

Centers Technical Adjustment Act. This bill addresses an issue brought to our attention by a number of States that are at risk of having to reduce services for adults with disabilities. Authorized under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Independent Living Center program serves adults with disabilities by providing an array of independent living services, including the information and referral services, independent living skills training, peer counseling, and individual and systems advocacy training. This program is administered by the Rehabilitation Services Administration, which allocates Federal funds to the centers based on a formula in an established State plan. Under current law, Centers within a State must first receive funds at the level they received in the previous year, and absent sufficient funding, they must receive the same proportional amount of the total they received the previous year.

The Independent Living Centers were provided additional funds through the stimulus package passed by Congress in 2009. States were given maximum flexibility for determining the allocation of these funds among the centers in their States. Several States opted to distribute these temporary funds using a formula different from their base formula. As a result, some Centers received a proportionally larger or smaller allocation than they did in previous years.

This one-time change in the allocation of funds made sense because of the challenges State economies were facing. At the same time, current law did not envision this one-time increase in funding. And, in fact, the Rehabilitation Services Administration is required to allocate 2010 funds based on a Center's total proportional allocation for 2009 and the additional funding a Center received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, or ARRA. This requirement may result in some Centers losing up to 35 percent of funds as the total proportion a Center received may be less than they received in the prior year.

The Independent Living Centers Technical Adjustment Act will allow States to request that ARRA funds not be included in determining their center's previous year allocations. That way, the temporary funds provided under ARRA do not permanently change the Center's base allocations. This is a complex but necessary fix to protect services for so many people with disabilities who benefit from the work of the Independent Living Centers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman MILLER for introducing this important legislation, and I urge support of this technical change to ensure Independent Living Centers can continue the important work for people with disabilities in our communities.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5610, the Independent Living Centers Technical Adjustment Act. Independent Living Centers are non-residential, private, not-for-profit agencies that provide an array of services for people with disabilities to enable them to live independently. Independent Living Centers provide employment, skills training, peer counseling, and information for people with disabilities to enable them to become participating members of society. They enable people with disabilities to live independent lives and participate in society as working adults.

The Rehabilitation Act provides funding for the planning, conduct, administration, and evaluation of Independent Living Centers. Due to the way 31 States chose to distribute funds provided for the Independent Living Centers in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, FY 2010 funds may be distributed disproportionately to Independent Living Centers in those 31 States.

H.R. 5610, the Independent Living Centers Technical Adjustment Act, would enable funds to be distributed to Independent Living Centers in the appropriate manner for FY 2010. H.R. 5610 enables States that distributed ARRA funds disproportionately to the centers to have those funds disregarded in the determination of the distribution of FY 2010 funds. This bill ensures the funding for Independent Living Centers, which provide such a valuable resource for people with disabilities, is distributed to the centers proportionally and appropriately. I stand in support of this bill and ask my colleagues for support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 5610, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5610, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE CHILDREN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the work being done by the Children of the American Revolution, Lake Minnetonka. They're hosting a pancake breakfast to raise money for their grant programs to teach kids about the real meaning of the Fourth of July. Their mission is to train good citizens, develop leaders, and to promote a love of the United States of America and its heritage.

The Lake Minnetonka chapter recently gave a grant to Our Military Kids, a nonprofit that provides tuition assistance for art, sports, and music camps to children of parents that are deployed overseas or recovering from serious injury. They're also presenting the first donation for a memorial that's planned for the Minnesota State capitol grounds that pays tribute to all family members of all men and women, past and present, who have served our country in uniform.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the children of the American Revolution, and I encourage all of us to remember those who serve this great Nation as we approach the Fourth of July.

REJECT JOB-KILLING BILL

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the job-killing bill, H.R. 4173, the Dodd-Frank Act of 2010. All this so-called financial reform legislation accomplishes is to heap additional regulations and burdens upon community financial institutions which, by and large, were not the cause of the financial crisis. Even worse, this legislation doesn't adequately address the issue of too big to fail for Wall Street firms that were the root of the problem.

The added regulatory cost on the community banks in this bill will further slow job growth in our economy. In Kansas, this will especially hurt businesses and farmers and ranchers that need loans from their community banks to help make payroll and grow their crops. The added costs of the regulations and increased capital requirements on these financial institutions will lead to an even worse credit market.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should reject the bill and pass commonsense legislation that addresses the problems of Wall Street that caused our financial crisis, not add further regulation and costs to Main Street.

□ 2110

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

GOD AND GUNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when I was at a town hall meeting in Texas recently, a local man came up to me afterward to talk about his concerns over where our country was headed—

something to do with a fiery inferno in a hand basket. Anyway, as he was talking to me, I noticed his T-shirt. Here's what it said: "I love my Bible," and it had a photograph of the Bible, "and I love my guns," with a photograph of two .45 Colt revolvers. Naturally they were in the right order. After all, he was a local preacher.

The most important right we have as Americans is the freedom of speech, and that includes the freedom of religion. It's first in the constitutional Bill of Rights because without it, none of the rest would be possible. The right to bear arms is the Second Amendment because without it, we could not protect the First Amendment.

The recent Supreme Court decision simply stated the obvious as it is written in the Bill of Rights: "A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed." Now I'm sure the halls of academia were all up in arms about the right to bear arms. The media immediately began spreading the shocking news: the Supreme Court actually upheld the Constitution. Oh, the hysteria they went through. They said, Murder rates will surely double upon the mere announcement of this. Never mind the fact that more gun control does not lower murder rates; it actually increases them. Look at this city, Washington, D.C., the toughest gun control in the country.

But let's don't let the facts get in the way of a political agenda. I wonder how the media and the antigun protesters would have felt about the First Amendment being ignored for political purposes. The Second Amendment, like the rest of the Bill of Rights, protects citizens from the power of government. People have rights. Government has no rights. Government has power. And when citizens give away their rights, like the Second Amendment, government increases its power and oppression over the people.

The Supreme Court ruled accurately and restored the rights of all Americans based on the due process clause of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution which commands that no State shall "deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." To truly understand the meaning and purpose of the Second Amendment, we need to understand the men who actually wrote the Constitution and what they said when it was ratified.

The Founding Fathers were very concerned that a strong Federal Government would trample on individual freedom and individual rights because that's what happened to the colonists under the power of Great Britain. Governments historically do that to their people, trample on individual rights. That's historical. So after the ratification of the Constitution, the Framers knew that a declaration of rights had to be added to protect basic individual rights, rights that are inalienable, created by our Creator and not created or given to us by government.

The Second Amendment was included in the Bill of Rights to prevent the government—that's the Federal Government—from disarming the public like the British Army did to American citizens. The right of the free people to defend freedom and protect themselves was so important that it was placed second in the Bill of Rights behind the First Amendment, freedom of speech and freedom of religion and the freedom of press and the right to peacefully assemble.

Currently, gun control advocates and their elitist allies wish to subject the people to more government oppression of freedom by denying individuals the right to arm themselves. Thomas Jefferson knew the importance of an armed citizenry. He said: "No free man shall ever be debarred from the use of arms." Samuel Adams wrote: "The Constitution shall never be construed to prevent the people of the United States who are peaceful citizens from keeping their arms." And of course James Madison, who helped write the Bill of Rights, once wrote that the Americans had "the advantage of being armed," and that other nations' governments were "afraid to trust the people with such arms."

So leave it to a Texas preacher to keep it all in perspective. You see, without the Second Amendment, you can't protect the First Amendment, the freedom of speech, the freedom of religion, the freedom of press and the freedom to peacefully assemble without the Second Amendment.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SUTTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WALL STREET REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share my major disappointment and key concerns with the so-called Wall Street reform bill that just passed this House and why I voted "no" on this measure. Bottom line, the bill does not fundamentally change the skewed financial power relationship between Wall Street and Main Street. That relationship has so gravely hurt our Nation.

The bill allows the Wall Street institutions to maintain their choke hold on Main Street's vitals. The big banks that have caused our economic crisis by severely abusing their privilege to create money were treated with kid gloves.

Now, the Republican leader said that the bill was like a nuclear weapon aimed at an ant. I say, the bill was a

cotton ball thrown at an elephant. The bill does not even create real competition to the handful of big banks that have simply become too big and controlling.

Indeed, the bill allows them to keep their vaulted positions with a few modifications to their business practices. It will take years for regulators to sort out and apply, if ever, the mild provisions in the bill. And there are so many loopholes you could read the bill for another year to find them all. A Consumer Financial Protection Bureau at the Federal Reserve cannot compensate for a banking system that is, at its heart, terribly misformed. Time will prove this view correct.

A handful of big banks—Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan, Bank of America, Citicorp, Wells Fargo, HSBC and Morgan Stanley—have so harmed the vast majority of other financial institutions on Main Street that these smaller institutions, which comprise the majority that are still left, are being penalized big time by having to pay exorbitant additional insurance fund fees to the regulators to prop up the losses of the big banks that have so harmed the whole financial architecture of our country. That's why lending remains seized up coast to coast. It's why over 84 more banks have folded this year. And while this is happening for the remains that are left, then the big six go in and gobble up what's there.

The bill basically grandfathered the too big to fail big banks that have grown even more unwieldy as the financial crisis has deepened. Today they have been rewarded because they're even growing bigger. Before the crisis, they controlled one-third of the assets of this country. Astoundingly, they now control two-thirds of the assets of our Nation. Can you imagine a handful of banks with that much power? The bill does absolutely nothing about that. It kind of looks the other way. One cannot call this structure free market competition. One has to call it oligopolistic control of our financial marketplace.

If you're feeling the pain because you lost your home or you're about to lose your home or you lost your job or you lost some of your pension or you lost some of your IRA, you know who to blame. Their bad behavior has hurt all the other banks in this country and, in fact, other nations and people around the world. For shame.

But as a result of their concentration of power in the hands of far too few, it is expected that 20 million American families will lose their homes, 2.4 million more Americans this year. Unemployment rates remain stuck too high, and our economy is not producing the jobs it should because lending has seized up across this Nation. People are losing more equity and their savings, yet Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan, Citigroup, Bank of America, Morgan Stanley, Wells Fargo, HSBC, they're doing just fine, making billions and billions in profits and taking bigger and bigger bonuses to boot.