

everybody to be able to be profitable so that they can continue to create jobs. But I think to most people what is the most concerning is not maybe this year they're making less than last year, that's bad, but what I think is concerning most people is that the one great tradition of this country, from the day George Washington took that oath of office until this day today, every generation has had better opportunity than the one that came before them. Every single generation in the history of our country has had better opportunity than the one that came before them. And I think we all know if we stay on this unsustainable path of spending and taxing, with unemployment like it is, the next generation is not going to have that same opportunity, and we cannot let that happen. I don't think the American people are going to let that happen. And I think that's why in November, in that historic election that was just held a few weeks ago, people said they're not sitting on the sidelines anymore because they know what's at stake. They know we can't keep going down this road. And if we want to keep the light lit on that Statue of Freedom, if we want to make sure that the promise that's envisioned and represented in the Statue of Liberty, if we want to keep that torch lit for the next generation, we have to make serious changes right now starting today.

Mr. AKIN. I think you're absolutely right. I think that's what the American public is seeing and sensing. I might put it in slightly different words, and maybe just because I'm a little older than you are, but my sense is we had a tradition that the government was to be the servant of the people. It seems to many of us as though that has started to tilt, and the government is now a fearful master. I think the public is saying we have had way too much government, we're taking a look. The problem isn't the outside, the problem is the government, and the government has to be reduced back to its servant status, back to the basic principles of economics, back to honoring the traditions of our Founders and the dream of allowing people to use their imagination and their ingenuity, and to succeed or to fail. If we didn't let Thomas Edison fail hundreds and hundreds of times, we wouldn't have any lightbulbs. You have to allow freedom to work. I think that's where we have to go as a country; we have to go back to the traditional paths that have always worked for us.

We are a very unique Nation in so many different ways. People around the world, when there's an earthquake or when there's a problem, the Americans are there. After World War II, we defeated our enemies and we taxed ourselves to rebuild our enemies. We established no empires. We built no kingdoms. We are absolutely unique in the history of mankind, and it's because we have high standards, high traditions, and we believe in freedom and the

American way. This is the way to turn things around.

My good friend, Congressman SCALISE, I thank you so much for joining us tonight. I know our time is starting to get a little bit short here.

I would once again encourage Americans—we know the solution to move forward, but we are not going to be moving forward if we allow the largest tax increase in the history of our country to settle in on January 1. It will have the same negative effect as its positive effect when it first went into place. We do not want that. We have to keep those tax cuts in place, and we have to make that decision and move forward for the good of all of America.

Mr. Speaker, thank you so much.

□ 1940

#### MODERN DAY SLAVERY REPARATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TITUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, it's my privilege to be recognized here on the floor of the House of Representatives in this great deliberative body that we are. And it is a blessing and a gift to the American people that we can have our debates and our discourse that rages back and forth here on the floor of the House. And sometimes we're not so polite to each other. I regret that. But the passions arise here rather than have them arise in the streets of America.

So in a way, we take a lid off the pressure cooker here in the House. And we vent these issues, and we find a way to at least sort out the policy that can be accepted or accommodated by the other side. And often we're able to come to a good product that's good and right for the American people.

Madam Speaker, I come to you tonight with a number of things on my mind and the primary issue that concerns me is what took place here in the House yesterday with the debate on the rule and on the bill and subsequently the vote spent another \$4.6 billion, unbudgeted, unauthorized, unacceptable—and not just 41 cents out of every dollar borrowed, a lot of it from the Chinese and the Saudis—but all of this money, all of this unbudgeted funding is a hundred percent borrowed money because it goes above that level. It was unnecessary money to be spent. So every bit of it was borrowed money.

And by a vote of 256–152, this lame duck Congress, this invalidated Congress, this reputed Congress, this rejected Congress, has gone down the path over and over again of spending money that we don't have for causes that don't have the support of the American people spent by a Congress that's no longer the valid representatives of the people. That's why it's called a lame duck. We should have

shot this lame duck a long time ago. It still limps along and it still flares up, and it still steps in and goes against the will of the American people.

Now, I would submit, Madam Speaker, if this Congress had reflected the will of the American people, the gavels would not be changing hands come January 4 of 2011. They'd stay essentially in the same hands with a smaller switch in seats.

But we can see this happen over the last 4 years as the San Francisco agenda began to manifest itself here on the floor of the House of Representatives. And it didn't really get enough traction that the American people really understood what was going on until such time as President Obama was elected and his agenda matched up so closely with that of the Speaker's agenda here—that San Francisco agenda—that the American people could see clearly. By the way, coupled with that of the gentleman from Nevada from down through across the rotunda on the Senate side, the three of them, HARRY REID, NANCY PELOSI and President Obama. I said this more than 2 years ago, 2½ years ago. If you elect this ruling troika, they will be able to go into a phone booth and do what they will to America, and they won't be accountable to anybody. And I should have said, Until the subsequent election.

Well, the American people did elect Barack Obama, and they sent NANCY PELOSI back here in a position to become the Speaker, which she was, and HARRY REID maintained his position as the majority leader in the United States Senate. And they did to the best of their extent what they could to America.

There's a whole list of things that aggrrieve me and very much that must be undone. Some things that passed the House that didn't make it through the Senate were painful votes for some of the Members that will be going home. And I regret some of the friends that I have made on the other side of the aisle that I'm saying goodbye to this week and the next week and the next week. There are some good Americans that have served this country well that were voted out of office because of the anchor that was attached to them by the San Francisco agenda.

But there's this agenda, this agenda that I've called modern-day slavery reparations. And some think that might be a rhetorical stretch. But, Madam Speaker, I'll point out not only did JOHN CONYERS, as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, hold impeachment hearings for President Bush and Vice President Cheney—he said they weren't impeachment hearings but they were, in fact, impeachment hearings, the basis of it I still don't know but I sat in on them—not only did he hold those, he held hearings on a whole number of things including hearings on slavery reparations.

