believe in; here's what went through regular order; here's what was passed out of the Judiciary Committee; here's the balanced budget amendment, and we took it to the floor and we have wide open amendments, wide open debates. The American public could see this body at work, and we would show what we believe is right for America and then force the Senate to pass what they believe is right for America and not continue to give the Democrat majority—who want to spend like never before—in the Senate, we keep giving them cover because we won't stand on what we believe and pass that here in the House. That's what we ought to be doing.

And that balanced budget amendment ought to be the one that came out of the Judiciary Committee. It ought to have a spending cap. It ought to have a supermajority in order to raise taxes. That was on that bill. Oh, it was debated. There were efforts to strike that part out. There were a lot of amendments—some to strike things like that out, some to put other things in, some to make it weak. But we fought those off successfully in committee and we came out of committee with this balanced budget amendment, and that's what ought to come to the floor, not the weak-kneed one we're going to get. Because a balanced budget amendment with no cap on spending unfortunately looks like a preserve the pork-barreling upward track; because we've seen even with a conservative majority in the House, it's just tough to cut spending because we're told we've got to spend to get the Senate to go along with these bills.

It's time to take the tough stands. America's in trouble. It's in big trouble. And as we fight these battles, it doesn't help to have people jumping on a bandwagon that really wasn't the bandwagon they showed themselves to really belong to and being previously and they say, I'm talking about Secretary Panetta, Secretary of Defense. He wrote this scathing letter talking about how if the sequestration occurs, hundreds of billions are cut from defense, it could mean the loss of—I believe it was a couple hundred million of our military, which is a little ironic coming from the current Secretary of Defense, because the people on this side of the aisle believe in a strong defense. We all believe that waving the flag of limited government, that actually cuts the Federal workforce. No, he didn't. He cut the military. He didn't cut the Federal workforce. He cut the military. That's the only area he cut. And we paid a massive price after 9/11 because we had to gear back up because we once again found having a strong defense is important. Reagan tried to warn us about that. He said people don't get attacked because they're perceived as being weak. And that's how we were perceived.

But let's see, in January of 1993, when now-Secretary of Defense Panetta started as a part of the Clinton administration, there were 1,761,481 members of the United States military. In July of 1994, Secretary Panetta started as the Chief of Staff for President Clinton, and that continued through January of 1997. We've got a look. From the time Secretary Panetta started as a part of the Clinton administration, we went from 1,761,481 members of the military to, in January of '97 when he left the Clinton administration, 1,457,413 members. That's a 304,068 drop in members of the military while he was part of the Clinton administration. Seems to fall a little bit on deaf ears when you have a Secretary crying about cuts to the military when he presided over a far more draconian cut to that same military when he was in charge or was part of the Clinton administration. Seems to fall a little bit on deaf ears when you have a Secretary crying about cuts to the military when he presided over a far more draconian cut to that same military when he was in charge or was part of the Clinton administration. Seems to fall a little bit on deaf ears when you have a Secretary crying about cuts to the military when he presided over a far more draconian cut to that same military when he was in charge or was part of the Clinton administration. Seems to fall a little bit on deaf ears when you have a Secretary crying about cuts to the military when he presided over a far more draconian cut to that same military when he was in charge or was part of the Clinton administration.

The problem is, we can't afford massive cuts to our defense. And at the very time they're okay with that, the President goes down to Australia and says we're going to commit some troops down there too. We've got troops this President's committing all over the place, without any regard, like in Libya or Egypt, to the outcome of what is being done, what's going to happen at the end. And we're going to pay a severe toll.

We need to stand for a solid defense. And if we get back to a regular order in this body, where things are voted out of subcommittee, after full chance to amend, voted out of the full committee, brought to the floor, America will see who stands for what, and it will be easier for the voters in the next election, and it will be easier for all of us to know what it is the American voters are wanting because they will have had a clear view of just exactly what they're getting.

I really enjoyed Mark Levin's book, Liberty and Tyranny. I think it ought to be a textbook. Let me just finish with this quote from Ronald Reagan that Mark puts in his book:

How can limited government and fiscal restraint be equated with lack of compassion for the poor? It's not a tax break that puts a little more money in the weekly paychecks of working people being seen as an attack on the needy? Since when do we in America believe that two diametrically opposed classes, one rich, one poor, both in a permanent state of conflict and neither able to get ahead except at the expense of the other? Since when do we in America accept the alien and discredited theory of social and class warfare? Since when do we in America endorse the politics of envy and division?

That's what the President's preaching right now. It needs to stop. It's time to provide for the common defense, get back to regular order in this body, and the country will be better off for it.

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

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on November 15, 2011 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 2447. To grant the congressional gold medal to the Montford Point Marines.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 17, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3869. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bacteriophage of Clavibacter michiganensis subspecies michiganensis; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0838; FRL-8891-3] received October 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3870. A letter from the Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting Report to Congress on Impact of Domestic Violence on Military Families, pursuant to Public Law 111-84, section 509 (123 Stat. 2315); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3871. A letter from the Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Brigadier General Scott M. Hanson, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of major general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3872. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8825] received November 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3873. A letter from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—TARP Conflicts of Interest [RIN: 3872-ETC].