

For the veterans who are coming back—who are homeless, who don't have addresses—for the people who don't drive, for the sick, for the disabled, for the elderly, for the children, do the right thing.

I would say to all of the people who have been on this floor tonight, we all understand the gravity of the problem. We are just saying to all of these States on the map of shame, it is time for them to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about voter suppression bills pending or already signed into law in a number of states. They have only one true purpose—to disenfranchise eligible voters.

This is a clear attempt to prevent certain predetermined segments of the population from exercising their right to vote. Students, the elderly, minorities and those for whom English is their second language are all targets.

Many of the bills, including one that was signed into law in my home state—Ohio, include the most drastic voting restrictions we have seen since before the Voting Rights Act.

These bills will not allow address changes at the polls and end volunteer-run registration drives. Twenty-one million citizens would be unable to vote because they do not have state-issued photo identification. We would say good-bye to same-day voter registration and hello to difficulty casting an absentee ballot.

There is no doubt that there is a concerted voter suppression effort underway in this nation. In the first three quarters of 2011, nineteen new restrictive laws and two new executive actions were enacted. At least forty-two bills are still pending, and at least sixty-eight more were introduced but failed.

If these bills were to become law, the effects would be catastrophic. These new laws would make it significantly harder for more than five million eligible voters to cast ballots in 2012.

Under these pending voter suppression laws, we can only imagine how many Americans would not have had the opportunity to vote in 2008. The two-hundred and two thousand voters who registered through voter registration drives in 2008 would find it extremely difficult or impossible to register under new laws. The sixty thousand voters who registered in 2008 through Election Day registration would not have registered or voted under pending laws.

Think about how many felons had their right to vote restored in 2008. Many of the pending state bills would make it virtually impossible for hundreds of thousands of rehabilitated citizens to ever vote again.

These numbers prove that votes will be suppressed in 2012. These laws are nothing but a ploy to give Republicans a political edge by suppressing the votes of many who voted Democratic in 2008.

The proponents of these voter suppression bills claim wide-spread voter fraud. I am here to tell you there is no truth to their assertion. A statewide study in Ohio found that out of nine million votes cast, there were only four instances of ineligible persons voting or attempting to vote in 2002 and 2004.

An investigation of fraud allegations in Wisconsin in 2004 led to the prosecution of 0.0007 percent of voters. From 2002 to 2005,

the Justice Department found, only five people were convicted for voting multiple times. Millions of voters cast votes each election. The minimal amount of voter fraud that occurs does not warrant the restrictive bills that are moving in the states.

I fought Ohio's voter suppression bill, HB 194. Now voters will cast their vote to decide whether or not HB 194 will become law. We placed the peoples' right to vote back into their hands. I also fought Ohio's voter photo ID legislation. Due to pressure, the Republicans decided to delay moving forward with the legislation. I will continue to fight to protect voter's rights across the nation. We cannot be silent.

I urge you to speak out against what we know to be a concerted effort to suppress votes. People died for our right to vote. People were slain to create the franchise we enjoy today. I will not let their deaths be in vain.

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

AMERICAN BEDROCK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANNA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's always my privilege and an honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor. As is often the case, I come here and hear the end of the debate that has gone on before me and feel compelled to address it from a bit of a different perspective.

As I listen to the gentlemen and the gentleladies talk about the right to vote, I think it would be important for us to remind the body that there has to be a qualified voter. It isn't that everybody has a right to vote. You have to be old enough for one thing, and you need to be an American citizen for another. As I've watched things change over my adult lifetime, the integrity of the vote has been damaged.

The gentleman from Maryland made the statement that there is no evidence of any widespread voter fraud. I know that it's difficult to put this into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker, but I would hold this up as, let me just call this, evidence number one:

This is an acorn. It's an acorn that I carry in my pocket every day. I carry it there every day to remind me of what that organization ACORN has done to the integrity of the vote in the United States of America. How much more widespread would you have to be than operations going on in nearly all, if not all, of the 50 States—the major cities—and millions of dollars spent to pay people to go out and fraudulently register voters? There are over 400,000 fraudulent voter registrations that this acorn symbolizes that they have admitted to going out and purchasing on a commission basis: We're going to pay you to get these fraudulent voter registrations. Oh, they can be legitimate, but they can also be fraudulent, and ACORN didn't differentiate between

the two. They just paid out in commissions. They violated the laws of the State of Nevada, and they violated the laws of the State of New York.