And I made the argument that you cannot fix something that happened a

century and a half ago. You can't go back and put the blood back in people's veins when they've paid in blood to put an end to slavery. And you can't hold the generations, six and seven generations hence, responsible for the sins of the great great great great great grandfathers.

And the chairman, Mr. CONYERS, a respectable individual whom I count as a friend and have always had a good personal relationship with, told me, That's why we're having these hearings to find out. You think we can't fix these problems by providing reparations, and we're holding hearings and we're going to see if we can figure it out.

Well, that's the mindset. I mean, if we're actually having a discussion about whether you can compensate people for labor that they did while they were slaves in the first half of the 19th century and earlier to those descendants, how do you sort out who's descended from slaves and who's not? They don't know how to answer that question. They just think somehow there should be a redistribution of wealth.

Well, this redistribution of wealth is something that also comes out of the mouth of our President. It was very clear when he made the statement to Joe the Plumber when he said, Share the wealth. And it's been very clear as he's played the class envy card time after time after time and divided Americans against each other for a whole series of reasons—and a lot of it that has to do with how much money each of us make, forgetting that it is the American Dream to become a millionaire, to pile another million on top of that, the second million is easier since the first. How long has it been since we've heard that? It might be harder than the first because this President wants to punish that first million and the second million and the third million. Hopefully, that gets resolved this week. We've reached a bit of an impasse on it. But the redistribution of wealth goes on.

The hard-core leftist agenda is still driven. The leaders and many of the Members of this lame duck 111th Congress, if they got the message, their message back to us is a spiteful message against the American people, which is, So you didn't like debt and deficit and you'd like to have jobs and a better growing economy. Well, on our way out the door—you've thrown a lot of us out of office—on our way out the door, we're going to give you a little more of what you didn't like. They're saying to the American people, Oh, you didn't like what we gave you in the 111th Congress or the 110th Congress, you didn't like what we gave you under President Obama. Well, if you didn't like it, here's some more. That's what's going on in this lame duck Congress.

If the American people don't like what's been served to them by NANCY PELOSI and President Obama and HARRY REID, they're saying, Madam

Speaker, to the American people, here's some more.

Well, here's some more that came at us yesterday: the Pigford Farms issue tied together with the Cobell issue that has to do with how resources were managed for certain Native American tribes. And I'm not an expert on the Cobell issue. I have been drawn into the Pigford issue.

But, Madam Speaker, Pigford Farms is this: it is the largest class action suit in the history of the United States. And the single largest recipient of that, her name is Shirley Sherrod. You remember Shirley Sherrod. She's the lady that announced on July 22 of 2009 that she would be the largest recipient in the largest civil rights case in history, which turns out now to be \$2.3 billion to compensate for discrimination—an amount that—I agree there was discrimination and I agree we should compensate people who were discriminated against. It's a very difficult task to quantify, however.

But Shirley Sherrod received the news of the award of \$13 million to her and whoever the people she might decide to distribute it to. We don't have access to those records. These cases are apparently sealed.

On 22 July, 2009, Tom Vilsack, Secretary of Agriculture, hired her 25 July 2009. Because she's the largest civil rights recipient in the largest case in the history of America, and the case is Pigford versus Vilsack—the Secretary of Agriculture.

Timothy Pigford filed the suit and the class action lawsuit and so his name, the first plaintiff's name, is listed as the name of the suit versus the Secretary of Agriculture, which was Glickman, and it became then the successor Secretaries until it became Tom Vilsack. But it was Tom Vilsack that was named then in the suit as successor, Pigford v. Vilsack, and the largest recipient was Shirley Sherrod. And what does he do 3 days after the \$13 million was announced that she would receive? Hires her.

I can't fathom hiring somebody who had sued me, who had pushed for a settlement that turns out to be \$13 million. The next piece is, what do they need the job for, and why would I reward them with a job? What else was going on in the mind of the Secretary and Shirley Sherrod that he would put her on the payroll and make her the director of USDA rural development in the State of Georgia?

□ 1950

This all came to light because there was a YouTube clip of Shirley Sherrod's speech before the NAACP that in its edited version appeared to make some racist statements. And I saw the speech in the totality enough that I accept the overall message on what she learned from that. And so I am not taking issue with the totality of her speech. But she was fired apparently for the clip that was out. And the clip I think is a clip that was available

to the Web site that posted it, what was available at the time.

But in any case, \$13 million recipient in the largest civil rights case in the history hired by the people she sued 3 days after the settlement announcement came down. And that's just a piece of Pigford Farms. Pigford Farms has been dragging on for years. And what happened was Dan Glickman, then Secretary of Agriculture under Bill Clinton as President, stepped up and announced that they had discovered that there was discrimination taking place by U.S. Department of Agriculture employees against black farmers primarily in the South, because that's where they lived. And when that happened, it opened up the class action. The lawyers went to work and they produced what's now Pigford I, the first settlement consent decree.

It was approved by Judge Paul Friedman. I brought his opinion, Madam Speaker, with me to the floor tonight. And if those might think when I say this is a modern day version of slavery reparations, I would point out that in the case the first words in the opinion of Judge Paul Friedman are this: "Forty acres and a mule." Forty acres and a mule.

Madam Speaker, he goes on to lament that he can't fix all of the wrongs that come out of slavery and the segregation in one civil rights suit. One can read between the lines that he is sorry that he can't fix it all. One can read between the lines that he may well be glad to hear a Pigford II proposal come before him so that he could ratify it once Congress has appropriated an additional \$1.15 billion.

Here is what Judge Friedman wrote about the Pigford settlements, these \$50,000 settlements that were paid out to black farmers for—they had to meet four criteria: had to be African American. They had to have farmed or wanted to farm. They had to have believed they were discriminated against. And they had to attest that they filed a complaint, that could have been verbal, to a USDA employee, a Member of Congress, a couple other categories. That's four criteria. Actually, the fifth one was then that someone, not a close family member, had to sign an affidavit that attested that they had not only believed they were discriminated against, but they had complained about it, not necessarily in writing, but it could have been verbally to any USDA employee under any circumstances. It didn't have to be a public meeting with witnesses.

