

improve the lives of Afghani citizens. They will work to build an agricultural and irrigation system where local Afghani farmers can grow fruit and vegetables, raise livestock, and better manage limited water resources. Their efforts will create a stable, vital agricultural base and water resources system that can support the Afghani people and serve as a springboard for further economic growth in rural Afghan villages.

I cannot emphasize enough the importance of this kind of development and reconstruction. A stable, productive Afghani agricultural sector will be a counter-balance to the Taliban and the illicit production of opium, both of which are prevalent in rural parts of that nation and a threat to the security of the Afghan people and our military mission there. We have a chance to counteract these activities by collaborating with the Afghani people to find the tools and the seeds to grow their own democracy. In partnership with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Georgia Army National Guard will also deliver clean water to more and more Afghani communities. By simply treating and transporting clean water to these communities, we will dramatically improve the health of the overall population, helping to win the hearts and minds of the Afghani people.

We have a real chance to turn the tide, and the Georgia Army National Guard Agricultural Development Team will continue that fight. I am so proud to see our Georgia military men and women meeting this challenge and leading the effort in the coming year to further transform Afghani society. It is my hope that through the work of the Agricultural Development Team and their Afghani partners, Afghanistan will develop an agrarian foundation that will not only bear food, but also the fruits of liberty, prosperity, and security in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Georgia Army National Guard Agricultural Development Team for their outstanding service to our country and for their commitment to growing the seeds of democracy. May God bless them on their mission in Afghanistan and return them safely home.

#### TAIWAN F-16 SALES

#### HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, April 15, 2011*

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, as a long-time friend of Taiwan and as a Member of Congress who has frequent interaction with Taiwanese American constituents, I rise today to bring a timely issue to your attention.

My support for Taiwan, and especially for arms sales to Taiwan, is well-known and well-documented. As a matter of fact, I inserted a statement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last spring calling for the expedient sale of F-16s to Taiwan.

Recently, I read an article in the Taipei Times that left me rattled.

On February 20, 2011, the director of the American Enterprise Institute's Program on Advanced Strategic Studies, Mr. Gary Schmitt, wrote in the Taipei Times, "When your girlfriend refuses to set a date for a wedding, and does so over several years, it's probably a good idea to start looking around for another

fiancé. So it is today with Taiwan's efforts to procure more than five dozen F-16s from the U.S. This is a courtship from Taipei's end that has been going on since 2006. After nearly five years, it's time to consider moving on."

I believe it is critical that we do not drive Taiwan to the point where they have to start looking for fighters elsewhere. This situation is especially concerning because it will cost the U.S. jobs at a time when the domestic economy—particularly my home state of Texas—could use all the help it can get.

Mr. Speaker, let's not forget that today's Taiwan continues to be under an ominous shadow cast by the over 1,600 short- and medium-range ballistic missiles that the People's Republic of China (PRC) has aimed at it. The PRC continues to refuse to renounce the use of force against Taiwan, continues to claim Taiwan as a renegade province, and, to add insult to injury, passed an "Anti-Secession Law" on March 14, 2005, mandating military action if Taiwan moves toward formal de jure independence. We strongly condemned passage of this "Anti-Secession Law" when we passed House Concurrent Resolution 98 on March 16, 2005.

Section 3(a) and (b) of the 1979 Taiwan Relations Act, which is the cornerstone of United States-Taiwan relations and the law of the land, stipulates that both the President and the Congress shall determine the nature and quantity of defense articles and services that we are legally bound to provide to Taiwan, based solely upon their judgment of the needs of Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude my remarks by urging my esteemed colleagues to join me in requesting the President move ahead with the sale of F-16s to Taiwan at this time.

#### TAXPAYER RECEIPT ACT OF 2011

#### HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, April 15, 2011*

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, in the recent months, taxes and spending have become a central topic in our national debate. How much federal income tax people pay and what those taxes pay for is not well understood by many Americans.

Very little information about how tax revenues are spent is ever made available to the American people. This results in significant misinformation. For example, a Washington Post and Kaiser Foundation poll found that by a margin of two to one, Americans believe that the federal government spends more on foreign aid than on either Social Security or Medicare. This is why I am reintroducing the Taxpayer Receipt Act of 2011. This bill requires the Secretary of the Treasury to provide each taxpayer with a simple annual statement explaining how his or her federal income tax dollars were spent.

In the previous session I introduced this bill to bring transparency to government spending. Today, in tandem with the President's launch of the official federal taxpayer receipt, I will reintroduce this legislation to require by law that this critical information be provided to the American people for years to come.

The taxpayer receipt act provides an unbiased objective receipt that details federal

spending based on the same budget functions used in the appropriations process and rarely changed. This ensures accuracy and consistency from year to year, to ensure that the tax receipt is used to inform the American people objectively and not be used as a political document.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "Information is the currency of democracy." To that end, providing Americans with information and transparency on government spending is essential to maintaining the strength and health of our democracy.

#### THE INDEMNIFICATION PROVISIONS OF THE DODD-FRANK WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

#### HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, April 15, 2011*

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, swap data repositories have the ability to provide regulators and markets with information on aggregate data positions that can assist them in evaluating and managing risk. However, that ability can be substantially diminished if important information is excluded from them. One risk of fragmentation or exclusion of data is if a country's laws in practice provide disincentives, or even prohibitions, to the sharing of such data to a repository located in another jurisdiction.

Sections 728 and 763 of the Dodd-Frank Act require that repositories obtain indemnifications from foreign regulators before sharing information with them. There was no legislative history behind this provision, which was incorporated late in the legislative process, without having been considered in the hearing process. As a result, it was not subject to extensive discussion and consideration prior to the enactment of the Dodd-Frank Act, and its negative consequences must not have been clear to the conferees or the relevant regulatory bodies. I believe that the indemnification provision will significantly impede global regulatory cooperation.

Foreign regulators are not likely to grant Derivative Clearing Organizations, DCO's, or Swap Data Repositories, SDRs, indemnification in exchange for access to information. Accordingly, regulators may be less willing to access the aggregated market data, resulting in a reduction of information consumption, domestically and internationally, which jeopardizes market stability.

Further, the provision could have an immediate negative impact on the ability of U.S. regulators to obtain information from repositories located in foreign countries should reciprocal indemnification provisions be enacted in foreign laws. U.S. regulators, like foreign regulators, might be legally or practically precluded from signing such agreements.

This is not a theoretical concern. Just a few days ago in March, Jean-Paul Gauzes, a French Member of Parliament from the Conservative Party included in a package of 950 amendments put forth by the European Parliament to the European Commission language that would mirror the indemnification clauses in Dodd-Frank Act. The amendment was a deliberate response to the extraterritoriality provisions of "indemnity" contained in Dodd-Frank, and adoption of the package is anticipated in May of this year.

The proposed European language would require the United States government to indemnify EU trade repositories for any expenses arising from litigation relating to the information provided by the trade repository. The provision, which could well be adopted, has the potential to create numerous problems for the United States. For starters, it is not clear that U.S. regulators have the legal authority to enter into such an indemnification. Were they to do so, the indemnification becomes an invitation to such litigation by third-parties, domestic or foreign.

These problems mirror precisely the problems for EU governments created by the indemnification clauses in Dodd-Frank. In practice, while governments worked to address the issues raised by such requirements, the default position for any SDR would have to refuse to provide such information absent the indemnification, creating fragmentation and information gaps that could meaningfully harm global safety and soundness.

Preventing the exchange of information between regulators will frustrate efforts to mitigate international financial risk and fragment regulatory oversight on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis.

The goal is to ensure that in situations where foreign regulators are carrying out their regulatory responsibilities in a manner consistent with international agreements, which includes maintaining the confidentiality of data, can be appropriately exchanged without Sections 728 and 763 becoming an impediment to the goals of transparency and sound policy.

In light of the EU calendar on indemnification, swift action to prevent the unintended consequences of this inadequately considered provision of Dodd-Frank is needed.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

**HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 14, 2011*

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, today's legislation is the eighth—and I hope final—Continuing Resolution the Congress as a whole will be considering this fiscal year.

Throughout this debate, I have rejected the false choice between deep cuts that harm our fragile economic recovery or shutting down the government. Rather, as Ranking Member of the Budget Committee, I have argued for a middle ground of graduated and predictable fiscal reform that both supports our recovery and reflects our values and priorities as a nation. In that regard, I am pleased that today's agreement reduces non-emergency outlays by only \$352 million for the rest of FY 2011—and then spreads the next \$20 billion in cuts over the next five years.

I have also made clear that our nation's fiscal imbalance cannot be addressed solely through reductions in the 12 percent of the budget representing non-security discretionary spending. Like the Bipartisan Fiscal Commission, I believe the final solution must include savings from our defense budget, adjustments to mandatory spending, and increased revenue. In my judgment, that revenue can and

should come from comprehensive tax reform that eliminates tax loopholes and reinstates the Clinton era marginal rates for upper income earners.

Mr. Speaker, to govern is to choose, and today's legislation contains choices I would not have made. For example, because I believe the United States should be second to none when it comes to medical and scientific research, I do not think it makes sense to cut \$260 million from the National Institutes of Health. Additionally, because our economy needs more clean energy, reducing energy efficiency and renewable energy research, development and deployment by \$407 million is a visible step in the wrong direction. Finally, because our nation deserves a 21st century infrastructure and the jobs that go with it, slashing nearly \$1 billion from the Clean Water and Drinking Water Revolving Funds is clearly misguided. In my view, medical research, clean energy and infrastructure are all examples of investments we can and should be willing to make in order to build a healthier, cleaner and stronger America.

While I am acutely aware of this bill's shortcomings, I also believe today's agreement contains some important victories. In a very challenging fiscal environment, we have been able to fund critical educational priorities. The Head Start program serving our youngest Americans will get a \$340 million increase, and the maximum Pell Grant award will be maintained at \$5500 so deserving low-income students can go to college. Additionally, with our unemployment rate at 8.8%, we have largely protected vital job training funds at a level of \$2.8 billion. Finally, while I do not believe the Republican party has any right to impose its ideological agenda on the District of Columbia, this bill eliminates the vast majority of extreme policy riders in HR 1 ranging from women's health to public broadcasting to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Law to the EPA's efforts to combat climate change.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a far from perfect process, and not surprisingly, today's legislation is a far from perfect measure. But it is apparently the best we can do in this sharply divided Congress—and in the final analysis, I believe it is preferable to shutting down the government.

#### STATEMENT OF REP. EDWARD J. MARKEY ON THE NINETY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

**HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, April 15, 2011*

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today, we remember and honor the victims of the Armenian Genocide, and we call, once again, for passage of a resolution affirming the Armenian Genocide in the U.S. Congress.

Between 1915 and 1923, a campaign conceived and executed by the Ottoman Empire forcibly deported nearly 2 million Armenians from their homes, resulting in the deaths of 1.5 million innocent children, women and men. The history surrounding this issue is abundantly clear—genocide did occur.

While the target of this campaign of extermination was the Armenian people, it was in-

deed a crime against all people—and we must not forget lest we let it happen again. On this day every year, communities across our nation and across the world come together to remember this great tragedy. On this day, we are all Armenians.

The term “genocide” had not yet been coined in 1915, when the first Armenians were driven from their homes. The definition of this most profound crime against humanity came in 1944 from Raphael Lemkin, a Polish Jew who survived the Holocaust by fleeing to America after the fall of Warsaw to the Nazis. In the wake of World War Two, Lemkin led the international community to establish the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide. Lemkin's definitive example of genocide was the crimes against the Armenians.

And as we commemorate the Armenian Genocide, we must redouble our efforts to stop similar crimes being committed today. The scorched towns of Darfur, in western Sudan, continue to suffer mass murder, displacement, rape, and torture at the hands of the government and its militia allies. In the Democratic Republic of the Congo, armed forces continue to target ethnic populations with abductions and violence, leading to more than 5.4 million civilian deaths in the past 15 years. And just weeks ago, the humanitarian group Doctors Without Borders was forced to suspend clinics in eastern Congo due to attacks from armed Congolese soldiers. These ongoing genocides must be stopped. Immediately.

In order to eliminate these genocides in the future, we must keep alive the memories of genocides past.

The U.S. House of Representatives has had before it, for many years now, a resolution which clearly affirms the United States record on the Armenian Genocide. I have been a strong supporter and vocal cosponsor of this resolution in every Congress, and I remain so today.

Last year, when the Foreign Affairs Committee voted in support of the resolution, Turkey recalled its Ambassador to the United States. Turkey's leaders continue to say that properly recognizing the Armenian Genocide will harm U.S.-Turkey relations—that it is not the right time to pass this resolution. But it is always “the right time” for the truth.

Already, 43 states and 20 nations have officially recognized the Armenian Genocide, and it is time for the United States to do the same. After all, how can we have the moral authority to call out and condemn the genocides in Darfur or Rwanda when we are unable to acknowledge the tragedy of Armenia? I look forward to the day that this truth can be spoken aloud, in one voice, by our government, and by governments around the world. Because it is the truth.

In 2009, the governments of Turkey and Armenia announced a roadmap for normalizing relations between the two countries. In a process brokered by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, the two countries signed protocols to resume diplomacy and end the Turkish blockade of Armenia. However, before the ink had dried on those accords, the Turkish government backtracked on its commitment by adding additional preconditions.

The people of Armenia continue to face the devastating hardships wrought by the dual blockades of Turkey and Azerbaijan. These