initiating bills. Read the Constitution.

We sent H.R. 1 over there, as my good friend, the former Speaker of Idaho,

says to me, and they didn't pass it. It's not their responsibility to initiate. That didn't go anywhere.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. I will say to you, we can wring our hands and say that the Senate's not doing its job. We're not in the Senate. We're here. Let us come to agreement. And we know the agreement is going to be someplace in between where you are and where we are. We know that. But what we don't know is what you can pass. What you don't know is what you can pass. You don't know what your caucus will do. I understand that. You are deeply divided, in my opinion, and we need to know, because it is not just us here that are adversely affected.

Let us come to agreement. Let us stop this process of funding government in very short cycles. It is not good for our country, it is not good for the people who work for our country, and it is not good for the people who are doing work around the world.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, could you tell the chairman and myself what our time remaining is?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 12¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kentucky has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Of which I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriation, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the gentleman that just spoke, the minority whip, a good friend of mine, what we can pass in this House and what our conference will agree to, and that is the \$61 million in cuts or \$100 million overall that we have already agreed to and already passed. We can pass that in this House.

I have heard that this is no way to run a railroad. My good friend from Virginia said this is no way to run a government. I have heard this is operational outrage. I will tell you the outrage here is that we are having to do this because the former majority, when they had the majority in the House, the majority in the Senate and the White House, failed to pass an appropriation bill. They left the American people in this country with this pile of crap. They should not complain about how we try to clean this up.

Mr. Speaker, by the end of this week, the appropriations subcommittee which I am privileged to chair, the Interior and Environment Subcommittee, will have had 12 budget oversight hearings over the past 3 weeks. That is 12 hearings addressing the fiscal 2012 budget that we will soon be writing.

It is worth noting that we are now 5½ months into the fiscal year 2011, and we still don't have a budget to fund the

government through the end of the current fiscal year. The CR we are considering today keeps the government operating for another 3 weeks. And you're right: We need to solve this within this next 3 weeks. The problem is you cannot negotiate with a body across the Rotunda that fails to act. We can't be the only ones at the table. We have to have something to negotiate with. We don't have that.

This CR saves taxpayers \$6 billion, including \$650 million in spending cuts from the Interior Subcommittee accounts that Republicans, Democrats, and the administration agree are reasonable and supportable on a bipartisan basis. The overall savings achieved through this CR, at a rate of \$2 billion per week, is the 3-week equivalent to the \$100 billion in cuts achieved in the long-term CR passed by House Republicans several weeks ago.

□ 1410

In the Interior budget alone, we have cut \$380 million out of earmarks. We have cut the National Park Service Preserve America Program, eliminated it, and other programs, Save America's Treasures in the National Park Service, programs that the administration did not request funding for in their 2012 budget. So these are things that are agreed on by both Republicans and Democrats.

Now that the Senate has voted down two versions of the year-long CR, the Republican version, H.R. 1, that cut spending by \$100 billion and the Democratic version that cut substantially less, it is time for both sides to come together on a funding bill for the rest of this year. The truth is that we really need to get the fiscal year 2011 budget written, passed, and signed into law so that we can turn our attention to next year's budget.

In the midst of the back and forth debate on spending, it is important to remember that these funding bills don't write themselves. Our Appropriations Committee staff have been working day and night, 7 days a week, for months now writing one CR after another, even as they prepare for hearings and study budget proposals for next year.

I encourage my colleagues to support this CR to keep the government open while both parties work to identify an acceptable level of spending cuts for the rest of the year. We can and should cut more from the spending budget, and I encourage my colleagues to support this CR.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from Hawaii, MAZIE HIRONO, who is going to correct the record on the NOAA issue.

Ms. HIRONO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, the cuts to NOAA and our Weather Service are contained in H.R. 1, and we have not reached agreement on H.R. 1, which is why we are doing yet another CR. And, believe me, those kinds of cut to NOAA and our

Weather Service will have an impact on our ability to implement early warning systems.

Some of you may not know that Hawaii has already suffered millions and millions of dollars of damages as a result of the tsunami. And, yes, it does not compare at all to the tragedy that the Japanese people are facing, but nonetheless, thank goodness, our early warning systems were in place.

Now, as to this CR, I rise in opposition to this CR, which continues the Republican strategy of cutting \$2 billion every week from programs that support jobs and our families.

I want to focus on just one program being cut, out of many, by the way, that affect real people in real ways that is particularly troubling to me in this CR. This is the elimination of all funding for the Watershed and Flood Prevention Operation Program, popularly known as PL 566.

This \$30 million program means a lot to small rural communities nationwide. For Hawaii, the decline of the sugar and pineapple industries has forced us to transition from large scale plantation agriculture to small scale farming. PL 566 has been the only Federal program that has really worked to deal with our agricultural water issues, and it is the single most important Federal agriculture program for Hawaii.

Hawaii is the most food import-dependent State in the entire country, so agricultural self-sufficiency is a priority for us, which is one reason why continued funding for Hawaii's PL 566 project is so critical.

In addition, PL 566 provides flood prevention for small communities that the Army Corps does not serve. Hawaii projects include the Lower Hamakua Ditch Watershed Project to rehabilitate a 26-mile-long irrigation ditch that provides water to hundreds, hundreds of small farmers on Hawaii Island.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield the gentlelady another 30 seconds.

Ms. HIRONO. Another project is the Upcountry Maui Watershed Project, providing water to 170 farmers and ranchers on Maui, and also the Wailuku-Alenaio Watershed and Lahaina Watershed Projects that prevent flooding on Hawaii and Maui.

These long-term projects help to build our local economies and create jobs, and stopping these projects in midstream is irresponsible, unsafe, and makes no economic sense at all. Most of these projects are well under way. We need to continue funding these programs to support our communities and support jobs.

This program has long had bipartisan support. In fact, last year, I signed a joint letter, led by Agriculture Committee Chairman LUCAS, urging funding for this program.

Mr. DICKS. I yield myself 30 seconds.

In going back and looking, NOAA operations, research, and facilities in

H.R. 1 is cut by \$454.3 million. And one of the officials there said what would happen in the continuing resolution, there will be a dismantling of our Nation's early warning system, Dan Sobien, president of the National Weather Service Employees Organization, said in a telephone interview. It will result in a roughly 30 percent cut in the budget of the National Weather Service. Sobien said the current plan called for the Weather Service to close individual offices for about a month at a time on a rolling basis.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this continuing resolution, for two reasons.

Number one, it keeps us on the path to put the brakes on this runaway spending that has gone around this place too long. It continues us to get to the place where we start a culture of savings instead of this culture of spending.

The second reason to vote for this, of course, is to make sure that we don't shut down the government, to give us a little more time to try to have a final negotiation on the spending levels for next year.

Somebody asked the question, is this the best way to fund the government? Of course it is not. There is no way. It would have been a whole lot better if last year under the Democratic leadership in this House we had a budget before this House that would pass. But that didn't happen.

It would have been better last year during the session if the Democratic leadership had gone through regular order. We would have passed the appropriations bill, and then the government would be funded for 2011. But they didn't do that.

It would have been a whole lot better after this House got together and made some tough choices, set some priorities, made difficult decisions, and passed a spending bill that cut \$100 billion out of this year's spending and sent it down to the Senate. It would have been better if they would have taken that up and passed it, or at least done something. But they didn't do that.

So here we are. We find ourselves with another CR, 3 more weeks. But let me tell you, these are difficult times, and in difficult times leaders have to lead. We have got to sit down together and establish the priorities we have for spending. We have to make tough choices. That is what every American family does, that is what every American business does. If we are going to get this economy moving again, we need to settle this once and for all.

So I just hope that we will pass this continuing resolution and that this

will indeed be the last time we do this; that in 3 weeks we sit down, have that other body sit down and negotiate with us. It takes two to tango, as they say.

We sent the whole ball of wax down there and they didn't like it, so now we are sending them a little at a time. But we are honoring that pledge to cut \$100 billion. When you cut \$2 billion every week, that all adds up to \$100 billion. So this is \$6 billion more we are cutting on top of the \$4 billion we cut. But, again, that is no way to settle the year.

Let's settle it once and for all. Let's pass this, move ahead, and get this thing done.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from Ohio, MARCY KAPTUR, who is a very senior member of the Appropriations Committee and, I think, the longest serving woman in the House of Representatives.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank my dear colleague for his great leadership and for yielding me this time.

Let me just say that I urge my colleagues to vote no on this continuing resolution. It cuts money for jobs to people that give social services to our senior citizens at a time when gas prices are going up and food prices are going up; it cuts jobs to clean up our brownfield sites across this country, and if you don't know what those are, you are lucky; it cuts jobs that affect our public broadcasting, the only decent broadcasting left in this country with the garbage that's on the airwaves today; and it cuts jobs dealing with construction and repair of our Save America's Treasures Program, some of the oldest buildings in America that our children and grandchildren have a right to enjoy, as we have.

So people say, where are you going to get the money? Let me tell you where the money is, and what is not on the table in trying to balance the Federal budget. How about the profits of the Wall Street "Big Six": Goldman Sachs, J.P. Morgan Chase, Bank of America, Wells Fargo, Morgan Stanley, and Citigroup. They scooped up just last year \$51 billion in profits; \$51 billion at the expense of the American people hit hard in this great recession that we're enduring. Wall Street titans are happy as clams.

□ 1420

Their top executives alone took \$26 million in compensation, not counting all their stock options. We didn't touch a penny of their bonuses. Oh, we can't do that! Wall Street banks are paying at an effective 11 percent tax rate when businesses in my district have to pay at 35 percent. What's fair about that? We could have \$13 billion, \$14 billion, \$15 billion, \$16 billion if Wall Street just paid at the same rate as other honest businesses do—just for last year.

And oil prices? The American people are being gouged all across this country. But Exxon made \$9 billion in the third quarter of last year—the largest

profit of a company in U.S. history. Guess how much they paid in taxes? A big goose egg. Zero. Zero. And British Petroleum, \$5 billion in one quarter. How much did oil companies pay in taxes? Where's that on the deficit cutting table?

So, we say to the American people, you can't balance a trillion-dollar deficit on 14 percent of the budget. All you do is hurt people. Wall Street and Big Oil have already hurt the American people.

Let's pay the bills by expecting those who have much and give nothing to pay their fair share. That's how you seriously balance the budget—everything has to be on the table.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a very hardworking member of our committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of H.J. Res. 48 for the continuing appropriations for this fiscal year. It seems to me that we've got three questions we ought to address in the course of this debate. First, and very elementally, why are we here? Second, what does the bill do? And third, what are the consequences if the bill isn't passed?

We're here for the simple reason that the last Congress, that my good friends on the other side ran, never passed a budget and never passed a single appropriations bill. We're here because the Democratic majority failed to do its work. We're also here because the current Democratic majority in the other body has so far failed to do its work.

I remind my colleagues, we actually passed legislation and sent it over. I also remind my colleagues that the one proposal in the Senate that actually got the most votes was actually the Republican H.R. 1. But nevertheless, they failed to give us something to negotiate against. It's their obligation in the Senate at some point to have a common negotiating position. I don't know how we can sit down and negotiate otherwise.

So we're here, I think, because of a Democratic failure both in the last Congress and this one.

Second, what does this bill do? Well, it's pretty commonsensical. It cuts and reduces 25 programs, saving \$3.5 billion. Most of those programs the President and the majority say they don't want to continue. It eliminates \$2.6 billion in earmarks and, by itself, is one of the largest cuts any CR has ever administered. As has been pointed out earlier, if you combine it with the previous CR, it is a very substantial cut indeed. It buys time, but it also keeps the government running and it keeps us on course to reduce spending at \$2 billion a week, something that my colleagues and I are committed to.

Finally, what happens if we don't pass this bill? I know there's some that want to spend more, some that want to

spend less. The first thing that happens is we shut down the government, something all of us know is not a wise thing to do. The second thing that happens is that we probably create financial panic in the country and harm a fragile economy. Finally, the last thing that happens, and I think actually the most important, is we raise fundamental doubts amongst the American people as to whether or not this institution and we, as elected officials, have the capacity to actually address and solve our problems.

So I think we need to pass this bill. We need to give our friends on the other side of the aisle, particularly in the Senate, another 3 weeks to see if they can possibly come up with a negotiating position. And I'm confident once those negotiations begin, our Speaker will keep the government running, will bargain in good faith, but will cut spending, as we're committed to do.

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

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take a moment to congratulate and thank two long-time committee staff members who both are leaving us this month after many years of service.

Beverly Pheto spent 10 years on the committee, serving as clerk on both the Transportation Subcommittee and the Homeland Security Subcommittee before becoming the first woman staff director of the full committee under former Chairman David Obey. Bev was the top Democratic staff person during 9/11, the creation of the Transportation Security Administration, and the Department of Homeland Security, and during Hurricane Katrina. And in the last Congress, as majority clerk, Beverly helped craft the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act—the Recovery Act that saved tens of thousands of American jobs and kept this country from slipping into another Great Depression.

We thank Bev for agreeing to stay on with us and help with the committee's transition and congratulate her on her many years of service, both in the executive branch as well as for us. She will be missed, but we wish her well in her new endeavors.

I also want to extend my deep appreciation to Chris Topik, who has served on the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee since 1995, most recently as the minority clerk. Chris began his career with the U.S. Forest Service before coming to the committee as a detailee. During his time on the Interior Subcommittee, Chris found himself in the middle of some of the most contentious environmental policy disputes but always remained the consummate professional. While I chaired the Interior Subcommittee, I relied heavily on his solid judgment and wise counsel. I wish Chris the very best as he leaves the committee and thank him again for his service.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Let me join, on behalf of us on this side, in thanking those two wonderful individuals for their dedicated public service. They have worked hard on behalf of the public, and they deserve our utmost thanks, which I offer at this time.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman.

On behalf of the majority, I would like to echo the comments of my good friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Chris Topik came to the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations as a detailee from the Forest Service in the mid-1990s and, since that time, has worked on a nonpartisan basis to address many of the most critical issues facing our land management agencies. Chris is one of the most professional and widely respected individuals on the Appropriations Committee staff. His dry wit and friendly disposition will be greatly missed, and his institutional knowledge of Forest Service issues will be impossible to replace.

Chris, we appreciate your dedication and commitment over your many years of public service and wish you all the best in your future endeavors.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining on our side?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a very hardworking member of our committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BONNER).

Mr. BONNER. I thank the chairman, and I urge my colleagues to support this continuing resolution, as unpleasant as it is.

Our Democrat colleagues, our Republican colleagues, we agree; we don't like being in the situation that we're in, but we're in the situation nevertheless. Our colleagues remember that for the first time since 1974, we didn't pass a budget last year. We didn't pass a single appropriation bill, as the chairman of the committee has noted. We don't like being in this situation, but we're in this situation. And yet I think there's a real disconnect between Washington and the American people.

I was listening to the television news that Sunday when Senator KYL put the budget debate in perspective. While rarely do House Members quote Senators, I think it's worth it. We talk about trillions and billions and millions, but if you had a \$10,000 budget, which most Americans can more easily

identify with, and 40 percent of that is actually borrowed money, then what we're talking about with H.R. 1, which is the basis upon which this CR is going forward, we'd be shaving off \$28 from a \$10,000 budget.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, the reason that Congress has continued to draw such unpopular respect with the American people is that there is a disconnect. Last year, we had a \$223 billion deficit; the largest in the history. We're talking about shaving \$6 billion until we can get a resolution between the House and the Senate and encourage the White House to join the mix.

I thank the chairman for allowing me to speak out, and I encourage our colleagues to support this CR.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished leader of the Democratic Party in the House, NANCY PELOSI of California.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his hard work to help keep the government open.

While many of us will not agree on the legislation before us today, we know it is necessary for us to proceed. So I don't rise to support or oppose the legislation but, instead, to comment on the situation that we are in.

□ 1430

Again, today, we are in a situation. We are debating a short-term bill to keep the government open on a week-by-week basis. This is not any way to run a government or a business. It certainly is not the way, as the military leadership has told us, to protect the national security of our country—on a week-to-week basis.

Democrats will work with Republicans on legislation that will create jobs, that will strengthen the middle class, and that will reduce the deficit. On all three of these scores, this Republican spending bill fails.

Democrats have long fought for fiscal responsibility as a top priority of this Congress. We won't go into the history right now, but it's well known that President Clinton took us out of a period of deficit—his last five budgets being in surplus, or in balance. President Bush turned that around immediately when he became President, and now we have to dig ourselves out of the deficit that he has taken us into. Last December, Democrats passed a \$41 billion cut in the President's budget. We did so with only one Republican vote, \$41 billion. Democrats are in the lead on fiscal soundness.

On the subject of jobs, we are in the 11th week of the Republican majority in the Congress, and we have not seen one bill that will create jobs. In fact, the only bill coming from the Republicans, the only legislation that has come to the floor to create jobs, would be the Democratic initiatives.

One is Build America Bonds: to build the infrastructure of America to keep ahead of the game in terms of innova-

tion. Build America Bonds. Republicans overwhelmingly rejected that. The other bill was a bill to keep our jobs from going overseas by rewarding businesses that sent jobs overseas. Democrats said "no" to that idea. Republicans said "no" to our legislation. Zero jobs bills in 11 weeks.

It is quite different from the record of President Obama, who came into office 2 years ago with a Democratic Congress. President Obama was a job creator from day one, one week and one day after the President's inaugural address, calling for swift bold action now to create jobs. The House of Representatives passed the recovery bill, which was then passed by the Senate and signed into law in a matter of weeks. That legislation created or saved 3.6 million jobs. This is important in terms of the deficit because it produced jobs. It produced revenue into the Treasury that helped reduce the deficit.

Tax cuts for the wealthy, which has been the job creator that the Republicans put forth in the Bush administration and have put forth since, do not create jobs but increase the deficit.

So we are at the place, again, of 11 weeks. Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke said the Republican spending bill would cost not a trivial amount of jobs; Mark Zandi, the Republican economist, said the Republican spending bill would destroy 700,000 jobs. Goldman Sachs said the Republican spending bill would reduce U.S. economic growth by 1.5 to 2 percent; 320 economists sent a letter, calling Republican cuts a threat to our economy's long-term economic competitiveness and to the strength of our current economic recovery.