It could have simply been walking down the street and you meet someone who might be the director of your county FSA, and you say, I don't think your people treated me right. I should have had a loan. That would be all it would take. If you didn't get the loan, you wouldn't even have had to apply. You just maybe had to think you weren't going to be treated right and failed to apply for the loan. That's enough. You don't have to prove discrimination. You just have to allege it

and get a friend to sign the affidavit. That's all that's required under Pigford I.

And then according to Judge Paul Friedman, he writes this: "The consent decree accomplishes its purpose primarily through a two-track dispute resolution mechanism that provides those class members with little or no documentary evidence with," and I am quoting from this opinion, Madam Speaker, "a virtually automatic cash payment of \$50,000 and forgiveness of debt owed to the USDA." And anybody who believes that that's not enough, they can actually sue on their own and prove it by the preponderance of the evidence.

But there is no proof required to receive the \$50,000 virtually automatic cash payment except to get a friend to sign the affidavit that says that you complained about it and you believed you were discriminated against. And then all it had to be was to allege that you were turned down for a loan or a farm program of some type or another.

Madam Speaker, \$1.05 billion was distributed under no basis beyond that, no requirement or proof for discrimination. And a very, very low level of even asking them if they actually ever complained or filed a complaint. And no verification required that they ever farmed or ever applied for a USDA loan or program. You didn't have to farm. You just had to say I am black, I wanted to farm, and I believe they discriminated against me, and I complained about it, and I have got a friend that will sign the document. That's it, Madam Speaker.

And \$1.05 billion was distributed on that basis. And virtually automatic payments, much of it debt forgiveness included. And if anyone actually was a farmer and actually did have debt with the USDA, all of their debt was forgiven also. And Judge Paul Friedman said a virtually automatic payment if you didn't want to go through track two and get a bigger check than the \$50,000 and the debt forgiveness, which Judge Friedman calculates that the average settlement would be \$187,500.

Now, we don't have an accounting from the USDA on how large the average settlements are. We don't have the spreadsheet of the 22,500 applicants that poured in after the direction of this opinion by Judge Friedman and the consent decree that accompanies it directed that there be town hall meetings across the South, that the attorneys on this case, in order to earn their contingency fees, needed to go out and promote this. And they needed to put newspaper ads in and radio ads in. I believe there was also television. I can't verify that for sure. And hold meetings and call people to them.

And we have reports from throughout the South that there were meetings that were held in churches, in town hall meetings, and they were told this is your 40 acres and a mule. You need to come and sign up for this. And this is what you have to attest to in order

to get the \$50,000 check. And if you have any debt, it will be forgiven.

Now, if you present that, if you have attorneys working on contingency fees, you have the perfect mechanism for fraud. And so as we look across the South, I can't believe that all of the counties discriminated against their African American population equally. I would have to believe that if discrimination took place—and I believe it did—that it took place sometimes in a county there would be none, because the culture of that office in that county would be such that everybody gets treated equally, with respect and promptly, with all the help that they can give with the staff that they have. I believe that takes place in at least some of the counties in the South. And I believe it has for a generation or more.

I suspect—and I don't have reason to believe, but I suspect—there were counties on the other side of that spectrum where they as a matter of practice discriminated against African Americans. And these are the cases that I believe needed to be compensated. But I can't believe that it was the same level of discrimination across all of these counties.

And when I see applications, and I have a stack of these applications, most of which were paid out, and they name the same USDA employee as the one they complained to, and they give the location and the date, and that USDA employee was not at that location, could not have been at locations as far apart as they were claimed, as many dates as were claimed. And why would it be that one USDA employee had all of these complaints and yet nothing was done about the discrimination? It's this, that they offered the name over and over again.

It's kind of like if you see an individual's name, and when you look through all these applications, and I have looked through stacks of them, when I look through them and I see often the same name of the USDA employee, I see the same handwriting on application after application, I can see the narrative has been changed just slightly from application to application. If they were numbered chronologically, I can just about tell you what's going on. There is an attorney's staff that is sitting there filling out these applications. They may actually be interviewing the individuals. The individuals had to sign because they were going to get the check. And the attorney's going to get a contingency fee out of that. And we don't know how much that is. And that's not in this opinion. It's not in the consent decree. But what is in there is that the IRS gets paid also as a matter of settlement.

□ 2000

So if it's a \$50,000 virtually automatic payment, as Judge Friedman says, there is also a \$12,500 check that accompanies that that gets mailed off to the IRS.

And so now it becomes \$62,500. Judge Friedman estimated the average debt would be \$100,000. And so the debt forgiveness at \$100,000 would automatically send the check to the IRS for \$25,000 to pay the tax liability that comes from the debt forgiveness that would become a tax liability for those individuals.

Those things went on. His estimate, \$187,500 per settlement, believing that the applicants, or at least presuming to believe that the applicants for the Pigford settlement were applicants that actually were engaged in programs within the USDA. Now I can tell you whether we can get a decent insight into whether there are actual farming participants that are predominantly part of these Pigford settlements, the 14,500 that have received their first payments under the first version of Pigford I.

If we can go back and look at all the data, check their name, address, contact information, the amount of the check that they got, how much got sent to the IRS, how much debt forgiveness there was, how much got sent to the IRS. And we can look down through there, and we can see what percentage of them had debt with the USDA that was written off.

And then we can take a look at the addresses and see—some of those who have analyzed this more deeply than I would tell me that if you take out a map of the United States and start down through these applications and start sticking pins in the map at the addresses of the applications, you will find that many of these pins go directly into the inner cities and into the urban areas of America.

It's true that people can move from the farm to the city. They have been doing that for a long time. But the preponderance of the pins tell a story that doesn't appear to be consistent with the allegations of the depth and the level of fraud that they say are there.