This Congress shut down the funding to ACORN, and the national organization of ACORN collapsed. So for the gentleman to say—and I quote—there is no evidence of any widespread voter fraud, I think there is massive evidence of widespread voter registration fraud, and from that flowed fraudulent votes as well.

We have watched the integrity of the voter registration and the election system be undermined over the last generation in almost a calculated way. Issue after issue has eroded the integrity of the qualified voter in these ways: motor voter during the Clinton years. If you show up for a driver's license—and we know how well that works. How many of the—I think it's 15 of the 19—September 11 hijackers had driver's licenses, that breeder document for false identification? You show up for a driver's license, and they say to you in their native language, Do you want to register to vote? If you answer in the affirmative in any language, they put you down and register you to vote.

People don't understand that they're bound by perjury laws. We don't know about the prosecutions that may or may not be taking place. It's not considered to be as serious an offense by, let me just say, the Department of Justice as it should be. After all, they have their prosecutorial discretion. They have testified before the Judiciary Committee, where I serve, that they select which laws they want to enforce and which ones they do not want to enforce.

With regard to voting rights in the civil rights division of the Department of Justice, we know how that works. They have a policy that has been testified to under oath under several different scenarios that they will not move a voting rights case if it damages a minority. That's the policy of the Department of Justice, and it's the policy of the most recently departed Loretta King, who found that, in Kinston, North Carolina, that voted like 70 percent of the communities in America to have nonpartisan local elections for mayor and city council, they voted to abolish the partisanship and go to nonpartisan elections. So that would be a common practice, and 70 percent of the cities and municipalities have done that. But in Kinston, North Carolina, they were forbidden by the Department of Justice because, if you read the Department of Justice's agent's letter on that—and that was Loretta King—African Americans—no, she said “blacks”—wouldn't know who to vote for if they didn't have a “D” beside their names. Therefore, she forbid them from abolishing partisan elections in a city council and mayor's race in Kinston, North Carolina. That's one example.

There is another example of the intimidation that took place with the

New Black Panthers of Philadelphia, who were standing out there, calling people “crackers,” smacking their billy clubs in their hands, taking an offensive posture in paramilitary uniforms. That’s all on videotape—most of America has seen that—and we saw this Justice Department write off the case. The case was made. The convictions were there. This Justice Department canceled those convictions and released everyone except for the one individual, the most egregious violator, who got the tiniest little message. He got an injunction: Don’t do this again right here in this city at least for the short term. That was the injunction.

Tom Perez, the Assistant U.S. Attorney, testified under oath that that was the most severe penalty that they could have under law. Not true. Under oath, he uttered words that were not true, and we should bring him back before the committee and call him to account for this.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want every American citizen who is qualified to vote. I don’t want anybody slowed up at the polls and intimidated because of any reason. But to imply that people are denied their right to vote in this country as if this were 1960 all over again really is a false premise to establish this on. We’re all about legitimate voters, and I’m all against illegitimate voters that erode the vote and dilute the vote of the legitimate voters.

□ 2120

I just mentioned motor voter. Absentee ballots themselves have been stretched out, and they can pass through numerous hands, and the various States have different policies. And whenever a ballot goes from one hand to another hand to another hand, it opens up the opportunity for fraud. I can remember a case in Iowa where near the end of the election, they found 444 ballots, absentee ballots that had not been turned in yet that were—where did they find them? Oh, Democrat campaign headquarters; 444 absentee ballots. So, Mr. Speaker, there is an example of the election fraud. I would call it widespread voter fraud that is taking place. There are convictions in Troy, New York, for example.

I also listened to testimony before the Judiciary Committee by the Secretary of State of the State of New Mexico who had to admit under oath that if I were working the election board and am a resident of New Mexico in good standing and am registered to vote, if I went in to work and figured that I would vote at the end of my shift, and somebody walked in, and they said that they are STEVE KING—me—and they lived at my address, whatever it might happen to be in New Mexico, even if they alleged that they were me, and I am working the board, I can’t challenge them by law in New Mexico. That’s a law that encourages voter fraud.

So what happens when they call up an hour before the polls close and they

say, Sally, we know that you voted, but your husband, Joe, is registered to vote, and he’s not been in to vote yet. Can you send him down? And Sally says, Well, no. Joe is in a truck in Maine. He isn’t going to be voting. And 15 minutes later, somebody shows up and says, I’m Joe, and he votes as Joe. How do you catch that? How do you police that? I suggest you do so with a picture ID, a government-issued picture ID.

We need to have a number of things go on. We have people voting on the rolls that—dead people are voting. People are voting in New York and voting in Florida; that happened in the year 2000. We know about those cases. When you have fraud within the States and that fraud flows over State lines, and when people get in buses and take a ride across a State line and go into the polls, and they vote same-day registration in voting, it opens up the door again for fraud. And the people that want to game it and invest money in it are marginally winning those close elections.

So this acorn that I carry in my pocket every day, it isn’t because I have such an abiding dislike for ACORN, as an entity. But it’s because I understand—and I want the American people to understand—what happens to the United States of America if the people that are perpetrating widespread voter fraud get their way. And it’s this, Mr. Speaker: the Constitution of the United States is the foundation of this country. It is the foundation of our law. It is the supreme law of the land, coupled with Federal law that’s written within the guidelines of the United States Constitution.

We often look at it, if we hold on to the Constitution—because if we fail, our Republic will fail and collapse as well. And I embrace the Constitution. I hold on to it. I have one in my pocket every day, and I refer to it on a regular basis. But there’s something underneath that Constitution.

When you think of the edifice of a building, and you go down and you build a foundation, a foundation on sand, for example, or a foundation on something unstable, no matter how good your foundation is—the Constitution—no matter how good that foundation is, if it’s on unstable soil, it will collapse. No foundation can be sustained just by the strength of the foundation itself. And the underpinnings, the bedrock upon which this foundation of our Republic, called the Constitution, sits is free elections, honest elections, legitimate elections, elections where qualified voters, American citizens go forth and redirect the destiny of the United States of America.

But they have to be free elections. They have to be open elections. They have to be legitimate. They have to be fair. And we cannot have noncitizens voting. We cannot have fraudulent votes. We can’t have dead people voting. We can’t have transients that are not American citizens voting. If that

happens—and it is happening—and if America loses confidence in the election system that we have, this bedrock that upholds our Constitution collapses. That bedrock of legitimate elections collapses. And if it does, the Constitution itself falls with it, Mr. Speaker. That’s why it’s important that we have voter registration lists that are free of duplicates.

And where the States have laws prohibiting the voting of felons—like Iowa, for example—free of felons, free of deceased—free of deceased, duplicates, and felons, we require a picture ID, and we need to require that the Secretary of State certify that the registered voters are citizens, and we need to enforce it, and we need to police it. And we need to say to the Department of Justice and the attorneys general within the States that have jurisdiction to bring these cases, that you must set this as a high priority.

Prosecutorial discretion, when there’s an assault on the bedrock that is the underpinning for the foundation of the United States, the Constitution, when that assault comes, it must be enforced to the fullest extent of the law. And this society and this culture and this Congress should rise up and demand that we have legitimate elections in this country.

When you think, Mr. Speaker, that a single State and a handful of votes, 537 votes in the State of Florida in the year 2000, determined the President of the United States—it may well have been for the next 8 years rather than the next 4 years—and each recount of those votes in Florida came back to the same or a very similar total—there’s not a legitimate argument any longer that Al Gore really won that race. He did not. History cannot write that. Even the recount down by The Miami Herald comes back to George Bush winning marginally by very nearly the same number that the Secretary of State certified by 537 votes.

But how many votes in Florida were fraudulent votes altogether? How much closer was that election because of election fraud? How many people voted in Florida that also voted in the State of New York? How many deceased voted? How many felons voted? We’ve got some records of those. And even though the felons that are voting that we know of are not in great numbers, this could have come down to a handful of votes. This could have come down to one vote. And if a State doesn’t have a legitimate election process, and that State’s electoral votes determine the President of the United States, and we would stand here and argue that anybody that came into the polls should be allowed to vote because, if not, their vote might be disenfranchised even though they took no responsibility to register themselves to vote, to go to the right polling place to vote, that they should be motor voted and same-day registration voted and walk into any precinct and vote, and that can be sorted out after the fact.

That happened in my State. My former Secretary of State, Chet Culver, who later became Governor, amazingly gave the order that anybody could vote in any precinct at any time, and they would sort that out afterwards. So the election that he presided over—where Iowa is the first-in-the-Nation caucus, we were the last in the Nation to certify the vote. And he is the one that also supported an executive order to grant the felons the right to vote, even though a State statute specifically prohibited such a thing.

I came to talk about a different matter, Mr. Speaker, and I will endeavor to do that. But legitimate elections with integrity in our voter registration rolls, requiring citizenship, and devoid of duplicates, deceased and felons, where the law applies and a picture ID where the people that maybe can't figure out how to vote under the rules that every other citizen can meet, such as a picture ID, will pop out their picture ID to rent a movie, for example, or to get on an airplane is another example. They can have their picture ID, but they can't be bothered to show up with that.

When we're choosing sometimes by a handful of votes the next leader of the free world within the jurisdiction of the States, that if one single State has a corrupt election process, even one that isn't as clean as it can be, even one that's just sloppy where illegitimate, illegal voters cancel out the votes of the legitimate voters and, thereby, by a marginal vote—like we saw in Florida, perhaps—change the results in that State and by doing so shift the electoral votes over to one side or the other for the Presidency, and America gets a President that we really didn't vote for because we didn't have integrity in the voting process.

□ 2130

And we could watch, not so much just the fraud, but if America loses confidence in the electoral system, if we don't have faith that the decisions of the American people emerge through the election process, then we lose confidence in our Republic altogether, and that's when the United States, our Constitution, could collapse, Mr. Speaker.

So this is a high and important goal that we have. And ACORN was cut off from Federal funding by a massive outpouring of votes in the House and the Senate. When they saw what was going on inside ACORN, even some of the strongest left wing Democrats that sit over here voted to cut off the funding to ACORN.

I had introduced the first amendment to cut off ACORN about 4 years earlier, but I'm going to carry this in my pocket because they're reforming. They're reforming in localities and cities and States across the country again. They're coming back, some of the same faces with a little bit different names. They're organizing, by the way, in the Occupy Wall Street effort in New York.

Should've known. You know, we could have called that shot early from the beginning.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a couple of comments in a transitional discussion here. I didn't set myself up with a segue, and so I'll just jump right into it, that is, I have the privilege to represent a good part of Iowa here in the United States Congress. And I've had the privilege to be involved in and engaged in the first-in-the-Nation caucus process for quite a long time now.

It came about somewhat in this way, and that would be an Iowa legislature from years gone by decided to establish the first-in-the-nation caucus. A lot of the rest of the country didn't pay much attention to it. It didn't attract the Presidential candidates in the fashion that they would have envisioned early on.

But in 1976, a little-known candidate and low-profile candidate for President who was the Governor of Georgia, Jimmy Carter, came to Iowa. He saw that opportunity that the first-in-the-Nation caucus provided and Jimmy Carter spent a lot of time in Iowa. He traveled the State and got to know people. He built a network and organization and friendships within the State. By the time the caucus rolled around in 1976, Jimmy Carter won the caucus in Iowa, which was a surprise win. People didn't see it coming. The polling didn't show it. And that surprise win was a springboard that launched Jimmy Carter on to the nomination of the Presidency out of this little-known, first-in-the-Nation caucus we have in Iowa.

And the State law that was introduced says that we shall be the first competition in the Nation, and it automatically moves the State of Iowa forward if any other State moves their date. This year it will be on January 3. So it's earlier than usual, earlier than I would like; but it will be a significant competition that evening that will give the country the first look at what Iowa activists think about who should be the next President of the United States.

Taking us back in history also, something to reflect on, and that would be Jimmy Carter in 1976 won the nomination because of the springboard of the Iowa caucus. If he had lost the Iowa caucus, I don't think we would have heard of Jimmy Carter after that. His campaign very likely would have died. That was 1976. That was the year, by the way, that Ronald Reagan challenged unsuccessfully Gerald Ford for the nomination of the Presidency.

Well, 4 years later, Ronald Reagan was a player in the Iowa caucus, but he didn't work Iowa very hard. George H.W. Bush did work Iowa very hard, and Bush won the caucus in Iowa. Reagan expected to, but he took Iowa for granted and George Herbert Walker Bush won the caucus in Iowa in 1980, and then Ronald Reagan had the pressure on him when they went to New Hampshire. And there in New Hamp-

shire Ronald Reagan had the famous line: I'm paying for this microphone, and he pulled the microphone forward, and that was the shot. That was the vignette that went around the country and around the world, and it exemplified the authority with which Ronald Reagan came to the debate and the authority with which he had governed as Governor of California and the authority with which he would later on become the best President of the 20th century. But that moment in New Hampshire was a moment for Ronald Reagan that launched him out of New Hampshire and on to the nomination and on to the Presidency.

But if you'll remember, Mr. Speaker, Gerald Ford was under serious consideration for the nomination as Vice President of the United States. And I'm actually glad they didn't make that decision. A former President as a Vice President would be too much friction, too much conflict, and not enough room for the new President to operate. But George Herbert Walker Bush was nominated and became the Vice President under Ronald Reagan, for two terms, 1980 through 1988, or 1981 through 1989 would be another way to describe that. And was, of course, the nominee and was elected to become the President of the United States.

So I would just speculate, Mr. Speaker, that had it not been for the Iowa caucus victory of George H.W. Bush, he very likely would not have been named the Vice Presidential candidate since he ran a competitive nomination competition against Ronald Reagan. Gerald Ford was not named Vice President; George H.W. Bush was. He became Vice President for 8 years, and then President for 4 years. And would we have had a President George W. Bush? Had we never had Bush 41, we maybe would never have had Bush 43.

So the continuum of history has shifted itself dramatically on the results of what was prior to that time a very low-profile, not-very-significant caucus in Iowa. Now since that period of time, it has been leveraged up again and again and again. And in the last caucus, we saw what happened with Barack Obama emerging. His movement began in Iowa. Iowa gave him his launch to New Hampshire. It wasn't my choice, obviously, Mr. Speaker; but there's a legacy that will play itself out again January 3 of this year.

I'm watching all of the Presidential candidates, and I'm watching how they perform and how they resonate with the voters. I have said since January, concluded that it was a slow start on the Presidential race. You know, most people weren't yet clamoring for a Presidential race. I thought we should start seeing and we should be seeing more activity, and so we did some things to initiate Presidential activity in the State, including hosting a Presidential event on March 26 at the Marriott Hotel in Des Moines. That seemed to galvanize and launch this caucus process.

A number of the Presidential candidates came there and made their presentations, and we intermixed it with good thinkers on policy issues of the day. That was one of the things that took place. But even then, as I listened to the Presidential candidates, and as I have the privilege to talk with them and get to know them, and it is an extraordinary privilege to know these Presidential candidates in this way, I like them all. I respect them all. Mr. Speaker, every one of them, in my opinion, would make a better President than the one we have. I will have no hesitation about endorsing and campaigning for the eventual nominee.

But there have been a couple of things missing. One of them is an economic policy plan. As I listened to the candidates, they would talk about what they would repeal, but I wasn't hearing very much about what they would do on the proactive side. So I even toyed with this idea, Mr. Speaker, and the idea of advancing some of those repeals in my own way. But as I watched the Presidential candidates, they want to tweak the tax policy some and they all want to repeal ObamaCare. I think that looks like plank number one in the platform of the nominee or any of the candidates as they compete for the nomination going forward. Plank number one, repeal ObamaCare.

Then they have their tax cut plan and how they would structure the taxes. But I have not seen all year long a significant economic proposal. One of those that has emerged now that people can identify with is Herman Cain's 9-9-9 plan. The 9-9-9 is a bumper sticker that does get people's attention. They can remember it. It has a unique ring to it, and it causes them to pay attention and look into it and understand each of the three components. Well, there's a marketing brilliance in the 9-9-9 plan. I'm going to try to avoid discussing the economic components of it, but there's a marketing brilliance.

Then Mitt Romney had, prior to that, a 59-point plan. Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I can't get through 59 points. What I can't memorize, I can't defend and explain. But subsequent to Herman Cain's 9-9-9 plan, then Rick Perry's 20/20 plan. Let's see: cut, balance and grow, or pretty close to that. I call it the 20/20 plan—that also caught people's attention—to go to a flat tax. Steve Forbes is one of the advisers on it. It looks like Art Laffer is one of the advisers on Herman Cain's 9-9-9 plan. Both are very respected economists.

□ 2140

I'm one who goes for a fair tax, so it's hard to move me on these other policies. But we're starting to see now the

Presidential candidates differentiate themselves on their economic policies.

But, Mr. Speaker, what I bring this up for is that I'm looking yet for a candidate for the Presidency who can articulate a vision for America on what their view is, what their vision is on how to take America to the next level of our destiny. What does America look like in a generation if they're able to bring their policies into play and lead with the bully pulpit of the Presidency of the United States? What does America look like? What are our fundamental principles that can be inspired by a President with that kind of vision? And how does that mesh in, how does that couple with the policies that they would advocate?

I take you back, Mr. Speaker, to Ronald Reagan, again, who for his entire political career talked about America as the shining city on the hill. He didn't talk about the shining city on the hill that he promised we were necessarily going to have. He said, America is a shining city on a hill and standing strong and true on a granite ridge. That is pretty close to a Reagan quote. It may not be exactly right, Mr. Speaker, but this gives you the concept. All of his political life, he had the vision for America as a shining city on the hill. He articulated it. When we heard it from him, maybe we didn't see it with the clarity that Reagan did, but we knew he saw it with the clarity. That was the vision thing. That is what inspired America to come behind Ronald Reagan, and that's what inspired America to become, again, this resurgent Nation where the malaise speech was put behind us and the imagination, the hope and the robust future for America unfolded from the Reagan administration. That's the biggest reason why we see him as the greatest President of the 20th century.

The next President of the United States needs to articulate a vision, needs to tell us what America looks like, what are our foundational principles, how they will refurbish those pillars of American exceptionalism, how they can strengthen the measures of life and marriage, how they can strengthen the family, that basic building block of our civilization, and how they can restrengthen the constitutional understanding. I want to hear from Presidential candidates how they would make appointments to the Supreme Court of Justices who will read and interpret the Constitution, the text of the Constitution, to mean what it was understood to mean at the time of ratification.

We have a President who is intentionally nominating activists to the Federal courts. It's a tragedy that those kinds of judges would remove the

understanding of the Constitution from the American people. And so far we've kind of moved forward accepting the idea that the people in the black robes understand more about what's written and what is meant in this Constitution than other people.

All of us in here took an oath to this Constitution. Our Federal workers take an oath to this Constitution in the executive branch. Our troops all do the same thing, and many of our State officers do the same thing. You can't take an oath to a Constitution that is living and breathing. You can only take an oath to a Constitution that means what it says. And some of them take the oath and set about seeking to amend it de facto, amending the Constitution by redefining it.

I want a President who understands the pillars of American exceptionalism, who can articulate them and can transfer them into the future as the timeless values that have gotten us to the present; one who can articulate the great, great difficulty of moving to a balanced budget, how we get a balanced budget amendment that will guide this Congress so we can be bound by our obligation to our constituencies; one who has an understanding of foreign policy; and one who has a full and complete tax plan that transforms America.

All of those things are things that fit within the vision. And the vision, right now, is what I've tuned my ear for. And I'm hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that we will be able to hear this vision come from the Presidential candidates and, before we get into January, that we'll understand or hear with that clarity from the next President what their shining city on the hill speech is for us.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 2, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during 2011 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows: