order to pay this massive new tax bill. Many will have no choice but to reduce the workforce. We don’t need a health reform law that destroys jobs; we need one that encourages the creation of good jobs with good benefits. We must repeal the so-called Affordable Care Act.

RECESS
The SPEAKER pro tempore, Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore, Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

FAIRNESS FOR HIGH-SKILLED IMMIGRANTS ACT OF 2011
Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3012) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to increase the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3012
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the “Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act of 2011”.

SEC. 2. NUMERICAL LIMITATION TO ANY SINGLE FOREIGN STATE.
(a) In General.—Section 202(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(a)(2)) is amended—
(1) in subsection (a)(3), by striking “both subsections (a) and (b) of section 203” and inserting “section 203(a)”; (2) by striking subsection (a)(5); and (3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows: “(c) Special Rules for Countries at Ceiling.—If it is determined that the total number of immigrant visas made available under section 203(a) to natives of any single foreign state or dependent area will exceed the numerical limitation specified in subsection (a)(2) in any fiscal year, in determining the allotment of immigrant visas to natives under section 203(a), visa numbers with respect to natives of that state or area shall be allocated (to the extent practicable and otherwise consistent with this section and section 203) in a manner so that, except as provided in subsection (a)(4), the proportion of the visa numbers made available for each of paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 203(a) is equal to the ratio of the total number of visas made available under the respective paragraph to the total number of visas made available under section 203(a).”.
(b) Conforming Amendments.—Section 202 of the Chinese Student Protection Act of 1992 (8 U.S.C. 1255 note) is amended—
(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking “migration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(b)) and not reserved under” and inserting “section 203(a)”;
(2) by striking “(3), (4), and (5),” and inserting “(3)”; and (3) by striking subsections (a) and (b) of section 203 and inserting “section 203(a)”;
(4) by striking “2” and inserting “15”;
(b) and (c) be inserted for purposes of this subsection and notwithstanding subsection (e) as subsection (d).
(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if enacted on September 30, 2011, and shall apply to fiscal years beginning on or after fiscal year 2012.
(d) Transition Rules for Employment-Based Immigrants.—
(1) In General.—Subject to the succeeding paragraphs of this subsection and notwithstanding title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.), the following rules shall apply:
(A) For fiscal year 2012, 15 percent of the immigrant visas made available under each of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 203(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153) shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of a foreign state or dependent area that was not one of the two states with the largest aggregate number of natives obtaining immigrant visas during fiscal year 2011 under such paragraphs.
(B) For fiscal year 2013, 10 percent of the immigrant visas made available under each of such paragraphs shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of a foreign state or dependent area that was not one of the two states with the largest aggregate number of natives obtaining immigrant visas during fiscal year 2012 under such paragraphs.
(C) For fiscal year 2014, 10 percent of the immigrant visas made available under each of such paragraphs shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of a foreign state or dependent area that was not one of the two states with the largest aggregate number of natives obtaining immigrant visas during fiscal year 2012 under such paragraphs.
(e) In General.—With respect to the visas reserved under each of subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1), the number of such visas made available to natives of any single foreign state or dependent area that was not one of the two states with the largest aggregate number of natives obtaining immigrant visas during fiscal year 2012 under such paragraphs.
(f) Unreserved Visas.—With respect to the immigrant visas made available under each of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 203(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153) that are reserved under paragraph (1), for each of fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014, not more than 85 percent shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of any single foreign state or dependent area.
(g) Special Rule to Prevent Unused Visas.—If, with respect to fiscal year 2012, 2013, or 2014, the operation of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection would prevent the total number of immigrant visas made available under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 203(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)) from being issued such visas may be issued during the remainder of such fiscal year without regard to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material on H.R. 3012, as amended, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3012, the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act. I would first like to thank Chairman SMITH for his work and diligence and commitment on this issue. We wouldn’t be here today without his efforts and his commitment to this. I also want to thank Ranking Member CONEY and Immigration Subcommittee Ranking Member ZOE Lofgren. She cares deeply about this and has also been very instrumental in putting this bill together to make it something that we hope will pass today, and I thank her for her work on the Judiciary Committee.

The Immigration and Nationality Act generally provides that the total number of employment-based immigrant visas made available to natives of any single foreign country in a year cannot exceed 7 percent of the total number of such visas made available in that year.

The bill completely eliminates the per-country caps for employment-based visas and raises the per-country cap from 7 percent to 15 percent for family-based visas—all without adding even a single additional visa. In other words, there is no net increase in the total number of visas. When I was a Member, both sides of the aisle understood and recognize is that there is not a net increase in the total number of visas; but it does make important adjustments that will allow us to better serve our citizens and to meet our international obligations, which is one of the commitments that I have in working in this Congress.

While per-country limits make some limited sense in the area of family immigration, they make no sense in the context of employment-based immigration. American companies treat all highly skilled immigrants equally regardless of where they come from.