I sat down with USDA employees. I have had these applications handed to me. I have had them come back sick at heart that they had to administer these settlements in Pigford farms and tell me that they believe that the minimum fraud level in the applications that they were required to provide a virtually automatic payment for, a minimum fraud being at 75 percent. I hear numbers from USDA employees that dealt with more application of this that go into the upper 90th percentile.

I want to look at these numbers and see. It's amazing to me that we can have 22,000 applicants, 14,500 settlements, payments that are made, and throughout all that time not have a single USDA employee that has been fired or disciplined or even identified as a perpetrator of discrimination. If we really care about ending discrimination in America—and we may have actually cleaned up the USDA, I don't allege that's the case today. In fact, I would argue that it wasn't nearly as

bad as they would like to have us believe.

And so if a discrimination took place, we should have been able to identify the perpetrators, and they should have been punished. And I think that it's irresponsible on the part of the secretaries of Agriculture, who have supported this Pigford settlement, to also say I can find not just 22,000 people that will apply; now we have applications and an additional 70,000 or so.

Now we are looking at applications in Pigford II of as many as 94,000 altogether, an additional 70,000 or so, 72,000 added to the 22,000 original claimants. And we end up with a total number of claimants of 94,000 who say that they were discriminated against. That's a really effective and efficient marketing result on the part of the attorneys that have been set up on these contingency fees and who are charged by the consent decree, the original consent decree, of holding these town hall meetings and getting the word out to African American farmers so they know if they have been discriminated against they can apply.

Again, no proof required that they were discriminated against. Early on they were required to prove that they were denied benefits compared to a similarly situated white farmer, and they complained that that was too hard. So they waived that similarly situated, and it turned out then there is no proof required that they ever farmed or applied for a program; they just have to say they wanted to farm, and that they believe they were or would have been discriminated against, and that they complained about it, and have their friends sign their affidavit.

That's what up: 94,000 applications all together. Perhaps a few less, but these are the estimates I am working with: 94,000 applications. John Boyd, President of the National Black Farmers Organization that has pushed on this and actually was formed for the purpose of bringing forth the Pigford Farms issue, testified before the Judiciary Committee that there are 18,000 black farmers in America, 18,000.

Now, granted there were more a generation earlier. There were more farmers a generation earlier. A lot of my neighbors went broke. I burned and buried a lot of farm sites across western Iowa in those years as the farm crisis went into its downward spiral, and there were people there that carried debt. There were people that were out of debt that took on debt in order to stay in business.

And as the downward spiral came, the value of their land went down, their machinery went down. The commodities prices weren't there for their crops, and bank after bank closed. And, in fact, my bank closed April 26, Friday afternoon, 3 o'clock, 1985. I will never forget that day.

I had a company to run, I had customers, most of whom were also customers of the bank that was closed—two branches shut down—a payroll to

meet. I had 2 pennies in my pocket, literally 2 pennies to rub together, just almost a symbol of how hard it was. Rub those two pennies together and hope and wish and work and pray to figure out how I could meet payroll with my employees, keep the business running, find some customers that could pay because I had my customers, all their accounts were frozen like mine was frozen.

We found a way to get through. It was difficult. But I watched that crisis hit, not just the bank closing in my neighborhood, all across the Midwest, especially. I watched it crush people. I watched family farms move off and load their things and move to the city.

So some of those pins that get stuck in the city are pins of people that were on the land that had to move off in the farm crisis here. But my point is this: That thousands of farmers went broke during the farm crisis years of the 1980s. The entire decade of the 1980s—actually starting in 1979 and flowing through, were farm crisis years.

These are the primary years where they alleged discrimination against black farmers. And where it took place, it's hard to quantify because its laid over the top of the disaster of the farm crisis years of the entire decade of the 1980s. Many people went broke. Many people were denied farm program benefits and loan programs. There were many that were not viable, and the USDA concluded that they couldn't work with them because they were going to go under.

They were already upside down. And to put good money after bad was not a good decision, not when things were spiraling downwards.

I saw banks close, new owners come in. I saw them interview the people that would come in with their loan application form, their financial statements. And I saw them go down through the financial statements. I mean I was a part of this, and I engaged with my neighbors that were going through this as I was.

As they would look at the assets and they would say, let's see. You have got this nice new combine here. Well, you are going to sell it. And you have a pretty nice pickup that's 2 years old, we are going to sell it. And by the way all the livestock that's here, you know, it could die or get sick, but it's very liquid. It can go to the sale barn this week. We will sell all of that.

And you won't need that feed so you can auction off all that hay you have got there for the cattle that are in the feedlot, you can sell them. And you don't need the horse, and you don't need your best tractor. We can get you down to a small tractor, and you can hire somebody to come in and custom combine, and you can borrow your neighbor's planter, and we will keep you on some of this land. We will take the mortgage on it. We will take a first and a second mortgage on it, and we will keep you operating for a little while, but you are going to work for the bank.

Now I am not picking on the bank; that's what they had to do to keep some of these people alive and keep them functioning. That's part of the farm program, or that is part of the crisis. The farm program did come in, and it was helpful in 1983. It gave us another boost in 1985. It got us through that decade, and now we are relatively prosperous compared to those years.

But whatever color you were, if you were farming in the 1980s, you were having trouble. And a lot of people went under, there was farm sale after farm sale. I remember the bills hanging up, the sale bills hanging up in the gas stations around, in the sale barn, where there would be farm auctions.

You could go to farm auctions, several of them a weekend every weekend, and we did that for a long time, and it hurt a lot. And I saw tears run down people's cheeks because they were standing on the land that had been homesteaded by their ancestors, and they were losing it. And it was their identity. It's who they were.

So I know, I know from personal experience how painful this is to go through those years. And to completely discount that component of the economy and argue that a lot of African American farmers that went under in the 1980s would still be farming today if it hadn't been for the discrimination in the USDA offices, it denies the starkest facts of the economy altogether. But they can't be untangled; they are tangled together. It's impossible to quantify.

□ 2010

And so the leftists in the country have decided they're just going to pay everybody that applies. That's what Pigford I was. And there was a deadline. It was filed on April 14, 1999. So you get 6 months for everybody to sign up and go out and have all these meetings, do your fish fries, meet in the churches, advertise on the radio, in the newspaper, wherever you can, and hold all these town hall meetings. And they held them—42 of them in Alabama alone, 42 meetings. And people signed up. When the deadline came 6 months after that April 14 date, then they found they had things so ginned up there were a lot of other applicants.

So even though \$1.05 billion was paid out under this Pigford discrimination claim, there were Members of the House and the Senate that introduced legislation to open up a second one, Pigford II. And they tried to do it, but they didn't get it done. This Congress wouldn't buy it. We had already seen the level of fraud in Pigford I, and to open it up again and extend the closing deadline for the consent decree so that all of these other applicants could come pouring in, this roughly 70,000, at least 66,000 that had accumulated, wasn't bought by this House and Senate in the same form. It bounced back and forth. It passed in a couple of versions on one side or the other, but this Congress never got together on

that, never got together on the authorization to extend the date.

We did get together on one thing, Mr. Speaker. We got together on the 2008 farm bill to address Pigford in a way that the House and the Senate agreed, and the President signed it. It was brought forward here on the floor, right over there from that microphone, by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, COLLIN PETERSON, a late amendment of language that came into the bill, into the farm bill that we worked on for a long time. And it's a hard job to bring a farm bill through this Congress. And I'm sure that the weight of that weighed a little on the chairman and weighed on all of us, more on him than on anybody else. It had to have. But I argued with him at the time, the language in the farm bill authorizes \$100 million to close the Pigford issue so that if there were any remaining claims that had not been resolved, they would be put underneath the \$100 million amount, and they would all be resolved.

I argued, Mr. Chairman, you are opening up Pigford for an additional \$1.3 billion in liabilities. And it's full of fraud. And I sat way into the night in a markup on the farm bill with a representative of the USDA who had lived this and went down through anecdote after anecdote, circumstance after circumstance, and convinced me completely that there's a very, very high level of fraud that was taking place. But yet the structure of this settlement was such that they couldn't look into the fraud because you didn't have to meet the standard of being discriminated against; you just had to say you believe you were discriminated against.

So we had our debate, Chairman PETERSON and I, outside the record of this Congress actually. I said it's \$1.3 billion; this is a placeholder and a marker that opens up the door for \$1.3 billion. He said, no, \$100 million puts an end to it. And that's what we're doing. We're cleaning it up, and we're putting an end to Pigford. And I said, I don't think so. We went around on that dialogue which ended with him walking away. I don't know if I blame him for that.

But here is what's in the bill. He says the maximum amount, farm bill 2008, H.R. 2419, the total amount of payments and debt relief pursuant to actions commenced under subsection B shall not exceed \$100 million. That's what the chairman said. And here is the intent, intent of Congress as to the remedial nature of the section. It is the intent of Congress that this section be liberally construed so as to effectuate its remedial purpose of giving a full determination on the merits for each Pigford claim previously denied that determination.

In other words, if there are 66 or 70,000 applicants out there that didn't get in before Pigford closed in October of 1999, if those Johnny-come-latelies wanted to pour their applications into

this, this Congress said, here is \$100 million, that's it, it's going to take care of all the claims and no more; this is the end by law. This is the section that's cited by the current Secretary of Agriculture that he says gave him the authority at the direction of Congress, actually, acting at the direction of Congress to open up and create a Pigford II settlement where he, Secretary Vilsack and Attorney General Eric Holder sat down with John Boyd, the head of the black farmers organization, and they cooked up Pigford II, not authorized by the House and the Senate and the President as would be required if he's going to act in the fashion that he told me, in fact, not authorized at all, \$100 million cap put on this Pigford I to put an end to it. By the way, I disagreed with \$100 million. I thought we went too far with the first \$1.05 billion.

But in any case, there exists no authorization that came from Congress and no legislation that was passed by the Congress and signed by the President that gave the authority to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Attorney General to sit down with the head of the black farmers organization and arrive at an agreement early last year in February that would tap the taxpayers for an additional \$1.15 billion. But that's what they agreed to. They went on their own and had these negotiations.

Now, where would this inspiration have come from? If Congress said it's capped at \$100 million, how would Cabinet members, full Cabinet members, come to a conclusion that they needed to go sit down with John Boyd and tap the taxpayers for an additional \$1.15 billion? Where would this come from?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you where I think it may come from, and that would be from the President of the United States who, as a United States Senator, introduced the Pigford II language that opened up the filings for a second round of Pigford claims as the United States Senator, led by Barack Obama, and over on this side led by ARTUR DAVIS of Alabama and BOBBY SCOTT of Virginia.

They pushed that. They tried to push it through the Judiciary Committee. It didn't go. They slipped it into the farm bill at \$100 million. They got their placeholder. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, who was right? Who was right? Was it Steve King or Tom Vilsack or was it Collin Peterson? Because we are here today lamenting what happened on the House floor yesterday, which was a vote to send \$1.15 billion additional into this Pigford II settlement that I will tell you even though they have put some provisions in here still result in—still result in a virtually automatic payment to those claimants that will come. That's what will happen, Mr. Speaker.

And so the chairman of the Agriculture Committee that said this is the end of it at \$100 million, who would he disagree with? Tom Vilsack or Steve

King? I'm sure he remembers the conversation. I'm sure he remembers that I said it's 1.13 billion, and this is just a placeholder that opens it up, this \$100 million is a placeholder that opens it up. We disagreed we had that conversation. One of us is going to be right.

Did he know when he brought the language to this floor that \$100 million was going to turn out to be a placeholder for \$1.25 billion? That's \$100 million plus the \$1.15 billion. Did he know that? Or was the chairman of the Agriculture Committee apparently was he misinformed by someone else? Did the President of the United States direct his Cabinet members to go negotiate and reach an agreement for an additional payout under Pigford II of \$1.15 billion? Where would it come from? Would the Secretary of Agriculture take it upon himself if he could have ended this to open it up again? I don't think so. Would the Attorney General take it upon himself to open this up if it was ended by the farm bill of 2008? I don't think so.

I think the American people, Mr. Speaker, will suspect, as I do, that since the President was the initiator of this Pigford II legislation as a United States Senator, it was the President of the United States more likely to order his Cabinet members to go sit down and negotiate with the president of the black farmers organization and then try to figure out how to get Congress to fund it. Because the deal, the settlement proposal, and it's not a consent decree, a judge hasn't ruled upon it, a settlement proposal was something that was agreed to be contingent upon, conditional to Congress appropriating the funds to pay.

Well, last night Congress did that by a vote of 256-152. Now, if I were completely wrong on this—remember, this is a repudiated Congress. This is the lame duck Congress. This is the Congress that the American people have said enough already, shut it off. Take the shovel out of the President's hand; he's dug a deep enough hole. Stop your spending. We're going to send people to the Congress that will do the battle for fiscal responsibility and stop spending.

□ 2020

Those folks have not arrived yet, those 87 new freshmen Republicans who will be here taking the oath of office on this floor on January 4, 2011. They are not here yet, so we have the old troika ruling. We have the old troika ruling, and still, still we produced 152 “no” votes on this Pigford funding of \$1.15 billion that came through here yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that I believe that all 152 who voted “no” on that either deeply suspect or are convinced that there was a significant amount of fraud in Pigford I, and that the fraud in Pigford II will be substantially greater than it was in Pigford I because those, at least in theory, who were most discriminated against are the ones most likely to have filed the

application in Pigford I in a timely fashion. Those who got the news late, once the inertia of the recruitment went on across the South, they are the ones who lined up a little later. It is kind of a chain letter effect.

There were 152 who voted “no.” It was a bipartisan objection to the funding of Pigford. It wasn’t all Republicans this time. By Speaker PELOSI’s definition, it would be clearly bipartisan. There were three Democrats who voted “no.” Those Democrats, I presume, were making a statement that they believed either that those who had been discriminated against had been compensated or were making a statement against the fraud that they must believe exists. I have not talked to them so I can’t take a position as to what they believed and why they voted “no.”

But it is curious to me that two of the three Democrats who voted “no” on Pigford were two that were defeated in the last election. So one can presume that they are votes of conscience that they put up on their way home from this Congress. I thank them for their service to this country. We have one that won his election who is seated from the South who also voted “no.” I would like to hear from him. He happens to be a Rhodes Scholar, a man with a brain and a conscience that voted “no.”

So now it is up to us here in this upcoming Congress to take a look at these records, to go down and compile the spreadsheet and analyze the data and interview the people that were involved in administering this to get a real picture of what was going on. I am very well aware there are good, solid people who are responsible constitutional conservatives who don’t want to touch this. I am very well aware of that, Mr. Speaker, but we have an obligation to the American people to shine a light on this. And I intend to move forward to do that within the limitation of the time and the resources and the cooperation I am able to get in the 112th Congress.

There has been a massive amount of fraud defined to me in the interviews I have done with USDA employees. To the extent, as I said, that African American employees of the Farm Service Administration who worked within the offices, presumably if they worked there, they would not allow themselves to be discriminated against. And if they never farmed and never filed an application but received a check anyway, it is pretty clear that there is levels of fraud that need to be exposed.

And so, Mr. Speaker, there is much to be said about Pigford II. It is not a consent decree. There is only an agreement that has been negotiated between Tom Vilsack and Eric Holder and John Boyd. They have negotiated that agreement. They have negotiated the amount. They have succeeded in getting it past the Senate after the Senate reached a point of exhaustion in fighting it. That is my reports from some of

the Senators over there. They did pass it through the House after vociferous objections, 256 to 152, but with bipartisan objection; southern Democrats voting “no,” not urban but southern Democrats voting “no.”

It is on its way and we are pretty sure the President will sign it because, after all, it has been his baby since he was in the United States Senate. It is really odd that a man from Chicago would take such an interest in an issue that he can’t have personal experience with, not having personal experience that we know of in the rural areas.

And here we are, Mr. Speaker, anticipating the President will sign it. When he does, if and when he does, then I believe they will take it before the same judge that started out the Pigford I opinion with these words, “40 acres and a mule,” and laments that he can’t fix all of the problems of slavery and segregation in one class action suit. Well, he has got a second one now. It is likely to come to him. I am pretty sure Judge Friedman will approve this. And I am really confident that the Secretary of Agriculture, and if you can get the Attorney General to speak, will say that they put all kinds of safeguards in here, safeguards like lawyers have to sign off. Yeah, well, they had to sign off on the first one, too, and that didn’t really resolve this issue. It is just to the best of their knowledge they think it is true. That is not a very strong statement. There is no requirement for evidence. They did put some language in there that allows the administrators, if they think there is fraud, to ask more questions and require more documentation. Okay. But if they are instructed not to think there is fraud, they will not find fraud.

This administration does not think there is fraud or they would be looking for it. It is amazing to me—18,000 black farmers, 94,000 claims. Even if you presume that 100 percent of the black farmers were discriminated against, we still have four and a half claims for every black farmer. How does this work? It should be fraud. It can’t be described any other way.

And the percentages of these claims, there is no question that comes out of this administration, out of the White House or the Department of Agriculture or the Attorney General’s office. They are not saying we are looking into the fraud. They are saying, if it exists, it is so low it is really not an issue. But we are going to satisfy your concerns by having an IG report come out in 6 months. The money is gone. You won’t be able to get it back.

If you want to learn something about how to protect against fraud in Pigford II, let’s look at Pigford I. We already have the data. Let’s dig into it. So what I think we have to do is dig into both. And we owe it to the American people not to be paying out 40 acres and a mule. You cannot right wrongs from a century and a half ago. But if they were righted, Abraham Lincoln told us how: For every drop of blood

that was drawn by the lash be paid by a drop drawn by the sword. That’s done. That is behind us. We have an American future. We can’t be paying modern-day slavery reparations thinking we compensate what took place in the past. We have the future to worry about. Let’s make sure everybody has equal opportunity and let’s build for the future.

I see my friend, the gentleman from Texas, Judge GOHMERT has arrived. And when Judge GOHMERT comes to the floor, I know that there is some real important input that the American people need to know, and so I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. My dear friend from Iowa has made some really important points. But it seems to be part of a pattern, what we have seen for the last 4 years, of the majority here in the House dividing America, playing class envy, trying to just really take—it is not Robin Hood, because Robin Hood took money back from people that stole it to give it back to the people who had actually generated the money. So I know there are some friends on the other side of the aisle who think that they are being a bit of Robin Hood, but they need to understand Robin Hood better. He didn’t take from people who earned the money; he took from people who basically stole it and gave it back to people that generated it. And yet that is the kind of stuff we see going on.

There is so much fraud in Medicare and there is so much fraud, waste, and abuse in the government itself. And yet still we hear this class envy being trumpeted. I know my friend from Iowa agrees 100 percent with me, if anybody in America makes more money, they should pay more income tax. If you had a flat income tax, that would be the case. You do have people like the renowned Warren Buffett who says he should pay more taxes. Many people like him pay less money in income tax than somebody making \$30,000, \$40,000 because they have all kinds of great ways of getting around having to pay taxes.

But I just am so deeply grieved to my soul that this class envy that is being played up by people across the aisle to avoid helping the economy by giving some certainty to people who are wondering whether they will be able to afford to hire people right now when it comes January 1 because they know the capital gains rates are going up, every marginal rate is going up.

□ 2030

It is outrageous that we have played games for 2 years now—4 years under this majority—and we have done nothing to give certainty to employers so that people will not have to file suit to try to get a job. There will be jobs created because there is certainty out there.

Most people who know about job creation know the old saying: “Capital is a coward. Capital goes to where it feels



safest." But to feel safe, investment money has to be placed where there is some certainty under the law. It is why it's not pouring into Mexico, because they don't know who is going to be in charge, who is going to be killed, who is going to be corrupted.

So all that the community is needing to know is: Is there going to be some certainty? Are our taxes going to go through the roof come January 1 as they are currently scheduled to do?

The fact that this majority would play this kind of gamesmanship and class warfare when people are out of work—they need jobs, and they want to have a Merry Christmas. There would be no better Christmas than to have a job for Christmas, but we've got this tremendously high rate of unemployment, particularly when you figure those who are underemployed. Yet this majority, even now in December, is still not willing to just say across the board that we're going to not create tax cuts—that's not even out there—but just extend the current tax rate and say we're not going to play class warfare. Of course the people who make more money should pay more money in taxes. That's why their rate is 35 percent instead of 15 percent or 10 percent at the lowest rate.

So it just grieves me. I know people who are out of work, and I know there are businesspeople I've talked to who say, I've got to find out what my taxes are going to be, what the tax rate will be for next year, because if it's going up, I can't hire anybody. If it's going to stay where it is, I can hire some people.

Now, that's a Merry Christmas when you give people a job. You limit all the bogus class warfare going on in this body, and just say, Forget the games. This is too serious. We are playing with people's lives. We are tired with the gamesmanship about how we can squeeze more money out of the Federal Government. Forget the Federal Government. Just get out of the way so that we can create jobs in America and put people back to work.

Still, unless my friend from Iowa knows differently, as far as I know, we're not taking it up, as we didn't on Monday. We congratulated some people. We, I think, named a post office, and we did a bunch of stuff yesterday—nothing, you know, breathtaking. With the Child Nutrition Act, we're going to run up the Federal Government costs.

Why not give these people an opportunity to have a job so they can pay for their own nutrition?

As far as I know, the tax extension, at the current rate across the board, is not coming up tomorrow. It may not come up Friday. We don't know when it's coming up.

So, anyway, I have been grieved to my soul as I think about the people I know who don't have jobs and about the people I know who would hire people if they knew that the tax rates were not going up. I just had to point it out one more time to our friends across the aisle. Please don't leave an-

other day leaving the tax rates in limbo. Give some certainty. Allow jobs to be created that are not government jobs.

Perhaps you know when this is going to come up.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time and thanking the gentleman from Texas, also my friend, I appreciate the subject matter that you brought here to the floor tonight.

I would add to this: not only do we need to continue the tax rates that we have today, but I would make them permanent so there is certainty, so that people can do the investments that Mr. GOHMERT talked about and will be able to plan their businesses and create the jobs and plan for the future.

But there is another one that hangs over the head of many families in America today, and that is the estate tax. That one is the most ominous of them all. If we aren't able to reach an agreement on these tax brackets by the end of this lame duck session and if we are just in the condition that we are in today in that there is no certainty and where the \$1 trillion or \$2 trillion of capital that is sitting on the sidelines doesn't get released and invested into our economy, that's bad. We've already seen a lot of months of it, so another month of it doesn't devastate us completely, although it would be a great Christmas present.

I know people would be sitting around the family shop, figuring out, We can add onto this production line. Let's hire this person here. Let's make this part of our operation go. Let's open up a new business over here.

These things would be going on. That would all happen if we could get these tax brackets made permanent between now and the end of this wounded, crippled lame duck session that we have of this repudiated Congress that has been renounced by the American people.

Another month of it isn't as bad as what happens if we go another month with the estate tax hanging over our heads the way it is, because I will tell you that what will happen is there will be thousands of Americans who are lying on their death beds—some in hospices around the country, some in hospital beds, some of them lying at home—and there will be decisions made by them and their families.

Somebody who is lying there, who has got some years on him and a lot of life behind him, knowing he doesn't have much ahead of him, will say, Don't put me on life support. Don't give me any life-saving treatment. Let me pass away in 2010 because, if that happens, then you'll get the full inheritance of my life's work.

That's what he will say. He'll make that decision.

He'll tell his loved ones, Don't extend my life. Don't give me extra ways to feed me. Don't give me IVs. Let me lie here. Put me in hospice now, and let me slowly die.

That's what will be said over and over again.

There will be those who will go further. There will be those who will decide they want to end their lives so that their children don't have to pay an onerous estate tax that will have, as of midnight on December 31, a \$1 million exemption. After that, there will be an up to 55 percent tax on the balance.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, how that works in the neighborhood where I live. Let's just say there is somebody there who is 90 years old, and he went out and bought some land early on in life, and he leveraged it and bought another piece of land. He slowly paid for that, and ended up with a couple sections of land paid for. That's 2 square miles. That's 640 acres times two. That's 1,280 acres paid for. That's the nest egg that he worked all his life for. Maybe he worked 70 or more years to put that together. He paid the tax on the income, and retired the principal and paid the interest, and there it sits for his children. Maybe he has got five children there around that death bed.

If he passes away in the first second of 2011—by the way, there will be death certificates that are backdated, too. They'll be back-timed, probably not backdated. They'll be back-timed past midnight so the estate tax won't apply. But let's just say there are two sections of land, five kids. He passes away in the first second of 2011, and the death certificate says so. Here is what happens to those two sections of land:

The \$1 million exemption doesn't really touch the value of those two good valuable sections of land, so you can take one section out of there. There's the 55 percent tax to pay the taxman, to pay the death tax. It takes one whole section of land, 1 square mile, to pay the Federal Government. The second component of that is the section of land that is split up five ways because of the five kids.

So what they have is actually two sections of land—one that is essentially debt free because the other one has gone to pay the taxes, and it gets split five ways. Everyone has got 20 percent equity. They can't buy that land back and keep it in tact. It takes a long time to put a unit together, to put the building site together, to get the storage that's there for the grain and the livestock and all the pieces to work. It doesn't just work to go out there and say, Well, here's another piece of land that's the same or you can operate an operation that's half the size with only 20 percent equity. So it wipes out both sections of land. They sell out the whole legacy. A century of work or more goes out the window because we have a death tax that comes. The bell tolls on the death tax at midnight, December 31.

It is cruel, unconscionable and, I think, a sin for this Congress not to address that before that time.

So, Mr. Speaker, being very well aware of the clock and the duties that we all have here, I want to thank my friend from Texas for coming to the

floor and for volunteering that valuable input that we have.  
I appreciate your indulgence here this evening and the privilege to address you on the floor of the House of Representatives.  
I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:  
Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of the birth of her baby girl born December 1 at 12:21 a.m.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:  
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CARNAHAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)  
Mr. YARMUTH, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. KLEIN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.  
(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. SCHMIDT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)  
Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, December 8.  
Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, December 8.  
(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)  
Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. CLAY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. REYES, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. CARNAHAN, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. GARAMENDI, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mrs. DAVIS of California, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. SHEA-PORTER, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. CLEAVER, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. TAYLOR, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3386. An act to protect consumers from certain aggressive sales tactics on the Internet, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.  
S. 3987. An act to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act with respect to the applicability of identity theft guidelines to creditors to the Committee on Financial Services.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the speaker:  
H.R. 6162. An act to provide research and development authority for alternative coinage materials to the Secretary of the Treasury, increase congressional oversight over coin production, and ensure the continuity of certain numismatic items.  
H.R. 6166. An act to authorize the production of palladium bullion coins to provide affordable opportunities for investments in precious metals, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.  
The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 2, 2010, at 10 a.m.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 6184, To amend the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 to extend and modify the program allowing the Secretary of the Army to accept and expend funds contributed by non-Federal public entities to expedite the evaluation of permits, for other purposes, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CBO ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 6184, A BILL TO AMEND THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000 TO EXTEND AND MODIFY THE PROGRAM ALLOWING THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY TO ACCEPT AND EXPEND FUNDS CONTRIBUTED BY NON-FEDERAL PUBLIC ENTITIES TO EXPEDITE THE EVALUATION OF PERMITS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, AS TRANSMITTED WITH AN AMENDMENT TO CBO ON NOVEMBER 9, 2010

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—											
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2011–2015	2011–2020
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (–) IN THE DEFICIT												
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

H.R. 6184, as amended, would extend through 2016 the authority of the Corps to collect and spend funds contributed by private firms to expedite the evaluation of permit applications. Because the legislation would affect direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures apply. However, based on information from the Corps, CBO estimates that amounts collected and spent for such purposes would total less than \$500,000 annually and that the net budgetary impact would be negligible.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:  
10530. A letter from the Chair, Election Assistance Commission, transmitting a letter in response to a report by the Government Accountability Office regarding the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.  
10531. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Brigadier General Byron C. Hepburn, United States Air Force, to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of major general; to the Committee on Armed Services.  
10532. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Captian Scott P. Moore, United States Navy, to wear the authorized insignia

of the grade of rear Admiral (lower half); to the Committee on Armed Services.  
10533. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Safety of Facilities, Infrastructure, and Equipment for Military Operations (DFARS Case 2009-D029) (RIN: 0750-AG73) received October 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.  
10534. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS); Continuation of Essential Contractor Services (DFARS Case 2009-D017) (RIN: 0750-AG52) received October 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

10535. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Continuation of Current Contracts-Deletion of Redundant Text (DFARS Case 2010-D016) received October 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.  
10536. A letter from the Chairman, Congressional Oversight Panel, transmitting the Panel's monthly report pursuant to Section 125(b)(1) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, Pub. L. 110-343; to the Committee on Financial Services.  
10537. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: