

Nevertheless, such a program no matter how far reaching, will be of limited success unless it also addresses deep-seated negative images of Poles and Poland that lie buried in our culture. It will be hard for most people to even hear, let alone incorporate more positive images of Poland and Poles until these are attacked and extirpated. As Malgorzata Warchol-Schlottmann pointed out in her study of stereotypes of Poles in German culture "Positive personal experiences or empirical knowledge of Poland did not modify the stereotypical images". On the basis of my experience, I believe that the same is true of American culture.

I do not think that you picked the image of incompetent Polish soldiers shooting at each other at random out of thin air. It would have left your listeners puzzled if you had chosen "The Norwegian army" as your example. You were drawing, certainly without deep reflection, perhaps ever reflexively on deeply embedded negative images of Poles and Poland in American culture.

These stereotypes took shape in Europe in the 18th century as part of propaganda by Prussia, Russia and Austria to justify their unprecedented partition of Poland and the destruction of the Polish constitution. They were later used to justify Nazi genocide against Poles. Those images were transmitted to America in the 19th century and became a distinct American bigotry in response to the large influx to Polish immigrants. Those stereotypes still exist and have power. This is clear from the fact that a President of a major American university could invoke them so unthinkingly and cavalierly.

I would hope that any program to provide redress would also include a mandate to examine the character and roots of anti-Polonism in courses and special programs designed to deal with racism, bigotry and prejudice in American Society. The Piast Institute, which is a national research and policy institute, would be pleased to assist in curriculum development and materials for such classes and programs.

We maintain close ties with the Polish community in Ohio and have worked with them on educational and cultural programs as well as providing demographic analysis of the Polish American population in Cleveland and Akron. The work of the Institute on such projects as our national survey of 1,400 Polish American leaders published as *Polish Americans Today* (2010) and our work in preparing curricula for the genocide curriculum in the California schools and for the National Catholic Holocaust Education Center at Seton Hill College has given us unparalleled recognition in Polish American communities and among their leaders. I also served for eight years as President of St. Mary's College founded by Polish immigrants and for many years a national center for Polish studies in the U.S.

I look forward to working with you and the university to turn this unfortunate event into a positive project to lessen prejudice and create a genuine pluralism at Ohio State as well as to build bridges to the half a million Polish Americans who live in Ohio and the 10 million Polish Americans in the United States.

Sincerely yours,
THADDEUS C. RADZILOWSKI, Ph.D.,
President.

FISCAL DISCIPLINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Obama asked Congress for

\$1.2 trillion in additional borrowing authority, and today Congress has the opportunity to respond to the President's request. Since the President took office, the national debt has increased \$4.6 trillion. The current Federal debt now exceeds the U.S. gross domestic product, and our Federal Government is borrowing more than 30 cents of every dollar it spends. In recent years, that has been as high as 40 cents of every dollar it spends.

The President's most recent request for a \$1.2 trillion increase will bring the debt limit to \$16.394 trillion. Yet despite this fiscal outlook, Admiral Mullen, the recently retired Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has rightly called the national debt "the single-biggest threat to our national security." President Obama and some in Congress still refuse to make the difficult, long-term spending choices necessary to begin restoring fiscal discipline to the Federal budget.

The President publicly opposed a balanced budget amendment, an idea about which Thomas Jefferson said, "I would be willing to depend on that alone for the reduction of the administration of our government."

The House of Representatives, in a majority fashion, passed a balanced budget amendment late last year. Unfortunately, it did not receive a two-thirds vote here, as the Constitution requires; and I hope we can revisit that issue.

President Obama has failed to put forth a credible budget plan that reins in runaway Federal entitlement spending. It is the single-biggest contributor toward our long-term fiscal problems.

When the President releases his budget proposal for fiscal year 2013 in a few weeks, he has another opportunity to propose real spending caps and entitlement program reforms. I hope he will seize the opportunity to do so.

I commend to the President's attention and to the administration's attention, for example, Chairman RYAN's budget proposals, and we would like to work in good faith with the administration and with the President to make sure that we move forward in a fiscally responsible way.

But today's debate, Mr. Speaker, is about leadership and making tough choices. The Governor of the State of New Jersey, my friend Chris Christie, said last year, "Leadership, today in America, has to be about doing the big things." When given the opportunity to lead on issues concerning levels of spending, debt, and deficits, I urge President Obama to join with us in doing the big things to make sure that we can get our fiscal house in order, a glide path back toward fiscal responsibility for balancing our budget over time.

We need to restore that fiscal discipline in Washington instead of choosing the fiscally perilous path of more spending, larger annual deficits, and mounting debt. The next generation will have to pay back this debt. It is a

tremendous burden on young people, and it will sap our strength in the continuing competition of the United States with the nations around the world, including, for example, China and India.

Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the President's request for an additional \$1.2 trillion in spending. I hope that we can work together with the administration on this fundamental issue, the issue that confronts the Nation's fiscal responsibility. And may the United States be restored to fiscal responsibility so that future generations might succeed, as generations have succeeded generation in and generation out, the great promise of the American Nation.

MORE THAN LIP SERVICE: HELPING OUR VETERANS FIND JOBS

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is now in the 124th consecutive month of war. And while those of us privileged to serve in this body enjoyed time back home with our families for the holidays, there is no such holiday break for our servicemembers who are serving in harm's way.

□ 1050

Thousands of American families had a permanently empty seat around their table this holiday season because a son or daughter or mother or father was killed in one of these senseless wars that we've been fighting.

I would note as a bit of an aside, Mr. Speaker, how ironic it is that 2 days ago we celebrated a Federal holiday named for a man who was a proud and principled pacifist, who believed in the moral power of nonviolent resistance. Martin Luther King once said, "A nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual doom."

Mr. Speaker, it's time we paid more than lip service to his dream; it's time we started living it.

It's time also that we paid more than lip service to our veterans who are returning home from Iraq and Afghanistan. These men and women who have courageously sacrificed so much for us are coming home to an economy that seems to have no place for them.

Yes, we're in the grips of a devastating job crisis that's affecting just about every community and every group in the United States, but veterans of the Afghanistan and Iraq wars are feeling the squeeze disproportionately. Even as the job numbers have picked up some for the rest of economy, because it has rallied slightly, veterans are slipping further behind.

Overall, unemployment dropped to 8½ percent in December for our country. But for veterans who've served since September 2001, the jobless rate is a staggering 13.1 percent. Is this

what we call a hero's welcome? Is this how our Nation shows its gratitude? Closing this gap must be at the top of our 2012 calendar.

There has been some progress. For example, in November, Congress passed and the President signed the Vow to Hire Heroes Act, which provides tax credits to employers who hire veterans. But, Mr. Speaker, we need to do much, much more because unless we take bold action, this problem is going to get much worse before it gets any better as the war in Iraq and, hopefully, the war in Afghanistan winds down and even more returning troops flood the jobs market.

We know what to do. There's no question. We need more job training. We need more technical assistance so that these skilled young people can find the work they need. We need more career counseling and job fairs. We need to increase our investment in veterans' housing initiatives. How about helping veterans become entrepreneurs by starting their own businesses? And basically, we need more jobs in this country.

We must not pinch pennies on veterans. We must not pinch pennies on their health care, and we must make sure that wounded veterans aren't victimized by job discrimination.

So let's get creative here. Let's put our money where our mouth is. If we can spend billions of dollars every month on wars, then certainly we can spend a fraction of that to help the Americans who fought those wars. When they come home they should have a seamless transition back to civilian life.

These wars have already taken too much from all of us, from our country. We can't let them also destroy the job prospects and the successful futures of the people who served so bravely on the front lines. It's time to bring our troops home and, at the same time, provide them with the jobs they need to support their families.

WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED ABOUT THE CONSTITUTION FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, PART I

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the United States Constitution is the law of the land. It must be followed in the spirit and in the letter of the law.

Article II, in section 2, gives the Executive authority to appoint certain public ministers with advice and consent of the U.S. Senate. When the Senate is in recess, the Executive can make temporary appointments until the end of that legislative session.

See, the Constitution envisions cooperation by the Executive with the Senate over naming persons to offices that rule over the people of America. Both the Executive and the Senate must agree prior to an official appointment.

The Senate, within their legal prerogative, has been blocking three NLRB appointments and the appointment of the head of the new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

However, ignoring the Senate, the Executive appointed these people anyway. He declared the Senate was in recess when he made such appointments. But was it?

Well, constitutional experts disagree. The Senate was in a pro forma session. One reason they were in pro forma session was to prevent recess appointments by the executive branch. During pro forma sessions, the Senate can do business and meet another constitutional requirement to not be in recess without permission of the House of Representatives.

More from the Constitution. Article I, section 5 says no Chamber, the House or the Senate, can recess for more than 3 days without the approval of the other Chamber. The House did not and even could not agree to a recess of the Senate because the Senate was in session, not in a recess.

The Executive's claim that the Senate was in a recess is flawed because the House did not consent to any Senate recess. Thus, the Senate legally had to still be in session until the House agreed to a recess under our Constitution.

Furthermore, Congress determines when it's in recess, not the executive branch.

There is more evidence the Senate was in session. The Executive says the pro forma session was not a real session but a recess, so, thus, the recess appointments. However, during this pro forma session, the Senate passed legislation. The controversial payroll tax extension law became law signed by the Executive.

If the Senate was in recess, as the Executive claims, then it seems the payroll extension law is null and void. Why? Because Congress cannot pass legislation unless it's actually in session.

However, the opposite is true. Since the payroll tax law was passed during this pro forma session, and the appointments were made during this pro forma session, the appointments are null and void. They violate the letter and spirit of the Constitution. They were made without confirmation of the Senate. These were not recess appointments because the Senate was in session.

The Executive cannot have it both ways. The Executive cannot use linguistic gimmicks to redefine the words "recess" and "session" to his own liking, just so he can have it his way. The letter and spirit of the Constitution have been bruised and violated by his actions.

The Constitution must be followed, whether one agrees with what it says or not. Even if the Executive wins his argument, which is legally and logically flawed, he has ignored the framework of the Constitution, which is

built on Executive cooperation with Congress.

The Executive went his own way. And that's just the way it is.

CELEBRATING THE 70TH BIRTHDAY OF MUHAMMAD ALI

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 17, Muhammad Ali became 70 years old, so I rise to salute the champ and to wish him a happy birthday.

Ali has taken a lot of hard licks during his lifetime, but has always gotten up and has always maintained his dignity. Ali lived in and spent a great deal of time in Chicago. He attended events, went to meetings, and was part of community life. Therefore, I got to know him quite well.

A few years ago, after he had become ill with Parkinson's Syndrome, I sat next to Ali at a community banquet, and he was having difficulty holding on to his food and eating. The person on the other side of him was trying to help. Ali was becoming more and more irritated and finally, in a polite but firm manner, said, Thanks, but please leave me alone, I can do this, and he did. And I think that's characteristic of his life.

Born Cassius Clay, Ali converted to Islam, became a Muslim, and changed his name. Ali took hits from individuals and fans who disagreed with this position.

□ 1100

Initially categorized as not qualified to serve in the military because of poor performance on a Selective Service exam, Ali is then reclassified. But in April of 1967, he refused induction into the Army. He is tagged a draft dodger and stripped of his championship and barred from boxing. He is ultimately permitted to return.

As he worked his way toward the title shot at Sonny Liston, there are rumors that the fight might be canceled because of his emerging relationship with Malcolm X and the Nation of Islam. However, the fight does take place. Cassius Clay wins, and a month later, the honorable Elijah Muhammad gives Clay a new name: Muhammad Ali.

Ernie Terrell, a friend of mine, who graduated from high school with my wife and was a heavyweight champion, refused to address Ali by his new name, and Ali whipped him soundly and taunted him by asking him continuously, "What's my name? What's my name?"

Muhammad Ali is known as "The Greatest" to most people for his electrifying style in the boxing ring. But others might call him "The Greatest" for his continued humanitarian efforts outside the world of boxing. Since his retirement in 1981, he has gone on to do great things to help out the less fortunate and disenfranchised people throughout the world.