They all agree, to one extent or another, that the Republican agenda is taking us in the wrong direction, and that agenda is manifested in the continuing resolution, H.R. 1, and in the budget approach that they are taking. In fact, in addition to not creating jobs, the Republican initiative is making matters worse.

Many of us have come to the floor to talk about budgets year in and year out. We all say that our national budget should be a statement of our national values. What is important to our country should be reflected in the allocation of our resources. We want to have that debate on values rather than just on cuts.

Again, we all agree we have to get rid of waste, fraud, abuse, duplication, obsolescence, and the rest. The GAO has given us a blueprint for that, and we subscribe to that. We all agree that we must reduce the deficit, and the fiscal commission has given us a road map for that. We can agree or disagree with some of it; but the fact is it gives us a blueprint for how to go forward, and we should take heed of that. That blueprint says that we should not be making cuts right now that will be harmful to our recovery. Yet that's exactly what the Republican initiatives do.

So as to this statement of value, when we have this debate, it's not a debate about are we going to cut 6 million or 3 million seniors off of Meals on Wheels. It's about who we are as a country, how do we protect the American people both in our national security and our neighborhoods. It's how we educate our children to make them happy and also how to keep us competitive as innovators internationally. It's how we maintain a healthy America. It's not just about their health care but about their good health: the air they breathe, the water they drink, the safety of the food they eat.

It is about the creation of jobs. I believe we have an obligation as a government to be job creators. Jobs give people the means to find their own happiness and also to bring revenue into the Treasury, if we're just speaking pragmatically and not in terms of values.

I don't believe it's just about the dollars. It's because of the values that we have to have this debate. Unfortunately, the bills that we are being presented with, like H.R. 1, are like a balloon. You squeeze it here and it pops out there. It doesn't change anything for the better. In fact, as has been indicated, it makes matters worse.

So as we consider our budgetary decisions as a discussion, as a statement of our national values, we have to remember that the greatness of our country depends on the strengthening of our middle class. We have to do that by creating jobs, and we certainly must reduce the deficit.

Now we are waiting at the negotiating table for the Republicans to show that they are willing to work together—we cut \$41 billion with one Republican vote—and that they are willing to work together to reach an agreement that is a statement of our values. I think we can do that. Many of us have worked together on the Appropriations Committee over the years.

I urge our Republican colleagues to join us in our efforts to create jobs, to strengthen the middle class, and to reduce the deficit—and to do so in the interest of the American people.

That's why I think, on this vote today, people will vote however they view their own statements about it. The big vote that is coming up is the vote on the continuing resolution, on the long-term basis to keep the government open and functioning for people—again, in a way that is a statement of values for our great country.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a new member of our committee, a hard-working member, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his leadership on the Appropriations Committee and for yielding me some time here this morning.

Mr. Speaker, yes, it's true. I came here on January 5. Just a few weeks ago, I put my hand up and took the

oath of office. As I did, I was reminded of the fact that, at that precise time in my life, I was taking the oath of office already 3 months into the fiscal year. Now, you show me what business or what governmental jurisdiction anywhere in America is effectively and efficiently managed when you're operating without a budget already 3 months into the budget year.

I was a mayor of a very dynamic city in northwest Arkansas. We never did that. We couldn't survive by passing our budget sometime during the course of the ongoing year. So our conference, in particular, is leading by example. We are providing a leadership example for the spending cuts that so many people around America have said over and over again we have to achieve.

Look, America gets it. We are at a \$1.5 trillion deficit in this FY, and we are \$14-plus trillion in debt. We have to do something about spending. It's all about the end game, which is where this side of the aisle and that side of the aisle can come to an agreement because we know that the end game is about the creation of jobs. The ideological difference about how we get there, I think, is what divides us; but I am a firm believer and will tell you—as will any businessman, any mayor, any county judge, any government official—that your balance sheet drives a lot of things.

□ 1440

I think fundamental to that balance sheet is how much you're in debt, because how much you are in debt in business is tied to your assets. In government, it's tied to your capacity to tax; and right now, one of the fundamental problems about growing jobs in this economy is the uncertainty that hangs over the job creators in America.

Let me just finish by saying that I urge support of H.J. Res. 48.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. May I inquire of the time remaining, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 4 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of this temporary continuing resolution to urge my colleagues to do the same.

As we debate this measure, let's remember why we are here. Let's remember that on November 2, the people of Virginia's Fifth District and the people across this country sent a message to Washington, a message to Republicans and to Democrats. The message was urgent, it was clear, and it was loud. The message sent was that now is the time to stop the government spending, stop the government borrowing, and stop the raid on our children's future.

So what have we found since we got here? We find that our President and the last Congress, despite enjoying great majorities in each Chamber, completely and totally failed nearly 6 months ago to live up to its fundamental responsibility to adopt a budget for fiscal year 2011. Because of their failure to lead, the American people still 6 months later do not have a budget.

After the House worked into the early morning hours nearly a month ago and sent H.R. 1 down the Hall to the opposite Chamber, what has the Senate done? They left town, and they failed to adopt any proposal to fund the government for the rest of the fiscal year.

And what has the President done? While continuing to fail to lead on the 2011 budget, he has now proposed a budget for fiscal year 2012 that does not decrease spending and borrowing but instead increases government spending and nearly doubles government borrowing in the next 10 years. After it is all said and done, the Senate and the White House have not heard the message from the people in the last election and are continuing to fail to lead.

Now is the time for this Congress to listen. Now is the time for this Congress to act. I believe that the majority in this House is listening and this temporary continuing resolution gets us one step closer to fulfilling the purpose given us by the American people: cut government spending and reduce government borrowing for the sake of future generations.

Simply put, by voting in favor of this measure today, we are putting a \$6 billion deposit on the account for our children and our grandchildren who for far too long have been forgotten here in Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I rise to review the bidding here. We are down to the end of this debate on this continuing resolution, and I hope—and as I know Chairman ROGERS hopes—that this will be the last continuing resolution and that working together we can come together on a solution to the FY11 budget.

Now, I've heard repeatedly, repeatedly, and I've even mentioned this in my last statement, and the next thing I knew it was on CANTOR's Web site, but back in 2007, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky will remember that when we took over power and won the election in 2006, most of the nine, I think, or 10 of the appropriations bills were not enacted, and the Democrats had to pass a bill in February enacting all of these things. So maybe we learned that lesson from you-all over there, and I hope you will remember it because you seem to act like this has never happened before. Well, that's number one.

Number two, the American people in a Washington Post-ABC poll yesterday over the weekend said that they are

worried that the cuts in H.R. 1 will hurt the economy. It was narrow. It was 45–41, but 71 percent of the people said the problem was that your side isn't engaging and that they blame the Republicans for not getting this deal.

Now, why would they think that? I think the reason for it is when the first Rogers amendment proposal came out, that was kind of a reasonable approach, but that was rejected; and then they doubled the amount of these cuts, and the cuts became very severe and very questionable.

There was a story in *The Washington Post* today that lays out if you cut food inspectors, you're going to pay for it; if you cut WIC funding, you're going to pay for it, billions, in these children.

So I just point these things out. Cutting Head Start, this was perceived by the American people as too extreme, and that is why the Senate rejected H.R. 1, the President rejected H.R. 1. We need to have reasonable people sit down and work out a compromise and not let the government be shut down.

I believe that this should be the last CR and that we all should agree here today that this is going to be the last CR and that we are committed to getting this resolved. And that's what the American people also said in this ABC-Washington Post poll, not that I follow the polls much; but they also said they wanted us to come to an agreement.

So, again, I pledge to our chairman that we're not going to let this happen again; that this year we will pass all 12 appropriation bills by August, and we've done that before; and that we will end this process that started back in 2007 and which got continued in 2011. It is not the way to do the government's business. So let's make a pledge today that after this CR, we're going to work together to solve this problem and move on to FY12.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to a hardworking member of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I listened with great interest to the distinguished minority leader and her remarks, and I always like listening to her. I never cast my ballot for her to become the Speaker of the House in the last two Congresses, but as an American we all celebrated the historic accomplishment when she became the first woman to preside over this Chamber since the founding of the Republic. And a lot of wonderful things will be said and written about her tenure as Speaker of the House.

One thing that will not be said or written is that she presided over two Congresses that will be known for fiscal responsibility—that Congress passed a bank bailout bill costing \$700 billion which may bankrupt the Nation; passed an \$800 billion stimulus bill that created no jobs that may bankrupt the Nation; passed a cap-and-

tax piece of legislation that would gut jobs in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, and would have bankrupted the Nation; and, finally, a health care bill that took over one-sixth of the Nation's economy, did not bend the cost curve and, if not checked, will, in fact, bankrupt the Nation.

The distinguished minority leader's speech reminds me of that old adage that everybody wants to go to heaven but nobody wants to die. We hear continuously we have to cut, we have to cut, we have to cut, but not these cuts, not those cuts, not this program, not my program. The time is now. The time is serious. We have laid an offer upon the table, and we wait with great expectation.

Now, I know what all those people in St. Peters Square must feel like when they are waiting for the white smoke to come out of the top of the dome for the election of a Pope. We would like very much for the other side of this Capitol to give us a proposal to negotiate with. We would like very much for the Vice President of the United States to return to this Nation to talk to us. It's not happening. We need to pass the bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, today's legislation is designed to allow the federal government to continue operating through April 8, 2011. Additionally, this three-week CR does not contain the kind of truly reckless cuts and extreme policy riders contained in H.R. 1.

While this measure is clearly preferable to a government shutdown, we simply can't continue running the government on a series of short term extensions. The time has come to negotiate a long term CR that makes responsible reductions in federal spending while keeping job creation and our ongoing economic recovery on track.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 48, another short-term Continuing Resolution.

This is enabling bad Congressional behavior.

Continuing to cut specific environmental programs that have meant so much to communities across the country without at least putting it in the context of the broader budget request is irresponsible. It does not make sense to chip away at the Environmental Protection Agency by cutting local climate change and targeted airshed grants or the Department of Interior by cutting the Save America's Treasures program without looking at the rest of the budget to ensure that community needs are still being met.

This CR continues to target public broadcasting. It aims to eliminate all funding for the Public Telecommunications Facilities Program, PTFP. This program—started before the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967—is the only source of federal revenue for the replacement of aging or damaged equipment. Public broadcasting's programming can't be enjoyed if there's no way to maintain the infrastructure that delivers it to our homes.

PTFP is needed because by statute, station funds from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, CPB, are to be used for the production or acquisition of programming, not upkeep. Unfortunately, infrastructure needs far outpace recent funding. In FY 2009, stations

received nearly \$38 million from the PTFP and the CPB Digital Program. However, in that same time period, stations spent nearly \$191 million in equipment and infrastructure—reflecting the fact that both programs together have only been able to help stations address roughly 20% of their needs. We should be supporting these infrastructure investments and public broadcasting, not defunding them.

On the first CR, I was willing to vote yes in hopes we'd get serious. The problem with multiple short term CRs is more short-term spending authority that cripples the ability of the federal government to manage important functions while it drives up costs. It is expensive to make decisions on a week-to-week basis.

I am disappointed that this bill avoids the tough decisions that must be made, unsettles the business climate, and makes the job of our state and local partners harder.

Mr. WEST. Madam Speaker, I rise today to take a stand, a stand that may not be popular with the Leadership of the House of Representatives, but a stand I must take because I believe we cannot kick the can down the road for even another 3 weeks. The American people recognize that we must no longer take these small calculated measures. Today I will vote against another short-term Continuing Resolution.

In the shortest month of the year, February, the Federal Government had the largest deficit of \$223 billion in our nation's entire history. The American people know that we are in a fiscal crisis and have sent me to address out-of-control spending.

The majority in the House of Representatives passed H.R. 1 which reduced spending by \$61 billion for the remainder of this fiscal year. Even though H.R. 1 only cut spending by approximately 1.5 percent of the entire requested budget for fiscal year 2011, H.R. 1 reversed the trend of the Democrat Majority which increased overall discretionary funding by 24% over the last 2 years. The United States Senate rejected this amount as too much. They believe that, after President Barack Obama and the Democrat Congress presented trillion dollar deficit budgets, a freeze is the only viable approach.

I am not a supporter of big government. However, the Federal Government does perform certain important functions. Many essential Federal agencies cannot move forward with planning and using resources if every several weeks they are faced with the threat that they will need to close their doors until we resolve this impasse. Could any business in America function this way? Can a family household function this way?

Madam Speaker, President Obama and the United States Congresses of the past have created the Nanny States of America. Vast segments of the American people are now dependent on our Federal Government and not dependent on their own ability, skills and entrepreneurial spirit to succeed in this Nation.

We are in this position today because the Democrats in the last Congress failed to pass a budget. Further, the President appoints Vice President Biden as the Administration point person on the negotiations while he flies off to Europe. The Democrats failed to show leadership last year and the President is showing a lack of leadership today. I will show what I consider appropriate leadership now and vote against this Continuing Resolution.



Madam Speaker, the American people are watching us closely. Today, with information so readily available on the Internet they know the truth of our desperate economic situation. The days of Washington, D.C. double-talk no longer works.

The American people know that the Federal Government is collecting \$2.2 trillion and spending \$3.7 trillion this year. The American people know forty cents of every dollar the Federal Government spends is borrowed, much of it from China. The American people also know our nation is piling up new debt at the rate of \$4 billion a day. So, what does \$6 billion of spending cuts really buy the American people?

Further, the General Accountability Office released a 345-page report detailing the redundancies of Federal programs and the \$100 to \$200 billion of savings that could be achieved if these programs were consolidated or eliminated.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to argue that these cuts in spending will weaken an already slow economy and contribute to an increase in the loss of jobs. I believe this is a disingenuous argument. The truth is, the spending over the last 2 years has not reduced the loss of jobs, but instead has contributed to the largest debt in American history which will be passed on to my children and my grandchildren.

In Wisconsin, we have seen what the unionized entitlement class can do and the pressure they can place on their elected officials. Wisconsin State Legislators running to a neighboring state to hide from making a hard vote and protestors storming the Wisconsin State Capitol are not in concert with the principles of a representative democracy.

Madam Speaker, Madison, Wisconsin is only 700 miles from the United States Capitol.

The Founders of our nation wrote in the Declaration of Independence "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." The "Pursuit" of Happiness, not the Federal Government's "Guarantee" of Happiness!

Finally, Madam Speaker, we can continue to rehash the past of how we have gotten into this situation, but I would rather focus on the future. The future is now and the place is here for us to get our Nation back on track. I support the cuts in the Continuing Resolution. I support the elimination of these projects.

However, my "No" vote should not be construed as my willingness for a "government shutdown." My "No" vote is based on a simple principle that we need to complete the Federal budget for 2011. It is time to have this debate on Federal spending and get our nation back on track by cutting spending for the long term economic restoration of our Republic.

Alexander the Great once stated, "Fortune favors the bold." The American people are looking for principled and bold leadership. I understand "political maneuvering" but the time has come to engage in the battle for the fiscal responsible future of America. I take my position on the frontlines.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 167, the joint resolution is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

□ 1450

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. CRITZ. Yes, I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Critz moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 48 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 20, line 2, strike the final period and the preceding quotation marks.

Page 20, after line 2, insert the following:

"SEC. 295. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop or implement a system that cuts Social Security benefits, or that privatizes Social Security.

"SEC. 296. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop or implement a system that cuts Medicare benefits, eliminates guaranteed health coverage for seniors, or establishes a Medicare voucher plan that limits payments to beneficiaries in order to purchase health care in the private sector."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. CRITZ. Madam Speaker, as I listen to the debate on the current CR and where this debate has been taking us throughout this year, I have some reasons for alarm. I think the best way to start it off is to at least start to let you know a little bit about myself.

For most of my life, I have worked in the private sector. I have worked all my life and paid into Social Security. And the folks that I live with and live around and the people of my district have come to rely on Social Security, as it provides for, actually, generations at this point.

As I have been sitting here listening to this current CR, which I am opposed to, you know, all 435 of us are sent here to lead. Unfortunately, what we have heard time and time again is finger-pointing as, "It's your fault," "It's our fault," "It's their fault," instead of us sitting down, talking to one another and figuring out where we can compromise and how we can come to a final solution to what our problems are. And it's really very disheartening.

I can understand that the folks who watch this at home are trying to figure out, well, whose side are we on? Are we on their side? Or are we on our particular party's side or on our particular stance's side? And I think it's very unfortunate because, at the end of the day, we all have very strong opinions on what the best way forward is in this country. Unfortunately, it's about

compromise. Because even though we all have strong opinions, we all have differing opinions; and if we don't work it out, we are not going to get anywhere.

As I stand in opposition to this CR, it is something that is disheartening.

Now, I am on the Armed Services Committee and have been hearing from industry time and time again at how difficult it is for them in the long term. So as we talk about cutting, we are going to cut \$2 billion a week for these next 3 weeks. Well, by doing these short-term CRs, we are actually costing our country money. And no one talks about that, of what the impact is going to be from this temporary solution. The Republicans have talked about, well, the Democrats didn't complete their work last year. That's true. But now the Republicans are in charge. You are in charge. You were given a charge to lead this country. And here we are going around again doing a 2-week, a 3-week. This isn't leading. This is playing games, and it's time to stand up and do the right thing for this country.

But my MTR, motion to recommit, involves Social Security, because the debate that has been happening has been trying to frame Social Security as a problem and the reason for the deficits that this country is experiencing. I brought a chart with me, and I want to read to you the net increase in assets in the Social Security Trust Fund for the last 6 years.

In 2005, the Social Security Trust Fund increased \$172 billion. In 2006, it increased by \$189.5 billion. These are increases. This means that the money that comes in to Social Security via your taxes and interest is more than what is going out, being paid in benefits. So when people start talking about, well, Social Security is causing our deficit problem and we have to address entitlement programs, they're not giving you the whole picture. They are trying to tell you that down the road we may have an issue. Well, no.

In 2007, the Social Security Trust Fund increased \$190.4 billion. In 2008, it increased \$180 billion. In 2009, it increased \$122 billion. So the trust fund is going up. And it actually has \$2.6 trillion in it right now. So the people that are receiving Social Security now shouldn't be worried about what it's doing to the deficit, because that increase in the trust fund is actually money that's coming in to the government in excess of what Social Security is spending.

But I brought up a chart here because I want to show people that when you start talking about Social Security—now, if you look at the 12th District of Pennsylvania, I have an elderly population. I am one of the districts that has a lot of senior citizens in it. A lot of people are on Social Security. And if you look at this chart, 77 percent of people say, Leave Social Security alone. Don't touch the retirement age. Don't touch the benefits. They say,

Come to a solution. Figure out a way to move forward.

And there are compromises that can be had to help solve the Social Security issue because we do have an issue long term. Baby boomers are retiring. Less people are paying in. So there are some issues that we have to address. But don't be buying into this crisis legislation that, if we don't do something immediately, Social Security is going to be in trouble. You are hearing all kinds of scenarios.

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

Mr. CRITZ. I urge support of this amendment. It does not recommit the bill. It is an amendment and will just be added to the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, this provision doesn't do anything. Nothing in the CR would cut Social Security or Medicare benefits, nor would it privatize Social Security. We are totally committed in this bill to saving Social Security.

Let me be honest. This is a procedural motion that is simply a fog screen, trying to hide us from our real task at hand, but I don't think we'll be fooled at that. The debate should not be about procedure or fog screens or things unrelated to the bill. It should be about doing our job.

We are here this afternoon to provide the necessary resources to keep the government's doors open while we lock in important budget savings totaling \$6 billion. That is \$2 billion in spending reductions, or savings, to the taxpayer, \$2 billion a week, the path this body has set with the passage of H.R. 1 a couple of weeks ago.

I would also like to remind my colleagues that, with the passage of this CR today, we will have cut over \$10 billion in the span of 2 weeks. That sets a record. That has never been done before in this body. The closest was 1995 at \$9 billion. This is more than double the \$4.7 billion that Senator REID and the Senate Democrats proposed in their CR last week to fund the government for the remaining 6 months. We do in 2 weeks what they would take 6 months to do.

The American people sent us here with a clear message last November. They want us to end the partisan bickering and get our work done. Instead of picking political fights, they want us united in cutting the budget. This motion moves us further away from that goal. It would send us backwards, not forwards. It's a smokescreen, a procedural motion.

Let's get on with it. Vote "no," and then vote "yes" on final.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.J. Res. 48, if ordered; and adoption of H. Con. Res. 30, by the yeas and the nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 239, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 178]

YEAS—190

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

NAYS—239

Adams	Bachmann	Benishek
Aderholt	Bachus	Berg
Akin	Barletta	Biggart
Alexander	Bartlett	Bilbray
Amash	Barton (TX)	Bilirakis
Austria	Bass (NH)	Bishop (UT)

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

NOT VOTING—3

Giffords Moore Sanchez, Loretta

□ 1523

Messrs. WITTMAN and SULLIVAN and Ms. GRANGER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 271, noes 158, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

AYES—271

Adams	Engel	McCarthy (NY)
Aderholt	Farenthold	McCaul
Alexander	Fattah	McClintock
Altmire	Fincher	McHenry
Austria	Fitzpatrick	McKeon
Baca	Fleischmann	McKinley
Bachus	Flores	McMorris
Barletta	Forbes	Rodgers
Barrow	Fortenberry	Meehan
Bass (NH)	Fox	Mica
Berg	Frelinghuysen	Michaud
Berkley	Gallely	Miller (FL)
Biggert	Gardner	Miller (MI)
Bilbray	Gerlach	Miller (NC)
Bilirakis	Gibbs	Miller, Gary
Bishop (GA)	Gibson	Moran
Bishop (NY)	Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)
Black	Gosar	Myrick
Blackburn	Granger	Neugebauer
Bonner	Graves (MO)	Noem
Bono Mack	Griffin (AR)	Nugent
Boren	Griffith (VA)	Nunes
Boswell	Grimm	Nunnelee
Boustany	Guthrie	Olson
Brady (PA)	Hanna	Owens
Brady (TX)	Harper	Palazzo
Braley (IA)	Hartzler	Pascarell
Brooks	Hastings (WA)	Paulsen
Broun (GA)	Hayworth	Perlmutter
Buchanan	Heck	Peters
Bucshon	Heinrich	Peterson
Buerkle	Hensarling	Petri
Burgess	Herger	Pingree (ME)
Butterfield	Herrera Beutler	Platts
Calvert	Higgins	Polis
Camp	Himes	Pompeo
Canseco	Holden	Posey
Cantor	Hoyer	Price (GA)
Capito	Capps	Price (NC)
Cardoza	Hultgren	Quayle
Carney	Hunter	Quigley
Carson (IN)	Hurt	Rahall
Carter	Inslie	Reed
Cassidy	Israel	Reichert
Castor (FL)	Issa	Renacci
Chandler	Jenkins	Ribble
Coble	Johnson (OH)	Rivera
Coffman (CO)	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Cole	Keating	Roe (TN)
Conaway	Kelly	Rogers (AL)
Cooper	Kildee	Rogers (KY)
Costa	Kind	Rogers (MI)
Courtney	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Cravaack	Kingston	Rokita
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)	Rooney
Crenshaw	Kissell	Ros-Lehtinen
Cuellar	Kline	Roskam
Culberson	Lance	Ross (AR)
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Rothman (NJ)
Davis (KY)	Lankford	Royce
DeFazio	Latham	Runyan
DeGette	LaTourette	Ruppersberger
Denham	Latta	Ryan (WI)
Dent	Lewis (CA)	Sarbanes
DesJarlais	Lipinski	Scalise
Deutch	LoBiondo	Schiff
Diaz-Balart	Loeb	Schilling
Dicks	Lowey	Schock
Dingell	Lucas	Schrader
Doggett	Luetkemeyer	Schwartz
Dold	Lujan	Schweikert
Donnelly (IN)	Lummis	Scott (SC)
Doyle	Lungren, Daniel	Scott, Austin
Dreier	E.	Sensenbrenner
Duffy	Manzullo	Sessions
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Sherman
Ellmers	Marino	Shimkus
Emerson	Matheson	Shuler
	McCarthy (CA)	Shuster

Simpson	Tiberi	Whitfield
Sires	Turner	Wittman
Smith (NE)	Upton	Wolf
Smith (TX)	Van Hollen	Womack
Smith (WA)	Visclosky	Woodall
Speier	Walden	Wu
Stark	Walz (MN)	Yoder
Stivers	Wasserman	Young (AK)
Terry	Schultz	Young (FL)
Thompson (CA)	Webster	Young (IN)
Thompson (PA)	Welch	
Thornberry	Westmoreland	

NOES—158

Ackerman	Grijalva
Akin	Gutierrez
Amash	Hall
Andrews	Hanabusa
Bachmann	Harris
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)
Bartlett	Heller
Barton (TX)	Hinchee
Bass (CA)	Hinojosa
Becerra	Hirono
Benishek	Holt
Berman	Honda
Blumenauer	Huelskamp
Brown (FL)	Huizenga (MI)
Burton (IN)	Jackson (IL)
Campbell	Jackson Lee
Capuano	(TX)
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)
Chabot	Johnson (IL)
Chaffetz	Johnson, E. B.
Chu	Jones
Cicilline	Jordan
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur
Clarke (NY)	King (IA)
Clay	Kucinich
Cleaver	Labrador
Clyburn	Lamborn
Cohen	Landry
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)
Costello	Larson (CT)
Critz	Lee (CA)
Crowley	Levin
Cummings	Lewis (GA)
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe
DeLauro	Long
Duncan (SC)	Lynch
Edwards	Mack
Ellison	Maloney
Eshoo	Markey
Farr	Matsui
Filner	McColum
Flake	McCotter
Fleming	McDermott
Frank (MA)	McGovern
Franks (AZ)	McIntyre
Fudge	McNerney
Garamendi	Meeks
Garrett	Miller, George
Gingrey (GA)	Moore
Gohmert	Mulvaney
Govdy	Nadler
Graves (GA)	Napolitano
Green, Al	Neal
Green, Gene	Oliver

NOT VOTING—3

Conyers	Giffords	Sanchez, Loretta
---------	----------	------------------

□ 1532

Mr. CICILLINE changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. INSLEE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of H. Con. Res. 30, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 197, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—232

Adams	Goodlatte	Noem
Aderholt	Gosar	Nugent
Akin	Gowdy	Nunes
Alexander	Granger	Nunnelee
Altmire	Graves (GA)	Olson
Amash	Griffin (AR)	Palazzo
Austria	Griffith (VA)	Paul
Bachus	Grimm	Paulsen
Barletta	Guinta	Pearce
Bartlett	Guthrie	Pence
Barton (TX)	Hall	Petri
Bass (NH)	Hanna	Pitts
Benishek	Harper	Pompeo
Berg	Hartzler	Posey
Berkley	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Biggert	Hayworth	Quayle
Bilbray	Heck	Reed
Bilirakis	Heinrich	Rehberg
Bishop (UT)	Heller	Reichert
Black	Hensarling	Renacci
Blackburn	Herger	Ribble
Bonner	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Bono Mack	Huelskamp	Rivera
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Brooks	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Bucshon	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Buerkle	Johnson (IL)	Rokita
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Butterfield	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Jones	Roskam
Camp	Jordan	Ross (FL)
Canseco	Kelly	Royce
Cantor	Kind	Runyan
Capito	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Carter	King (NY)	Scalise
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Schilling
Chabot	Kline	Schock
Chaffetz	Labrador	Schweikert
Coble	Lamborn	Scott (SC)
Coffman (CO)	Lance	Scott, Austin
Cole	Landry	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Lankford	Sessions
Cooper	Latham	Shimkus
Cravaack	LaTourette	Shuster
Crawford	Latta	Simpson
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Culberson	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Davis (CA)	Long	Smith (TX)
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Southerland
DeFazio	Luetkemeyer	Stearns
DeGette	Lummis	Stivers
Denham	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Dent	E.	Thompson (PA)
DesJarlais	Duffy	Thornberry
Deutch	Duncan (SC)	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	Duncan (TN)	Tipton
Dicks	Ellmers	Turner
Dingell	Farenthold	Upton
Doggett	Fincher	Walberg
Dold	Flake	Walden
Donnelly (IN)	Fleischmann	Walsh (IL)
Doyle	Fleming	Waxman
Dreier	Flores	Webster
Duffy	Forbes	West
Duncan (TN)	Fortenberry	Westmoreland
Ellmers	Franks (AZ)	Whitfield
Emerson	Frelinghuysen	Wilson (SC)
	Gallely	Wolf
	Gardner	Womack
	Garrett	Woodall
	Gibbs	Yoder
	Gibson	Young (AK)
	Gingrey (GA)	Young (FL)
		Young (IN)

NAYS—197

Ackerman	Becerra	Brady (PA)
Andrews	Berman	Braley (IA)
Baca	Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)
Bachmann	Bishop (NY)	Burgess
Baldwin	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Barrow	Boren	Capps
Bass (CA)	Boswell	Capuano

Cardoza	Hinojosa	Peterson
Carnahan	Hirono	Pingree (ME)
Carney	Holden	Platts
Carson (IN)	Holt	Poe (TX)
Castor (FL)	Honda	Polis
Chandler	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Chu	Inslee	Quigley
Cicilline	Israel	Rahall
Clarke (MI)	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Clarke (NY)	Jackson Lee	Reyes
Clay	(TX)	Richardson
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Ross (AR)
Cohen	Kaptur	Rothman (NJ)
Connolly (VA)	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Conyers	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kissell	Rush
Costello	Kucinich	Ryan (OH)
Courtney	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Critz	Larsen (WA)	T. Sarbanes
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Cuellar	Lee (CA)	Schiff
Cummings	Levin	Schrader
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Schwartz
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Scott, David
DeGette	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano
DeLauro	Lowey	Sewell
Deutch	Lujan	Sherman
Dicks	Lynch	Shuler
Dingell	Maloney	Sires
Doggett	Markey	Slaughter
Donnelly (IN)	Matheson	Smith (WA)
Doyle	Matsui	Speier
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Stark
Ellison	McCaul	Sutton
Emerson	McCollum	Terry
Engel	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Farr	McIntyre	Tierney
Fattah	McNerney	Tonko
Filner	Meeks	Towns
Fitzpatrick	Michaud	Tsongas
Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)	Van Hollen
Fudge	Miller, George	Velázquez
Garamendi	Moore	Visclosky
Gerlach	Moran	Walz (MN)
Gohmert	Murphy (CT)	Wasserman
Gonzalez	Nadler	Schultz
Graves (MO)	Napolitano	Waters
Green, Al	Neal	Watt
Green, Gene	Olver	Weiner
Grijalva	Owens	Welch
Gutierrez	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Hanabusa	Pascrell	Wittman
Harris	Pastor (AZ)	Woolsey
Hastings (FL)	Payne	Wu
Higgins	Pelosi	Yarmuth
Himes	Perlmutter	
Hinchev	Peters	

NOT VOTING—3

Giffords Sanchez, Loretta Stutzman

□ 1542

Ms. McCOLLUM, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 15, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
The Capitol,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Please accept this letter as my notice of resignation from the Committee on Financial Services, effective today.

It has been a great honor and pleasure to serve on this committee.

Sincerely,

KENNY MARCHANT,  
Member of Congress.

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

SUCCESS FOR KIDS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Success for Kids, a wonderful organization working in my congressional district to help improve the lives of children and adolescents.

Success for Kids is dedicated to empowering at-risk children by focusing on the improvement of four personal strategies: interpersonal skills, emotional intelligence, problem-solving skills, and improved self-sufficiency.

In addition to its great work in south Florida, Success for Kids operates in eight countries and has proven to be effective in some of the most challenging areas in the world.

Our children must be provided with every possible opportunity to achieve success, and this program is certainly making a positive difference in their lives.

I especially applaud our local executive director, Yossef Sagi, and all the wonderful staff at Success for Kids for their valiant efforts in improving the lives of our children.

END THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

(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, Congress heard from General Petraeus today that significant progress is being made in Afghanistan. We've heard that before. Military and civilian leaders have for years told lawmakers and the public that we're making progress in Afghanistan.

We heard it here 7 years ago when President Karzai of Afghanistan talked about our presence there as being a journey of success and victory. President Bush at the same time was saying that a revival was under way. In another joint press conference in 2006, President Bush says progress is being made. In 2007, Lieutenant General Eikenberry says we're on a steady path. In 2008, President Bush says we're making good progress. In October 2008, General McKiernan says we're not losing, and President Bush says there has been progress.

We keep hearing the same story over and over again.

Now President Obama has requested another \$113 billion to continue the war in Afghanistan in fiscal year 2012. That sum will be on top of the \$454.7 billion that has already been spent.

It is time that Congress stepped up, denied the money, and got out of Afghanistan. Mr. Speaker, we have a vote coming up this Thursday to accomplish that.

ELECTING CERTAIN MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 168

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

(1) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Mr. Hanna.

(2) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—Mr. Marchant (to rank immediately after Mr. Paulsen).

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

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine in your household if, for every \$1 you spent, 40 cents was borrowed? Can you imagine if you were in that situation and didn't change your buying or your spending habits?

That would be absurd. Yet that's what the U.S. Congress is doing. We've had a debate on a spending reduction of less than 2 percent. Yet, the way some people are screaming and hollering, you would think that we were cutting spending in half.

This isn't about protecting programs and the status quo. This is about the next generation. Sit down, and tell your children: You know what? We've got a deficit of \$1.6 trillion, and we've decided the tough decisions that are necessary to balance the budget aren't worth it for the next generation.

That is not the America that you and I know and love. We deserve better. We can do better. It's time for Democrats and Republicans and independents to come together to do what is best for the United States of America, to not worry about the next election but to worry about the next generation.

□ 1550

DIRTY AIR ACT

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, we are some 11 weeks into a new Congress and still we have not seen a single bill focused on job creation from the other side of the aisle. What are they focused on? Allowing big polluters a free pass to pollute the air we breathe and poison the water we drink.

In the pockets of Big Oil and Big Polluters, Republicans are advancing the Dirty Air Act, a radical bill that would undo over four decades of public health, scientific advancement, and pollution standards. The Dirty Air Act would ban EPA from exercising its role as the protector of our air and as the protector of our water.

For decades, the Clean Air Act has protected children from asthma and seniors from emphysema, while reducing our dependence on foreign oil. It has created jobs, and we simply cannot undo it.

My friends on the other side of the aisle should be focussed on America's priorities, that being job creation and economic growth. Instead, they remain committed to the deep pockets of the dirty energy industry.

What is more important, public health for our children and seniors or lining the pockets of the oil industry? I think the choice is very clear. I rise today in support of the Clean Air Act.

#### THE FEDERAL BUDGET

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to reiterate some statistics that I entered into the record earlier today as we try to balance the Federal budget. Let's look at who has the money.

If you look at the big banks from Wall Street that took us down this dangerous road, six banks—among them Citigroup, Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan Chase, Wells Fargo—made last year \$51.5 billion in profits. That's with a "B," billion. Today, the majority passed a few billion dollars in cuts, and they took it out of the hides of ordinary Americans who are paying the price of this recession. But imagine if you worked for a Wall Street bank and only had to pay an effective tax rate of 11.5 percent or 11 percent when most businesses in America have to pay 35 percent. They are getting a really good deal. We didn't nick their bonuses a penny, and the top executives walked home with \$26 million.

If you really want to ask yourself the question how to balance the budget, why don't we look at where the money really is, and none of that is on the table. And while you're paying those high gas prices, take a look at Exxon. They have the largest profits in American history: \$9 billion last year in one quarter. Paid no taxes.

American people, wake up.

#### JOBS

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to talk about what's on the minds of the constituents in my district, and that's jobs. They're worried about the economy, they're worried about jobs, and they want to find an opportunity to get a job.

Unfortunately, it's actually 11 weeks since the Republicans took control of this House, and there's not been one job bill. The big bill that passed here 4 weeks ago was the continuing resolution for the year, and that piece of legislation actually disposed of 700,000 jobs. It was all couched in the terms of how we're going to solve the deficit, but the reality is you're not going to solve the deficit by making small cuts through multiple programs, and that's what it did. What it actually would have accomplished is to destroy 700,000 jobs here in America.

What we need to do is to take the long view. We need to look at the overarching problem, and we do have a deficit problem. Most of it, frankly, was created during the George W. Bush administration. If you look back to the year 2000 when the Clinton administration ended, there would have been, if the same policies had continued, a \$5 billion surplus. We would have wiped out the American debt. That didn't happen. Policies changed, two wars, tax reductions, and an incredible deficit, and the collapse of the American and the worldwide economy.

So where are we today? We're left with a problem. We're going to talk about that today.

I've asked my friend from New York (Mr. TONKO) to join us and my good friend from Illinois, JAN SCHAKOWSKY, to join us.

Mr. TONKO, if you would start us.

Mr. TONKO. Sure. Absolutely my pleasure, and, Mr. GARAMENDI, thank you for bringing us together during this coming hour so that we can address what is the most critical issue: the jobs and the economy.

The American public speaks out overwhelmingly to make certain that that is our highest priority here in Congress. In every public opinion survey that you have seen in the last several months, it's about jobs. It's the pledge that we have made since I've been here as a Member of this House. As Democrats in this House, we have been pushing the agenda for jobs. We believe there's no other higher priority.

I think of the 8.2 million jobs lost during the Bush recession when there was a willful neglect of the manufacturing sector, of the ag sector of our economy. It was dedicated and directed towards service sector, primarily the financial industry and the investment

community. We know what happened. There was not stewardship over that arena. There was not the sort of watchdog application, and we allowed for many people to be hurt by that painful recession, where their lifetimes' worth of savings were invested through portfolios of investment on Wall Street, and because of the greed, they got brought down, and people were left hurting, losing their homes, losing their lifetime savings, and 8.2 million jobs lost to this American economy.

So we have got to turn that around. We have begun carefully with the programs and the policies, working with this President, starting in the 111th Congress over a year or two ago where we made certain that jobs, jobs, jobs were the highest priority. We put together a package a policies that would make certain that we would grow jobs in America.

We began with some very strong efforts to invest, through the Recovery Act, in those industries that need that sort of launching, that we could somehow take this clean energy agenda, their industry, the innovation economy, and make it work for America, and that affects people in the elements of trades on over to the Ph.D.s. And we saw what happened. In the last year, for instance, 1.5 million jobs added from the private sector column. Now our friends want to put on this cut in domestic programs that every think tank has forewarned would cost us jobs. In fact, many are suggesting 700,000 jobs would be lost if these cuts to the domestic investments that are so important to America's working families would be allowed to have happen.

So we need to go forward with a very thoughtful plan that enables us to not only grow jobs, in fact, jobs not yet on the radar screen, but to grow jobs in a way that can allow us to compete, and compete effectively, on the global scene, in that global marketplace; because I agree with the President on this notion: Whoever wins this race on clean energy, the global race on innovation, will become the exporter of energy intellect, energy ideas, innovation.

We saw it happen decades ago with the global race on space, and America embraced that with passionate resolve and said we are going to win this race; we're going to invest. President Kennedy set a tone that was a winning tone. It engaged everybody. We worked as a team in this country. People came together in a bipartisan, spirited way, and all we talked about was investing in science and technology and engineering. And guess what? We won that race because we embraced it with passionate resolve. And it wasn't just the poetry of landing a person, an American, on the Moon first where he was quoted as saying, One small step for man; one giant step for mankind, but it was the unleashing of several elements of technology that pervaded every sector of development out there from

health care to education to communications to energy generation.

□ 1600

And it was using new technology, making the difference by embracing that technological advancement.

We not only won the global race on space but created all sorts of technology, science and tech investment in our American industries and our American fabric. That made a difference. And that's the sort of synergy, that's the sort of focus, laser-sharp focus we need today; not the cutting and dismantling of R&D investments that enable us, empower us, give us the muscle to win the global race on innovation, but also to have the sort of human infrastructure developed through investments in education. That's where we need to be.

This conference, the Democratic conference in this House has made it its mantra: Make it in America. Bring it back. Rebuild America. Let's show the hope to the American public. Let's make a difference. Let's win this global race on innovation. We can do it. But we won't do it if we disinvest in America, which is happening on this floor. The attempts to disinvest in America will set us back.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. TONKO.

I would also point out that in the continuing resolution, H.R. 1, that passed this House by the Republican Party, the innovation was essentially destroyed. There had been a layoff of over 6,000 researchers at our national laboratories; money for the ARPA-E, which is the advanced energy research program which was decimated, literally stopped, so that the energy issues you talked about would not be funded going forward. And in the National Institutes of Health, cancer research, heart ailment research, those were also cut. So one thing after another, all that new technology, including technology for the health of Americans, was defunded.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, I would add to that public safety. We even dismantle the efforts to forecast tsunamis. We just saw the devastation in Japan with this horrific earthquake. We take away the opportunity for science to work for us, to address our own public safety. How long can we be here?

Mr. GARAMENDI. If the gentleman will yield, not more than 23 minutes ago, the House, under the Republican leadership, voted to remove almost \$120 million of funding for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. That's where the information comes from about the tsunami. The tsunami warning came from that agency. And here we find the Republicans pulling money out of that not more than 25 minutes ago here on the floor.

I would like now to turn to our colleague from the great State of Illinois. JAN, if you would share with us. I know that you have got a project underway,

a bill that you are about to introduce. Perhaps you can share it with us.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I do. First of all, let me thank you for focusing not just tonight but so many days on the floor of this House on jobs, especially since the new majority has done nothing, absolutely nothing to create jobs for the American people since they have been in charge and, instead, want to gut Federal programs in a way that economists say will eliminate jobs and slow our economic recovery and put hardship on the American people.

Yes. I do want to say, first of all, that Democrats have a plan, and we know what it takes to make investments by building strong infrastructure and what our plan is called. And I want to thank our leader, the whip, STENY HOYER, for summarizing it in the best way possible, and that is: Make it in America. I know he will talk about that, that we mean both making stuff here, which we ought to do, and I think Americans everywhere—and certainly in my district, they start nodding as soon as I say, “We need to make it in America,” and everybody, regardless of party, regardless of income starts to nod.

But this week, I am reintroducing a bill that I have had called the Patriot Corporations of America Act, which provides incentives to and rewards companies that are good corporate citizens of the United States of America. Right now, sadly, the United States gives billions of dollars in subsidies and tax breaks and government contracts to companies that outsource jobs, that exploit workers, that avoid their fair share of taxes. And this only encourages those companies to invest abroad instead of making it in America and using the best workers in the world—American workers.

The Patriot Corporations of America Act would help us reverse course by providing incentives to companies that create a real partnership with American workers and invest in our economic future. It would be paid for, this legislation, by closing corporate offshoring loopholes and reining in some of the new tax breaks for millionaires.

This bill would reward companies that voluntarily meet the following patriotic standards by moving them to the front of the line for government contracts and giving them a 5 percent reduction in their taxable income. To qualify as a patriot corporation, businesses must produce at least 90 percent of their goods and services in the United States; spend at least 50 percent of their research and development budgets in the United States; limit top executive pay to no greater than 100 times that of their lowest compensated full-time workers—pretty generous, actually; contribute at least 5 percent of payroll to a portable pension fund; pay at least 70 percent of the cost of health insurance premiums; maintain neutrality and employee organizing drives; and comply with Federal regulations

regarding the environment, workplace safety, consumer protections, and labor relations, which they're supposed to do anyway.

So I think it's time for the United States to reward companies that show a dedication to the American workforce, and that's why I call it the Patriot Corporations of America Act. I certainly would invite all my friends on both sides of the aisle to support this kind of legislation that helps to make it in America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That kind of legislation is the type of policy we ought to be pushing forward here, one that rewards American corporations that are actually making things in America and employing Americans.

I'm going to turn to our minority whip in just a moment, but this Make It in America slogan was created by STENY HOYER, and there are about six, seven different policies, some of which we have already covered. We haven't talked about trade yet, but tax policy, which is what you just brought forward, a tax incentive for corporations to be good citizens here. Mr. TONKO talked about energy policy. Labor, certainly that's part of what you talked about; education, which we haven't yet covered; intellectual property, which is, in fact, that research agenda; and the infrastructure. These are all elements of the Make It in America agenda.

Mr. HOYER, this is your concept of using this term “Make It in America.” Would you share with us where we are today with this whole agenda and how things are moving along.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI has been as faithful in bringing before the American people the concept of the Make It in America agenda. And, of course, the gentlelady from Illinois pointed out that it means two things: that we're going to succeed. We're going to grab opportunity. We're going to expand our quality of life. We're going to make it, in other words. And we're going to make it in America. We're going to manufacture it in America. We're going to grow it in America, and we're going to sell it here and across the world.

We can compete with anybody in the world, frankly, given the proper environment. And I have talked to numerous members of the corporate community. I have talked to labor. I have talked to the National Association of Manufacturers. And we are going to pursue this Make It in America agenda because Americans know that we need to be focused on jobs, on expanding opportunity and providing for good wages and good benefits for working American families so they can provide a good life for themselves and their families; and, as a consequence of doing so, will create communities and States and a Nation which will be and will continue to be the envy of the world.

Democrats believe, Mr. GARAMENDI, that when more products are made in

America, more families will be able to make it in America, as I said. That's why we've worked hard since the last Congress to advance the Make It in America agenda—nobody has worked harder than you have to do that—a legislative agenda that helps create conditions for American companies to stay here, innovate here, and create jobs here. When more products are made in America, more families have access to well-paying middle class jobs. And when more products are made in America, we are able to turn expertise in manufacturing them into the new products and new industries of the future.

□ 1610

“Make It in America” is about creating middle class opportunity and about keeping America's innovators here and keeping our innovative edge.

Mr. Grove, who founded Intel, made the observation that the problem that we have in America today is we are still the inventive center of the world. We're still the innovative and development center of the world. But too often what we're doing is taking the products that we've invented, innovated, and developed and taking them to scale overseas. His proposition is—and I think Andy Grove is absolutely right on this—if you continue to do that, the inventors, innovators, and developers will move to where the product is being taken to scale.

The president of Dow recently wrote a book—by the way, in January, the publishers named it—and the name of that book is “Make It in America.” As a matter of fact, I think I am going to get copies of that book for all our Members.

So far, President Obama has signed seven Make It in America pieces of legislation that we passed last year. They speed up the patent process for inventors; help small businesses with loans and tax cuts that enable them to innovate, grow, and create new jobs; and strengthen science, technology, engineering, and math education, much of which is on your poster there.

One thing I would add that I'd say to my friend is, and I'm not sure where you want to add it, but regulatory policy is going to be critical. And what I have said is that in the last administration the financial community got way out of hand. Why? We took the referee off the field.

We need to put the referee back on the field but make sure the referee doesn't get in the way of the game being played within the rules. And that's of a critical nature.

Some people want to take the referee off the field and forget about the environment. Some people want to take the referee off the field and forget about fair wages. Some people want to take the referee off the field and not worry about a safe working place.

All of those things are important, but it's important to make sure that, within the rules—and we can do so profitably in America. I've talked to

Alan Mulally at Ford. Whirlpool has brought enterprises back from offshore. GE has brought enterprises up. They still have a lot offshore, but they brought some back.

And the proof of the pudding is foreign manufacturers have come to the United States and are exporting their cars to other places. They're selling them here but exporting, which shows, clearly, that you can make it in America and do so profitably.

In the weeks to come we will be proposing more “Make It in America” legislation. And we hope that it will win support of both sides of the aisle. This is not a partisan agenda. There's not a Republican who doesn't want to make sure Americans make it in America.

But we haven't, frankly, in the first 3 months of this session, and we're about to leave. But there's nothing on the schedule that's focused on jobs. So we will have taken up January, February, and March, and not focused on jobs.

As a matter of fact, as the gentleman knows, the only thing we have done is pass H.R. 1, which, Mr. Zandi, JOHN MCCAIN's advisor, says will cost us 700,000 jobs.

So I'm hopeful that we can pursue, in a bipartisan basis, the Make It in America agenda, expand our manufacturing capability, grow those jobs that pay well, and provide good benefits, and make America the kind of country it has been, is now, and we want to be in the future.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for focusing America's attention on this critical agenda.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you very much, Mr. HOYER. And we thank you for your leadership on this entire agenda because this is about middle class America. This is the middle class America that was rapidly disappearing over the last 15 to 20 years as we exported American manufacturing jobs. Your agenda, the Make It in America agenda, brings those jobs back to America.

I will note that there are a couple of pieces of legislation that you could add to that list.

Mr. HOYER. These are, of course, the ones that we have already passed and that have been signed into law. But you have a very important piece of legislation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I'll come to the future, but I'd like to add one to the past, and that is, in the legislation that we passed last December, without any Republican votes, there was a provision that gave to every business in America the opportunity to immediately write off, against their taxes, 100 percent of a capital investment. So if they wanted to expand their business they could write off immediately, not depreciate over several years, but immediately. Not a Republican vote for that.

There was also in that piece of legislation, actually in a previous piece of legislation, a tax provision, one of the things we talk about here on our agen-

da, that would eliminate a tax break that American corporations had when they offshored a job. When they sent a job offshore, American corporations received about \$12 billion in tax breaks every year. Well, what's that about? We eliminated it. Again, we had no help from our colleagues on the Republican side.

So our agenda started way before this year. We're going to carry it forward with your leadership. And we've got an agenda here of seven different elements in that, tax policy being one of them.

Thank you so much for your leadership on all of this.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I thank you for yielding again, but simply to say I thank you for your leadership. You have been one of the most faithful, effective, and articulate spokespersons for an agenda for middle and working class Americans.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You're kind, but Mr. TONKO's been there this entire time. Let me turn back to Mr. TONKO. Thank you very much, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, STENY. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI.

I think the tragedy that results from the lack of vision by the new Republican majority in this House, the sadness that results, is that not only is it near 3 months of a new regime with zero numbers of bills as a number of bills that's been approved that would create jobs—that would be bad enough. But it's dismantling success that's been achieved in the last couple of years. That translates into jobs, the health care industry, the innovation economy, dismantling that, disinvesting in America. That's even worse. Instead of standing still, which is tragic, we're going backward, backward, that takes us into what could be the recession of the recent past that was 8.2 million jobs lost.

We need to invest. Now, it's a no brainer to assume that if you put R&D into play—and they've dismantled R&D, education, higher education, health care—all of this impacts jobs and the potential to compete with the muscle that America needs.

The American public is asking for hope to be built into the fabric of this Nation. We have advanced that message of hope. We're talking about making it in America. We're talking about investing in R&D. Why? Because where R&D takes place is probably where manufacturing follows.

It makes sense to incorporate the R&D elements with the manufacturing sector. That's a given in the current economy, in the present day industry. So we need to invest. We need to invest in R&D, rather than cutting drastically the programs that will lead to energy research.

I served at NYSERDA as president and CEO, the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority. I saw what happened with job creation when you create new shelf opportunities, new product lines. And this R&D

effort is about taking ideas and moving them along. You prototype, you test, you evaluate, and then you manufacture. And we need to carry those steps through. We need to fund them, we need to invest. It's going to take that kind of effort to grow the economy and grow it in a way that allows us to have reasonable expectation to win the global race on energy, clean energy, and innovation.

You don't dismantle education by making drastic cuts. You don't undo the opportunity to dream of a higher education and advance your skill set and allow your dreams to be met, to be tethered.

□ 1620

Instead, you invest. We have not done that. I represent a necklace of communities called mill towns that were established with the Erie Canal, Barge Canal District. We created a port out of a little town called New York City, and we developed the westward movement through the mill towns that were established in the district that I represent.

That pioneer spirit where these mill towns became the epicenter of invention and innovation still exists. It is still part of the American DNA. And America knows that if we invest, if we instill hope into the equation, they are there. We know that we can make it happen, but it takes the sort of investment and not the denial that we have seen in this House where zero jobs are the result of zero bills being passed here that would promote an American Make It in America campaign, where we would have an American industrial bolstering by this kind of effort.

America knows that this is not the action that they called for. This kind of standing still is not good, because it takes us backwards. It takes us backward when we need to build upon the progress that was achieved over the last year where 1.5 million sector jobs were added to the equation. We can do it. We can do it in significant measure. We can do it in cutting-edge fashion where we advance the intellectual capacity of this great Nation, where we are continually investing in the brain power, and we are not tapping into it.

Patents are going off shore. Why are we standing here now talking about continuing the mindless effort of subsidies, handouts to big oil companies to the tune of \$100 billion, when that could be denied and we could invest, fungibly move those dollars over to investing in R&D for new product delivery so we are not dependent on an oil industry, we are not dependent on disruption in the Mid East, but rather controlling our own energy future, self-sufficiency energy independence.

Those are the thematic. Those are the dynamics that should guide us. I don't see that here. We are walking away from it. We are walking away from the sound faith we should have in America's workers.

Look what is happening in Wisconsin. Workers are revolting. We need

to respect workers. We need to understand that they are the solution.

Let's invest in America. Let's invest in Make It America, and let's turn this around. America is placing its hope in the leaders here, and to have the results be zero jobs because zero bills were introduced and passed is unacceptable. And the majority needs to account for the 700,000 jobs they want to kill simply by the cuts they are making to the budget that has been presented.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, your passion and knowledge on this is extraordinary and so well placed.

If we look at what has happened here on the floor in the last 11 weeks, it has only been about destroying jobs immediately. The continuing resolution that was passed by the Republicans 4 weeks ago actually would destroy, if it became law—fortunately, it hasn't—would destroy 700,000 jobs.

And it's not just those immediate jobs that are lost. As you so correctly point out, the key investments in tomorrow's economy were similarly destroyed. The research agenda for the energy economy was wiped out. The program called ARPA-E, Advanced Research in Energy policy, the program, was wiped out. Those are where the clean energy jobs, those are where the conservation, where the new lights, the new energy systems that we need to deal with the reality of our dependence on foreign oil and the climate change issue, just wiped them out.

Similarly, in the National Institutes of Health, where you are talking about cancer research, research in diabetes, the things that hold back the American economy, because people do get sick. And when they are sick, they are not able to work. So this whole array of research, which is one of the fundamental ingredients of future economic growth, was wiped out by the Republican agenda.

Just today, if I might just add this piece to it, I was looking at the details of the continuing resolution which passed this House some 50 minutes ago. On agricultural research, we know that we have a food crisis coming up. There are going to be 7 billion people in this world. We have a food crisis that is imminent; and in fact, much of the disruption that is going on in the Middle East is in part due to the price of food. There are food shortages. Agricultural research to the tune of over \$220 million to \$230 million wiped out. Where are we going to get the food for future generations? They like to talk about that.

One final point before I turn it back to you is all of this discussion about the deficit. We have to deal with the deficit. But you can't deal with the deficit by cutting off the ability of the American economy to grow and to perform in the years ahead. So it is the research, it is the Pell Grants for education. All of those things are critical for tomorrow's economic growth.

And you cannot deal with the deficit in 1 year. This is a multiyear program.

Therefore, we need to be very careful where we are spending our money so that we create the jobs for tomorrow and we create the opportunity for America to make it, to make things in America once again.

Mr. TONKO?

Mr. TONKO. I will make this one point. Obviously, it is about investments. Not spending, investments. Expecting lucrative dividends, lucrative returns. And who is this cutting frenzy an attack on? It is an attack on middle class America. It is an attack on children, it is an attack on working families, it is an attack on our seniors. And we only get here what we are wanting to invest here. I think that we can go forward with the soundness of policy and a resourcefulness of investments made that allow us to carry us, transition us into a new economy designed intentionally to grow the potential of this Nation.

That is what America wants from us, and I think this attack is a tremendously cold-hearted attack on America's working families. It is going to destroy our middle class. Without a strong middle class, there is not a strong America.

Someone needs to create the products, build the products; someone needs to purchase the products. And without a strong middle class, without strong purchasing power for that middle class, that story is over. So let's move on. Let's march forward with Make It in America.

It is great to join you, Representative GARAMENDI, for this Special Order.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, if I could just pick up on one of the issues you raised, which is the ways in which we spend our money.

Now, we all pay gasoline tax. Right now, it seems as though we are being taxed by the oil companies an extra 50 cents or \$1 because the price of gasoline is way up there, but actually the Federal tax on gasoline is about 18.5 cents and on diesel some 25 cents. That money is used to build our infrastructure, our streets, our roads, the interstate highway system, as well as trains, buses, and the like.

The question is, where do we spend that money? Now, previously we would spend that money on buses that were made overseas. We would spend that money on trains and light rail cars that were made overseas. But our agenda here is to bring it home to America. If it is our tax money, we want that money to be spent on things that are made in America. Let me give you a couple of examples on transportation.

Buses: Are they made in America? Our tax money, is it being used to purchase buses that are made in America? It can be. I have a bill that I have introduced that says if it is our tax money, it is going to be spent on American-made equipment. It happens to be the exact same policy that China is following, and it is a good policy.



You have talked about solar and you have talked about wind, the energy future of tomorrow. People and economists that look at the energy issues say that if we go to renewable energy, clean energy sources, we can have an enormous new economy in America. But if we fail to take up the challenge, that economy will be overseas.

How can we jump-start the American economy in the new energy sector? We can do it by using our tax money to support American-made solar systems, whether they are panels like this or the new solar thermal programs, the wind systems. It's our tax money that is allowing these systems to be built.

But are those American-made? My legislation would say, yes, they must be American made. I will give you one example of where this has worked, and this is the President's agenda on high-speed rail. It happens to be mine. I introduced a piece of legislation in California in 1989 that established the High-Speed Rail Commission. We need to do that. And in the legislation, and this was the Recovery Act, the stimulus, it said: money for high-speed rail must be spent on American-made equipment. So Siemens, Austin, other companies are establishing manufacturing facilities in America. We can do it with wise public policy.

I know that you have talked about this and you have introduced some legislation of your own. So if you would share with us your views on how this is working.

Mr. TONKO. Well, I think that it is important for us to make certain that we create the renewable industry here in this country.

You talked about the challenges of competing with China. Let's look at the proof in the pudding. Let's take a look at what it looked like in 2008.

Private sector investment in the United States was at some \$32 billion and China was at about \$23 billion in terms of private sector investment and renewables. Then fast forward to the next year in 2009, and it flipped. China was at \$35 billion, and we are down to \$19 billion. We need to be certain we can compete, and we can compete effectively by investing.

It is there. The clarion wake-up calls are sounding, and we need to heed them. We need to listen to those alarms that are going off, telling us that without investing into the future, we are going to lose the race.

So I want to put a hopeful spin on this. I think that our efforts as Democrats in this House to make it in America are right on. It is what the doctor ordered. We are talking about investing in a clean energy innovation economy, we are talking about investing in higher ed, in R&D. That is how we win it. We win it by a complete commitment to an agenda that is well documented through the years.

It is no different now. If we want to win this global race on innovation, we need to march forward aggressively with the resources and with passionate

resolve, and we can win it. I believe in my heart we can win it. We just need to commit to the American public that is counting on us to provide the hope at their doorstep.

□ 1630

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. TONKO. You are a tremendous representative of New York State and America. Your passion for the build it in America, Make It in America agenda, is so very obvious. We thank you for that.

I want to wrap this session up by going back to what we dealt with on the floor earlier today. Earlier today, we dealt with a continuing resolution that would go for 3 weeks, and it has a series of cuts in it. Some of those cuts are appropriate. Some of them are very, very detrimental.

For example, about \$120 million of reduction in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. That is where we get information on tsunamis. That is where we get information on hurricanes. Why we would cut that out, I have no idea. It is going to be very, very detrimental to America.

On research, we have talked about that, not only in this bill. Agricultural research, so we can move forward once more with a new green revolution so that there will be food for the people of this world and for ourselves, that was cut out of this budget.

And if you love to have germs and other problems with your food, well, you will love what the Republicans did earlier this afternoon when they cut some \$24 million out of the animal and plant inspection services. Why we want to have contaminated food, I don't know, but apparently our Republican colleagues do know. So, anyway, that has been done.

But if you take the whole thing in context, I want to point out here that in December, with the continuing resolution in December that was a Democratic-sponsored resolution to continue funding the government for about 3 months, we cut \$41 billion out of the budget; \$41 billion out of the budget.

Now, when the Republicans came in, they decided to do a new resolution a couple of weeks ago, and that resolution would actually eliminate some 700,000 jobs in America. Is it going to lead to a solution to the deficit? Not really, because we are talking about the discretionary spending, which is a very, very small part of the American budget. As such, there is no way you can really solve the deficit problem in that way.

Yes, we need to make reductions. That is why we did \$41 billion back in December. But those were targeted cuts that continued to allow America to invest in those things that create jobs.

We are now into a new set of continuing resolutions, 2 weeks 2 weeks ago, another 3 weeks this week. That is no way to run a government, but that is apparently what we have been reduced to.

Now, I understand the argument that we didn't get an appropriation bill last fall. Why wasn't there an appropriation bill last fall? The reason is that it was blocked in the Senate by a handful of folks that threatened a filibuster. That is why we don't have a resolution. That is why we have been thrown into this continuing resolution problem.

What we need to do is take the long term. In President Obama's budget, the long-term deficit is dealt with over a period of 5 years, bringing down the deficit to a point where it is an acceptable part of the American economy. It allows the economy to grow with investments that are made now in infrastructure, education, investments made in research and development, so that we can grow the economy for tomorrow. That is a wise way to do it. But a feeding frenzy of cuts that actually would eliminate 700,000 jobs is not the way you grow the American economy.

We have to be wise. We have to have the long term. And we have had the long term before. During the Clinton administration, we actually balanced the budget for the last 2½ years of that administration; and had those policies gone forward during the Bush administration, had those policies been kept in place, we would have eliminated the American debt. It would have been gone.

But those policies were radically changed by the George W. Bush administration; two tax cuts, not paid for, most of those benefits going to the high end of the economy, to the very, very wealthy, resulting in a significant increase in the deficit; and then an increase in the Medicare program for drug benefits, again not paid for, increasing the deficit; and two wars, neither of which were paid for, the Afghanistan war and the Iraq war, not paid for but, rather, borrowed money from China and other places.

The result of that was an enormous increase in the deficit followed by the Great Recession, which was basically caused by greed, Wall Street greed and the elimination of regulation. It was as though you had an NFL football game and you wiped out the sidelines, you took the referees off the field, sent them back to the locker room, and said, Okay, play ball, boys. You know what would happen. Chaos. That is what we got in the financial sector when regulation was removed, and we wound up with the Great Recession.

We need to put in place sound regulation, good regulation, and we need to have the referees on the field. We also need to have a long-term vision on how to deal with the deficit, and you cannot do it by just, in a feeding frenzy, wiping out critical programs that create future economic growth. Unfortunately, that is what our Republican colleagues have suggested we do.

We are not there yet. H.R. 1, the resolution that would have lost 700,000 jobs, was stopped in the Senate. We are now into a process of short-term continuing

resolutions to keep the government going.

Be wise as you put forward those resolutions, I would ask my colleagues on the Republican side. It is a great challenge. It is a challenge that we must and we will meet. We need a balanced, long-term vision, bringing the economy along, allowing it to grow and to build in the future, whether that be the green tech economy of the future, the medical systems, the health care systems. We have great opportunity, but those opportunities will not be met if we are not wise and if we have the wrong kinds of deficit reduction plans, which, again, we saw today on this floor not more than an hour ago.

I thank my colleagues for their participation.

#### CELEBRATING WOMEN'S HISTORY

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me this opportunity to talk about a subject I really love, and that is history, especially women's history.

I think all too often as we grew up as children, our history books failed to mention the courageous activities of women throughout the Nation and throughout the world. Somehow we learned about men, but all too often not about women. But when we did learn about women, we didn't learn what they really were all about.

Growing up as a little girl, I grew up in an era where women were not really allowed to do all the things we could do today. We weren't allowed to run marathons or drive race cars or be in the pits at the Indianapolis 500 as a press person. We weren't allowed in Rotaries. It was just not something women were allowed to do. Why, shoot, women weren't even allowed to vote until 1920. In fact, the first woman that served in this House served there 2 full years before women had the right to vote.

And when you think about all the things that happened in this last century, we have to look to a century before to see, wow, who were the folks that really made this happen, because it just didn't happen overnight.

In the hallway out in the Rotunda there is what I think is the best statue, and it is the statue of the pioneers for women's suffrage. It is an extraordinary piece of artwork, one that depicts the likenesses of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, and Susan B. Anthony, arguably the women who pushed the button for women today to have true equal rights with men.

□ 1640

These were the most pro-women feminists in the history of America. And as you will see in a few moments, the rest of the story, as Paul Harvey

would say, for Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony was just not written when I was a little girl.

I would like to begin this hour by referring to a few quotes from a couple of these four mothers that truly show where they stood in history with what I believe is the most pro-feminine issue, and that's the issue of abortion. You see, Mr. Speaker, every one of us has the right to life, born and unborn. And it is the women who have the responsibility to make sure that that baby is born. Unfortunately, our courts over 38 years ago decided to change that and said that women had the right to end that life. But, Mr. Speaker, we don't have that right. It is our responsibility to bear those children. And these four mothers knew that.

In a letter to Julia Ward Howe in 1873, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the woman who shocked society, Mr. Speaker, by daring to leave her house proudly showing her pregnancy—because that was just not done—wrote: "When we consider that women are treated as property, it is degrading to women to treat our children as property to be disposed of as we see fit."

When I was a child in school learning about the issues of women's suffrage and women's rights, I knew Elizabeth Cady Stanton was pro-woman, pro-freedom pioneer, but I didn't know she was pro-life. I didn't know she was pro-life until a few years ago. She was hardly alone in her pro-life views. As you can see, Susan B. Anthony also expressed her thoughts about pro-life in the publication "The Revolution":

"Guilty? Yes. No matter what the motive, love of ease, or a desire to save from suffering the unborn innocent, the woman is awfully guilty who commits the deed. It will burden her conscience in life; it will burden her soul in death."

Mr. Speaker, those words were written over 150 years ago, and yet they could easily be written today. Because today, Mr. Speaker, we hear from women who have had the painful tragedy of abortion on their soul, and they talk about how their heart weeps because of the life that they gave up and how they want not just to forgive themselves but to protect women from that awful decision that they made to protect other women from the suffering that they have. And yet Susan B. Anthony knew that years ago. So, you see, in history, pro-life was an issue.

You have to think about it, Mr. Speaker, and you have to think it makes sense because the whole issue of abortion, it just didn't come about in the 21st century. It came about centuries ago. Unfortunately, indiscretions have happened throughout history. And when indiscretions happen, babies are created, and then the issue becomes what do you do to hide the dirty little secret. Are you like Hester Prynne in Nathaniel Hawthorne's, "The Scarlet Letter," where you put her in prison and then put her out into the wilderness, trying to hide Pearl,

her beautiful daughter; in the end, only knowing that Pearl became the most beautiful little girl?

What was Nathaniel Hawthorne saying about the pregnancy? What was he saying about the birth of that child? Was he saying that child had the right to life or was Nathaniel Hawthorne thinking other things? We don't know. We can only wonder why he put her in prison and why he chastised her to the wilderness, but the point was they wanted to hide the secret. And because she chose to have the child, that secret was going to be born.

So for people like Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton in the 1860s to say, wait a minute; women should have the right to get married, to get divorced, to raise their children, and, oh, by the way, have their children, own property, be able to vote; we shouldn't be surprised that protecting the child and the birth of that child was part of their platform.

Today, in 2011, I am very proud to stand here and carry on with their message, because today, ever more so, the assault of life is all around us. And I believe that assault to life is there because we don't recognize the meaning of life at its conception. And when you compromise it at its conception, I think you question the validity of life all the way through to its end.

Each year—and I'm so proud to represent the Second Congressional District of Ohio—I am really proud of the hundreds of thousands of people that come out to the lawn on the Capitol on probably the coldest day in January to petition Congress to end abortion. It's called the Right to Life March. In the 5 years that I have been in Congress, standing with them, we've yet to have a decent day. Sometimes it's just cold. Sometimes it's cold and snowy. Sometimes it's cold and rainy. But it's always cold.

And I stand out on a platform, and I'm there for maybe an hour, but they're standing there for hours. Kids from schools are coming up in buses, traveling all night, getting off the bus, only to stand on cold ground, only to get back on that bus and go right back home and go right back to school. Parents are coming with small kids, buses, cars, airplanes, caravans asking Congress to end something that is so wrong.

And as I look out on the lawn and I see these brave people, I say to myself, Wow, that's what America is all about. And among the crowd I see so many women. I believe more women than men, because women, we have the privilege to experience childbirth, and we understand firsthand what that life is like inside a womb. And I think when we do have that experience and we understand the meaning of life, it makes us want to get out and protect it so that it can have its natural right to come into the world and be the person God wants it to be. And I do this because I'm so proud of the folks that are out there, but I also do it for some folks back home.

Back when I was in high school, the whole issue of abortion began to emerge before *Roe v. Wade* because States were considering whether they should legalize abortion or not. There was a couple in Cincinnati by the name of Dr. Jack and Barbara Wilke—he a physician, she a nurse—who were at the forefront of this movement. They gathered people like my parents and other people around their coffee table to discuss how we could protect Ohio from legalizing abortion. Of course, *Roe v. Wade* hit in 1973, and the campaign escalated to a national debate.

But along the way—and they weren't the only ones, Mr. Speaker. There were people all across coffee tables all across America debating how we're going to protect life. But it was Barbara among the group. And they were talking on the telephone. It was before email and BlackBerrys and even fax machines, talking on the phone long distance with one another.

But it was Barbara at her kitchen table that said one day, Jack, I just don't understand this whole debate. My gosh, we're protected. Our Nation protects us. It's as if everybody has the right to life. And he says, Barbara, that's the name of the movement. And the name of the movement was branded: the National Right to Life movement.

Now, Barbara and Jack Wilke have served for many years in many capacities in this movement. Jack served as president of the National Right to Life Committee for well over a decade. They founded the International Right to Life Federation and wrote the "Handbook on Abortion," a book often described as the unofficial bible of the pro-life movement during the seventies and eighties.

□ 1650

They also have other groups that they work with around the world, fighting all kinds of life issues, not just for the unborn but for human trafficking and women's rights. I mention this because this couple, this simple couple from College Hill, Ohio, is just one of many across our Nation who recognizes the importance of this issue and is dedicating their lives to eradicating abortion.

So, when I stand out on that lawn on those cold January days each and every year, I look at people, and I think there are other Jack and Barbara Willkes—maybe not as famous—who are doing the same thing, hundreds and hundreds and thousands.

Then I think of Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton and of the contemporary bearers of that message like that of the Willkes, and I say, wow, there is a plan out there, and the last note on abortion hasn't been written. Alice Paul is another pretty important feminist in history. She was actually the original author of the Equal Rights Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, if you think that abortion is a hot issue, I can remember

back in the 1970s when the Equal Rights Amendment was being debated across this land and the hot issue that that was. Oh, my gosh.

Should we give women the same rights as men?

There were women who said, No, no, no. They need to be back in the home.

Then there were folks who said, No, no, no. Women need to have equal pay as men.

What are we going to do about private facilities?

Ah, it was just an awful debate because it really deflected from the real issue that all of us are God's creatures and that all of us are created equal.

So I remember Alice Paul as being at the forefront of this, and I remember the debate both in high school and college—but, man, I didn't know until a few years ago that Alice Paul was pro-life. Now, here is a woman who was painted as this equal rights, left-wing feminist. When we look at pro-life issues, we think they're conservative, right-wing issues. Yet it was Alice Paul, the original author of the Equal Rights Amendment, who stated: "Abortion is the ultimate exploitation of women." Let me repeat that. "Abortion is the ultimate exploitation of women." This is from this far-left, hard-nosed person. Add to her views the ones previously referenced, and it is difficult to see any ambiguity or confusion about where these feminists and advocates of the women's rights movement stood on the issue of abortion. Simply put, they detested abortion and went as far publicly and privately as they could in condemning it.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it seems as though their rhetoric has been largely lost over the years, hidden in the annals of history, and I just don't know why, because, if we don't understand the full depth of history, we'll never understand March 15, 2011, and the views that we debate in this very Chamber today.

It's sad because, as a little girl, I didn't know about these pioneers. I didn't know about their pro-life positions. I didn't know that they were sisters with me. I thought they were different. I thought that the folks who stood before me to give us equal rights were pro-choice. That couldn't be farther from the truth.

I think many people wrongly believe that feminism and pro-life principles are mutually exclusive and cannot be reconciled with each other; but when you look at history, you can see that they're not exclusive but inclusive because it is we, as I said earlier, who have the responsibility to have the children, to continue to procreate for the future. That is why we were put here on Earth—to have children. It is our responsibility to make sure that these children are cared for both inside the womb and out; and for a court to say it is our right to end it I think is exclusive of what we are made of. It is against what we are made of.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'll speak more, but I've had the privilege of being

joined by my good friend, the Congresswoman from North Carolina. I would like to yield as much time to the good Congresswoman as she would like.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much, my esteemed colleague from Ohio. Your comments are so pertinent to today's fight.

We are women. We are conservative women. As for those who have come before us, as you pointed out so eloquently, we don't know what they believed, but we are starting to unveil all of that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of women, to honor the rich contributions women have made in the history of this world. I want to take a moment to discuss the strong pro-life movement that my colleagues and I are continuing to fight today. I rise in support of and fight on behalf of women. In this month dedicated to women, I ask them to choose life for themselves and for their children.

The original feminists were, indeed, against abortion. These women believed that there was power in motherhood and in choosing life. Alice Paul, the author of the original Equal Rights Amendment, said it best: Abortion is the exploitation of women.

It is this exploitation by groups like Planned Parenthood that frighten me for the women of our country. It has been proven that a woman who has had an abortion is six to seven times more likely to commit suicide in the following year than a woman who chooses to deliver her child. We all know of the syndrome postpartum depression. Women who abort are 65 percent more likely than women who deliver to be at risk for long-term clinical depression. Sixty-five percent of U.S. women who had abortions experienced multiple symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder, which they attributed to their abortions. In another study, 60 percent said they felt "part of me died." Compared to women who deliver, women who abort are more than twice as likely to be subsequently hospitalized for psychiatric illnesses within 6 months and to subsequently require significantly more treatments for the psychiatric illnesses through outpatient care.

There are also numerous health risks that can occur after an abortion is performed. Reproductive complications and problems with subsequent deliveries can occur, one of these being pelvic inflammatory disease, which is a major direct cause of infertility. After an abortion, there is a 7- to 15-fold increase in placenta previa in subsequent pregnancies, which is a life-threatening condition for the mother and baby that increases the risk of birth defects, a still birth and excessive bleeding, leading to the possible loss of life of the woman.

Honestly, I could go on and on about the aftereffects of an abortion, but I think that the picture has been made quite clear.

□ 1700

The picture has been made, as Susan B. Anthony said, who believed it was not sufficient merely to denounce abortion. Anthony considered it the work of women to prevent this violation. This is the task that Susan B. Anthony gives us to continue today. Like Anthony, we, too, must challenge the status quo for the sake of women and their children. Women deserve better than abortion.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you to the gentlelady from North Carolina for so eloquently pointing out some of the dangers of abortion, both physical and emotional, and I don't think the chapter, Mr. Speaker, has been written on the dangers of abortion, but I do wonder about the lives that we've missed and the fabric, and how it has been compromised, the fabric of America, the fabric of the world, because an innocent life didn't get to be woven into it.

You know, when we're born, our parents don't know what we're going to become. They just hope that we're happy. They hope that we're healthy. I mean, if you look at our President, do you think when he was born his mom thought he was going to be the President of the United States? I seriously doubt it. He didn't come from a dynasty of Presidents. He was just an ordinary person born from an ordinary mom, but he, you know, had the opportunity and the privilege to live in America and become the President.

Our very own Speaker from Cincinnati, Ohio, I dare say, his parents never thought he would be Speaker of the House. They were ordinary people. They owned a bar. They had 12 kids. Chances are 12 kids will do 12 different things, but I don't think any of them thought they were going to be Speaker of the House. But that mother gave all those kids love, and because they lived in America, the piece of fabric that he has become resides over this wonderful body.

And I point that out because none of us knows what our children or grandchildren will become, but it's incumbent upon us to give them that chance to be the best person they can be, the best version of themselves, and that starts at conception. It doesn't start when we choose for it to start. It starts when God chooses for it to start, or if you don't want to use the term "God," nature chooses for it to start, and when you compromise that, you compromise life all the way through.

You know, as I said before, many people see feminism and pro-life issues as exclusive. Well, they're inclusive, and I would like to offer evidence of the pro-life feminists in the past, the ones that we owe so much to, because they are in large part responsible for women being able to go to college, to serve in the military, to vote, and may I dare say, stand on the floor this very evening. It is because of them that we are here today arguing for this precious position.

In a few minutes, I am going to be joined by another good lady from North Carolina, and I believe that this young lady is going to eloquently talk about her views on women in history and the pro-life movement, and I now yield to the gentlelady from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio, my colleague, for organizing this time to speak about the importance of protecting unborn children in this country.

March is national Women's History Month, and each year other Members and I of the Pro-Life Women's Caucus make a point of coming to the House floor to celebrate the achievements of women and talk about the detrimental impact of abortions on women.

Last year, it was brought to my attention that the University of North Carolina's system, which I attended, three of the universities in the system required its students to purchase health care through the university if they did not have acceptable coverage through their parents or on their own. These plans automatically enrolled students in abortion coverage, regardless of gender or their feelings regarding abortion.

Pro-life groups in North Carolina, as well as the Students for Life of America, wrote to the UNC system, as well as North Carolina Governor Bev Purdue, requesting that they not force students to purchase abortion coverage as part of their student health plan. The UNC system responded by allowing students to opt-out of abortion coverage. However, a student still pays the same amount for health care coverage regardless of whether or not abortions are included on his or her plan.

This situation was brought to my attention because the UNC system, along with at least 37 other university systems across the country, requires their students to purchase health care coverage that includes abortion. These universities are including the cost of this health care plan in the total cost of attendance, which means there may be Federal money covering these health insurance plans and thereby covering abortion.

My concerns about unborn children not only in North Carolina but across the United States prompted me to send a letter to the Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, requesting that he look into the UNC situation and determine if, in fact, taxpayer money was being used to purchase these health insurance plans. Secretary Duncan responded last month and said the Department of Education was not able to determine if students were able to use Federal, also known as taxpayer, student aid money to purchase these health insurance plans, which can include abortion coverage.

This is unacceptable. There should be no question whatsoever that taxpayer money should not be used to purchase abortion coverage, regardless of whether it is through a student health plan

at a university or at an abortion clinic. I will continue to work with the Department and the UNC system to ensure that taxpayer money is not being used to pay for abortions.

As a Christian, I am adamantly opposed to the practice of abortion, and I'm especially opposed to American taxpayers being forced to pay for it. This is why last month I voted with 239 of my colleagues to stop subsidizing Planned Parenthood's radical abortion agenda with taxpayer money. In 2009 alone, Planned Parenthood reported that the organization performed over 332,000 abortions nationwide, and in the next 2 years will require each and every one of its 87 affiliates to have at least one abortion clinic.

The vast majority of my constituents do not want their hard-earned money paying for abortions, and as their elected Representative, I will continue fighting to protect unborn children and taxpayers from the scourge of abortion.

Congresswoman SCHMIDT, I have here a chart that I'd like to make sure people watching can see. This is from a Quinnipiac poll in December 2009. It is a little hard to read Quinnipiac down here, but it was a poll that asked women: Do you support or oppose allowing abortions to be paid for by public funds under a health care reform bill? Only 25 percent of the women polled said they support it, 70 percent opposed, and 5 percent didn't know or didn't care. That is an astounding number to have.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Especially for women because we're always cast as the ones that really want abortion, and it's the men that don't want it, but you're telling me that 70 percent of the women in that December 2009 study adamantly opposed Federal funding of abortion under the health care bill?

□ 1710

Ms. FOXX. That's correct. I'm sorry I couldn't be on the floor for your entire presentation. I was in the Rules Committee and could not leave to come down. But as I came in, I heard you talking about the fact that pro-life women can be feminists, and I think that's very important for us to point out. I do quote from Alice Paul, who worked very hard for equality for women, who said, "Abortion is the ultimate exploitation of women." And I think that as we work hard to see that women are treated equally in our society under the law that we make sure that they are not exploited by abortion.

And there is another quote from Elizabeth Cady Stanton. I don't know if you have used it. But she said, "When we consider that women are treated as property, it is degrading to women that we should treat our children as property to be disposed of as we see fit." That was in a letter to Julia Ward Howe in October 1873 and was recorded in Howe's diary.

I think, again, that it's so important that women be here during Women's

History Month to speak in favor of rights for women and that we point out that we are opposed to abortion, which is the ultimate exploitation of women.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you so much. I am really glad that you took the time to point out that survey, because I believe that the Nation has shifted its opinion on abortions since 1973. And maybe it's because with technology and the fact that sonograms can now show us the color of a baby's eyes and what it's going to look like inside the mom's womb as early as like 3 months, that we're really believing and knowing that it really is a baby. It's not this little fetus, this little mushy thing. It's really a baby. And when you see that sonogram and you see that baby inside the womb, you've got to say to yourself, How can I call this anything else but life? And I think that's probably one of the reasons why, throughout the years, public opinion has truly shifted on abortion.

A decade ago, back in 2001, there was a poll taken wherein 40 percent of the respondents identified themselves as being pro-life while 49 percent identified themselves as being pro-choice. Well, in 2005, another poll was taken. There was little movement toward the pro-life position: 42 percent said they're pro-life while 52 percent said they're pro-choice. But for some reason, in 2006, the number grew 45 to 47; and in 2008, the numbers were 46 to 48. Now maybe that's because of the prevalence of all these sonograms. And today when your daughter or your son goes in with his wife for the sonogram, the grandparents and great grandparents go, too. It didn't happen a decade ago. But, oh, my gosh, it's a family thing because we can't wait to see what the baby is. And we are told to cover our eyes at that one moment if you don't want to know what the sex of the baby is. Believe me, I couldn't tell anyway. But I have gone twice and had to close my eyes twice. And I think because the family is involved in this whole sonogram with the birth of the baby, that all of our eyes are beginning to light up and say, Wow, that really is a life. In just 3 months' time, it's a real baby.

In May 2009, 51 percent of those polled identified themselves as being pro-life where only 42 percent responded that they were pro-choice. Now, the latest poll I could find on the subject was conducted in January of this year, just a couple of months ago; and it was consistent with the 2009 poll. Half the respondents said they were pro-life. The numbers become even more definitive when it comes to public funding or taxpayer moneys going towards the funding of abortions, even indirectly.

This is a very real and timely debate as we struggle today to tackle our enormous deficit and debt which, Mr. Speaker, if we don't get under control will reshape this country in a way that I don't believe will allow our children to have at least as equal an oppor-

tunity as us, if not to have a better opportunity than us. But that's a debate for another day on the debt and deficit.

When I first got here in September of 2005, the very first person I wanted to meet was Henry Hyde of Illinois because he was my hero. You see, after *Roe v. Wade*, people at my kitchen table and in my family were talking about money, Federal money being used for abortion. My mom and dad were mad; and, shoot, even I was mad. And Henry Hyde was mad, too.

In 1976, he offered the Hyde amendment, and it simply said that Federal taxpayer dollars were barred from funding abortion, period, case closed. And that amendment has been consistent with the policy of this House ever since. So I wanted to meet that hero, that gentle man. And when you walk into my office, you see a picture of him and me on the last day that he served in this House. Of all the people that I have ever met, he is truly my hero.

Anyway, every year we debate this. Even in the health care bill, it was a hotly contested issue. And after the bill was voted on, the President had an executive order that at this point still stops the Federal funding of abortion in health care, we believe. But that's a very fragile piece of paper, and I really believe this body needs to recodify in the health care bill that no money will ever be spent for abortion and no insurance policies will have any Federal dollars attached to it that would allow for abortions to occur. But that's something I believe we have to work on this year, Mr. Speaker.

And even today in this body as we voted on the CR, the issue of abortion was there. Do we put it in the CR and stop the Federal funding of abortion or not? You know, we have a lot of pro-life leaders in the House. They have looked at the budget very, very shrewdly; and they have determined that if we don't put these protections in place, Federal funding will slip into the budget in the future. And that's why they are so adamant about putting out bills and provisions in CRs that would stop the Federal funding of abortion.

One of the latest initiatives to receive a full vote in the House was an amendment introduced by my good friend from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) that would prohibit Federal funding for Planned Parenthood, which happens to be the largest abortion provider in the country. Now, I know what you are going to say, Well, they have a separate wall, and they're really only using the money for women's health issues. They're not using it for abortion. But we know money is fungible, and we know in a building, you can't really dissect how much energy costs are going to one side of the building and how much are going to the other. We know that while, yeah, the actual procedure isn't using Federal money, we know that the building is. So it's fungible, and it's slipping through.

But a few weeks ago when we had the CR, his amendment received, I think, 239 votes out of this body that said, No, Planned Parenthood shouldn't receive the money. And you know, Mr. Speaker, maybe it's a bigger debate than just the abortion issue because what we saw last fall was a sting operation that showed where in some cases, abortion clinics, Planned Parenthood clinics across the country were actually talking about or ignoring the fact that people were coming in about human trafficking and saying there was a human trafficking issue, and if the underage girl got pregnant, how could they get an abortion. And the gal at the desk didn't think there seemed to be a problem with that conversation.

□ 1720

Now, I'm not saying that Planned Parenthood International condones it, and I'm sure that they don't, but I'm saying that there were clinics at which this conversation occurred. I know in my own hometown in Cincinnati, Ohio, where in 2 cases there were young girls that went to the Planned Parenthood clinic on Auburn Avenue, and both told the abortion provider they were underage and they were pregnant, one by her father, one by a coach. The father's now in jail. And the situation with the parents was, they didn't know the coach took her to the abortion clinic. He signed the document that said, oh, I'm the legal guardian, and it wasn't until later when she went to the doctor on another issue that the doctor said—When did your daughter have an abortion?—that this whole thing exploded. And right now it's in court. They're going after the coach, and they're trying to go after Planned Parenthood because the girl said, I'm 15.

So maybe Planned Parenthood shouldn't have our money if they're not careful stewards about people that are coming through their doors, because a 15-year old that's pregnant, well, I think that's called statutory rape, no matter who the father was. And if a girl comes in at 15 we should be asking questions—How did you get pregnant? Who was the father? What happened?—because that's breaking the law.

So above the fact that we have a looming deficit and a looming debt, above the fact that I believe that money is fungible with Planned Parenthood, above the fact that in some cases they have people that go into clinics and they have a lady or a guy at the desk that doesn't understand what human trafficking is all about, maybe they shouldn't have the money, because when it's right in their eye, they simply choose to ignore the issue.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of pro-life people in America, and there are a lot of pro-life people in this House. And I think it is time that we discussed this issue more openly, because people of this Nation understand that all life is precious, including the life of the unborn. They also understand that our

money comes from taxpayers, and taxpayers expect us to do the right things with their money, and that means protecting life at all costs.

One of the things that I want to say before I wrap up—and we talked about polling—is that there have been multiple polls conducted on the subject within the last year of Federal funds and abortion. Two that I want to highlight were conducted by CNN and Quinipiac. Now, CNN is hardly a right-wing organization. But the CNN poll showed that 60 percent of Americans oppose public moneys going to fund abortion. That's well over a majority. The Quinipiac poll shows 72 percent oppose it. Wow, that's a lot of Americans.

I believe that we need to do the right thing and end the public funding of abortion whether it's in the health care bill, any bill that comes here, or any moneys that go overseas.

Like the feminists, the pro-life women of the past, pro-life women today simply believe that we are all afforded the right to life. It is not a gift from our government; it is a gift from our Lord. He is the one that has allowed us to stand here in America and across the world. He is the one that has said to us, He wants us to be in His image and His likeness. It is our Lord that wants us to be the best person we can be. And if we are to be the best person we can be, we have to ensure that each other has that same chance whether it's a little seed in a womb that is 20 minutes old or it's an elderly person in a nursing home. All of us are equal in the Lord's eyes. All of us have the right to life.

So I am proud to stand here today, like my sisters before me—like Elizabeth Cady Stanton, like Susan B. Anthony and, yes, like Alice Paul—and say, enough's enough. Women's rights are women's rights, and if a woman has rights, those rights are the child's rights because everybody has the right to life.

#### CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives and also to have listened in on the presentation over the previous hour, the Republican Women for Life, led by Congresswoman SCHMIDT, who has relentlessly stood up for the innocent unborn. I certainly support that cause and lend my voice to it, although I don't know that there's much to be added after the presentation that I've just heard. I'm just thankful that it's in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that your ear has been tuned to it, Mr. Speaker, and that the ear of the American people is tuned to that message as well.

I have a couple of subjects that I wanted to discuss here within the up-

coming 30 minutes that's been allotted. The first one is to speak to the vote that we've just had here on the floor on the continuing resolution for extending the funding for this government for an additional 3 weeks. It is known as a clean CR.

This House came together to work its will on H.R. 1. We debated that continuing resolution, which would be designed to fund this government for the balance of the fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's really important that you and the American people are reminded that we're in this condition of this debate over this continuing resolution because the Pelosi Congress didn't do business as directed and as framed under the Constitution of the United States.

The Pelosi Congress continued to digress when it first opened up here in January of 2007, after the majority and the gavel was passed right behind me where you are, Mr. Speaker. This Congress functioned for the first few weeks pretty much the same as it had under the previous Speaker.

But in that transition that took place, the rules began to get changed, and there were fewer and fewer opportunities for Members to weigh in. The committees began to function less and less. More and more bills were written out of the Speaker's office, and as this unfolded, the rules changed. They took away—one of the things was an open rule under the appropriations process so that Members couldn't offer their amendments and force a debate and a vote on an issue of their concern.

The appropriations bills have always been the tool that allowed Members to work their will on the package that came from committee. Well, that went away. That was taken away, I just presume it was, by order of the Speaker, Speaker PELOSI.

So the House was no longer able to work its will. Bills came down under a closed rule. Appropriations bills came down under, well, modified closed rule, and then they didn't come down at all. Then they turned into omnibus spending bills or they turned into continuing resolutions, and this government limped along, without having the opportunity to gather together from across this country the collective wisdom of the 435 Members of Congress, as informed by our constituents.

□ 1730

So the Congress became dysfunctional. One of the things that is a result of that is the legacy today of having to be in this business now of seeking to put Congress back on its tracks again in the fashion that the Constitution frames and the tradition of functional Congresses direct us. That has been the mission of Speaker BOEHNER, and he has been very clear about this to make this Congress work again. Because of that commitment, it brought about the debate on H.R. 1, which debated all the funding of the Federal Government for the balance of this fis-

cal year and allowed it under an open rule.

There were hundreds of amendments that were offered by Members that had 4 years of pent-up frustration, Democrats and Republicans alike, that had a voice that wanted to be heard, votes that we wanted to see cast, and a message that helped shape, let's say, the political consensus of this body before a bill goes over to the United States Senate.

We worked through that bill for over 90 hours of debate. Of the hundreds of amendments that were offered, there were a good number that were passed, and some of them shut off funding to certain pieces of policy. But it was the will of the House wrapped up in the result of the passage of H.R. 1 that went over to the Senate. That was the first offer, and it was the best offer of the House so far, and it reflects the will of the House of Representatives and the House of Representatives designed, by definition, to reflect the will of the American people.

So I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that we are in this debate and in this discussion over continuing resolutions: the continuing resolution that was passed in the lame duck session that carried this Congress until March 4 of this year and the 2-week "clean CR" that funded this government for 2 weeks that is set to expire on the night of March 18. They've extended now a 3-week "clean CR" that extends the funding an additional 3 weeks under similar terms, not identical terms, to the previous continuing resolution.

That is the scenario that we are in, Mr. Speaker, and we are in this scenario because Congress wasn't doing its job from 2007 on up until we gaveled in here in January of 2011.

There is a 4-year period of time where, in 2007, it wasn't too bad when it started. It digressed progressively until it became as close to completely dysfunctional as the Congress has been, at least in my understanding of the history. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I have lived a fair amount, and I have studied the rest of it, although I wouldn't present myself as being a congressional scholar and historian on all of the detail, but that is generally what has taken place.

Now we have Speaker BOEHNER putting this Congress back on the tracks. And, yes, there were some growing pains going through those 90-plus hours of debate on the continuing resolution under an open rule. And, yes, some of us compromised. Many of us actually compromised to take our amendments down and negotiated a unanimous consent agreement that was negotiated in good faith. I appreciate all the effort that went into that. It was a very, very good exercise.

Democrats and Republicans alike, I heard no one argue that the process of open rules and open debate was a bad process or that it wasn't fair or that it somehow should not have been done, that we should have engaged in a

closed-rule process. No, Mr. Speaker, that was the right thing to do. And the subsequent continuing resolution, the first one for 2 weeks, was designed to buy some time for the Senate to digest H.R. 1. The one that passed here on this floor, over my vote when I voted “no” on it, is an extension of a similar philosophy with another little slice out of the cuts. So maybe, just maybe, the Senate will swallow this one bite at a time when the whole loaf seems to be too much. But, on the other hand, the leverage is diminishing as the pages on the calendar turn.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't come here tonight to belabor this issue but just to make the point that there is a reason that we are at this position with debates over continuing resolutions, and it is because the Congress didn't function in previous years and handed over this CR scenario to be taken up by March 4. We are trying to resolve this with a Senate that has been cooperative and complicit in the downward spiral of the functionality of the House of Representatives. I am not speaking on the functionality of the Senate; although, I might not be complimentary of that either, should I dig into that.

So that is the scenario that we are in. It has brought about some leverage points. It puts the House in the position where, if we choose to, we can hold our ground, and we can direct policy across to the Senate and through to the President of the United States.

We should all understand that when the majority leader in the United States Senate speaks, he is speaking in such a way that is designed to be, in a way, a mouthpiece for the President, a shield to protect the President from public criticism and to protect the President from the initiatives that start here in this House.

If Members of this House will make the argument that we can't pass legislation here that we believe in because HARRY REID won't take it in the Senate, we should be thinking in terms of: The proxy for the President in the Senate is resisting the Republican initiative, which is the will of the people that was brought about by the 87 new freshmen that have come here to support the incumbent Republicans. All the gavels in the United States House of Representatives were passed from the hands of one party into the hands of the other party. That is what has happened, the will of the people.

Mr. Speaker, we have the obligation to carry out this will of the people in conformance, though, with our best efforts and our best judgment. And that works in consultation with Democrats, as it should. It hasn't always been the case working across the aisle, and there have been times that I have been accused of that myself. I will be a little more open than I have in the past, but in the end, the House should work its will.

I stand on that principle, and I compliment the Speaker for laying that standard out. It is not going to be an

easy banner to carry. He knows that. He understands this organism of the House of Representatives. And, in spite of all of the stress that is going on here, the House is positioning itself to work its will on the Senate. Working its will on the Senate is working its will through the proxy for the President and on towards the White House.

If the President of the United States believes that all of the functions of government don't match up to his desire to protect his signature issue, ObamaCare, the American people need to know that that is his priority. My priority is to repeal it and defund it until such time as we can get a President to sign the repeal of ObamaCare. That has been my effort: to first kill the bill and then work to repeal it. We are about 1½ years into this effort, and I will continue my effort as intensively as I need to and for as long as it takes until the day comes when we can actually celebrate: free at last, free from the yoke of the socialized medicine policy called ObamaCare and free to exercise our liberty that I believe has been unjustly taken from us by the legislation. And something, too: two Federal courts have found it unconstitutional.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is my little editorial here. I haven't worked out a smooth transition into the next subject matter, but it occurs to me, as I stand here, that it has been a little while since I addressed you on the subject of immigration and that it has been a little bit quiet in the House of Representatives on the subject of immigration.

So I want to raise this point and have this discussion, and it is this: We are looking at numbers that show still millions of illegals here in the United States, about 60 percent of whom came across the border illegally, about 40 percent of whom overstayed their visas. And it is odd that the number of illegals is reported by the Department of Homeland Security to be less than it has been over the previous 8 years that I have been here in this Congress.

When I came here, the number was 12 million illegals here in the United States. I have gone down to the border many times. I have sat in on hearings year after year, week after week, where expert witnesses come forward and testify, and they will testify that, of the net numbers of people that are interdicted coming across the border, they would perhaps stop one out of four of those. And it is not too hard to extrapolate those numbers: 3 to 5 years ago would come to 4 million illegal border crossings in a year, of which they contend that they stop about one out of four. I think they said perhaps they catch one out of three or one out of four. That would be the under-oath testimony of one of the representatives of the Border Patrol. I think that number may or may not be higher now.

But I would go down to the border, and the agents down there would tell me, 25 percent? 10 percent has to come first, a 10 percent effectiveness rate.

Now, one could argue whether 10 percent is the right number, and I hear

numbers less than that, too, or whether 25 percent is the right number. What it says that, I don't think anybody contends that the effectiveness rate of the full list of Border Patrol officers we have all across our southern border is interdicting a number that would be approaching even half of those that attempt to cross the border. And those attempts to cross the border are probably down from the data that I have given you from 4 or 5 years ago.

But think of 4 million illegal border crossings. Think of those attempts. Think of stopping perhaps 1 million, and now there are 3 million in the United States in a year. And that 3 million number is going to grow. Now, some of them go back to their home country again, and they cross multiple times; that is true.

But if we had 12 million illegals in 2003 and we have less than 12 million illegals today, according to Janet Napolitano's Department of Homeland Security, what happened to all those people? We were accumulating people for all of these last 8 years. And if somehow by some miracle or some mystery of nature of humanity we don't accumulate illegals in America when we have large numbers of them coming in here, I suppose you could chalk it up to a death rate or a self-deportation rate.

But, Mr. Speaker, we got to 12 million somehow. They came from somewhere. And people agree that 12 million was the illegal number—at least it was the floor, not the ceiling. I have always thought it was higher.

□ 1740

But if in the years prior to 2003 we accumulated 12 million illegals, and if we are watching 4 million illegal border crossings a year, that might even be a peak, and maybe that number is down by a third or so now, and a large percentage get into the United States, and a significant percentage of them stay here, the 12 million gets to be a bigger number, not a smaller number.

How did Janet Napolitano come up with a number lower than 12 million? That is a question I would like to ask her, if she would stop before the Immigration Subcommittee so we could have that conversation. But I think the number is larger than 12 million. I have always thought it was larger than 12 million since I have been in this Congress, and I don't think that reduction shows the real population that is here.

And as we look at the enforcement ratio that they show us on the southern border, it will show that they are stopping fewer and fewer illegals on the border. The Department of Homeland Security contends that because there is less interaction with our agents and illegals, that that says that there are fewer illegals. Well, that might be the case. But it also might be the case that there are just less arrests, fewer interdictions.

But I do think that when you double the number of Border Patrol agents,

which we have done and then some on the southern border, they are out there competing to be able to make those arrests and make those pickups. So I think the natural order of our law enforcement officers, they will still be doing the enforcement.

But also it pushes people out away from those highly concentrated enforcement areas, those areas like El Paso, for example, and puts them through places in the desert that aren't watched as closely.

So I ask the question: I used to hear testimony that would show that there were several hundred people that died in the desert trying to sneak into the United States, and as that number would grow, it would be 200 a year, then 250 a year, and a number that I recall that went up to 450 a year. Now, that is data that is more than 5 years old, and I haven't been able to get my hands on that old data, but I do remember.

So if the number of deaths in the desert is going down, that would indicate that there are fewer people going through the desert, if the climate hasn't changed and other factors being all the same. But if the number of deaths in the desert of illegals is going up, that would indicate the traffic is going up.

So in a number of the sectors we have seen those deaths go down, but in the Tucson sector most recently we have seen the number go up, which would indicate a larger number of illegals coming into the United States through the Arizona desert.

As I traveled across New Mexico, the people there in a town hall meeting in Columbus, New Mexico, said almost unanimously that they believe there are more drugs coming through and more illegals coming through than they have seen before, and they believe that it is more dangerous for them than it has been before.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the circumstance on the border. In any case, whether we have 1½ million illegals here or whether we have 20½ million illegals here, I don't believe the number is shrinking. I think the number still grows. We know we have a significant number of illegal entrants into the United States. We don't have operational control of the whole border. We may have operational control of segments of the border, but there is much of it that we do not have. We've got a long ways to go.

But I do believe, I believe that we can get operational control of the border, and I mean operational control of the border as defined in the Secure Fence Act that was pushed through this Congress by Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER of California, whose son now serves in this Congress, and I am grateful that he does. I want to do honor to DUNCAN HUNTER's work that passed the Secure Fence Act. I want to complete that project, because there are some other things I know.

We are spending about \$12 billion, let me see if I can get these numbers right,

about \$12 billion on our southern border, and that turns out to be about \$6 million a mile; \$6 million a mile.

Mr. Speaker, I think about, what is a mile? That is four laps around an old track. Where I live in Iowa, it is to my west corner, or any other corner, for that matter. Our roads are laid out in a mile grid pattern, every section, a mile to the corners, and there is a survey pin in the center of every intersection that is a mile apart each way. They surveyed the old way, and they got a lot of it very, very close.

A mile, \$6 million a mile for every mile, all 2,000 miles of our southern border. Six million dollars a mile. And we are guarding that border with a 10 percent or 25 percent or maybe even a higher efficiency rate, but not up to 50 percent. And we think we are getting our money's worth in doing that? It doesn't mean that the agents aren't doing their job. It is, tactically, are we investing the right dollars into the right resources to get the best results that we can?

So I look across my west mile, for example, and I think what if Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano came to me and said, STEVE, I'm going to make you an offer. I'll make you an offer for a contract for you to guard a mile.

How about a mile by my house? Guard that so that people that want to cross it cannot cross it unless they are authorized, and, if they are, direct them to a port of entry. And I'm going to pay you \$6 million next year to see to it that no more than, say, oh, 75 percent of the people that try get across.

That's what we're looking at. If it is a 25 percent efficiency rate at our southern border, that means that 75 percent of those that try are getting through. I admit, it is a little bit of old testimony, but not that old, Mr. Speaker, and it has changed in some of the sectors, but not all of them.

So I am thinking in numbers that is the most recent congressional testimony that I know of, and that is a 25 percent efficiency rate, which was, some thought, a stretch then. So it is a 75 percent inefficiency rate.

So if Janet Napolitano came to me and said, I have this offer for you. Here is \$6 million. Guard that west mile of your house, and you can only let 75 percent of the people that illegally want to cross it go across. The other 25 percent, you've got to turn them back.

Would I take that deal for that level of efficiency, especially if it's a 10-year contract? So now it's \$60 million for 10 years? I would just hope I could live long enough to spend it all. Yes, I would take them up on that.

Now, if the offer was, you're going to get your \$60 million for your mile, \$60 million over 10 years for guarding a mile of the border, you'll get your \$60 million, but you have to provide efficiency, and you don't get to build empire, and you're not going to grow an empire that gives you political clout by hiring a lot of people and giving

them good benefits packages and marketing it off in that fashion. You're going to have to make the best efficiency with it you can.

I would look at that mile, and here is what I would do, Mr. Speaker. I would pick up the DUNCAN HUNTER proposal and I would say, let's build a fence, a wall and a fence. Let's build a fence, a wall and a fence across that mile. And I would put the capital investment in it, and for a couple of million dollars, I would have that all done.

For about a third of my first annual budget I would have that all done, and it would cut my costs on the guard and manpower costs for the duration of the decade and beyond, if you build a fence, a wall and a fence, when you amortize it and depreciate it out about for 40 years, and it would yield benefits every single year. They built that kind of a barrier in Israel, and it is 99-point-something percent effective. If you look around the world, there is fence after fence after fence.

The people over on this side of the aisle as a rule will say, Don't you know that we don't do that? Don't you know that the Berlin Wall is abhorrent to us? My answer to that is, how did you get history so distorted in your mind that you would compare a fence to keep people out with a fence to keep people in? They are two opposite proposals, two opposite reasons.

You can't argue that the Berlin Wall is like building a fence on our southern border unless you want to argue that the people that were in the west wanted to get over that wall into the east. They did not. There was no traffic sneaking in behind the Iron Curtain. It was the other way around.

So we are trying to keep large masses of people out of the United States and force them all through the ports of entry and let them come in here the legal way. And there is no country in the world that is more generous than the United States. In fact, all of the countries in the world don't match up to the generosity of the United States from an immigration perspective.

So we are generous. We bring in about 1.5 million people a year legally, and we watch as every night we have dozens and hundreds of people that come into the United States. One calculation showed during the peak of this 11,000 a night, 11,000 in a 24-hour period. Most of that is at night.

Santa Anna's army was only about 5,000 to 6,000. It is nearly twice as large as Santa Anna's army every single night. No, they weren't in uniform, and a lot of them weren't carrying guns, and maybe they weren't a physical threat to us in a general sense. But that is a pretty large group of people, every night to see twice the size of Santa Anna's army coming into the United States illegally. And I will tell you, I believe it is at least the size of Santa Anna's army now, every night.

And we are letting this happen day by day by day, and we turn a little



blind eye to it, and we watch as we tragically pick up the bodies in the desert of those who are sneaking into the United States illegally that don't make it across that desert.

□ 1750

As the summer comes along, the numbers go up and up. But I asked the question a few years ago when they were testifying before the Immigration Committee about how many lives were lost in the desert while they were sneaking into the United States. How many Americans died at the hands of those who made it into the United States? How many times have we seen fatalities on the highway of someone who didn't have a driver's license? didn't have an insurance policy? that was in the United States illegally that didn't understand our laws? drinking and driving? had been picked up and had been interdicted by law enforcement?

We lost a nun in Virginia last year very close to home. Corey Stewart knows about that, the county supervisor down there in, I believe, Prince William County. That's an example.

We lost several kids in a school bus wreck in southwest Minnesota, north of me. That happened with an illegal that had been interdicted several times and turned loose into our society. And those families grieve for their lost children in a school bus wreck that would have been avoided if we'd enforced our laws at the border, if we'd enforced our law with local law enforcement here in the United States when we come across people in the United States illegally.

This is not a big ask. A sovereign nation has to have borders. And what do borders mean? They mean that you control the traffic that's coming into those borders. And we can actually decide. You control the traffic going out of the United States. But we don't have to do that because we've developed a pretty good country here, but we're going to lose this country if we don't adhere to the rule of law. And the rule of law is that, when this Congress acts, the executive branch is bound to enforce the law. It's a prudent decision that reflects the will of the American people.

The American people have said, We want our borders secure, and we don't want workers in the United States illegally taking jobs away from Americans or legal immigrants who become Americans. We want to have a tighter labor supply than that.

If we wanted to up our 1½ million immigrants into the United States, we could do that. We could double this. We could triple it. We could go tenfold. We can say that anybody could come to the United States. All you have to do is sign up at the U.S. Embassy in your home country, and we'll give you a visa to come to the United States. We could say that. We could bring anybody in that wanted to come in. But why do we say no? Because there's a limit.

We have asked the question here in this Congress, and a previous Congress

has asked and answered the question: How many are too many? And what kind of people do we want to encourage to come here? And what kind of people do we want to discourage from coming here?

These are the questions. We have all kinds of people involved in this debate that don't have the slightest idea how to begin to answer those questions. They just say, Oh, my compassion compels me to be for open borders. My heart bleeds for people that aren't as fortunate as Americans are. So, therefore, I'm just going to be for turning a blind eye or granting amnesty so that I don't feel guilty that everybody can't live the American Dream like we all do.

Well, things have changed. Things have changed.

There was a time when we had high levels of immigration into this country and a zero welfare state. When my grandmother came over here in 1894, we weren't a welfare state. They screened people before they got on the boat, and they checked them out physically; they checked them out mentally. If they had a lot of resources, they got to ride first class and got unloaded in a different dock, but the rest of them went to Ellis Island.

And even though they screened a good number of the people out before they boarded the ship—and, remember, they didn't want to haul them back to Europe. It was Europe primarily at this time. But even still, after they were screened and they arrived at Ellis Island, they gave them a physical. They looked in their eyes. They gave them kind of a quick mental test. They looked underneath their eyelids to see if they had a disease that put little white spots underneath there. And if they weren't of physical ability or mental ability to be able to take care of themselves, they put them back on the boat—I should say “ship”—and sent them back to the place where they came from. About 2 percent were sent back.

Now here we are. We're interdicting 10 percent, 25 percent. We don't even get that many sent back because it's round robin. For a long time, we did catch and release, and we said, Come back and appear. Of course, they didn't appear. Then we did catch and return. We'd pick them up at downtown Nogales, take them up to the station sector location, and they would come in with their little Ziploc bag. We fingerprinted them, took the digital photograph of them, and sometimes we saw that same person came back. The peak one that I know of down there was in 27 times.

We had a really good return trade going on with people that were coming into the United States illegally. We'd pick them up, give them a ride up to the headquarters, and all they had to do is just have their prints taken again, get their picture taken again, and then they got a little van ride down to the port of entry where they

turned that little white van sideways, opened up the side door, and they'd get out and walk back to Mexico. The van would take off and go get another load. Around and around and around we went. It was round robin, and it wasn't accomplishing very much.

Now we're at least bringing prosecution against most of them, which is providing a little more of a deterrent, Mr. Speaker. We've got to do a lot better. We've got to understand this mission. The mission is to protect our borders for this sovereign Nation. You can't have a border if you don't control the border.

We need to control the border—all of it. We need to force all traffic through the ports of entry. We can do it if we build a fence, a wall and a fence. Yes, we need to put sensory devices up there and use some of the other technology that's there. And yes, we have to have Border Patrol agents that are there that are manning the fence and running to the locations where they need to to make the proper interdictions. All of that needs to take place.

But we need to use our resources smartly, and we can. We can shut off all illegal traffic that's going to come across our southern border if we do these smart things. And I have not advocated, I will point out, Mr. Speaker, a 2,000-mile fence. I simply advocated that we build a fence, a wall and a fence, and build it until they stop going around the end—that's the standard—and force all the traffic through the ports of entry. Then we have to widen our ports of entry, beef them up so we can handle the increased traffic that's there so that it's not a significant impediment.

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

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 839, HAMP TERMINATION ACT OF 2011; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 861, NSP TERMINATION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-34) on the resolution (H. Res. 170) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 839) to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to terminate the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to provide new assistance under the Home Affordable Modification Program, while preserving assistance to homeowners who were already extended an offer to participate in the Program, either on a trial or permanent basis; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 861) to rescind the third round of funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and to terminate the program, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 16, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

863. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 6 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

864. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the National Defense Stockpile (NDS) Annual Materials Plan (AMP) for Fiscal Year 2011, along with proposed plans for FY 2012 through 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98h-2(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

865. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting copy of the Department's Energy Fleet Alternative Fuel Vehicle Acquisition Report in Fiscal Year 2008; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

866. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Amendment to the Definition of Fuel-Burning Equipment [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0011; FRL-9268-2] received February 22, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

867. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [DC103-2051; FRL-9267-6] received February 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

868. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0617; FRL-9267-8] received February 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

869. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions To Control Volatile Organic Compound Emissions From Consumer Related Sources [EPA-R06-OAR-2010-0252; FRL-9269-9] received February 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

870. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation Quality Implementation Plans; Kansas: Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Permitting Authority and Tailoring Rule Revision; Withdrawal of Federal GHG Implementation Plan for Kansas [EPA-R07-OAR-2010-0932; FRL-9268-7] received February 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

871. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Industrial Solvent Cleaning Operations [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0594; FRL-9268-1] received February 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

872. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Designation, Reportable Quantities, and Notification; Notification Requirements [EPA-HQ-SFUND-2010-1068; FRL-9268-8] received February 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

873. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0119; FRL-9273-4] (RIN: 2060-A012) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

874. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Sewage Sludge Incineration Units [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0559; FRL-9292-9] (RIN: 2060-AP90) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

875. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's eleventh report describing the progress made in licensing and constructing the Alaska natural gas pipeline and describing any issue impeding that progress; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

876. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — License and Certificate of Compliance Terms [NRC-2008-0361] (RIN: 3150-AI09) received February 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

877. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certifications and waivers of the prohibition against contracting with firms that comply with the Arab League Boycott of the State of Israel, pursuant to Public Law 103-236, section 565(b) (108 Stat. 845); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

878. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting a formal response to the GAO report GAO-11-138; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

879. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the 2011 NASA Strategic Plan; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

880. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Annual Report of the Administration of the Government in the Sunshine Act for Calendar Year 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

881. A letter from the Commissioner, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting a letter regarding the current budget deliberations for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Appropriations.

882. A letter from the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a letter regarding the Northern Border Counter-narcotics Strategy; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Homeland Security.

#### 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 170. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 839) to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to terminate the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to provide new assistance under the Home Affordable Modification Program, while preserving assistance to homeowners who were already extended an offer to participate in the Program, either on a trial or permanent basis; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 861) to rescind the third round of funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and to terminate the program (Rept. 112-34). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 1076. A bill to prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. RICHARDSON (for herself and Ms. BASS of California):

H.R. 1077. A bill to establish a pilot program to provide training and certification in the culinary arts for Federal inmates to be utilized during the normal inmate meals process and to be accredited for future employment and educational opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 1078. A bill to make technical corrections to section 3013(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. COSTELLO):

H.R. 1079. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend the airport improvement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. NOR-TON, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1080. A bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of pediatric research consortia; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. KELLY, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1081. A bill to delay the implementation of proposed or final rules issued under the authority of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act relating to the reasonable and proportional fees and rules for electronic debit transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HURT (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 1082. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to provide a registration exemption for private equity fund advisers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1083. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to establish an Office of Rural Broadband Initiatives in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; 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 Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STARK, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1084. A bill to repeal the exemption for hydraulic fracturing in the Safe Drinking Water Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOLT, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1085. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to eliminate the abstinence-only education program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HARPER, Mr.

TONKO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1086. A bill to mandate the monthly formulation and publication of a consumer price index specifically for senior citizens for the purpose of establishing an accurate Social Security COLA for such citizens; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 1087. A bill to direct the head of a Federal department or agency that is carrying out a project involving the construction of a culvert or other enclosed flood or drainage system to ensure that certain child safety measures are included in the project; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HELLER:

H.R. 1088. A bill to prohibit any increase in the amount established for the Members' Representational Allowance during a period of high unemployment and public debt; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 1089. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide members of the Individual Ready Reserve, Individual Mobilization Augmentees, and inactive members of the National Guard who served in Afghanistan or Iraq with information on counseling to prevent suicide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1090. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants for the support of full-service community schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SHULER, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 1091. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to construct not less than 350 miles of reinforced fencing along the United States-Mexico border and to gain operational control over such border; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. JONES (for himself and Mr. BOREN):

H.R. 1092. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to prohibit certain increases in fees for military health care; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself and Mr. ALTMIRE):

H.R. 1093. A bill to reform the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, modernize firearms laws and regulations, protect the community from criminals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. PAUL:

H.R. 1094. A bill to abolish the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks, to repeal the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1095. A bill to sunset Federal laws and regulations which treat the American people like children by denying them the opportunity to make their own decision regarding control of their bank accounts and what type of information they wish to receive from their banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1096. A bill to provide that human life shall be deemed to exist from conception, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1097. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and make permanent the standard deduction for real property taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1098. A bill to repeal the legal tender laws, to prohibit taxation on certain coins and bullion, and to repeal superfluous sections related to coinage; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1099. A bill to prohibit any Federal official from expending any Federal funds for any population control or population planning program or any family planning activity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1100. A bill to amend the Tsunami Warning and Education Act to direct the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, through the National Weather Service, to establish, maintain, and operate a Caribbean tsunami forecast and warning center in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1101. A bill to restore the American people's freedom to choose the health insurance that best meets their individual needs by repealing the mandate that all Americans obtain government-approved health insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1102. A bill to reduce the price of gasoline by allowing for offshore drilling, eliminating Federal obstacles to constructing refineries and providing incentives for investment in refineries, suspending Federal fuel taxes when gasoline prices reach a benchmark amount, and promoting free trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 1103. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to develop, maintain, and administer an annex in Tinian, Commonwealth

of the Northern Mariana Islands, as an extension of the American Memorial Park located in Saipan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. STUTZMAN (for himself and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa):

H.R. 1104. A bill to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to require the appointment of a member of the Science Advisory Board based on the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 1105. A bill to ensure that Transportation Worker Identification Credentials held by certain maritime workers do not expire before the deadline for full implementation of electronic readers for such credentials or December 31, 2014, whichever is earlier; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 1106. A bill to establish the Social Work Reinvestment Commission to provide independent counsel to Congress and the Secretary of Health and Human Services on policy issues associated with recruitment, retention, research, and reinvestment in the profession of social work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JONES, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. PAUL):

H.J. Res. 49. A joint resolution directing the President to remove the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.J. Res. 50. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to abolishing personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the United States Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODALL:

H. Con. Res. 30. A concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JONES, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President is required to obtain in advance specific statutory authorization for the use of United States Armed Forces in response to civil unrest in Libya; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENSARLING:

H. Res. 168. A resolution electing certain Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. STARK):

H. Res. 169. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner notify the Clerk of whether that Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner elects to participate in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 171. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Minority Health Awareness Month in April 2011 in order to bring attention to the severe health disparities faced by minority populations such as American Indians and Alaska Natives, Asians, Blacks or African-Americans, Hispanics or Latinos, and Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. FALCOMA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. CHU, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SABLON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WU, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H. Res. 172. A resolution expressing heartfelt condolences and support for assistance to the people of Japan and all those affected in the aftermath of the deadly earthquake and tsunami of March 11, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### 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 Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 1107. A bill for the relief of Adrian Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 1108. A bill for the relief of Francisco Rivera and Alfonso Calderon; 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 Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 1076.  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 1077.  
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 1078.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 1079.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 1080.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 1081.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
The Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. HURT:

H.R. 1082.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1083.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States), Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce), and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 1084.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LEE of California:

H.R. 1085.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 1086.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
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.  
Section 8. (1) The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general

Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 1087.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. HELLER:

H.R. 1088.

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

The appropriation authority outlined by Article I, Section 9 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 1089.

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

Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 1090.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1091.

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

Clause 1 of Article 1, Section 8, which grants Congress with the authority to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States and Clause 18 of Article 1, Section 8, which allows the authority to make laws deemed necessary and proper.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 1092.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 1093.

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

This bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the people, in accordance with Amendment II of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1094.

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

This legislation is authorized by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution:

“To 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.”

This includes the power to repeal legislation that exercises power beyond that which is granted to the Congress in the Constitution.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1095.

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

This legislation is authorized by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution:

“To 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.”

This includes the power to repeal legislation that exercises power beyond that which is granted to the Congress in the Constitution.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1096.

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

The Sanctity of Life Act is authorized by Article 1, Section 8 and Article 3, Section 1 which gives the Congress power to establish and limit the jurisdiction of lower federal courts as well as Article III, Section 2 which gives Congress the power to make exceptions to Supreme Court regulations.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1097.

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

This legislation is authorized by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: “The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes.”

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1098.

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

This legislation is authorized by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: “To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.”

“To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States.”

“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1099.

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

Article 1, Section 9, Paragraph 7, which states that no money shall be drawn from the treasury but in consequence to an appropriation made by law, and Article 1, Paragraph 1, which vests all legislative authority in the Congress giving Congress the ability to prevent the expenditure of taxpayer funds on activities such as abortion and family planning.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 1100.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1101.

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

The End the Mandate Act is justified by Article 1, Section 8’s grant of power to Congress to regulate commerce which includes the authority to repeal federal laws that exceed Congress’s power under that provision.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1102.

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

The Affordable Gas Price Act is justified by the 16th amendment, which gives Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, the Commerce Clause of Article 1 Section 8, which gives Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution which vests all legislative power in the Congress. This clearly gives Congress authority to pass legislation changing laws and polices relating to offshore drilling and the use of environmental impact statements in litigation.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 1103.

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

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 1104.

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 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution bestows upon Congress the authority “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

Congress is within its constitutionally prescribed role to direct the Environmental Protection Agency, a body which regulates interstate commerce under the auspices of Congress, to appoint a member of the Science Advisory Board based on the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 1105.

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

The Constitution including Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 1106.

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

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

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

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 1107.

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 3, Section 2, which states that judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States and Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 1108.

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 3, Section 2, which states that judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States and Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.J. Res. 49.

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

Art. I, Sect. 8, Cl. 14 of the Constitution (authorizing Congress to “make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces”). Art. I, Sect. 8, Cl. 11 of the Constitution authorizes Congress to “declare War.” Congress did not properly declare war in Afghanistan, and this resolution takes corrective action.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.J. Res. 50.

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

This legislation is authorized by Article V of the Constitution.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

- H.R. 23: Mr. BOREN, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DENT.  
H.R. 59: Mr. RUNYAN, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.  
H.R. 74: Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 96: Mr. LANCE.  
H.R. 104: Mr. DEFAZIO.  
H.R. 114: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.  
H.R. 115: Mr. COURTNEY.  
H.R. 122: Ms. FOXX.  
H.R. 177: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mrs. CAPITO.  
H.R. 223: Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 236: Mr. RIGELL.  
H.R. 324: Mr. GUTHRIE.  
H.R. 329: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 358: Mr. LEWIS of California.  
H.R. 380: Ms. WOOLSEY.  
H.R. 382: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.  
H.R. 385: Ms. WOOLSEY.  
H.R. 414: Mr. JONES and Ms. TSONGAS.  
H.R. 452: Mr. KISSELL, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. MARINO.  
H.R. 459: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.  
H.R. 469: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.  
H.R. 470: Mr. QUAYLE and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 540: Mr. COURTNEY.  
H.R. 544: Mr. CARNAHAN.  
H.R. 601: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 605: Mr. MCCOTTER.  
H.R. 642: Mr. HERGER, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. MULVANEY.  
H.R. 663: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. LATHAM.  
H.R. 674: Mr. MORAN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HUNTER.  
H.R. 676: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. FATTAH.  
H.R. 681: Mr. REED.  
H.R. 690: Mr. SCHOCK.  
H.R. 700: Mr. HALL.  
H.R. 702: Mr. MANZULLO.  
H.R. 704: Mr. FORBES.  
H.R. 718: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. POSEY.  
H.R. 719: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. DENT, Mr. BOREN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TURNER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 733: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 745: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. LANDRY, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.  
H.R. 747: Ms. HIRONO.  
H.R. 764: Mr. CRAWFORD.  
H.R. 802: Mr. GRIMM.  
H.R. 805: Mr. MCINTYRE.  
H.R. 812: Mr. HINCHEY.  
H.R. 813: Mr. COURTNEY and Ms. WILSON of Florida.  
H.R. 816: Mr. FLEMING.  
H.R. 822: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.  
H.R. 827: Mr. STARK and Mr. HUNTER.  
H.R. 849: Mr. CHAFFETZ.  
H.R. 854: Mr. BACA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SIREN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.  
H.R. 862: Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. POLLS.  
H.R. 863: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
H.R. 866: Mr. CHANDLER.  
H.R. 872: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. SHIMKUS.  
H.R. 875: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. LANKFORD.  
H.R. 880: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. MCCOTTER.  
H.R. 886: Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. JENKINS, and Ms. BORDALLO.  
H.R. 890: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.  
H.R. 891: Mrs. CAPITO.  
H.R. 905: Mr. LANCE.  
H.R. 910: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. LANDRY.  
H.R. 936: Mr. ROSS of Florida.  
H.R. 943: Mr. GRIMM.  
H.R. 959: Ms. BERKLEY.  
H.R. 964: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. KILDEE.  
H.R. 965: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. DICKS, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
H.R. 969: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. BUCSHON.  
H.R. 977: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.  
H.R. 984: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SULIVAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LANCE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. PEARCE.  
H.R. 993: Mr. FLEMING.  
H.R. 997: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. HALL.  
H.R. 998: Ms. EDWARDS.  
H.R. 1000: Mr. SIREN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. REYES, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
H.R. 1004: Mr. PAUL.  
H.R. 1006: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1023: Mr. CONAWAY.  
H.R. 1027: Mr. REED.  
H.R. 1040: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 1044: Mr. HELLER.  
H. R. 1046: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. LUMMIS, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. JONES.  
H.R. 1049: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. LATTA.  
H.R. 1056: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. GALLEGLY.  
H.R. 1065: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.  
H.R. 1070: Mr. CANSECO and Mr. MANZULLO.  
H.R. 1075: Mr. BOREN and Mr. GOODLATTE.  
H.J. Res. 37: Mr. POSEY and Ms. HAYWORTH.  
H.J. Res. 47: Ms. NORTON.  
H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. HALL.  
H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. CAPUANO.  
H. Res. 60: Mrs. SCHMIDT and Ms. BUERKLE.  
H. Res. 83: Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
H. Res. 137: Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. LEE of California.  
H. Res. 154: Mr. CARDOZA.

#### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

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

OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

My amendment No. 1 printed in part B of the Committee Report to accompany H. Res. 170 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.