you raise taxes in a faltering economy, job creation is thwarted. The President acknowledged as much in 2009, but his policies run to the contrary.

Perhaps the President's lack of familiarity with running a business in a recession is responsible for his insistence on increasing taxes on 940,000 small business tax filers in 2013. Perhaps it's because he doesn't know the ins and outs of private sector creation that he's willing to risk 710,000 American jobs on his tax crusade. We who know the private sector want to spare him that lesson. Taxes will devastate our economy. To grow it, every American should benefit from an extension of tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, Washington didn't buy the American Dream for the millions of small businesses that comprise the backbone of our economy. Nor did Washington show up sick when a shift needed to be covered, miss soccer games because a shipment had to be received, or work graveyard because someone had to do it. Americans did that.

Too quickly we forget that everything the government has it takes from taxpayers; and if taxpayers do poorly, so does the government. So Washington must remain mindful. If the policies it imposes make it harder for small businesses to grow and create jobs, and eliminate their ability to invest, it is Washington that will find itself in crisis as it is now.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. There is a battle under way about the very existence of public broadcasting. We thought we were past this when, 15 months ago, the House Republican leadership targeted NPR and tried to defund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Luckily, last year, 170 million people—who don't just listen to or watch public broadcasting, but depend on it—unleashed an unprecedented show of support. As a result, the Republican leadership walked back.

One good thing about last year's budget was a requirement to have a study about alternatives to funding public broadcasting so that people would have hard facts for this year's budget discussion. Well, that study is in, and it clearly shows that there is no viable alternative to Federal funding for public broadcasting.

Many of the proposals that have been suggested would actually result in less money overall for public broadcasting in the long term. Yet the House appropriations bill, marked up yesterday, would slash funding now, defund NPR Federal support, and end public broadcasting as we know it within 2 years.

I had dinner with Ken Burns last night, and we discussed this. He pointed out that his five or six projects in the pipeline would never be seen if this budget goes forward. So enjoy his program about the Dust Bowl this November because you will never be able to see the Roosevelts, Jackie Robinson, Vietnam, Hemingway. All will never be finished or seen if the Republican budget proposal is approved.

The problem is that Governor Romney—who has singled out public broadcasting as one of five projects that he would defund—and the Republicans listened to a tiny fraction of the American public that is even a minority in their own party. Polls show that two-thirds of Republicans surveyed would either keep Federal funding for broadcasting as it is or increase it.

What resonates with Republican primary voters is not what America wants, needs, or believes. The unprecedented threat comes at exactly the time Americans need public broadcasting the most. NPR news, the object of greatest Republican scorn, is the most trusted brand in American news media.

PBS shows like ''Sesame Street'' have helped three generations of parents raise their children with effective, commercial-free educational programming.

□ 1010

Locally owned news is becoming only a memory for most America as large corporations buy up local stations and newspapers. There's no money to be made by commercial stations that cater to the special needs of rural and small town America. Luckily, public broadcasting is there because their mission is to serve, not make money.

We must stop this attack on the critical service, especially for rural and small-town America. It's time for the 170 million Americans who depend on public broadcasting every month to again fight back and for Congress to finally listen.

The radical proposal to slash public broadcasting, defund NPR, and terminate public broadcasting as we know it, is a powerful symbol of how far out of step the Republican leadership is from the country they're supposed to represent.

There's no reason to make public broadcasting a partisan issue. Public broadcasting has broad support from Republicans, Independents, and Democrats alike. That's why PBS and its member stations were named number one in public trust and a ''excellent'' use of taxpayer dollars for the 9th consecutive year.

It's time for people who believe in public broadcasting to stand up to this extremism and settle the question once and for all about the future of public broadcasting. Unless we fight now, there may be nothing left to protect.

MINNESOTA'S 86,000-ACRE PROBLEM

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

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Speaker, for far too long—over 30 years, in fact—Minnesota and its students have been faced with an 86,000-acre problem.

When Minnesota became a State in 1858, sections 16 and 36 of every township were set aside in trust for the benefit of schools. The State could use, lease, or sell the land to raise money for education. Then, in the 1970s, the Federal Government created the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. These State school trust lands within the Boundary Waters cannot be timber harvested, leased, or utilized for their minerals. Thus, they are not generating money for the school trust. As a result, approximately 86,000 acres of State trust lands are currently locked within the borders of the Boundary Waters and unable to produce critical funding for Minnesota public education.

Ultimately, Congress got us into this situation in the first place, and Congress will have to get us out.

On June 8, the Natural Resources Committee's Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, conducted a comprehensive hearing on this legislation. Our goal: preserve and protect the Boundary Waters and allow State-owned school trust lands to raise revenue for Minnesota education through utilizing our timber and mineral resources.

It is imperative we resolve this long-standing problem. Minnesota law specifies these lands must earn money for the school trust. In fact, the State has a constitutional responsibility to earn a financial return from these lands to fund the education system.

That is why I introduced H.R. 5544, the Minnesota Education Investment and Employment Act, which will give State-owned school trust lands trapped in the Boundary Waters to the Federal Government in exchange for Federal Government-owned land outside the Boundary Waters. This legislation is needed for the Federal Government to execute the bipartisan plan recently agreed upon by the Minnesota Legislature and signed by the Governor.

Our economy cannot wait, and our kids in the classroom shouldn't either. This legislation will produce new opportunities to create well-paying jobs and additional revenue for our schools.

Minnesota's school trust lands are a 154-year investment in our future. Times are tight, and our schools and teachers could use the help. Currently, some school districts in Minnesota, including mine in North Branch, have classes with up to 40 students and have scaled back to 4-day school weeks.

Just recently, the largest paper in Minnesota, the Minneapolis Star Tribune, penned an opinion piece which stated that enactment of this legislation would be a boon for our economy in the Eighth. Unfortunately, special interests are attempting to derail this broad, bipartisan land swap plan, which

includes jobs for Minnesotans and additional revenue to fund our schools. To swap these lands trapped within the Boundary Waters for lands located outside the Boundary Waters—to simply execute this Federal action—our State, its people, and our students should not endure years of litigation and disingenuous delay.

Importantly, the Minnesota Education Investment Employment Act would not eliminate a single acre of Boundary Waters land. In fact, it would add Federal wilderness acres to the existing boundaries. The Boundary Water Canoe Area wilderness would therefore become whole.

The Boundary Water Canoe Area is an important and vital aspect of the Eighth District of Minnesota, and we will take care of it. As a side benefit—the bill guarantees Minnesotans will retain their existing hunting and fishing rights in the Boundary Waters.

Now, more than ever, it is our duty as Minnesota's leaders to honor the State's obligations owed to Minnesota students and restore the integrity of the Boundary Water Canoe Area Wilderness. This is a team effort, and I am ready to work with involved stakeholders and my colleagues to put Minnesota schools first.

SUPPORTING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S DECISION TO STOP DEPORTATIONS FOR DREAM ACT-ELIGIBLE IMMIGRANTS

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to announce today that more than 100 of my colleagues have joined me in writing to President Obama to thank him for his action to use prosecutorial discretion to stop deportations for DREAM Act-eligible immigrants.

We are pledging our continued and strong support for this policy. My colleagues and I, 104 of us, are standing together to make clear that we think America is a better place with the immigrants who will be helped by this new policy.

Of course, not everyone agrees. Progress doesn't always mean consensus. My colleague, Mr. KING of Iowa, wants to sue the President, take him to court, because Mr. KING is determined to deport every last young person who is DREAM Act eligible. Mitt Romney says that he would veto the DREAM Act and does not support steps to protect these very young people.

Let's remind ourselves exactly who the Republican candidate for President believes should be deported.

DREAM Act-eligible young people who have lived in America for more than 5 years. Most of them were brought to our Nation as children, many of them as infants, toddlers, yes, babies. They've stayed away from crime. They attended our high schools and colleges. They are no different from your children or my children. They regularly excel at school. Some are valedictorians. They are athletes and musicians and leaders. Many of them want to serve our Nation in the military. They are leaders in their high school ROTC. They are, in every sense of the word, except for the very narrow, exclusive sense promoted by Mr. KING and Mr. Romney, outstanding young Americans.

Apparently, when Mr. KING and Mr. Romney look at the winner of your high school science fair or a young immigrant eager to become a soldier, they see a threat to our national security.

Sensible Americans see their friends and neighbors, young people who want to make America better. They want these young people to be treated fairly, and they also want our Nation to be safe.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask Mr. KING and Mr. Romney a question: In a world where our law enforcement officials have limited time and resources, who should they be focused on investigating, detaining, putting behind bars, rounding up, and deporting—the captain of your high school chess team or a drug smuggler?

I know the answer. I think most of Americans would agree. Immigrants who break the law should face serious consequences. Immigrants who are busy studying for exams should simply be left alone. That's not just my opinion or just the opinion of immigrants or advocates or 104 of my colleagues.

Despite those few who would like to sue the President and force him to kick high school kids out of this country, President Obama's actually legally and responsibly using prosecutorial discretion to leave young people alone and focus instead on actual criminals.

□ 1020

It is the consensus legal opinion among experts. Even the Supreme Court has weighed in. In their Arizona decision last month, the Supreme Court wrote:

A principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials. Federal officials, as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all.

''Whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all,'' says the Supreme Court.

If the Supreme Court's opinion is not enough, then I submit the opinions of Members of Congress, including those of Members I don't often agree with when it comes to immigration. These Members include LAMAR SMITH, the chairman of our Judiciary Committee; DAVID DREIER, chairman of the Rules Committee; and even BRIAN BILBRAY, chairman of the House anti-immigration caucus.

Just a few years ago, as this letter notes, they weighed in forcefully on prosecutorial discretion. In a letter to a previous President's administration, these staunch opponents of immigration reform enthusiastically defended prosecutorial discretion, writing: ''The principle of prosecutorial discretion is well established.'' They wrote that legal experts at Immigration Services ''apparently well-grounded in case law'' show that the Immigration Services has prosecutorial discretion in the initiation—the beginning—and the termination of deportations.

It's simple, really. The Members of Congress who signed this letter with me today, the Supreme Court, President Obama—and yes, even LAMAR SMITH and dozens of his colleagues just a few years ago—get it. It is time to leave hardworking immigrants alone. When we do, our law enforcement officials can focus on catching the actual bad guys.

JULY 18, 2012.

President BARACK OBAMA,
The White House, Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, DC

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We write to thank you and express our appreciation for your recent decision to grant ''deferred action,'' protection from deportation, and work permits to certain young people who call the United States home and who are not an enforcement priority for the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

We welcome the opportunity to ensure that our constituents who fit the criteria for relief are among the estimated 800,000 individuals whose lives will forever be changed as a result of your leadership. DREAMers coming forward to apply will mark a new chapter, but not the last chapter, in a long struggle for inclusion in society. The new policy represents an important down payment toward achieving broader reforms in the future.

The implications of your policy are already reverberating well beyond those who are potentially eligible for deferred action. With this announcement, you have changed the public discourse about immigration and immigrants, and our communities are now excited and hopeful. Even those who attack immigrants for political purposes are second guessing their negative posture toward the young immigrants you are protecting. You have opened the door to reform, and people of all political stripes recognize that change is coming and is inevitable.

We recognize that there are those who will want to take the power of discretion away from you and the Executive branch. Like you, we agree that you are on solid moral and legal ground and we will do everything within our power to defend your actions and the authority that you, like past Presidents, can exercise to set enforcement priorities and better protect our neighborhoods and our nation.

Despite this vital reprieve for a deserving group of promising individuals, we also understand that it does not diminish the need for a permanent solution and comprehensive immigration reform. Mr. President, we stand committed to fixing the broken immigration system once and for all, and we are ready to fight for a permanent solution that benefits all children and families, the economy, our national security and our nation.

We thank you again for your actions on behalf of DREAMers. We stand ready to work with you to ensure the policy's success and to use it as a stepping stone for broader relief and future legislative action.

Sincerely,

Luis V. Gutierrez; Joseph Crowley, Xavier Becerra; Steny Hoyer; Howard