



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 2010

No. 91

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord our God, in You there is no beginning, no end. You truly are dynamic presence, ever self-revealing, guiding all things and human events.

Show Your presence in the midst of our empowering activities and empty frustrations.

May the priorities and the work of this Congress reveal Your goodness to the Nation and make all aware of Divine Providence behind every problem and obstacle as well as every delightful gift.

For You are our life and our salvation, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FOXX led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 10 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CHARTING A NEW COURSE FOR OUR NATION

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KUCINICH. What if the BP gusher in the gulf is unstoppable? This is a challenging question which is making its way through various blogs. What if millions of barrels of oil continue to flow uncontrolled from the hole in the seabed? We should be preparing now for a worst-case scenario. We should be mobilizing our Nation now, developing new, comprehensive plans for sustainable, alternative energy, for environmental protection, for public health, for preservation of species, for security, for rebuilding our economy and repairing commerce. We should be challenging our fellow citizens and ourselves to take part in charting a new course for our Nation, towards creating an America which has unlimited energy because it has unlimited vision, unclouded by greed or partisan advantage.

DEFENDING THE CONSTITUTION

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the American people are tired of Washington politicians turning a deaf ear to their wishes and concerns. Two days ago, Congressman DAVE CAMP put forward a proposal to repeal the provisions in the government health care takeover that mandates Americans buy government-run insurance. But this popular proposal was defeated by Washington liberals by a vote of 187-230.

People in my home State of South Carolina do not want an out-of-touch Washington bureaucrat forcing them to buy government-run insurance. We support the lawsuit of Attorney Gen-

eral Henry McMaster. We must defend the Constitution. Washington bureaucrats do not know what is best for South Carolinians or their families. The government mandate is unconstitutional.

We need a constitutional alternative, and I have a solution: Siding With American Patients Act, SWAP Act, to repeal the government takeover and replace it with a patient-centered and affordable solution that expands access and continues to cover preexisting conditions.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

IRAN SANCTIONS LEGISLATION

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today once again to urge passage of a final bill to impose tough sanctions on Iran. A final bill is long overdue. The House passed the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act last year, and the Senate passed the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions Accountability and Divestment Act in January.

Iran is not stopping its ruthless quest for nuclear weapons while Congress continues to deliberate. We simply cannot allow Iran to obtain nuclear weapons. We must act quickly and boldly to prevent that from happening. A nuclear Iran would not only pose a dire threat to Israel, a vitally important ally in the region, but to the United States as well.

We need to act, and we need to act now. I hope the conferees will complete their work quickly so that a final Iran sanctions bill can be enacted soon.

WE NEED A BUDGET

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4599

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, over the past weekend, President Obama sent a letter to Congress. He said we need to spend \$50 billion “as quickly as possible” in order to “jump-start private sector job creation.”

I’m not sure if the President has read the unemployment reports lately, but 16 months since his trillion dollar stimulus bill became law, the private sector is still struggling under the tax and regulatory burden of an ever expanding Federal Government. Unemployment is at 9.7 percent, and frankly, the last thing the private sector needs is the fear of higher taxes to pay for more wasteful government spending.

What this country needs as “quickly as possible” is for House Democrats to put forth an annual budget and for Congress and the President to have the courage to make real spending cuts. We can’t keep spending billions of dollars and calling it “emergency” spending so that it doesn’t have to be paid for, because eventually it will have to be paid for, and the American taxpayers know that day of reckoning is coming.

It is time for Democrats in this Chamber to stop talking about fiscal discipline and actually do something about it. As your majority whip said over the weekend, this economy is your baby. So take responsibility, put a budget on the table, and let’s debate it and give the American people a chance to hear which party is listening to them.

GIVING SMALL BUSINESS THE RESOURCES THEY NEED

(Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, small businesses are the engines of our economy, and their success is critical to our economic recovery and long-term economic growth. Sixty percent of new jobs are created by small businesses, and over half of this country’s economic growth since World War II has been from innovation and new technologies. We can and should empower the businesses and entrepreneurs who make our economy go by creating favorable conditions for businesses to start, to expand, and to put people back to work. That’s why I urge my colleagues to support the Small Business Jobs and Credit Act designed to increase small business lending, help small businesses hire new workers and expand their operations. When I talk to small business owners back home in Missouri, the number one issue they identify as an obstacle to hiring people is access to credit. We must continue to focus on promoting our small businesses to grow this economy and to get people back to work.

OIL SPILL NOT AN EXCUSE TO KILL JOBS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the horrific environmental and economic damage in the gulf continues, but it seems like the administration wants to move on to other things before the leak is stopped and the oil cleaned up. The President spent a significant part of his speech Tuesday night talking about imposing new costs on energy and cap-and-trade climate legislation.

We all know how important it is to have less dependence on fossil fuels, especially from foreign sources, and encourage clean energy production. The question is whether we do that by imposing new costs on the American people because of global warming. We should not impose new taxes on energy just based on the hope that clean energy will become more cost feasible.

I don’t have to remind anyone that we have unemployment near 10 percent. Making it more expensive to run factories and small businesses will not bring back jobs.

We certainly need clean energy, and I’ve been proud to see sensible solar, geothermal, and hydroelectric projects move forward in my district. What we don’t need are job-killing taxes on what BP chairman calls the “small people” that will make it even more difficult to recover jobs not only along the gulf coast but across our Nation.

FIDEL CASTRO’S ANTI-SEMITIC STATEMENT REGARDING ISRAEL

(Mr. SIRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage at Fidel Castro’s recent anti-Israel comments. In response to Israel’s interception of the flotilla in May, Fidel Castro published a statement in which he absurdly asserts that Israelis would like to send Palestinians to be cremated, as the Nazis did to the Jews.

Castro’s comments are outrageous and cruel. He ignorantly disregards the horror of the Holocaust and the suffering of the Jewish community. To suggest that Israel will consider a Nazi-inspired genocide of the Palestinians is inexcusably malicious.

This propaganda was not only published by the Cuban regime but then widely distributed. His offensive comments clearly portray the prejudice and anti-Semitic position of the Cuban regime. Castro’s words cannot shame or erase the democratic tradition in Israel and the strong relationship Israel shares with the United States.

I ask my colleagues to continue to work with Israel towards a peaceful solution for the Israeli and Palestinian people. And I encourage my colleagues to view Castro’s comments for what they are, the dangerous scheme of a brutal dictator, designed to hurt the people of Israel and obstruct the peace process.

□ 1015

HONORING THE SERVICE OF HARRISON FIRE CHIEF JOHN NEAL

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Harrison Fire Chief, John Neal, who has devoted his life to the citizens of Harrison, Arkansas, and is now retiring from duty after 21 years of service.

During his time as chief, John has exhibited his ability to lay the groundwork to ensure the people of Harrison’s safety by instituting more pre-fire planning, better building inspections and construction plan reviews, along with assisting in better public education of fire safety. He went above and beyond and worked with all of the fire departments in Boone County, making the county a much safer place to live.

Chief Neal is an outstanding leader. John has been married to Mary Lu for 30 years, has five children, and he looks forward to spending more time with his grandchildren.

I wish him continued success in his future activities. And today I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Chief John Neal, who will be missed, but I’m confident will continue his dedication to his community and his State.

LEGISLATION TO BENEFIT SENIORS

(Ms. GIFFORDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, in these difficult economic times, the face of retirement is changing. Today, seniors are staying on the job longer—not just because they want to, but, frankly, because they have to. That’s why I’m introducing two bills that will begin to address some of the challenges that we see facing our older workforce.

The Older Americans’ Job Opportunities Blueprint Act expands the work opportunity tax credit already available to over a dozen specific parts of our employment pool that will now benefit employers in hiring older Americans. For the first time in our history almost 20 percent of our workforce is 55 years and older; this is very different than we’ve had in the past.

I have also introduced the Back to School Act, which will give seniors financial assistance to take courses if they want to change their careers or to make them more competitive in the workforce.

Congress, of course, focuses a lot of our attention on new entrants or future entrants into the U.S. workforce, but the reality is that seniors are putting off retirement until much longer, and it’s time that we change the way our Nation thinks about retirement. I am excited to introduce these two pieces of legislation that will give

older Americans a chance to continue working.

BUDGET WOES

(Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Congress is now 2 months late in passing a Federal budget, and the majority has shown no indication of considering one any time soon. This fiscal irresponsibility on display in Washington is affecting American citizens and further damaging our economy and job growth. In fact, we hear hints that the budget isn't late, it's actually not coming at all, and the majority may avoid considering one altogether to evade calling further attention to an addiction to reckless spending. Given that the Federal debt has gone up by nearly \$2.4 trillion since January, 2009, undoubtedly congressional Democrat leaders fear that they will soon be forced to account for their reckless spending.

America needs a pro-growth economic policy to promote job growth and business development. Instead, we face massive deficits and excessive government bailouts. As the clock ticks on an increasingly late budget, I will continue to fight for government accountability and reform.

PROTECT AMERICAN JOBS

(Mr. SCHAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHAUER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I testified before the Ways and Means Committee about U.S. trade with China because I'm tired of seeing millions of American jobs lost to China because of blatantly unfair trade practices.

China is playing us for fools regarding the Government Procurement Agreement, the GPA. Upon joining WTO in 2001, China said it would sign the GPA as soon as possible; 9 years later it still hasn't happened. Since that time, we've lost 2.4 million American jobs—68,000 in Michigan, 4,700 jobs in my district alone—due to China's unfair trade.

It's time that we get tough. We need to show China that we're willing to be strong until they open their procurement markets to us. I've introduced H.R. 5312 as a way of addressing the issue, to limit the amount of U.S. Government procurement of Chinese goods to the amount of American goods purchased by the Chinese Government.

How about fairness for a change? How about no more U.S. census materials paid for by our tax dollars made by Chinese workers? Please join me in protecting American jobs.

DEBT AND SPENDING

(Mr. ROGERS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about debt and spending.

This Nation today is \$13 trillion in debt, and the Democrat majority intends to spend another \$1 trillion to add to that debt limit by the end of this year; \$14 trillion of debt, that's unconscionable.

You look at the budget that's coming from this administration that was proposed this year, \$3.8 trillion, and we only have \$2.2 trillion in revenue. That's \$1.6 trillion in deficit spending, all of it on the credit card, and the credit card is maxed out.

People back home ask me, why do you keep spending? Why does the Congress keep spending like this when you don't have the money? I think there's two reasons. I think one is this Democrat majority wants to grow government as much as it can while it still has the super-majorities to do so. I think the second reason is they really want to overhaul our tax system, and they want to do that by creating an economic crisis to justify implementing a VAT tax and reaching back to the high rates of taxation that we had back in the Carter administration.

This is unconscionable behavior, and if it doesn't make you mad, it ought to.

TIME TO END AMERICA'S OIL ADDICTION

(Mr. GARAMENDI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARAMENDI. It's time for America to end its addiction to oil. Our national security is at stake. We spend \$1 billion a day sending our money overseas to the oil companies, many of them owned by foreign nations, some of whom are not at all friendly to America.

I hear a lot of whining from the Republican side of the aisle about, well, we can't do that. Well, we cannot continue doing what we're doing today. We see the risks—\$20 billion worth of economy destroyed along the gulf coast. Big Oil has had its day, \$12 billion. You want to save some money on that side, let's retrieve the \$12 billion subsidy that we send to the oil industry every day.

It's time for us to move to renewables. It's time for us to protect our coasts. On the west coast, we do not want new Federal oil leases, and therefore the West Coast Oil Protection Act must be passed. No more Federal leases off the west coast. Move to renewables. Let's retrieve our \$12 billion annual subsidy that we give to Big Oil. Let's not send \$1 billion a day of our money to the foreign countries.

WE NEED A BUDGET

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Americans say the growing national debt is the greatest threat to our country, according to a recent Gallup poll. Since Democrats took control of Congress in 2007, the national debt has grown by \$3.5 billion a day. Since President Obama took office, the debt has increased by \$4.8 billion a day.

To control spending and reduce the national debt, we need a responsible budget that addresses our fiscal crisis. But as American families make tough choices with their household budgets, the Democratic majority in the House has yet to even propose a national budget. If a budget is not approved this year, it will be the first time since the Budget Act became law in 1974.

Congress should listen to the American people, get government spending under control, and approve a national budget.

WE NEED CLEAN ENERGY

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today after weeks of outcry for action to acknowledge that BP has caved to pressure, and to discuss yesterday's steps by BP to finally put working families and small businesses ahead of shareholders and short-term corporate profits.

Had BP acted with rigor and integrity from the beginning, we would not be forced into having this conversation right now. However, their shortsightedness has demanded a swift and aggressive response, which the President has provided.

In the short term, we must stop the oil from continuing to spill and subsequently clean up our shores, making BP pay the tab. Our energy future is bright; it is filled with diversity, with clean energy and American jobs for America's workers. Let us heed the devastating message that this disaster sends to us. Let us build the strongest, most powerful and most competitive clean energy economy in the world.

We can and we must rise to this challenge. Our children's future depends on it.

ISRAEL

(Mr. REICHERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for Israel and its right to defend herself and her people against potential terrorist threats.

As the world watched, Israel took action to prevent a flotilla from reaching the Gaza strip because Hamas terrorists could have smuggled in weapons that would be used to take the lives of innocent people.

Israel is a good friend and a true ally to America. We must not turn our back

on Israel at this critical time. We must stand with them. We must support them and their right to protect and defend the safety of their people and the sovereignty of their nation.

The Israeli Government just announced the decision to appoint an independent public commission to review the circumstances surrounding the flotilla raid. This commission will be headed by a retired Israeli judge and will include two Israeli experts in international law and two high-ranking foreign observers. This action demonstrates Israel's commitment to act within the law and to hold itself accountable in good faith to the international community.

HONORING THE LIFE OF STEWART WINSTEIN

(Mr. HARE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in sorrow at the news of the death of my friend, Stewart Winstein, from Rock Island, Illinois.

Stewart was one of the most respected and admired leaders in my community and built a strong reputation for local activism, public service, and the belief that politics could be a driving force for positive change in the lives of everyday Americans. It's a legacy that will be sorely missed in Rock Island, the city that Stewart loved and called home.

As a child of the Great Depression, Stewart and his family faced great poverty. It was a powerful influence on him and I'm sure formed much of his success as an attorney and a founding force of the Rock Island Democratic Party.

As one of the greatest advocates for working men and women that I knew, I think his legacy will be that he wanted to make sure that other families didn't have to face economic hardships that he knew too well. And as many in the Quad Cities can attest, whether it was working people or the vast number of clients he represented, it is a legacy of great success.

Stewart had a huge impact on my life. He was a valuable teacher who led by example, and I learned by witnessing firsthand the contributions he made to the Democratic Party, numerous charities and local government. Above all, I was proud to call Stewart my friend. My thoughts go out to Stewart's family, especially his beloved son, Arthur.

□ 1030

GROWING DEMOCRATS' PROGRAMS

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the dire warnings of economists and the vivid lessons of Greece

and of other debt-burdened European countries which are collapsing under their cradle-to-grave welfare systems have done nothing to restrain the Democrats in Washington. They have failed to heed the warnings from abroad, and they continue to simply declare their out-of-control spending as emergency spending to try to cover up their fiscal irresponsibility.

As a constitutional conservative with grave concerns about the Democrats' out-of-control spending, I support a different plan. I say balance the budget; cut the deficit; pay down the debt; fire the czars; and grow the economy.

With President Obama in control, the term "GDP" has taken on a whole new meaning—growing Democrats' programs.

JOSH CONFERENCE

(Mr. BOYD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, we are 2 weeks into the hurricane season, and already the first tropical depression has formed in the Atlantic. If one of these storms were to strike the Gulf of Mexico, with millions of barrels of oil on top, the results would be disastrous to the communities along the gulf.

To make sure our region is prepared to deal with the effects that a hurricane or a tropical storm could have, this past Monday I held a joint oil spill-hurricane planning conference in Bay County, Florida. The conference brought together representatives from Federal and State emergency response agencies, and it brought together military leaders and key local stakeholders to discuss the hazards associated with a hurricane's impact on the oil spill and to discuss the threats posed to our area by having oil propelled inland.

Working together, we identified several planning and action items that need to be taken to better brace for the effects that a storm would have on our communities now that there is oil in the Gulf of Mexico. I plan to deliver these action items to the President and to urge him to incorporate these recommendations into a Federal hurricane preparedness and response plan so that our communities and people can be better protected.

North Florida is already feeling the significant economic and environmental distress from the BP oil spill. It is our responsibility to take steps to safeguard our region.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5297, SMALL BUSINESS JOBS AND CREDIT ACT OF 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1448 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1448

Resolved, That during further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5297) to create the Small Business Lending Fund Program to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make capital investments in eligible institutions in order to increase the availability of credit for small businesses, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1436, it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution as though they were the last two amendments printed in part C of House Report 111-506.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR). The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1448.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1448 is a structured rule, providing for further consideration of H.R. 5297, the Small Business Lending Fund Act. It provides for the consideration of two amendments which were initially cleared as PAYGO-compliant but which were subsequently deemed to violate PAYGO after the first rule was adopted. These amendments have been revised to comply with PAYGO rules, and this rule treats them as part of yesterday's rule.

Mr. Speaker, in 2008, after years of lax regulation and Wall Street roulette, our Nation's economy fell off a cliff. Within a matter of months, many Wall Street giants fell, and they took the livelihoods of thousands of small businesses with them. Since that time, we have taken bold action to stabilize the economy, to invest in economic growth, and we are in the process of putting in place new rules to protect against the casino-like atmosphere that existed on Wall Street.

Yet for small businesses, they are still feeling the pinch. Accessing capital to build, to grow, to diversify, and to hire new employees remains a pressing challenge. In September of 2008, there was an earthquake on Wall Street, and the aftershocks are still being felt on Main Street. The purpose of this bill is to help those small businesses deal with the aftershocks of that credit crunch from a year and a half ago.

The underlying bill, the Small Business Lending Fund Act, establishes a process for community banks to lend responsibly to small businesses. Because of a mistake, two of my colleagues, Representative SCHRADER and

Representative MILLER, were precluded from offering their amendments as reported in yesterday's rule. This rule merely allows for the consideration of their modified amendments so we can perfect this legislation and get our Nation's small businesses back to work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, just 2 days ago, I came before this body in opposition to a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 5297, a bill affectionately known as "TARP III." At that time, I expressed concern over the cost of this bill and over the ruling Democrats' lack of ability to run this House in an orderly fashion. My presence here today is testament to these concerns.

If the process for considering this legislation and accompanying amendments had been more thoroughly vetted, we could have avoided meeting today altogether, but apparently, in their zeal to add to the budget-busting TARP III legislation, some flawed amendments were found to violate the Democrats' cherished PAYGO rules.

Yesterday, it was discovered that two amendments—Miller No. 46 and Schrader No. 14—were not PAYGO-compliant. H.R. 5297 is being paid for with the savings in H.R. 5486, but due to the timetables used for those savings, the amendments failed to meet the first 5-year window of PAYGO. The rule did not contain any PAYGO waivers. Therefore, the amendments now need to either be redrafted or they need to have the PAYGO rules waived.

Despite the pledge made in a document entitled, "A New Direction for America," when then-Minority Leader PELOSI promised "bills should generally come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full and fair debate, consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives," it's worth mentioning that there were 57 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee for H.R. 5297. Of those, 37 were Democrat; 17 were Republican, and three were bipartisan. Of those 57 submitted, there were 17 amendments made in order, only one of which was Republican.

Therefore, I recommend voting against this rule, not only in opposition to the underlying legislation, but also in protest of the partisan process for which it is being considered.

Mr. Speaker, while the ruling Democrats claim the underlying TARP III bill is about helping small businesses, it is really just another bank bailout. The bill is intended to give the appearance that they're doing something. It appears the ruling liberal Democrat regime has completely given up on even trying to pretend they are capable of budgeting or of even governing this country. Certainly, the ruling Democrats would be better served on focusing on passing a budget than on considering the bill before us today.

So what is the next step for the Democrats?

In an apparent effort to help shield their vulnerable Members from having to endure their unconscionable approach to budgeting during an election year, the ruling Democrats are now planning to forgo the annual congressional budget process altogether, this during a time when voters are looking for real solutions and accountability. How is that for leadership?

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the Republican whip, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the YouCut program continues to pick up steam across the country as the American people reject the spend now-pay later philosophy that has long dominated Washington.

This week's YouCut winner was developed by my colleague, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ). It would amend Federal law to allow for the expedited sale of wasteful and unaffordable Federal properties, saving taxpayers up to \$15 billion. President Obama, himself, in a directive released the day after Mr. CHAFFETZ's YouCut proposal was unveiled, indicated his support for selling unneeded properties.

Today, my colleagues on our side of the aisle join together and call upon the House to support this easy, straightforward way to reduce spending.

Let us remember then-Senator Obama's 2006 words of support for removing barriers to the disposal of excess Federal property. He said, Regardless of what side of the aisle we sit on, we all agree we are in dire financial straits, and we need to manage our assets in the most cost-effective way possible to close the gap.

Mr. Speaker, America is at a crossroads. It is time for us all to act together in a bipartisan fashion to stop the runaway spending and to get our fiscal house in order. I urge the body to defeat the motion of the previous question so that we can actually begin to change the culture here in Washington against the runaway spending.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the whip, but I think what we've got to do is to just talk about reality here.

The reality is, when George Bush left office in January of 2009, this country was losing 780,000 jobs per month. Last month, we gained 400,000 jobs. That's a swing of over 1.1 million jobs per month. Yet, on top of that, not only did the Bush administration leave this country in a terrible lurch with jobs; it left this country with a terrible lurch and with a terrible deficit of \$1.3 trillion.

The Republicans would have America have mass amnesia, to forget where we

were. In 2007, we spent \$141 billion in Iraq. Today, they're telling us, Hey, let's sell off part of the country to pay our debts. We were spending \$141 billion in Iraq and not paying for it. This year, we're going to draw that down to \$65 billion. Republicans would have us forget.

Let's talk real money. I agree: we should never be wasting money in this country. Every dollar should be worthwhile and real, but we're going to spend \$77 billion less in Iraq than under George Bush and at the end of the Republican rule of Congress.

So here we've improved employment by some 1.1 million jobs per month. We were left with a terrible deficit by President Bush of \$1.3 trillion. We are drawing down Iraq and are saving real money. Then they come up with an advertising program of YouCut to sell assets of this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, all of my colleagues from across the aisle always fail to mention that, in the last 2 years of the Bush administration, Democrats were in charge of Congress. The President can't spend any money. Only the Congress can spend money. So they conveniently leave out the fact that, when they took over Congress, our economy was doing great, absolutely great. From the moment they took over Congress in January of 2007, things started going downhill. The \$1.3 trillion deficit came about as a result of the spending, spending, spending by our colleagues from across the aisle. They've lost touch with the real world.

□ 1045

The other thing my colleague points out is 400,000 jobs were created last month. He fails to mention that almost all of those jobs were created by the census hiring temporary people who will no longer be employed after the end of this year. So they're government jobs.

The American people are seeing through these tales they're being told by our colleagues across the aisle of how wonderful they have made the economy. They know that we have a 9.7 percent unemployment rate. They know that the deficit for the Republican-led Congress from 1996 to 2007 was only \$1.2 trillion in 12 years. This Democrat Congress racked up in 2 years a \$3.2 trillion deficit. My goodness. The American people, again, can see through this, Mr. Speaker. They're not going to be fooled by this rhetoric.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. As Members of Congress, our constitutional mandate is to be responsible stewards of the taxpayer dollars and assets. With the debt at \$13 trillion and counting, this House and government have failed miserably in the task. During times of fiscal uncertainty, savvy businesses identify excess and underperforming assets and eliminate them. Our government must do the same. The American people agree.

This week's winning YouCut proposal would incentivize Federal agencies to identify and eliminate underutilized Federal buildings and structures. According to OMB Director Peter Orszag, the Federal Government has 69,000 buildings and structures that meet this criteria. The total value of this excess property is nearly \$19 billion. The one-time sale of these properties would generate substantial revenues to fill short-term budget gaps. The long-term savings would have a more substantial impact. A leaner real estate portfolio would allow the Federal bureaucracy to function effectively and efficiently, and most importantly, the taxpayers will no longer be on the hook for underused, sometimes vacant Federal properties.

Current law prohibits the disposing of wasted property and cashing in on the savings. Most surplus property must be offered—often at no cost—to other government agencies, to State and local governments, to nonprofit organizations and others. Only at the end of this process is property offered at a competitive public sale. Federal taxpayers have missed opportunities to generate revenue and to reduce the deficit. For example, the Federal Government has conveyed, at no cost, a building in Los Angeles for a mob museum. A mob museum. Land in Massachusetts was conveyed for a public high school, where tuition is over \$29,000 a year. And a building in Florida the Federal Government now leases back at a cost of over \$100,000 a year.

The proposal would direct OMB to sell these properties and transfer 80 percent of the proceeds to reduce the Federal debt. This would result in approximately \$15 billion in debt reduction. The remaining 20 percent of the proceeds would act as an incentive to agencies to quickly dispose of the excess property.

Even President Obama is starting to appreciate the need. On June 10, he issued a Presidential memorandum to department heads directing them to "accelerate efforts to identify and eliminate excess properties." He went on to say, "Both taxpayer dollars and energy resources are being wasted to maintain these excess assets." We seem to be in agreement with the President. We urge the Democrats to join us.

Today, Congress can carry out the wishes of the American people, can support the President's effort to trim the Federal portfolio and take significant steps in getting our fiscal house back in order. I urge my colleagues to support this proposal. It's just common sense.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would remind the Speaker and others that we're here on the small business lending bill, not on Mr. CHAFFETZ's proposal or any proposal like that. It may have merit at another time when that bill, itself, is brought forward, but we're here to talk about the small business lending bill, which provides community banks, smaller banks with funds to make cred-

it available to the small businesses on Main Street that were hurt by the crash on Wall Street. So I would just remind the Speaker as to what this bill, the underlying bill, is.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps my colleague across the aisle needs to be reminded we're actually here to debate because of two amendments that violate their vaunted PAYGO, which means we are talking about the deficit and we are talking about the sorry economy that the Democrats have brought to this country.

Now I yield 4 minutes to my colleague from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me this time.

We have been told that this is the time the majority wanted us to discuss this proposal by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), and so that's why we're doing this at this time.

And I want, first of all, to commend Mr. CHAFFETZ for his proposal, which would save taxpayer money and which would potentially help cut into the huge deficit, the huge debt that we have, in a very significant way. As he mentioned, we have a national debt of over \$13 trillion now. The Congress recently voted to raise the debt limit to \$14.3 trillion. That's an incomprehensible figure. But what it means is that in a few short years we're not going to be able to pay all of our Social Security, veterans' pensions, and civil service pensions and all of the things we promised our own people with money that will buy anything. The Congress in those years will not politically be able to come in and cut the benefits, but they'll just print more money. And then people will find that their pensions that they were counting on will buy a third or a half of what they expect.

This is an issue that I have been interested in for quite some time, when I found out as far back as 1999 that the Bureau of Land Management had identified 3 million acres that they did not want because it was difficult to manage, inaccessible, unnecessary, and expensive. And so I introduced legislation in both the 106th and 107th Congresses to dispose of some of this property to gain some money for the Federal Government.

The Federal Government today owns approximately 30 percent of the land in this country. State and local governments and quasi-governmental agencies own or control another 20 percent. So, in other words, you have half the land in some type of public ownership. Yet we keep taking more and more, a few million more acres each year off of the tax rolls. At the same time that the schools and the police and everybody come to us wanting more money, we keep decreasing the tax rolls.

It sounds great for a politician to create a park, but we've created so

many parks now at the Federal, State, and local levels that we can't even begin to get the use out of them to justify these parks unless our people somehow find a way to go on permanent vacations. And then, USA Today reported that there are 1,667 land trusts and there are 1,400 nature conservancies, all taking over more and more land, so much that USA Today on its front page reported that they're taking over approximately 6.2 million acres a year, equivalent to half the size of the State of New Jersey each year, adding to—constantly adding to that hundreds of millions of acres that are already under some type of Federal, State, or local ownership, decreasing the tax rolls.

I introduced a bill with my colleague from the other side, DENNIS MOORE, in the last Congress, called the Federal Real Property Disposal Enhancement Act. The Office of Management and Budget had found 21,000 Federal properties that the Federal Government no longer wanted worth \$18 billion, and \$9 billion of those were real property assets that the Federal Government wanted to dispose of. But it's so complicated and so bureaucratic to dispose of it at this present time that it's cheaper for these agencies to keep this property that they're not even using.

Jim Nussle, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget at that time, in the last Congress, recently sent me a letter and endorsed the bill that I had introduced in the Congress and that Senator TOM CARPER, a Democrat from Delaware, and Senator TOM COBURN had introduced in the Senate. The goal of the OMB was to dispose of \$9 billion in unneeded real property.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. DUNCAN. Director Nussle wrote at the time I introduced that bill with Congressman MOORE, he said, "To reach this objective, I believe we must improve and streamline the current process that Federal agencies face in disposing of real property assets. Therefore, I applaud your introduction of H.R. 3049, which would establish a 5-year pilot program for expediting the disposal of properties no longer needed by the Federal Government."

We've got to wake up, Mr. Speaker, and realize that private property is a foundation of our freedom and our prosperity. Yet we're slowing doing away with it in this country, and we need to reverse this trend. And this action by Mr. CHAFFETZ will help start that process and save taxpayer money.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would just quote from a letter we received from the Independent Community Bankers of America: On behalf of the 5,000 members of the Independent Community Bankers of America, we strongly support passage of the proposed Small Business Lending Fund Act of 2010.

We're here on the rule to allow for that bill to go forward, and I would

like to remind the Speaker and others that that's the purpose of the hearing today.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to my friend from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my friend from Colorado for yielding.

I remember back in the movie, "The American President," there's one scene where Michael Douglas' character is being criticized by one of his staff members, and he says, Is the view pretty good from the cheap seats?

I have to sit here and say, my colleagues, the view is pretty good from the cheap seats. Because if you think back upon what we inherited, those of us who are now trying to pull that car out of the ditch, which is also the economy, and try to improve things for the American people, how deep in that ditch it was. And we're talking about 700,000 jobs lost per month. We're talking about an inherited projected deficit of \$10 trillion. That's what the Obama administration and this Congress has been trying to repair.

Now, what has been the response from our colleagues on the other side? It has been solely, Well, this isn't a good idea; this isn't a good idea; this isn't a good idea. We're spending too much money. Blah, blah, blah. Let's cut taxes. Well, we tried that. Been there, done that, and that's what brought us to the ditch.

Now what have we done in this Congress? What have we done to take that car out of the ditch and get it back on the road? We have taken, by every measure possible. We passed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. We put \$300 billion back in the hands of the American taxpayers. That's something that our colleagues on the other side neglect to mention, that that money—most of that money, or 40 percent of the so-called stimulus package, went back to the American taxpayers to spend.

I have the privilege of cochairing the Congressional Task Force on American Competitiveness. Two days ago, we had a forum here. We have had people from companies as large as General Electric and Ford to very small startups. Without an exception, every one of those businesspeople said that we would be in such worse shape were it not for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. You can imagine all of the progress or much of the progress they had made in sustaining or growing their businesses was attributable to support given through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and that the government has to continue to play a role.

One reason they said was very interesting. In the global economy, we are not necessarily competing in a free market atmosphere. We're competing with a lot of State-supported industry. So, for instance, when General Electric, which is bringing back 400 jobs from China to my district to build an energy-efficient hybrid water heater, they did it because support through the

Recovery Act enabled them to make that difference that they were trying to balance—the economics—because of a State-supported system in China. The support they got through the Recovery and Reinvestment Act made up that difference and now they are bringing 400 jobs back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. YARMUTH. They are bringing back 400 jobs. They are planning to bring back more jobs, again, because of the government's help. Now, as I said at the outset, there are two ways to approach this decline. We can say the government has no role. We can say all the government should do is get out of the way and the private forces will recover the economy. As I said, been there, done that. It hasn't worked.

The steps that we have taken, the steps that we propose to take in this Small Business Act, the subject of this rule, are steps that we believe are worth trying, that will be an affirmative effort to grow jobs in the small business segment of the economy to make capital available, to provide tax incentives—yes, to my friends on the other side, tax incentives—to motivate small business operators to grow their businesses, to start new businesses. These are the steps that this Congress and this administration are taking to grow the economy. It is better than sitting in the cheap seats and saying we want to go back to the agenda that put us in the ditch.

□ 1100

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, you know, the gentleman from Colorado reminds us to stay on the topic, but then he yields to someone who spends most of his time blaming a person who is not even any longer in office. That is the theme of our colleagues across the aisle. No sense of responsibility or accountability on their part.

They passed the disastrous stimulus, which all it did was put us deeper into debt. It hasn't done anything to help the economy. They talk about more government control. Well, what about the MMS department? They were the ones who were supposed to be checking out whether what BP was doing was okay. They signed off on all the permits and let them drill. That's what growing the government does for us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. has lived beyond its means for too long, and it will take commonsense ideas to restore responsible spending in Washington. But we can start by identifying what we need to fulfill the duties of the Federal Government and eliminate everything else.

The Federal Government is the largest property owner in the U.S. According to the OMB, we have \$18 billion in assets that we do not need. Rather

than selling unnecessary assets, like the American people do to live within their means, the Federal Government gives property free of charge to other government entities and nonprofits, including a building in Las Vegas to use as a mob museum.

The American people have spoken. We cannot continue ignoring our debt. I urge my colleagues to stand with the folks at home to use common sense and vote to sell excess Federal property and take a necessary step toward a sustainable future.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I remind my friend from Kansas that when you cut taxes for the wealthiest people in America, you prosecute two wars without paying for them, and you fail to police Wall Street so that it becomes a big casino and results in a crash leaving this country in terrible debt, and you turn a budget upside down, those are the policies that bring a country and bring small businesses to their knees. The country, because of various steps taken, has come out of the terrible dip of the last months of the Bush administration to where we're adding jobs.

We have a long way to go. We lost millions of jobs, and many small businesses were hurt in the process. The purpose of the bill that is to be voted on today is about providing funding to smaller banks so that small business will have credit, and people will get back to work. Providing a platform for small business to really get back on its feet and put the people back to work, so many of whom lost their jobs in this recession that was caused by the tax cuts, the two wars without payment, and failing to police Wall Street.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, every time my colleague wants to blame the economy on the former President, I'm going to remind him that the Democrats were in control of this Congress the last 2 years that President Bush was in office. You can talk all you want to about what the job numbers were in the last month of the Bush administration. The Democrats were in control of Congress, and they caused the problem.

I now yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague, my eloquent colleague, from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. When we talk about Wall Street, one of the things that really gets me is, if you look at the numbers and why there wasn't more reform of Wall Street, what we find out is that actually both to the Obama campaign running for President and to our friends across the aisle, the executives on Wall Street, despite what sometimes seems the conventional wisdom, the executives on Wall Street give to the Democrats and to the Obama campaign four to one over Republicans. It's an amazing thing to see. And if you look at that, then you begin to understand a little better why there may be games being played, but there was no real reform of Wall Street that was going on.

And that also brings up the issue of British Petroleum. Some might wonder, why in the world would the President of the United States wait all these weeks—week after week after week after week—to even meet with British Petroleum, to even call them down. Well, they've gotten pretty rough on them here lately in talking. But actually, it turns out the more you dig—it's kind of like Wall Street—it turns out British Petroleum was this administration's greatest ally in fighting what was an invented problem: Global warming. It turns out the planet may have been cooling in the last few years. The snow down in South Africa recently points toward that as well.

But British Petroleum was meeting with Senator KERRY, and they were pushing this global warming bill. They needed an oil company to help get this ridiculous bill that was being pushed, the so-called energy bill, they needed an oil company to give them credibility. So, of course, they didn't want to come down on them. Of course, they want to talk about Wall Street and getting tough on the fat cats, but as far as doing anything, it's just talk. That's why Goldman Sachs had their biggest profit in their whole company's history last year as the Democrats controlled the House, the Senate and the White House. And I'm trying to dig. We found some contracts, but I would like to know just how much of that was government money coming from this Congress and this administration into the coffers still of Goldman Sachs. It's still flowing there. And the contracts indicate that.

As far as the oil spill, you've got companies and countries around the world willing to help. President Bush, for all the criticism, actually within 3 days of the Katrina hurricane, had suspended the Jones Act so foreign countries could send ships and send help and go ahead and give us all the assistance they could. This administration still has not suspended the Jones Act. We had the Netherlands within days—man, they know something about building barrier islands and dikes and things like that. This administration said, Oh, no. We don't want that, allowing millions and millions and millions of dollars to pile up. And then you look in a little deeper, and you find out, Oh, gee.

After the President said that about the cozy relationship that existed between big oil and the regulators, it turns out the very person that we were told by the Inspector General who knew the most about that price adjustment language being pulled out of offshore leases in 1998-1999 left the Clinton administration when they went out; so they couldn't really talk to them to investigate what had happened. It turns out, she works now with the Department of the Interior, with the Minerals Management. Go figure.

There is a mess going on. There are a lot of things we can do to quit killing jobs. Those 700,000 jobs were being lost

when the Democrats had this majority, and compassion does not equal giving away money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time does each side have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 19 minutes. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 8½ minutes.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would ask my friend from North Carolina how many more speakers she may have.

Ms. FOXX. We have at least two more speakers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I just would say, again, reading from the letter from the Independent Community Bankers of America. The Act, which is the Small Business Lending Fund Act, the Act would offer capital to interested community banks to increase small business credit. We urge the House to pass this legislation. The Nation's 8,000-strong community banks are well positioned to leverage this fund and have established relationships with small businesses in their communities to get credit flowing. On down it says, Notably, leveraging the \$30 billion funds with community banks would potentially support many times that amount in loan volume to small businesses, as much as \$300 billion in additional lending.

By reducing the dividend costs on the capital investment as lending increases, this program helps to ensure more community banks have both the incentive and greater capacity to increase total loans to small businesses. That's the purpose of this rule, to pass the underlying bill, which is to increase credit to small businesses and get them back on their feet and help continue to add jobs, as we have over the course of the last 14 or 15 months. When we were at the very depth of the recession, in January 2009, the last month of the Bush administration, losing 780,000 jobs; in April, where we gained 290,000 jobs; in May, 400,000 jobs. That's what this is about, putting people back to work, getting this country back on a strong financial footing.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlelady from North Carolina yielding me the time.

We are here today to talk about a rule that would qualify certain amendments to solve a procedural problem, a mistake that the majority party made here. But why not use this rule as an opportunity to something really more, to help solve and resolve ongoing problems. One could look at the far map that I have of the United States over there. Everything that is in red is land and property owned by the Federal Government. Ronald Reagan looked at that and said, You never see something like that this side of the old Soviet

Union. Think about that. One out of every three acres of this country is owned and controlled by the Federal Government. And I hate to say this, but in 2007, OMB did a study and said that, of that, \$18 billion worth of that property is excess. It is useless. It is needless.

This year, Peter Orszag updated that report and said there are 14,000 buildings that the Federal Government owns that are excess, and 55,000 buildings that are underutilized and not necessary. When I first came here, The Washington Post did an editorial that said, Until the District of Columbia can get hold of all the excess land and buildings owned by the Federal Government and put those to economic use, the economy of Washington, D.C., would never grow.

Those of us in the West have been saying that for a long time. In fact, this year, I introduced two land transfer bills. In each bill, both the Forest Service and the BLM as well as the Army Corps of Engineers owned land that they did not use, they did not need, they didn't even know about it. One parcel of land was sold to the Federal Government in the 1940s for \$1, and the Forest Service did not know they had that land.

The local officials understood that this land is useless, and these buildings are useless, and thus, they are put to some kind of profitable need. The D.C. bureaucrats, though, said their policy is no net loss of land or real estate. In fact, the only way they will give up something is if they get more in return. That is pure insanity. Use this rule to go against the excesses of land and the excess buildings that we have so that we can send a true message to the business community and the money lenders who have money to invest in this economy that we really are serious about the debt by taking all of the excess and using it to pay down the debt, that we are serious about building a business climate here that will encourage people to invest in this company, and do that first by saying, We will retire our excess property and use it to build down and take down this debt.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I, again, remind everyone that the rule and the bill are about small business lending. Again, I would refer to the letter from the independent community bankers. ICBA believes the proposed Small Business Lending Fund Act supports their recommendations, and this fresh program approach will attract a broader spectrum of community banks to boost small business lending and job growth. We applaud the new program focused on getting funds to Main Street's small businesses using Main Street community banks.

We're here to try to get money to small businesses throughout the country using the smaller community banks, regional banks. The purpose is to get them back on their feet, get them growing. We're not here to talk

about selling off assets of America. We're here to talk about getting small businesses back on their feet.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague from Georgia, Dr. PRICE.

□ 1115

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentelady for yielding and for her leadership on issues of the utmost importance to the American people.

My friend says we are not here to talk about the debt that has been created in this Nation; we are here to talk about money. We are here to talk about the taxpayers' money. And this bill, this underlying bill that is being discussed right now spends another \$33 billion. That is right, Mr. Speaker, another \$33 billion of hard-earned money from the American taxpayer. But it can't come from the American taxpayer, because we have so much deficit right now. So it needs to come from where, China or Japan.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are sick and tired of what is going on here in Washington. Just this week the American people said in a survey that the greatest threat to this Nation, which they believe had been terrorism, is now debt. Debt. What they are saying to us is stop the madness. So what the Republicans have done, in an attempt to be fiscally responsible and try to encourage our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stop the madness, is to institute the YouCut program.

It is at republicanwhip.house.gov/YouCut, and this week's winner, these are the American people going to this Web site saying stop the madness, cut in this area, this week's winner will save \$15 billion by selling excess Federal property, property that is not being used right now, sell it for \$15 billion.

Every single week we try to identify those programs, those areas of the Federal Government that are recklessly spending the hard-earned taxpayers' money. And this week, there are five more new nominees that will be announced.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to go to the Web site, republicanwhip.house.gov/YouCut, and vote for whether or not they want to prohibit hiring of new IRS agents to enforce the new health care law, saving \$10 billion, whether they want to terminate exchanges in the Whaling and Trading Partners program, another \$90 million in savings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Or you vote to terminate taxpayer-subsidized political party conventions. That is right, Mr. Speaker, we spend tens of millions of dollars paying for Democrat and Re-

publican party conventions. That is crazy.

Or you could vote to require collection of unpaid taxes from Federal employees, a billion dollars we could save there; or to terminate the funding for the NDIC, \$440 million.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not just about whether or not we are acting responsibly here. It is what we are doing with the hard-earned taxpayer money. We are talking about money here, and this bill that you are talking about spends an extra \$33 billion that we do not have. In fact, there is money appropriated already through the TARP program, over \$500 billion of money available. You could use some of that if you wanted to be fiscally responsible. But, Mr. Speaker, we have seen that kind of leadership out of the majority party.

Mr. Speaker, the YouCut program allows the American people to assist in those things that they believe are wasteful in our Federal Government. This bill is an opportunity through the PC to be able to cut the excess Federal property.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would remind my friend, at the height of the Iraq war we spend \$141 billion, as we draw troops down to \$65 billion, a savings of \$76 billion a year. That is money. These things we can find other places to spend where there is wasteful spending, \$76 billion in Iraq. That is what this Congress is finding. That is what this President has found. Instead of going into war and not paying for it, \$76 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

I know the American people who are watching this must have their heads spinning because all we have heard for a year and a half now from our colleagues on the other side was TARP was a disastrous program; TARP is a disastrous program. They are running ads against us in our districts about how horrible TARP was: so and so voted for TARP. And yet here we have someone who is advocating that we take money from TARP and give it to small businesses. I actually think that is a good idea. I am for that.

But I want to clarify something because he is misstating the impact of the underlying bill. This bill does not add anything to the deficit. This bill is paid for, and the \$30 billion in loan facilities that we are actually making available to small banks throughout the country actually generates a surplus for the Treasury. That is a profit maker for the Treasury. There is no cost unless the money is actually borrowed. And if it is borrowed and paid back with interest, then the taxpayers actually benefit.

So it is one to thing to talk about deficits and argue about who is responsible and so forth, but to actually misstate the actual facts about the underlying bill here is a little bit disingenuous.

I would like to make one more comment. My friend from North Carolina mentioned earlier, you keep blaming the former President. No, we actually keep blaming the former 12 years of Republican control of the Congress because that is the period of time in which the really disastrous policies for the economy were implemented and were approved: the two tax cuts that mostly went to wealthiest Americans; the \$7 trillion projected debt because of the unfunded prescription drug plan; and, of course, the war funding.

I know that the President, President Bush, dealt for 2 years with a Democratic Congress. We did have control of the Congress, but we sure didn't have a veto-proof Congress. And every time we wanted to implement a policy or change the President's budget, he threatened a veto. So, yes, we did have control of the Congress, but we didn't have control of the Nation's economy. But for 12 years, the Republican Congress did. For 6 years of that, they had control of all three branches of government. That is when the true damage was done.

We have an important piece of legislation that will help small businesses create jobs.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

You know, my colleagues across the aisle talk about trying to create jobs. I will point out to my colleague that trying isn't doing it. What happens is you pass the stimulus to create jobs, omnibus appropriations to create jobs, auto bailouts to create jobs, health care, cap-and-trade, all of those things to create jobs. You are trying, but you are not doing. What you are doing is you are creating government jobs.

This is the chart that the American people want to look at: how many government jobs you are creating. You have also created a deficit in 2 years three times the size of the deficit that Republicans created in 12 years. You are so selective in how you talk about history. Clinton was President for part of that time. You say he had a surplus at the end of his term; but you never give Republicans credit for that. But then you talk about our being in charge of the Congress. You know, you are very selective with your statistics. But you have tried and you've failed. You have not created jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I want to make sure that the record is clear that the amendments that are presented in today's rule are in full compliance with the PAYGO rule, and that is why we are proceeding with this second rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment and extraneous material be printed in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I'm going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that I can amend the rule to allow all Members of Congress the opportunity to vote to cut spending. Republican Whip ERIC CANTOR really launched the YouCut initiative which gives people an opportunity to vote for Federal spending they would like to see Congress cut. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have cast their votes, and this week they have directed their Representatives in Congress to consider H.R. 5535.

According to the Republican whip YouCut Web site: "The Office of Management and Budget estimated in 2007 that the Federal Government is holding \$18 billion in real property it does not need. Rather than selling this property, however, Federal law usually requires that it first be offered, often at no cost, to other government agencies, to State and local governments, to nonprofits, and others. The Federal Government has conveyed at no cost: a building in Las Vegas that is intended to house the mob museum; land in Massachusetts for a private high school where tuition is over \$29,000 a year; and a building in Florida that the Federal Government now leases back at a cost of over \$100,000 a year. This proposal would amend Federal law to require an expedited process for selling unneeded Federal property with 80 percent of the proceeds used to reduce the deficit."

In order to provide for consideration of this commonsense legislation, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses cannot grow if credit is not available to them. Over the course of the last year and a half, credit has tightened substantially. This bill provides for a loan fund to small community banks and regional banks so that they can work with their small businesses throughout the country. This is not focused on Wall Street, but is focused on Main Street so we can get small businesses really back strong and prosperous and hiring people back so that this country is on a full and vibrant financial footing.

I would just remind the Speaker, we have strong support from a whole variety of organizations with respect to the bill: the National Small Business Association, the Small Business Majority, the National Association of Realtors, the Independent Community Bankers of America, the American Bankers Association, and a number of other organizations.

Our Nation's small businesses have waited long enough for much-needed capital, so we won't make them wait

any longer. This credit crunch has taken its toll, but now it is time to focus on Main Street.

I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Ms. FOXX is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1448

OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole house on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5535) to establish a pilot program for the expedited disposal of Federal real property. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill. Clause 1(e) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5535.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated

the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 1448, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules and adopt House Resolution 1429.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 179, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 368]

YEAS—241

Ackerman	Baldwin	Bishop (GA)
Adler (NJ)	Barrow	Bishop (NY)
Altmire	Bean	Blumenauer
Andrews	Becerra	Bocieri
Arcuri	Berkley	Boren
Baca	Berman	Boswell
Baird	Berry	Boucher

Boyd Hinojosa
 Brady (PA) Hirono
 Braley (IA) Hodess
 Brown, Corrine Holden
 Butterfield Holt
 Capps Honda
 Capuano Hoyer
 Cardoza Inslee
 Carnahan Israel
 Carney Jackson (IL)
 Carson (IN) Jackson Lee
 Castor (FL) (TX)
 Chandler Johnson (GA)
 Chu Johnson, E. B.
 Clarke Kagen
 Clay Kanjorski
 Cleaver Kaptur
 Clyburn Kennedy
 Cohen Kildee
 Connolly (VA) Kilpatrick (MI)
 Conyers Kilroy
 Cooper Kind
 Costa Kissell
 Costello Klein (FL)
 Courtney Kosmas
 Critz Kucinich
 Crowley Langevin
 Cuellar Larsen (WA)
 Cummings Larson (CT)
 Davis (AL) Lee (CA)
 Davis (CA) Levin
 Davis (IL) Lewis (GA)
 Davis (TN) Lipinski
 DeFazio Loeb sack
 DeGette Lofgren, Zoe
 Delahunt Lowey
 DeLauro Lujan
 Deutch Lynch
 Dicks Maffei
 Dingell Maloney
 Doggett Markey (CO)
 Donnelly (IN) Markey (MA)
 Doyle Marshall
 Driehaus Matheson
 Edwards (MD) Matsui
 Edwards (TX) McCarthy (NY)
 Ellison McCollum
 Ellsworth McDermott
 Engel McGovern
 Eshoo McIntyre
 Etheridge McMahan
 Farr McNeerney
 Fattah Meeks (NY)
 Filner Melancon
 Foster Michaud
 Frank (MA) Miller (NC)
 Fudge Miller, George
 Garamendi Mollohan
 Gonzalez Moore (KS)
 Gordon (TN) Moran (VA)
 Grayson Murphy (CT)
 Green, Al Murphy (NY)
 Green, Gene Murphy, Patrick
 Grijalva Nadler (NY)
 Hall (NY) Napolitano
 Halvorson Neal (MA)
 Hare Oberstar
 Harman Obey
 Hastings (FL) Oliver
 Heinrich Ortiz
 Herse th Sandlin Owens
 Higgins Pallone
 Hill Pascrell
 Himes Pastor (AZ)
 Hinchey Payne

NAYS—179

Aderholt Brown-Waite,
 Akin Ginny
 Alexander Buchanan
 Austria Burgess
 Bachmann Burton (IN)
 Bachus Buyer
 Bartlett Calvert
 Barton (TX) Camp
 Biggert Campbell
 Bilbray Cantor
 Billirakis Cao
 Bishop (UT) Capito
 Blackburn Carter
 Blunt Cassidy
 Boehner Castle
 Bonner Chaffetz
 Bono Mack Coble
 Boozman Coffman (CO)
 Boustany Cole
 Brady (TX) Conaway
 Bright Crenshaw
 Broun (GA) Culberson

Gingrey (GA) Gohmert
 Gohmert Goodlatte
 Granger Granger
 Graves (GA) Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO) Graves (MO)
 Griffith McCaul
 Guthrie McClintock
 Hall (TX) McCotter
 Harper McHenry
 Hastings (WA) McKeon
 Heller McMorris
 Hensarling Rodgers
 Herger Mica
 Hunter Miller (FL)
 Issa Miller (MI)
 Jenkins Miller, Gary
 Johnson (IL) Minnick
 Johnson, Sam Mitchell
 Jones Moran (KS)
 Jordan (OH) Murphy, Tim
 King (IA) Myrick
 King (NY) Neugebauer
 Kingston Nunes
 Kirk Nye
 Kline (MN) Olson
 Kratovil Paul
 Lamborn Paulsen
 Lance Pence
 Latham Petri
 LaTourette Pitts
 Latta Platts
 Lee (NY) Poe (TX)
 Lewis (CA) Posey
 Linder Price (GA)
 LoBiondo Putnam
 Lucas Radanovich
 Lueltkemeyer Rehberg
 Lummis Reichert

NOT VOTING—12

Barrett (SC)
 Brown (SC)
 Childers
 Gutierrez

□ 1202

Messrs. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, FRANKS of Arizona, ROGERS of Alabama and Mrs. LUMMIS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CROWLEY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 179, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 369]

AYES—237

Ackerman
 Adler (NJ)
 Altmire
 Andrews
 Arcuri
 Baca
 Baird
 Baldwin
 Barrow
 Bean
 Becerra
 Berkeley
 Berman
 Berry
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Boccieri
 Boren

Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Scalise
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Stearns
 Sullivan
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Turner
 Upton
 Walden
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Young (AK)

NOES—179

Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Austria
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Bartlett
 Barton (TX)
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Billirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Blunt
 Boehner
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boozman
 Boustany
 Boyd
 Brady (TX)
 Bright
 Broun (GA)
 Brown-Waite,
 Cantor
 Cao
 Buchanan
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Buyer
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Castle
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cole
 Conaway
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Culberson
 Dahlkemper
 Davis (KY)
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Djuo
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Ehlers
 Emerson
 Fallon
 Flake
 Fleming
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach
 Giffords
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Granger
 Graves (GA)

Kucinich
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lujan
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Markey (CO)
 Markey (MA)
 Marshall
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McMahan
 McNeerney
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Michaud
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, George
 Minnick
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy (NY)
 Murphy, Patrick
 Nadler (NY)
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Nye
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Oliver
 Ortiz
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Wilson (OH)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth

Graves (MO)
 Griffith
 Guthrie
 Hall (TX)
 Harper
 Hastings (WA)
 Heller
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Herse th Sandlin
 Hill
 Hunter
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan (OH)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kline (MN)
 Kratovil
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 Lee (NY)
 Lewis (CA)
 Linder
 LoBiondo
 Lucas
 Lueltkemeyer
 Lummis

Lungren, Daniel E.	Paulsen	Sessions	Brady (PA)	Gallegly	Lummis	Roskam	Shimkus	Titus
Mack	Pence	Shadegg	Brady (TX)	Garamendi	Lungren, Daniel E.	Ross	Shuler	Tonko
Manzullo	Petri	Shimkus	Braley (IA)	Garrett (NJ)	Lynch	Rothman (NJ)	Shuster	Towns
Marchant	Pitts	Shuler	Bright	Gerlach	Mack	Roybal-Allard	Simpson	Tsongas
McCarthy (CA)	Platts	Shuster	Broun (GA)	Giffords	Maffei	Royce	Sires	Turner
McCaul	Poe (TX)	Simpson	Brown, Corrine	Gingrey (GA)	Maloney	Ruppersberger	Skelton	Upton
McClintock	Posey	Smith (NE)	Brown-Waite,	Gomert	Malzullo	Rush	Slaughter	Van Hollen
McCotter	Price (GA)	Smith (NJ)	Ginny	Gonzalez	Marchant	Ryan (OH)	Smith (NE)	Velázquez
McHenry	Putnam	Smith (TX)	Buchanan	Goodlatte	Markey (CO)	Ryan (WI)	Smith (NJ)	Visclosky
McKeon	Radanovich	Stearns	Burgess	Gordon (TN)	Markey (MA)	Salazar	Smith (TX)	Walden
McMorris	Rehberg	Taylor	Burton (IN)	Granger	Marshall	Sánchez, Linda T.	Smith (WA)	Walz
Rodgers	Reichert	Terry	Butterfield	Graves (GA)	Matheson	Sanchez, Loretta	Snyder	Wasserman
Mica	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (PA)	Buyer	Graves (MO)	Matsui	Sarbanes	Space	Schultz
Miller (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Thornberry	Calvert	Grayson	McCarthy (CA)	Scalise	Speier	Waters
Miller (MI)	Rogers (MI)	Tiahrt	Camp	Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky	Spratt	Watson
Miller, Gary	Rohrabacher	Tiberi	Campbell	Green, Gene	McCauley	Schauer	Stark	Watt
Mitchell	Rooney	Turner	Cantor	Griffith	McCollum	Schiff	Stearns	Waxman
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton	Cao	Grijalva	McCotter	Schmidt	Stupak	Weiner
Murphy, Tim	Roskam	Walden	Capito	Guthrie	McCollum	Schock	Sutton	Welch
Myrick	Royce	Westmoreland	Capps	Gutierrez	McDermott	Schwartz	Tanner	Welch
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Whitfield	Capuano	Hall (NY)	McGovern	Scott (GA)	Taylor	Westmoreland
Nunes	Scalise	Wilson (SC)	Cardoza	Hall (TX)	McHenry	Scott (VA)	Teague	Whitfield
Olson	Schmidt	Wittman	Carmahan	Halvorson	McIntyre	Sensenbrenner	Terry	Wilson (OH)
Paul	Schock	Wolf	Carney	Hare	McKeon	Serrano	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (SC)
	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)	Carson (IN)	Harman	McMahon	Sessions	Thompson (MS)	Wittman
			Carter	Harper	McMorris	Sestak	Thompson (PA)	Wolf
			Cassidy	Hastings (FL)	Rodgers	Shadegg	Thornberry	Woolsey
			Castle	Hastings (WA)	McNerney	Shea-Porter	Tiahrt	Yarmuth
			Castor (FL)	Heinrich	Meeks (NY)	Sherman	Tiberi	Young (AK)
			Chaffetz	Heller			Tierney	
			Chandler	Hensarling				
			Chu	Herger				
			Clarke	Herstein Sandlin				
			Clay	Higgins				
			Cleaver	Hill				
			Clyburn	Himes				
			Coble	Hinche				
			Coffman (CO)	Hinojosa				
			Cohen	Hiron				
			Cole	Hodes				
			Conaway	Holden				
			Connolly (VA)	Holt				
			Conyers	Honda				
			Cooper	Hoyer				
			Costa	Hunter				
			Costello	Inslee				
			Courtney	Israel				
			Crenshaw	Issa				
			Critz	Jackson (IL)				
			Crowley	Jackson Lee				
			Cuellar	(TX)				
			Culberson	Jenkins				
			Cummings	Johnson (GA)				
			Dahlkemper	Johnson (IL)				
			Davis (AL)	Johnson, E. B.				
			Davis (CA)	Johnson, Sam				
			Davis (IL)	Jones				
			Davis (KY)	Jordan (OH)				
			Davis (TN)	Kagen				
			DeFazio	Kanjorski				
			DeGette	Kaptur				
			Delahunt	Kennedy				
			DeLauro	Kildee				
			Dent	Kilpatrick (MI)				
			Deutch	Kilroy				
			Diaz-Balart, L.	Kind				
			Diaz-Balart, M.	King (IA)				
			Dicks	King (NY)				
			Dingell	Kingston				
			Djou	Kirk				
			Doggett	Kirkpatrick (AZ)				
			Donnelly (IN)	Kissell				
			Doyle	Klein (FL)				
			Dreier	Kline (MN)				
			Driehaus	Kosmas				
			Duncan	Kratovil				
			Edwards (MD)	Kucinich				
			Edwards (TX)	Lamborn				
			Ehlers	Lance				
			Ellison	Langevin				
			Ellsworth	Larsen (WA)				
			Emerson	Larson (CT)				
			Engel	Latham				
			Eshoo	LaTourette				
			Etheridge	Latta				
			Fallin	Lee (CA)				
			Farr	Lee (NY)				
			Fattah	Levin				
			Fliner	Lewis (CA)				
			Flake	Lewis (GA)				
			Fleming	Linder				
			Forbes	Lipinski				
			Fortenberry	LoBiondo				
			Foster	Loebsack				
			Fox	Lofgren, Zoe				
			Frank (MA)	Lowey				
			Frank (AZ)	Lucas				
			Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer				
			Fudge	Lujan				

NOT VOTING—16

Barrett (SC)	Johnson (GA)	Sullivan
Brown (SC)	King (IA)	Velázquez
Capps	Meek (FL)	Wamp
Childers	Moore (WI)	Young (FL)
Hoekstra	Pomeroy	
Inglis	Roe (TN)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1209

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 369, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

SUPPORTING GOALS AND IDEALS OF FLAG DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1429) celebrating the symbol of the United States flag and supporting the goals and ideals of Flag Day, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 370]

YEAS—418

Ackerman	Barrow	Bishop (UT)
Aderholt	Bartlett	Blackburn
Adler (NJ)	Barton (TX)	Blumenauer
Akin	Bean	Blunt
Altmire	Becerra	Bocieri
Andrews	Berkley	Boehner
Arcuri	Berman	Bonner
Austria	Berry	Bono Mack
Baca	Biggert	Boozman
Bachmann	Bilbray	Boren
Bachus	Bilirakis	Boswell
Baird	Bishop (GA)	Boustany
Baldwin	Bishop (NY)	Boyd

NOT VOTING—14

Alexander	Hoekstra	Sullivan
Barrett (SC)	Inglis	Wamp
Boucher	Meek (FL)	Wu
Brown (SC)	Moore (WI)	Young (FL)
Childers	Schrader	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1218

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a Joint Resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution recognizing the 60th anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean War and reaffirming the United States-Korea alliance.

SMALL BUSINESS JOBS AND CREDIT ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1436 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5297.

□ 1218

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5297) to create the Small Business Lending Fund Program to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make capital investments in eligible institutions in order to increase the availability of credit for small businesses,

and for other purposes, with Mr. CUELLAR (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 16, 2010, amendment No. 17 printed in part C of House Report 111-506 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1448, it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in House Report 111-508 as if such amendments had been printed in part C of House Report 111-506. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SCHRADER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 111-508.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE _____ SMALL BUSINESS BORROWER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Small Business Assistance Fund Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. SMALL BUSINESS BORROWER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall carry out a program to be called the "Small Business Borrower Assistance Program" to provide payments of principal and interest on qualifying small business loans.

(b) AUTOMATIC ENROLLMENT; COMMITMENT OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent funds are available under the Program, each borrower that receives a qualifying small business loan after the date on which the Administrator issues regulations pursuant to subsection (e) shall be automatically enrolled in the Program, unless the borrower requests otherwise, and the Administrator shall commit an amount to each borrower equal to 6 percent of the principal disbursed amount of such borrower's qualifying small business loan.

(2) ONE YEAR WINDOW FOR PARTICIPATING IN PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a borrower may only be enrolled in the Program if the borrower is approved for a qualifying small business loan before the end of the 1-year period following the date on which the Administrator issues final regulations pursuant to subsection (e).

(3) TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.—In any instance in which the Administrator determines that a borrower participating in the Program has committed fraud or made a material misrepresentation related to such participation, the Administrator may terminate such borrower's participation in the Program and ban such borrower from any future participation in the Program.

(c) DISBURSEMENT OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A borrower enrolled in the Program may submit a request for the pay-

ment of committed funds by a method to be developed by the Administrator.

(2) MULTIPLE DISBURSEMENTS PERMITTED.—A borrower enrolled in the Program may request multiple payments under paragraph (1), as long as the aggregate amount of such payments does not exceed the amount committed to such borrower under subsection (b).

(d) TERMS.—

(1) PAYMENTS ONLY TO LENDER OR SERVICER.—Payments made by the Administrator under the Program shall only be made to the lender or servicer of a qualifying small business loan to be applied against outstanding principal or interest, and may not be made to the borrower.

(2) PROGRAM PARTICIPATION ONLY PERMITTED DURING FIRST 2 YEARS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Payments made by the Administrator under the Program may only be made with respect to a payment of interest or principal due on a qualifying small business loan within the 2-year period following the date on which such loan is disbursed.

(B) UNEXPENDED COMMITTED FUNDS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—With respect to any funds committed to a borrower enrolled in the Program that remain unexpended at the end of the 2-year period described under subparagraph (A), such funds shall be paid to the lender or servicer of the borrower's loan and applied to the principal of such loan.

(ii) EXCEPTION.—In any case in which the amount of committed funds that remain unexpended is greater than the remaining principal of a borrower's loan, the amount of any excess shall be returned to the Treasury.

(e) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator shall issue regulations necessary to carry out this section.

(f) CONTRACTING WITH AGENTS.—The Administrator may contract with one or more entities as necessary to carry out the provisions of the Program. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to designate financial institutions, including any bank, savings association, or trust company, as financial agents of the Federal government to carry out the authorities of this section, and such institutions shall perform all such reasonable duties related to the Program as financial agents of the Federal government as the Secretary may require. In engaging any such third parties to carry out the Program, the Administrator or the Secretary shall seek to involve small businesses in the provision of the core direct services required under the engagement.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(2) PROGRAM.—The term "Program" means the Small Business Borrower Assistance Program established under subsection (a).

(3) QUALIFYING SMALL BUSINESS LOAN.—The term "qualifying small business loan" means any loan, up to \$300,000, made to a small business concern and guaranteed under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)), other than a loan made pursuant to section 7(a)(31) of such Act, a revolving credit line, or any other revolving loan.

(4) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—The term "small business concern" has the meaning given such term under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator \$300,000,000 to carry out this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1448, the gentleman

from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. SCHRADER. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment basically authorizes funding in the establishment of the Small Business Borrower Assistance Program to provide temporary assistance for a lot of the struggling small businesses out in America.

The Small Business Borrower Assistance Program will provide these small businesses which take out 7(a) loans under \$300,000 with a reserve fund they can use at their discretion to help pay principal and interest payments if they should hit rough spots in their business cycles. Eligible small business borrowers will automatically be enrolled in the program unless they request otherwise, so it is very easy and unbureaucratic.

Once a borrower has been enrolled, the Small Business Administration will place an amount equal to 6 percent of the loan principal in reserve for the borrower. This means that a borrower who obtains a \$300,000 loan will have \$18,000 placed in reserve to help the borrower pay principal or interest payments. These funds can be applied to both of those at the borrower's discretion.

To be eligible for the program, a borrower must obtain the qualifying loan within 1 year after the SBA issues final regulations. This is a temporary bill to help us through the recession. The SBA must issue those final regulations within 180 days after the enactment of the program. That is to make sure that the program itself is available in the crunch times.

To prevent funds from being used for purposes other than for paying down the balances of small business loans, disbursements will be made directly to the lenders or to the loan servicers. Additionally, the Small Business Administration will have the authority to remove borrowers from the program who commit fraud or material misrepresentation.

Mr. Chairman, this is just another great tool in the toolbox for our small businesses in order to help them get back on their feet and to be the engines of economic growth.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

Small business owners are going to be enrolled automatically in a program that sets aside 6 percent of the value of an SBA guaranteed loan to pay off that loan, as it was previously described. While I appreciate very much the gentleman's effort to reduce the financial

burden on small business owners, there are a number of problems with this program.

First, it forces business owners to opt out of a federally mandatory set-aside of funds. This is going to reduce the amount of capital available because disbursements of those set-aside funds will be made to a bank or to a loan servicer instead of to small businesses.

Second, by requiring an opt-out, it suggests that a Federal agency, the SBA, is better at managing the small business rather than its owner—a conclusion that I, obviously, strongly dispute.

Third, loans under the 7(a) loan program are just that. Mr. Chairman, they are loans. It seems rather absurd to have the SBA automatically set aside funds in order to pay off loans it has just approved.

Fourth, the size of loans in the program are limited to those businesses with loans of less than \$300,000.

I wonder: Why are these businesses favored over small business owners who may need slightly larger amounts of capital? By making the program available for loans of less than \$300,000, I guess it suggests that small business owners at that level are less credit worthy and are incapable of managing their finances as opposed to businesses requiring a little bit larger loans.

All of these points, Mr. Chairman, are points that I am making. I strongly dispute the reason for this program. For that reason, I oppose the gentleman's amendment. Again, I appreciate very much his efforts and what he is trying to do, but I can't agree with this at all.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHRADER. I yield 2 minutes to the chairwoman of the Small Business Committee, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ).

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, we have spent much of this debate discussing ways to help the banks, but now it is time that we talk about helping small businesses directly.

The Schrader amendment does this by providing entrepreneurs with incentives to expand their businesses. It does so by giving business owners maximum flexibility because they know best how to purchase equipment or to hire workers when they need to do so. If we have this tool now, during the early stages of the recovery, it will allow manufacturers to purchase the new machine tools they need, and it will allow retailers to hire a few more salesmen.

As they have created two-thirds of the net new jobs over the past 10 years, it is absolutely critical to get small businesses off the sidelines. Unfortunately, the Federal Reserve Senior Loan Officer survey continues to report that loan demand among small firms has decreased. The most recent NFIB report also confirms this. Only 32 percent of small businesses borrowed last

quarter, which is near the record low. When fewer small businesses take out loans, there is less employment and more abandoned storefronts. By giving firms access to a financial backstop, the Schrader amendment will give them the confidence to turn this around.

With this in mind, it is no surprise that, when small firms are not active in the capital markets, we lose jobs. This is exactly what happened between 2007 and 2009 when self-employment declined by 7.5 percent. If we do not want to repeat this, we must embrace the small business-focused policies contained in the Schrader amendment.

I ask my colleagues to support Mr. SCHRADER's amendment.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. I would like to reiterate that this is just a giveaway. That is all it is. If we want to help small businesses, then let's reinstate bonus depreciation. Let's shorten appreciation to buy new equipment and to add more jobs.

The bottom line is let the government get out of the way. Increasing their taxes at a time when the deficit is running at a record high and when the administration continues to rack up more debt is not the way to help small businesses. Again, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHRADER. I appreciate the concerns of the gentleman from Missouri. I do take issue with them, obviously.

Mr. Chairman, to prevent fraud and abuse—and unfortunately, that does happen in tough economic times—these payments are made to the lenders to make sure they go back to where they are supposed to be, as the taxpayers have authorized under this amendment and this bill. The 7(a) program is the most popular program out there. It is something banks are familiar with, and it is the small, struggling businesses that are likely to take loans out for under \$300,000 that are most in need.

So this program is targeted, temporary, and timely. Small business lending in my State is half of what it was 2 years ago. We need every tool in the toolbox to encourage the lenders who have shown extreme reticence to lend to small businesses that this country is willing to back them up and to help these small businesses pay their loans if they need to during tough stretches and tough times.

I think if you're in favor of small business and of lending and if you want to make sure that they have access and that the program that we are establishing with \$30 billion really goes to small business, you will want to vote "yes," in favor of this amendment.

I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1230

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF NORTH CAROLINA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 111-508.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, after line 9, insert the following new clause:

(v) CONSTRUCTION, LAND DEVELOPMENT, AND OTHER LAND LOANS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Loans secured by real estate—

(aa) that are made to finance—

(AA) land development that is preparatory to erecting new structures, including improving land, laying sewers, and laying water pipes; or

(BB) the on-site construction of industrial, commercial, residential, or farm buildings;

(bb) that is vacant land, except land known to be used or usable for agricultural purposes, such as crop and livestock production;

(cc) the proceeds of which are to be used to acquire and improve developed or undeveloped property; or

(dd) that are made under title I or title X of the National Housing Act.

(II) CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY REQUIREMENT.—Subclause (I) shall only apply to loans that are extended to small business concerns in the construction industry, as such term is defined by the Secretary in consultation with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(III) CONSTRUCTION DEFINED.—For purposes of this clause, the term "construction" includes the construction of new structures, additions or alterations to existing structures, and the demolition of existing structures to make way for new structures.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1448, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the right idea. We will not have a strong recovery until small businesses can again get ordinary loans to expand and hire new workers. But this bill leaves out an important industry. In past recessions, the first industry to suffer from the recession and the first industry to come out of it was residential construction, home building. There's a reason that housing starts and building permits are leading economic indicators.

Home building will not lead us out of this recession, no matter what we do. Too much of the foolishness that led to the financial crisis was connected to housing. There are some markets that are hopelessly overbuilt. The inventory of new housing is at a 42-year low, but in many markets there is a substantial overhang of existing houses and a shadow inventory of homes destined for foreclosure. But there are many markets where there is a real demand for

new housing, and we won't have much of a recovery if we don't bring residential construction along.

Home building has been 16 percent of our GDP. We can't tell 16 percent of our GDP just to hang out until we get things figured out.

Because of foolish real estate lending a few years ago, many community banks were under great pressure from banking regulators to scale back on all real estate lending, including sensible projects where there is a market for new housing. Community banks are even calling in performing acquisition development and construction loans. We've gone from indiscriminate lending to an indiscriminate refusal to lend that is killing jobs.

We've lost 3 million jobs in home construction and related industries in the last 5 years. The jobs we lost are jobs for the working man—carpenters, plumbers, electricians, masons, painters, landscapers, roofers, and on and on. We've got to put those Americans back to work. In the words of Alan Jackson, There's nothing wrong with a hard hat and a hammer, the kind of glue that sticks this world together.

Our amendment adds construction and land development loans to the loans that qualify as small business lending under the SBLF program so we can put the working man back to work. God bless the working man and woman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition, although I'm not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman's amendment is trying to do. I think the intent, if this bill goes forward, is that all small businesses would be eligible under this program. But I think the gentleman is trying to accentuate the fact that land developers and home builders in America are also small businesses and should be able to participate under this program.

As a former developer and builder myself, I'm sympathetic to the difficulties many of these in the construction and housing business face. I think we have to be careful here not to send a signal that would encourage an oversupply in the marketplace and further hurt the industry and job creation.

Also, I would have to remind my colleagues, though, something that we talked about yesterday, is that this is a \$30 billion lending fund. The United States Treasury does not have \$30 billion, and that's the reason they have these auctions every week. And we're going to have to go borrow another \$30 billion, which is going to increase the national debt by another \$30 billion.

I have the same concerns about the bill that we had yesterday. We're not sure that this is the right prescription for small businesses. We've seen record liquidity in many of the financial insti-

tutions. And as I talk to many banker friends of mine and also the small businesses, basically what's really holding back the country is sales.

The American people are cutting back; they're balancing their budgets, but, unfortunately, the Federal Government is not balancing its budget. In fact, we're going to have a \$1.6 trillion deficit this year. We just went over \$13 trillion in debt in this country. We're approaching a time in this country, and God forbid, where our GDP and our national debt will be the same number.

So I appreciate what my colleagues are trying to do, but I believe if you really want to help small businesses, bring some certainty to the economy. Right now, many businesses are uncertain about what this body might do to them next. They've imposed massive increases in the cost through their health insurance, uncertainty about what the cost of utilities are going to be in the future with cap-and-trade.

So this overall uncertainty is creating a lot of angst in the marketplace, and I think it's affecting the American consumers. Certainly, the people that affect American small businesses the most are the American consumers—the people that are going to buy houses, going to buy cars, going to buy televisions.

And so while I understand where the gentleman is coming from and support his intent to make sure this program is all-inclusive, I do not support the underlying bill. Again, when we say that this is really not going to put the taxpayers at risk, I remind my colleagues that, in fact, 91 banks that received TARP money—and, by the way, this is another TARP program; this is TARP, Junior, TARP II—that another 91 banks missed their dividend payment in May. And so what does that say? That the Treasury's ability to pay out this money to banks that are not in trouble is somewhat questioned because, in fact, when 91 banks miss their dividend payment, evidently there's not something going well in that bank.

Many people voted against TARP I. I believe a number of people are going to vote against TARP II, because that's not the right prescription to get our country going again.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Mr. BACA. I rise in support of this amendment and thank Mr. MILLER for this amendment, which will open the programs that include housing production loans to home builders, which are primarily small businesses.

As we continue to see some positive signs in the economy, our housing market and construction industry show signs of distress. Moreover, the increase in foreclosures has created a perception of overstocked inventory in the housing market. However, this is not true everywhere. But the percep-

tion has forced the industry to shrink, cutting back on jobs and projects to save money. This downsizing has only made our economic troubles worse.

We must create an opportunity for jobs. In order to have a complete recovery, every aspect of our housing market needs to be supported, and that includes construction.

The construction industry has been a consistent source of jobs for the American people, and especially for the Latino community and many others. In 2006, employment in the construction sector was at 7.7 million. In just 2 years, the number has dropped to 5.6 million. The drop has been felt hardest in States like Nevada, Florida, and my home State of California, where the housing crisis has forced the construction industry to come to a standstill. In fact, we are now seeing Latino unemployment over 30 percent in the State of California, and then in my district, 17 percent overall for everyone.

In the committee's testimony, the National Association of Home Builders stated that the bill will do little to produce jobs and free up credit for builders. If our goal is to pass legislation that will work to create jobs, we must target our resources where they are most needed.

This amendment will address these concerns that include housing production loans to our Nation's home builders, who are comprised primarily of small businesses. Our housing collapse led our country into this economic crisis, and creating incentives to allow the housing market to thrive will help bring us out of this recession.

Again, I thank Mr. MILLER for his hard work on this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chair, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part C of House Report 111-506 and in House Report 111-508 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 in part C of House Report 111-506 by Mr. ISRAEL of New York;

Amendment No. 12 in part C of House Report 111-506 by Mr. CAO of Louisiana; and

Amendment No. 2 in House Report 111-508 by Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment printed in part C of House Report 111-506 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 371]

AYES—420

Ackerman	Carson (IN)	Faleomavaega
Aderholt	Carter	Fallin
Adler (NJ)	Cassidy	Farr
Akin	Castle	Fattah
Alexander	Castor (FL)	Filner
Altmire	Chaffetz	Flake
Andrews	Chandler	Fleming
Arcuri	Christensen	Forbes
Austria	Chu	Fortenberry
Baca	Clarke	Foster
Bachmann	Clay	Fox
Bachus	Cleaver	Frank (MA)
Baird	Clyburn	Franks (AZ)
Baldwin	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Barrow	Coffman (CO)	Fudge
Bartlett	Cohen	Galleghy
Bean	Cole	Garamendi
Becerra	Conaway	Garrett (NJ)
Berkley	Connolly (VA)	Gerlach
Berman	Conyers	Giffords
Berry	Cooper	Gingrey (GA)
Biggart	Costa	Gohmert
Bilbray	Costello	Gonzalez
Bilirakis	Courtney	Goodlatte
Bishop (GA)	Crenshaw	Gordon (TN)
Bishop (NY)	Critz	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Crowley	Graves (GA)
Blackburn	Cuellar	Graves (MO)
Blumenauer	Culberson	Grayson
Blunt	Cummings	Green, Al
Bocieri	Dahlkemper	Green, Gene
Bonner	Davis (AL)	Grijalva
Bono Mack	Davis (CA)	Guthrie
Boozman	Davis (IL)	Guthrie
Bordallo	Davis (KY)	Hall (NY)
Boren	Davis (TN)	Hall (TX)
Boswell	DeFazio	Halvorson
Boucher	DeGette	Hare
Boustany	Delahunt	Harman
Boyd	DeLauro	Harper
Brady (PA)	Dent	Hastings (FL)
Brady (TX)	Deutch	Hastings (WA)
Braley (IA)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Heinrich
Bright	Diaz-Balart, M.	Heller
Broun (GA)	Dicks	Hensarling
Brown, Corrine	Dingell	Herger
Brown-Waite,	Djou	Herseth Sandlin
Ginny	Doggett	Higgins
Buchanan	Donnelly (IN)	Hill
Burton (IN)	Doyle	Himes
Butterfield	Dreier	Hinche
Calvert	Driehaus	Hinojosa
Camp	Duncan	Hirono
Campbell	Edwards (MD)	Hodes
Cantor	Edwards (TX)	Holden
Cao	Ehlers	Holt
Capito	Ellison	Honda
Capps	Ellsworth	Hoyer
Capuano	Emerson	Hunter
Cardoza	Engel	Inslee
Carnahan	Eshoo	Israel
Carney	Etheridge	Issa

Jackson (IL)	Melancon	Sarbanes
Jackson Lee	Mica	Scalise
(TX)	Michaud	Schakowsky
Jenkins	Miller (FL)	Schauer
Johnson (GA)	Miller (MI)	Schiff
Johnson (IL)	Miller (NC)	Schmidt
Johnson, E. B.	Miller, Gary	Schock
Johnson, Sam	Miller, George	Schrader
Jones	Minnick	Schwartz
Jordan (OH)	Mitchell	Scott (GA)
Kagen	Mollohan	Scott (VA)
Kanjorski	Moore (KS)	Sensenbrenner
Kaptur	Moran (KS)	Serrano
Kennedy	Moran (VA)	Sessions
Kildee	Murphy (CT)	Sestak
Kilpatrick (MI)	Murphy (NY)	Shadegg
Kilroy	Murphy, Patrick	Shea-Porter
Kind	Murphy, Tim	Sherman
King (IA)	Myrick	Shimkus
King (NY)	Nadler (NY)	Shuler
Kingston	Napolitano	Shuster
Kirk	Neal (MA)	Simpson
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Neugebauer	Sires
Kissell	Norton	Skelton
Klein (FL)	Nunes	Slaughter
Kline (MN)	Nye	Smith (NE)
Kosmas	Oberstar	Smith (NJ)
Kratovil	Olver	Smith (TX)
Kucinich	Ortiz	Smith (WA)
Lamborn	Owens	Snyder
Lance	Pallone	Space
Langevin	Pascrell	Adler (NJ)
Larsen (WA)	Pastor (AZ)	Speier
Larson (CT)	Paul	Spratt
Latham	Paulsen	Stark
LaTourette	Pence	Stearns
Latta	Perlmutter	Stupak
Lee (CA)	Petriello	Sutton
Lee (NY)	Peters	Tanner
Levin	Peterson	Taylor
Lewis (CA)	Petri	Teague
Lewis (GA)	Pierluisi	Terry
Linder	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (CA)
Lipinski	Pitts	Thompson (MS)
LoBiondo	Platts	Thompson (PA)
Loeb	Poe (TX)	Thornberry
Lofgren, Zoe	Polis (CO)	Tiahrt
Lowe	Pomeroy	Tiberi
Lucas	Posey	Tierney
Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)	Titus
Lujan	Price (NC)	Town
Lummis	Putnam	Towns
Lungren, Daniel	Quigley	Tsongas
E.	Radanovich	Turner
Lynch	Rahall	Upton
Mack	Rangel	Van Hollen
Maffei	Rehberg	Velázquez
Maloney	Reichert	Visclosky
Manzullo	Reyes	Walden
Marchant	Richardson	Walz
Markey (CO)	Rodriguez	Wasserman
Markey (MA)	Roe (TN)	Schultz
Marshall	Rogers (AL)	Waters
Matheson	Rogers (KY)	Watson
Matsui	Rogers (MI)	Watt
McCarthy (CA)	Rohrabacher	Waxman
McCarthy (NY)	Rooney	Weiner
McCaul	Roskam	Welch
McClintock	Ross	Westmoreland
McCollum	Rothman (NJ)	Whitfield
McCotter	Royal-Allard	Bright
McDermott	Royce	Broun (GA)
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Brown, Corrine
McHenry	Rush	Brown-Waite,
McIntyre	Ryan (OH)	Ginny
McKeon	Ryan (WI)	Buchanan
McMahon	Sablan	Burgess
McMorris	Salazar	Burton (IN)
Rodgers	Sánchez, Linda	Butterfield
McNerney	T.	Buyer
Meeks (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta	Calvert

NOT VOTING—18

Barrett (SC)	Childers	Obey
Barton (TX)	Griffith	Olson
Boehner	Hoekstra	Payne
Brown (SC)	Inglis	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Meek (FL)	Sullivan
Buyer	Moore (WI)	Wamp

□ 1307

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. CAO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment printed in part C of House Report 111-506 offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 414, noes 0, answered “present” 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 372]

AYES—414

Ackerman	Christensen	Garrett (NJ)
Aderholt	Chu	Gerlach
Adler (NJ)	Clarke	Giffords
Akin	Clay	Gingrey (GA)
Alexander	Cleaver	Gonzalez
Altmire	Clyburn	Goodlatte
Andrews	Coble	Gordon (TN)
Arcuri	Coffman (CO)	Granger
Austria	Cohen	Graves (GA)
Baca	Cole	Graves (MO)
Bachmann	Conaway	Grayson
Bachus	Connolly (VA)	Green, Al
Baird	Conyers	Green, Gene
Baldwin	Cooper	Grijalva
Barrow	Costa	Guthrie
Bartlett	Costello	Gutierrez
Barton (TX)	Courtney	Hall (NY)
Bean	Crenshaw	Hall (TX)
Becerra	Critz	Halvorson
Berkley	Crowley	Hare
Berman	Cuellar	Harman
Berry	Culberson	Harper
Biggart	Dahlkemper	Hastings (FL)
Bilbray	Davis (AL)	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	Davis (CA)	Heinrich
Bishop (NY)	Davis (IL)	Heller
Bishop (UT)	Davis (KY)	Hensarling
Blackburn	Davis (TN)	Herger
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Herseth Sandlin
Blunt	DeGette	Higgins
Bocieri	Delahunt	Hill
Bonner	DeLauro	Himes
Bono Mack	Dent	Hinche
Boozman	Deutch	Hinojosa
Bordallo	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hirono
Boren	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hodes
Boswell	Dicks	Holden
Boucher	Dingell	Holt
Boustany	Djou	Honda
Boyd	Doggett	Hoyer
Brady (PA)	Donnelly (IN)	Hunter
Brady (TX)	Doyle	Inslee
Braley (IA)	Dreier	Israel
Bright	Driehaus	Issa
Broun (GA)	Brown, Corrine	Jackson (IL)
Brown, Corrine	Brown-Waite,	Jackson Lee
Brown-Waite,	Ginny	(TX)
Ginny	Buchanan	Jenkins
Buchanan	Burgess	Johnson (GA)
Burton (IN)	Burton (IN)	Johnson (IL)
Butterfield	Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.
Buyer	Buyer	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Calvert	Jones
Camp	Camp	Jordan (OH)
Campbell	Campbell	Kagen
Cantor	Cantor	Kanjorski
Cao	Cao	Kaptur
Capito	Capito	Kennedy
Capps	Capps	Kildee
Capuano	Capuano	Kilpatrick (MI)
Cardoza	Cardoza	Kilroy
Carnahan	Carnahan	Kind
Carney	Carney	King (IA)
Carson (IN)	Carson (IN)	King (NY)
Carter	Carter	Kingston
Cassidy	Cassidy	Kirk
Castle	Castle	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Castor (FL)	Castor (FL)	Kissell
Chaffetz	Chaffetz	Klein (FL)
Chandler	Chandler	Kline (MN)

Kosmas Nadler (NY) Schock
 Kratovil Napolitano Schrader
 Kucinich Neal (MA) Schwartz
 Lamborn Neugebauer Scott (GA)
 Lance Norton Scott (VA)
 Langevin Nunes Sensenbrenner
 Larsen (WA) Nye Serrano
 Larson (CT) Oberstar Sessions
 Latta Obey Sestak
 Lee (CA) Shadegg
 Lee (NY) Olver Shea-Porter
 Levin Ortiz Sherman
 Lewis (CA) Owens Shimkus
 Lewis (GA) Pallone Shuler
 Linder Pastor (AZ) Shuster
 Lipinski Paul Simpson
 LoBiondo Paulsen Sires
 Loeb sack Payne Skelton
 Lofgren, Zoe Pence Slaughter
 Lowey Perlmutter Smith (NE)
 Lucas Perriello Smith (NJ)
 Luetkemeyer Peters Smith (TX)
 Luján Peterson Smith (WA)
 Lummis Petri Snyder
 Lungren, Daniel E. Pierluisi Space
 Lynch Pitts Speier
 Mack Platts Spratt
 Maffei Poe (TX) Stearns
 Maloney Polis (CO) Stupak
 Manzullo Pomeroy Sullivan
 Marchant Posey Sutton
 Markey (CO) Price (GA) Tanner
 Markey (MA) Price (NC) Taylor
 Matheson Putnam Teague
 Matsui Quigley Terry
 McCarthy (CA) Radanovich Thompson (CA)
 McCarthy (NY) Rahall Thompson (MS)
 McCaul Rangel Thompson (PA)
 McClintock Rehberg Thornberry
 McCollum Tiahrt
 McCotter Reichert
 McDermott Reyes
 McGovern Richardson
 McHenry Rodriguez
 McIntyre Roe (TN)
 McKeon Rogers (AL)
 McMahan Rogers (KY)
 McMorrison Rogers (MI)
 McMorris Rohrabacher
 Rodgers Rooney
 Mc Nerney Roskam
 Meeks (NY) Ross
 Melancon Rothman (NJ)
 Mica Roybal-Allard
 Michaud Royce
 Miller (FL) Ruppertsberger
 Miller (MI) Rush
 Miller (NC) Ryan (OH)
 Miller, George Ryan (WI)
 Minnick Sablan
 Mitchell Salazar
 Mollohan Sánchez, Linda
 Moore (KS) T. Whitfield
 Moran (KS) Sanchez, Loretta
 Moran (VA) Sarbanes
 Murphy (CT) Scalise
 Murphy (NY) Schakowsky
 Murphy, Patrick Schauer
 Murphy, Tim Schiff
 Myrick Schmidt

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Miller, Gary

NOT VOTING—23

Barrett (SC) Gohmert Moore (WI)
 Bishop (GA) Griffith Pascarell
 Boccieri Hoekstra Ros-Lehtinen
 Boehner Inglis Stark
 Brown (SC) Latham Wamp
 Childers LaTourette Woolsey
 Cummings Marshall
 Fortenberry Meek (FL) Wu

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1314

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 372, the Jackson Lee/Cao amendment, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 372, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF NORTH CAROLINA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment printed in House Report 111-508 offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 3, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 373]

AYES—418

Ackerman Carson (IN) Farr
 Adlerholt Carter Fattah
 Adier (NJ) Cassidy Filner
 Akin Castle Fleming
 Alexander Chaffetz Forbes
 Altmire Chandler Fortenberry
 Andrews Christensen Foster
 Arcuri Chu Foxx
 Austria Clarke Frank (MA)
 Baca Clay Franks (AZ)
 Bachmann Clyburn Frelinghuysen
 Bachus Coble Fudge
 Baird Coffman (CO) Gallegly
 Baldwin Cohen Garamendi
 Barrow Cole Garrett (NJ)
 Bartlett Conaway Gerlach
 Barton (TX) Connolly (VA) Giffords
 Bean Conyers Gingrey (GA)
 Becerra Cooper Gohmert
 Berkley Costa Gonzalez
 Berman Costello Goodlatte
 Berry Courtney Gordon (TN)
 Biggett Crenshaw Granger
 Bilbray Critz Graves (GA)
 Bilirakis Crowley Graves (MO)
 Bishop (GA) Cuellar Grayson
 Bishop (NY) Culbertson Green, Al
 Bishop (UT) Cummings Green, Gene
 Blackburn Dahlkemper Grijalva
 Blumenauer Davis (AL) Guthrie
 Blunt Davis (CA) Hall (NY)
 Boccieri Davis (IL) Hall (TX)
 Bonner Davis (KY) Halvorson
 Bono Mack Davis (TN) Hare
 Boozman DeFazio Harman
 Bordallo DeGette Harper
 Boren Delahunt Hastings (FL)
 Boswell DeLauro Hastings (WA)
 Boucher Dent Heinrich
 Boustany Deutch Heller
 Boyd Diaz-Balart, L. Hensarling
 Brady (PA) Diaz-Balart, M. Herger
 Brady (TX) Dicks Herseth Sandlin
 Braley (IA) Dingell Higgins
 Bright Djou Hill
 Broun (GA) Doggett Himes
 Brown, Corrine Donnelly (IN) Hinchey
 Buchanan Doyle Hinojosa
 Burgess Dreier Hirono
 Burton (IN) Driehaus Hodes
 Butterfield Duncan Holden
 Buyer Edwards (MD) Holt
 Calvert Edwards (TX) Honda
 Camp Ehlers Hoyer
 Cantor Ellison Hunter
 Cao Ellsworth Inslee
 Capito Emerson Israel
 Capps Engel Issa
 Capuano Eshoo Jackson (IL)
 Cardoza Etheridge Jackson Lee
 Carnahan Faleomavaega (TX)
 Carney Fallon Jenkins

Johnson (GA) Miller (MI) Sanchez, Loretta
 Johnson (IL) Miller (NC) Sarbanes
 Johnson, E. B. Miller, Gary Scalise
 Johnson, Sam Miller, George Schakowsky
 Jones Minnick Schauer
 Jordan (OH) Mitchell Schiff
 Kagen Mollohan Schmidt
 Kanjorski Moore (KS) Schock
 Kaptur Moran (KS) Schrader
 Kennedy Moran (VA) Schwartz
 Kildee Murphy (CT) Scott (GA)
 Kilpatrick (MI) Murphy (NY) Scott (VA)
 Kilroy Murphy, Patrick Sensenbrenner
 Kind Murphy, Tim Serrano
 King (IA) Myrick Sessions
 King (NY) Nadler (NY) Sestak
 Kingston Napolitano Shadegg
 Kirk Neal (MA) Shea-Porter
 Kirkpatrick (AZ) Neugebauer Sherman
 Kissell Norton Shimkus
 Klein (FL) Nunes Shuler
 Kline (MN) Nye Shuster
 Kosmas Oberstar Simpson
 Kratovil Obey Sires
 Kucinich Olson Skelton
 Lamborn Olver Slaughter
 Lance Ortiz Smith (NE)
 Langevin Owens Smith (NJ)
 Larsen (WA) Pallone Smith (TX)
 Larson (CT) Pascrell Smith (WA)
 Latham Pastor (AZ) Snyder
 LaTourette Paul Space
 Latta Paulsen Speier
 Lee (CA) Payne Spratt
 Lee (NY) Pence Stark
 Levin Perlmutter Stearns
 Lewis (CA) Perriello Stupak
 Lewis (GA) Peters Sullivan
 Lipinski Peterson Sutton
 LoBiondo Petri Tanner
 Loeb sack Pierluisi Taylor
 Lofgren, Zoe Pingree (ME) Teague
 Lowey Pitts Terry
 Lucas Platts Thompson (CA)
 Luetkemeyer Poe (TX) Thompson (MS)
 Luján Polis (CO) Thompson (PA)
 Lummis Pomeroy Thornberry
 Lungren, Daniel E. Posey Tiahrt
 Lynch Price (GA) Tiberi
 Mack Price (NC) Tierney
 Maffei Putnam Titus
 Maloney Quigley Tonko
 Manzullo Radanovich Towns
 Marchant Rahall Tsongas
 Markey (CO) Rangel Turner
 Markey (MA) Rehberg Upton
 Matheson Reichert Van Hollen
 Matsui Richardson Velázquez
 McCarthy (CA) Rodriguez Visclosky
 McCarthy (NY) Rogers (AL) Walden
 McCaul Rogers (KY) Walz
 McClintock Rohrabacher Wasserman
 McCollum Rooney Schultz
 McCotter McGovern Watson
 McDermott McHenry Wamp Watt
 McIntyre McKeon Waxman
 McMorris McMorrison Weener
 McMorris Rodgers Roskam Welch
 Mc Nerney Meeks (NY) Ross Westmoreland
 Melancon Rothman (NJ) Whitfield
 Mica Roybal-Allard Wilson (OH)
 Michaud Royce Wilson (SC)
 Miller (FL) Ruppertsberger Wittman
 Miller (MI) Rush Wolf
 Miller (NC) Ryan (OH) Woolsey
 Miller, George Ryan (WI) Wu
 Minnick Salazar Yarmuth
 Mitchell Sánchez, Linda Young (AK)
 Mollohan T. Young (FL)
 Moore (KS) T. Whitfield
 Moran (KS) Sanchez, Loretta
 Moran (VA) Sarbanes
 Murphy (CT) Scalise
 Murphy (NY) Schakowsky
 Murphy, Patrick Schauer
 Murphy, Tim Schiff
 Myrick Schmidt

NOES—3

Campbell Flake McClintock

NOT VOTING—17

Barrett (SC) Childers Linder
 Boehner Cleaver Meek (FL)
 Brown (SC) Griffith Moore (WI)
 Brown-Waite, Gutierrez Sablan
 Ginny Hoekstra Wamp
 Castor (FL) Inglis Waters

□ 1323

Mr. BACHUS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chair, on rollcall Nos. 371, 372, and 373, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO) having assumed the chair, Mr. CUELLAR, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5297) to create the Small Business Lending Fund Program to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make capital investments in eligible institutions in order to increase the availability of credit for small businesses, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 1436, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. In its current form, yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Neugebauer moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5297 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of section 4(b), add the following new paragraph:

(4) SECRETARY CERTIFICATION TO SIGTARP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each time the Secretary makes a purchase (including a commitment to purchase) or a modification of a purchase under the Program, the Secretary shall certify to the SIGTARP that the Secretary is acting solely on the basis of economic fundamentals and not because of any political considerations.

(B) SIGTARP DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term "SIGTARP" means the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, established under section 121 of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008.

At the end of section 8, add the following new subsection:

(C) TARP SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL OVERSIGHT.—Section 121(c)(1) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2009 (12 U.S.C. 5231(c)(1)), is amended—

(1) by striking "section 101, and" and inserting "section 101,"; and

(2) by inserting before "including" the following: "and activities under section 4, 5, or 6 of the Small Business Lending Fund Act of 2010,".

Mr. NEUGEBAUER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. This motion makes two important changes to this bill. First, it puts a Special Inspector General for TARP in charge of the oversight of the new Small Business Lending Fund. Remember, this fund is TARP II or TARP, Junior, as it's referred to. Second, the motion requires the Treasury to certify that the decisions about which banks receive funds are based on merit and not political consideration.

This new lending fund follows the model of TARP, minus the stronger oversight, and puts another \$30 billion in banks. The motion to recommit would make the Special Inspector General for TARP, or SIGTARP, responsible for oversight of this new program.

In a letter to Chairman FRANK, Neil Barofsky, the Special Inspector General for TARP, said, "I believe it is absolutely critical to protect the taxpayers that the Office of SIGTARP be permitted to continue its oversight in what is essentially an extension of TARP's Capital Purchase Program. Accordingly, I write to recommend that Congress provide SIGTARP oversight for the SBLF in any resulting legislation."

Just yesterday, SIGTARP announced an indictment in a \$1.9 billion fraud case involving the failed Colonial Bank. Part of the fraud case involves efforts to obtain \$533 million in taxpayer money from TARP. Due to the efforts of SIGTARP agents working with law enforcement, the taxpayers were protected.

The underlying legislation puts a deputy of the Treasury Inspector General in charge of oversight. The Treasury Inspector General was not among the many agencies and law enforcement that worked on this \$1.9 million fraud involving TARP.

SIGTARP has considerable experience overseeing a program in which the government purchases preferred stocks in banks. If we create a new TARP program that will also purchase shares in banks, why should we not use the same oversight agency that has a proven track record and expertise? Failing to take advantage of SIGTARP's unique expertise is an extreme service to the taxpayers, exposing them to a greater likelihood of waste, fraud, and abuse.

□ 1330

Is the majority afraid to use this experienced and effective regulator sim-

ply because the word "TARP" is part of its title?

The taxpayers deserve to be protected when Treasury makes investments with their money. Unfortunately, we have some examples of TARP investments that have raised serious questions about how the investment decisions were made.

When One United bank received TARP funds in 2008, questions came up about whether the bank's political connections helped with its TARP approval. Prior to receiving funds, One United had lost capital and was under scrutiny by regulators for its lending practices.

More recently, a number of Members of Congress and others have questioned whether political pressure was involved in the decision by large banks to raise capital for the troubled Shore Bank in Chicago. Shore Bank has applied for TARP funds, in addition to the \$140 million in assistance from other banks, to head off a takeover by the FDIC. Shore Bank also has ties to the Obama administration.

We do not have all the answers on how these decisions were made for the banks, but we need to be sure that these types of questions are not raised about other banks.

The motion to recommit says Treasury must certify that each decision to provide funds is made solely on economic fundamentals and not because of any political consideration. This is the type of decision-making that taxpayers always expect and deserve. When their \$30 billion is being put on the line, we need to do all we can to protect their investment. The underlying bill falls short to do that.

The motion to recommit improves taxpayer protections by putting the experience of SIGTARP over this new TARP program and requiring that investment decisions be made on economic fundamentals, not political connections. If you're going to have TARP II, why wouldn't you use the same regulator that you had for TARP I?

I urge my colleagues to stand with the taxpayers and support this motion to recommit.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I rise to oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, let's be very clear. This is just a preliminary chance to vote "no."

For reasons that I don't understand, my Republican colleagues are opposed to a program in which voluntarily the Federal Government makes funds available to community banks so that, if they want to participate, they can lend it to small businesses. Maybe it is the fear that it might succeed and diminish their issues that leads them to oppose it. They have been unable to oppose it outright on its merits, so here's what they want to do. They want to say it's really the TARP program, and

in fact, the gentleman from Texas said that. He said, if you're going to create a second TARP program, put the TARP inspector in charge. That's true. If you're going to fly to the Moon, pack a big lunch. If shmif.

The fact is that we don't create a TARP program. This is classic bootstrapping. It's not a TARP program. It's very different than the TARP program in a number of ways. The community banks want to participate in it. They don't want to participate in another TARP program. So, to kill it, they are inaccurately characterizing it TARP and then talking about another Inspector General from SIGTARP. This is not the problem of what the Secretary's being asked to say. It is to try desperately to get a little TARP rubbed off on it so they can defeat, by that way, something they can't defeat on the merits.

Let me now yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) who is the chair of the oversight subcommittee of our committee and a man with a great reputation for integrity in enforcing taxpayer rights.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. I thank the chairman for yielding.

To Members of this House, I want to say that the bill, as written, says the Inspector General of the Department of the Treasury shall conduct, supervise, and coordinate audits and investigations of the purchase and commitments to purchase a preferred stock and other financial instruments under the program. That is directly from the bill. We should not add SIGTARP.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I reclaim my time to say, the gentleman from Texas began with a great, surprising revelation. A bureaucrat, the Inspector General of TARP, wants to expand his authority. I'm surprised that there were not gasps of wonderment in the House. We have an Inspector General here. They can do it, and the SIGTARP Inspector General, because that program is about to go out of existence, decided to expand his authority. However, it goes beyond in one sense. It says that the Secretary must certify that he is acting solely on the basis of economic fundamentals and not because of any political consideration.

So here's the offer I make, with the support of the majority leader. Within a few days, we will bring a suspension to the floor that will require the Secretary to so certify under oath—we'll go you one better in this effort—and the Secretary will be required to certify under oath to the Inspector General of the Treasury, and if Members want, we can have them certify under oath to the Government Accountability Office, and if there are other people you want them to certify to, we'll be glad to do that.

But the sole purpose of invoking the Inspector General of TARP here, with his collaboration, so he will continue to have a job, is to discredit the program. If you want this program to go

forward, you vote against this. We will come forward with further reinforcement of the oath taking—we'll even make it oath taking, but please, if you want to vote "no," vote "no" I would say to the Members, Mr. Speaker, but don't fall for this name game. This is an effort to call it TARP. It's your TARP; no, it's not. It's the Peewee Herman school of legislating; let's call each other names without dealing with the substance. Let's not, when we're dealing with a serious issue of trying to get money to community banks to help our smaller businesses, fall for that nonsense.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Would the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I didn't know that the other side liked TARP so much that you want to keep it going. We have put safeguards, penalties, restrictions, oversight in place. This is another bureaucratic layer that will hinder the needs of small businesses to access capital.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The gentlewoman is right.

What our friends on the other side have, for political reasons, is a severe case of TARP separation envy. It's going away. They haven't had their President tell us to do it. They are going to miss it, but we're not going to deal with that in this bill and kill the bill. I hope the recommittal is defeated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage, if ordered, and motion to suspend the rules on H.J. Res. 86.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 237, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 374]

AYES—180

Aderholt	Bonner	Cao
Akin	Bono Mack	Capito
Alexander	Boozman	Carter
Austria	Boustany	Cassidy
Bachmann	Brady (TX)	Castle
Bachus	Brown (GA)	Chaffetz
Bartlett	Brown-Waite,	Coble
Barton (TX)	Ginny	Coffman (CO)
Biggart	Buchanan	Cole
Bilbray	Burgess	Conaway
Bilirakis	Burton (IN)	Crenshaw
Bishop (UT)	Buyer	Culberson
Blackburn	Calvert	Davis (KY)
Blumenauer	Camp	Dent
Blunt	Campbell	Diaz-Balart, L.
Boehner	Cantor	Diaz-Balart, M.

Djou	Lance	Posey
Doggett	Latham	Price (GA)
Dreier	LaTourette	Putnam
Duncan	Latta	Radanovich
Edwards (TX)	Lee (NY)	Rehberg
Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Reichert
Emerson	Linder	Roe (TN)
Flake	LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)
Fleming	Lucas	Rogers (KY)
Forbes	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (MI)
Fortenberry	Lummis	Rohrabacher
Foxx	Lungren, Daniel	Rooney
Franks (AZ)	E.	Ros-Lehtinen
Frelinghuysen	Mack	Roskam
Gallegly	Manzullo	Royce
Garrett (NJ)	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)	Scalise
Gingrey (GA)	McCaul	Schmidt
Gohmert	McClintock	Schock
Goodlatte	McCotter	Sensenbrenner
Granger	McHenry	Sessions
Graves (GA)	McIntyre	Shadegg
Graves (MO)	McKeon	Shimkus
Griffith	McMahon	Shuster
Guthrie	McMorris	Simpson
Hall (TX)	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Harper	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Heller	Miller (MI)	Sullivan
Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Taylor
Herger	Mitchell	Terry
Herseth Sandlin	Moran (KS)	Thompson (PA)
Hunter	Murphy, Tim	Thornberry
Issa	Myrick	Tiahrt
Jenkins	Neugebauer	Tiberi
Johnson (IL)	Nunes	Turner
Johnson, Sam	Nye	Upton
Jones	Olson	Walden
Jordan (OH)	Paul	Westmoreland
King (IA)	Paulsen	Whitfield
King (NY)	Pence	Wilson (SC)
Kingston	Petri	Wittman
Kirk	Pitts	Wolf
Kline (MN)	Platts	Young (AK)
Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Young (FL)

NOES—237

Ackerman	Davis (IL)	Jackson Lee
Adler (NJ)	Davis (TN)	(TX)
Altmire	DeFazio	Johnson (GA)
Andrews	DeGette	Johnson, E. B.
Arcuri	Delahunt	Kagen
Baca	DeLauro	Kanjorski
Baird	Deutch	Kaptur
Baldwin	Dicks	Kennedy
Barrow	Dingell	Kildee
Bean	Donnelly (IN)	Kilpatrick (MI)
Becerra	Doyle	Kilroy
Berkley	Driehaus	Kind
Berman	Edwards (MD)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Berry	Ellison	Kissell
Bishop (GA)	Ellsworth	Klein (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Engel	Kosmas
Bocchieri	Eshoo	Kratovil
Boren	Etheridge	Kucinich
Boswell	Farr	Langevin
Boyd	Fattah	Larsen (WA)
Brady (PA)	Filner	Larson (CT)
Braley (IA)	Foster	Lee (CA)
Bright	Frank (MA)	Levin
Brown, Corrine	Fudge	Lewis (GA)
Butterfield	Garamendi	Lipinski
Capps	Giffords	Loebsack
Capuano	Gonzalez	Lofgren, Zoe
Cardoza	Grayson	Lowey
Carnahan	Green, Al	Lujan
Carney	Green, Gene	Lynch
Carson (IN)	Grijalva	Maffei
Castor (FL)	Gutierrez	Maloney
Chandler	Hall (NY)	Markey (CO)
Chu	Halvorson	Markey (MA)
Clarke	Hare	Marshall
Clay	Harman	Matheson
Cleaver	Hastings (FL)	Matsui
Clyburn	Heinrich	McCarthy (NY)
Cohen	Higgins	McCollum
Congolly (VA)	Hill	McDermott
Conyers	Hinchee	McGovern
Cooper	Hinojosa	McNerney
Costa	Hirono	Meeks (NY)
Costello	Hodes	Melancon
Courtney	Holden	Michaud
Critz	Holt	Miller (NC)
Crowley	Honda	Miller, George
Cuellar	Hoyer	Minnick
Cummings	Inslee	Mollohan
Dahlkemper	Israel	Moore (KS)
Davis (AL)	Jackson (IL)	Murphy (CT)
Davis (CA)		Murphy (NY)

Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speler
Spratt
Stark

Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Barrett (SC)
Boucher
Brown (SC)
Childers
Fallin

Gordon (TN)
Himes
Hoekstra
Inglis
Meek (FL)

Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Richardson
Smith (TX)
Wamp

□ 1355

Mr. BAIRD and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. NYE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was unavoidably detained and was unable to return in time for rollcall vote 374.

Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: On rollcall No. 374, I would have voted “no” (Motion to Recommit H.R. 5297, the Small Business Lending Fund Act of 2010).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 182, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 375]

AYES—241

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer

Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle

Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar

Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Ellison
Elsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee

Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markley (CO)
Markley (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pomeroy

Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—182

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Berry
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp

Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Culberson
Dahlkemper
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Djou
Doggett
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox

Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)

Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt

NOT VOTING—9

Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Brown (SC)

Childers
Hoekstra
Inglis

Meek (FL)
Moore (WI)
Wamp

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1403

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF KOREAN WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 86) recognizing the 60th anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean War and reaffirming the United States-Korea alliance, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE FIRST AMENDMENT IS FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, once again, we have discovered that there appears to be some glitch in the majority’s effort

to bring the so-called DISCLOSE Act to the floor. It apparently is over how many people get exempted from the disclosure rules that otherwise prevail.

We have had the NRA exemption, which was for organizations which have over 1 million people, which have actually existed more than 10 years, which have people in all 50 States, in D.C. and in Puerto Rico, and which have less than 15 percent of their funds from corporations. Now we understand they have dropped it to 500,000.

Madam Speaker, we did not take the oath to the Constitution to only uphold part of the Constitution. It is time that we stop auctioning off the First Amendment and start understanding that we here are supposed to protect the First Amendment, not parcel it out, not deny it to some and give it to others. The First Amendment is for all Americans, not just for those favored by one party or another.

POLITICAL HYSTERIA

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the administration's knee-jerk banning of deepwater drilling for 6 months is the second disaster in the gulf.

The government is intentionally putting companies out of business in the gulf with this unscientific moratorium. There are 50,000 workers who are losing their jobs due to government over-reaction. The administration is not only purposely putting blue collar workers out of work; the government is sending those jobs to Brazil and to Indonesia.

In 2005, there was a BP refinery explosion in Texas City, Texas. Fifteen people were killed; 180 were injured. The government did not close all of the refineries for 6 months in the United States to investigate the sins of BP then. That would have been foolish nonsense. It would have destroyed jobs, the economy, and it would have caused the loss of U.S. energy.

So investigate the rig explosion and hold BP accountable for their conduct, but don't in a moment of political hysteria stop deepwater drilling. Don't wipe out jobs, American companies, and sabotage the U.S. economy.

And that's just the way it is.

PROVIDE TAX RELIEF, NOT TAX CREEP

(Mr. GRAVES of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Speaker, in Georgia's Ninth Congressional District, there is the small town of Ellijay. It is known not only for Colonel Poole's barbecue and as the apple capital of Georgia but also as the home of the McCutchen-Poole Small Business Coalition. The reason is that community leaders like Colonel Oscar

Poole and Joe McCutchen are committed to creating an environment where small business can thrive. However, taxation and regulation are stifling small business expansion.

Throughout my legislative career, I have focused my efforts on removing these unnecessary barriers in order to unleash America's entrepreneurial spirit. As a small business man, I know that cutting spending here in Washington, eliminating the capital gains tax and reducing the corporate income tax, along with empowering the private sector, is the way to create jobs and to get Americans back to work.

Stimulating the economy must come from expanding the private sector, not by expanding government. We have a 16-month track record of failed economic policies, and they continued once more here today. We should be encouraging small businesses, not penalizing them with higher taxes and more regulation.

So I hope you will join me. Let's empower the taxpayer. Let's provide tax relief, not tax creep.

COMPENSATION FOR SURVIVAL FOR VICTIMS OF THE GULF COAST DISASTER

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, everyone knows that we are in the grips of trying to overcome the devastation of the gulf and to help the people of that region. That is why I want to applaud the serious work that was done at the White House to establish the independent framework that I called for 2 weeks ago, which was to ensure that the impacted communities—restaurants, fishermen, shrimpers, oyster persons, and people with small restaurants and large restaurants—in the gulf region, from Florida to Texas, have the ability to secure the kind of compensation needed now to make their bills.

This is not compensation for the injury as much as it is compensation to survive. For anyone to suggest that this was a shakedown is a misinterpretation and a distortion to the American people.

What do they want the government to do? They want the government to be responsive, to make sure that we work on their behalf and to make sure that people whose lights are being turned off can pay their bills.

Good news. We can now get claims and can help the people in the gulf region.

□ 1415

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House,

the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RECOGNIZING FLORIDA'S SMALL BUSINESSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise to recognize the many small businesses throughout the Nation, and especially in my home State of Florida and in my area of south Florida, that I hope will lead us into the great economic recovery.

As we have in the past, we shall recover again. Small business owners are going to be an essential part of that recovery because small business owners are truly the backbone of our Nation's economy, employing tens of millions of workers and creating most of the new private sector jobs that are so important for true economic growth.

I'd like to take this opportunity to especially recognize two small businesses in my district which definitely represent America's tradition of free enterprise and individual initiative.

Tri-City Electric has reached a well-respected place in both Florida and the electrical contracting industry with well over 300 employees. This family firm has been providing electrical design, installation, and service in south Florida for three generations since 1946. This small business's name also played a role in the fascinating rise of small business after World War II, in that it was selected to represent our area's three major cities at that time: Miami, Coral Gables, and Miami Beach. Like most small businesses, Tri-City Electric is made of folks who didn't start at the top and, in this case, started in the trenches digging to lay pipeline in the hot weather while working whatever hours it takes to get the job done.

Another small business with a long tradition of service in south Florida is Riverside Electric Company. This was established in 1922—I love anything older than I am—which is one of oldest electrical contracting firms in the southeastern United States. Another firm with a proud family tradition, its roots go back to Atlanta, where the company played a key role in converting the city's streetlights from gas to electric. Its founder, Eugene M. Irvin, Sr., later moved his family to Miami and began Riverside Electric Company. His great grandson, James Irvin, is now co-owner of the company, along with Alexander Rodriguez, who started as an apprentice and worked

his way up to become a journeyman and master electrician.

Madam Speaker, these are just two examples of Florida's nearly 2 million small businesses that have provided economic opportunities to diverse groups of people and have delivered innovative products and services to a worldwide marketplace.

Florida's small employers, in 2006, represented 99 percent of the State's employers and 44 percent of its private sector employment. Of even greater significance, however, is that small businesses created nearly 60 percent of my State's new jobs in recent years. Think of that figure. Sixty percent of the new jobs in the State of Florida were created by small businesses.

It is my honor and my privilege to recognize today the many dedicated and hardworking employees of small businesses who have done so much over the years to serve their neighbors in so many ways.

**JULY 2011 IS NOT SOON ENOUGH:
ACCELERATE TROOP REDEPLOYMENT
OUT OF AFGHANISTAN**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, General Petraeus was in Washington this week to testify before the House and Senate Armed Services Committee. And while his intent was to endorse the July 2011 Afghanistan redeployment date set by the Commander in Chief, it was not the kind of clear, unambiguous statement that inspires very much confidence.

According to an editorial in today's Washington Post, the General describes next July as "the point at which a process begins to transition security tasks to Afghan forces at a rate to be determined by conditions at the time." With all due respect, Madam Speaker, could there be any more qualifiers and escape hatches in that sentence?

The American people, who have 1,000 fewer fellow citizens and 278 billion fewer dollars than they did when this war began, aren't looking for the beginning of a process. They're looking for an end to this, an end to this miserable war.

Shouldn't we be at the end or at least in the middle of the process of transitioning security tasks to Afghanistan forces? Shouldn't the beginning of the process have come at some point over the last 8½ years that we've been fighting this war?

My concern, Madam Speaker, is that statements like this one are laying the predicate for an extension of President Obama's deadline, which is exactly the wrong lesson and the wrong approach. The problem is that, if you're locked into a certain mindset, it will never seem like the right moment to remove our troops from Afghanistan, because the mission as currently defined will never be complete and conditions on

the ground will forever remain bad. But the reason for that is the underlying policy of a military invasion and occupation that is fatally flawed in the first place.

So, in a twisted, paradoxical way, Madam Speaker, the more we fail, the more we try to succeed with the same misguided approach, and then we just fail some more. That's how you end up with perpetual war. If we had adopted smart security principles and invested in a humanitarian rather than a military approach, we'd be a lot closer to our goals of a peaceful, stable, and secure Afghanistan.

For my part, Madam Speaker—and I am not alone in this belief—the July 2011 date is not nearly ambitious enough. That's yet one more year in which Americans will be asked to sacrifice blood and treasure for a failed counterterrorism strategy that is doing nothing to advance our national security objectives. I believe General Petraeus is moving in the wrong direction and being cautious where he should be bold. It's time to accelerate the timetable, not push it back. It's time, Madam Speaker, to bring our troops home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HELP FOR THE UNEMPLOYED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, we have the highest number of long-term unemployed Americans ever on record, so you'd think we'd be overwhelmed by bipartisan cooperation to help us with these 7 million people who have been out of work for more than 6 months. Instead, every single House Republican but one voted against the legislation 3 weeks ago to continue emergency Federal unemployment benefits. And now, in the other body, every Republican has refused to support an extension of unemployment benefits. So a growing number of jobless workers are now losing their benefits.

By the end of this week, more than 900,000 Americans will lose their unemployment benefits unless the other body acts. We hear their rumblings over there, but I'll believe it when I see it. By the end of the month, the number will grow to 1.2 million. My colleagues from Florida should know an estimated 80,000 Floridians will lose their benefits; California, 180,000; Ohio, 66,000; Georgia, 57,000. And the list goes on and on.

The last lifeline for these workers and their families is being severed,

leaving them adrift with no job, no savings, and no support. Even some from my own party seem to be saying now is the time to start cutting back on help for the unemployed. In fact, it will take about 5 years of consistent, month-after-month job growth to make up for all the ground we have lost in this recession. That's how big the jobs hole is that unemployed workers are trying to climb out of.

You only have to hear from a few unemployed workers to know how hard they're looking for work and to feel their sheer sense of desperation. They're losing their homes, their health, and their faith in the American Dream. Are we really prepared to just stand by and watch them sink into abject poverty?

Opponents of helping the unemployed like to talk about budget deficits. Of course, they don't seem to care about deficits when it comes to two wars that have cost a trillion dollars and two tax cuts, mainly for the wealthy, which cost \$1.7 trillion. None of that seems to matter. But now the stingy other body says we might pass this if we can take away \$25 a week from all the unemployed. Of course, we couldn't take the money from the hedge fund people. That would be too tough on them. When it comes to helping the unemployed, they just say, We can't afford it. But I wonder if they have truly considered the real cost of abandoning these families.

Ending assistance to the unemployed will reduce consumer demand right at the point when the economy is struggling to rebound after the worst recession in 70 years. It would surely increase the number of homes that would go into foreclosure. And it would drive some individuals permanently out of the labor force if we don't do something. All these outcomes will increase our Nation's budget deficit. But even worse, they'll bring about a crippling deficit of hope—hope for the future.

Helping those who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own is the right thing to do for families, for the economy, and, ultimately, for the Federal budget.

Our failure to get this bill passed has very real and very immediate consequences. Tonight, thousands of people in every corner of this country will suffer because we have chosen to quibble and stonewall instead of act. These benefits help millions of people put bread on the table while they look for work. I sincerely hope the other body will take pity on the unemployed of this country and pass a bill today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN MEMORY OF MILTON CLOWERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay respect to Fayetteville, Georgia's Milton Clowers, who passed away a few weeks ago. Milton was a good friend of mine and a good friend to many.

He leaves behind his wife, Randi; his loving children, Eric and Cameron; and Eric's wife, Amy. His extended family included several brothers and sisters who preceded him in death and four brothers and sisters who have survived. Probably most special to him were his five grandchildren. And as a grandfather, Milton and I would often talk about our grandchildren and what a blessing they were to us.

Milton was a good friend to me. I knew him both personally and professionally. He was born in Tennessee and attended Tennessee State University. Milton enjoyed a career in the electrical industry, which I come from a construction background, and Milton and I had many discussions about the condition of our construction industry today.

He came to Atlanta, where he was accepted into an apprenticeship program with the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 613. Milton worked hard and had a successful career. He started at Grove Park Electric and went on to Dixie Electric Company. But the highlight of Milton's career was UpTime Electric. He made it into a very successful electrical contracting firm. He did a lot of work for Delta Airlines in the Atlanta Airport. I took a trip and visited that site with him probably a couple months before his death.

□ 1430

Milton also served on several industry boards. He served as the secretary, treasurer, president and chairman for the Atlanta Electrical Contractors Association.

Career and community work are important. However, a man is only as good as the family and friends who support him. Fortunately, Milton was blessed with a lot of both. He was a loving and devoted husband, father, brother and friend. He was a strong, talented, and compassionate man who gave so much to so many folks. I am proud to speak about him today on this floor to honor his life and his work. And Milton, I will miss you, my friend.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFazio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WOLF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE U.S.-MEXICO BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today during this specific time to talk about issues that are taking place on the borders of the United States. The issues I talk about are issues that impact both the northern border and southern border as well. But we have had quite a bit of hype in the media lately about things that are taking place on the southern border, so I would like to try to focus my attention primarily on what is happening between the border between the United States and Mexico. I also want to try to narrow the focus of the discussion tonight in some particular way because I'm not talking about everybody who is coming through the border, both legally and illegally. I'm talking about certain kinds of bad guys that are doing great harm to this particular country.

Let me talk about the kinds of people for which we should be vastly concerned. I am talking about drug cartels and drug runners. The sad fact is that almost all the illegal drugs coming into this country are coming across Federal lands that abut our southern border.

I'm talking about human traffickers. The sad reality is, those who are hijacking and kidnapping people, those who are running prostitution rings, those who are bringing people in here for unspeakable kinds of activities are coming through Federal lands on our

southern border. If you go down to those lands, you will see the rape trees, established where those who are leading innocent individuals will take people across the border, physically abuse them, rape them, and then leave an article of peril on a tree as a memento, a reward, a symbol of their success in such a heinous activity. That is happening on Federal land along our southern border.

And I also want to talk about the potential of terrorists who can come through Federal land on our southern border almost without any kinds of inhibitions. You see, not everyone who is coming through the southern border with Mexico are from Mexico or even Latin American. In recent years the Border Patrol has intercepted people from Yemen, Pakistan, Iraq, Somalia, people from most of the countries that are on our enemy watch list, those types of individuals for whom we should be suspect are the ones who are being captured and caught and detained. And the question is, how many are not being captured and caught and detained?

We have found discarded apparel, backpacks with old Chinese passports that had been modified, that had been cut up, that had been reused. We are not really sure exactly why they were there and for what purpose they had, but we know that those types of individuals are coming across our southern border.

So please let me try to emphasize: The reason there should be such concern is because of some of the kinds of people who are illegally entering this country, whose sole purpose—it's not to find a job or not to join a family—but whose sole purpose is to further the illegal drug trade, whose sole purpose is to further illegal human trafficking, and whose sole purpose could easily be for terroristic reasons.

Now one of the ironies of our situation on the southern border is, if you look at this picture of the southern border, the land from San Diego over to El Paso, everything that is colored along the southern border is different kinds of Federal land. Well over 40 percent of the southern border is Federal lands, 4 million acres of which are in wilderness categories.

I want to make a distinction between the southern border from El Paso to San Diego because if you go from El Paso down to the Gulf of Mexico, it's slightly different. First of all, you will notice from the map there is not a lot of Federal lands there, and the Border Patrol has a great deal more latitude and, consequently, a great deal more effectiveness on private lands, working with private individuals and local law enforcement, than they do in the areas where there are Federal lands; plus there's a river that makes a difference as well.

So I want to concentrate on all of that colored area between San Diego and El Paso where it is the Federal lands that are causing the problem.

And they are causing the problem not for an unreasonable reason. I think we can all logically understand this. The Border Patrol is being very, very effective in urban areas. The Border Patrol is also being increasingly effective along the Texas border where they are dealing with local law enforcement and private property owners. And that means that if you want to come into this country illegally to do drugs, do human trafficking, or for terroristic purposes, you try to go through the area that is the easiest.

The easiest access to this country has now become Federal lands along the southern border, and that means that even though this issue has been with us for many years and many administrations—going back to the Reagan years when we were talking about this particular issue—and even though the failings that I will be mentioning in this hour deal with this administration, they also dealt during the Bush administration, the Clinton administration, and years before that.

The only difference though is that now the situation is being exacerbated because the success we have in urban areas and on the private sector land means that the bad guys are being funneled more and more into the Federal lands where it is simply easier access to get into this country. So the problem has always been there. The problem, though, is intensifying, and that is why we must look differently at what we are doing.

Two agencies, actually three agencies are responsible for that southern border. They include those who own the lands, which is the Department of Interior and the Forest Service, and those who are charged with patrolling and protecting those lands, which is Homeland Security, specifically, the Border Patrol. And my contention to you today is that those three agencies have collectively failed in their responsibility.

A few weeks ago, a deputy sheriff from Pinal County, Arizona, comes to one of those sections of land which is wilderness designation, which means he no longer is able to stay within his vehicle—because, by our laws, we cannot have a mechanized vehicle in a wilderness area—so he has to get out of his car and walk into this wilderness area where he promptly walks into an ambush and is shot. Two weeks later, in the same area, the same wilderness area where the Border Patrol is not allowed to do their routine type of patrol work, two dead bodies of Americans are found in that exact same spot on Federal land.

You look over at the Rob Krentz family where, through a wildlife refuge, once again, because it has an endangered species on it, Border Patrol is prohibited from going into that area. Unfortunately, the murderer of Rob Krentz was not prohibited from entering this country through that wildlife refuge. He confronted a rancher whose family goes back to 1907 in Arizona in

that particular ranch. This is an elderly gentleman who was on a motorized vehicle on his own land. He did not have the opportunity of facing the issue of whether to fight or flee because he didn't have the capacity to do either. He had just had surgery on his back. He had just had a hip replacement, was scheduled for another hip replacement. He basically was immobile.

And in years past, when a rancher confronted drug cartels, drug runners, the human traffickers, they would usually flee. But for whatever reason—and this is becoming more and more constant—for whatever reason, this time the drug cartel decided to stay there, and they killed Rob Krentz, and they killed his dog. And then he fled on a very out-of-the-way route to going back through the exact wilderness refuge from which he entered into this country. I'm sorry, this is an example of where we are failing.

A Mexican rancher brutally murdered, bound and duct taped, was thrown into the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument on the U.S. side back in November. To this day, nobody has actually issued any kind of press release to allow anyone to know that that is happening. And the sad part is the examples I am giving you right now are not isolated. We have had several members of our Border Patrol who have been murdered in this exact same area. More and more individuals, both Americans and of Mexican extraction, are being assaulted, murdered, raped, and robbed in this particular area, and it is all happening on Federal land.

So the question one has to simply ask is, you know, Why? Why would this, indeed, be the situation in which we find ourselves? And one of the problems that this Congress needs to address—because only this Congress has the ability to address it—is some of the internal conflicts between different Federal agencies. If you have the Interior Department and Forest Service who own the land, they have certain laws that we, in Congress, have wisely passed on how they must manage their land. Homeland Security, though, is responsible for border protection. They have other requirements and laws, and not always do those laws fit together easily. In fact, sometimes they are in conflict.

It would be very simple to say, Well, common sense will tell you just to sit down and work out the issue. Unfortunately, we're dealing with the Federal Government, where common sense is not necessarily a high priority. Indeed, some of the land managers, working under the Department of Interior as well as the Forest Service, almost are doing their work as if they have blinders on. Dedicated to the task at hand and the legal requirement they have to consider the value and the protection of the land as their highest priority, and dedicated to fulfilling that legal requirement, they are sometimes oblivious to the real world that is around them. They forget that there are other missions that have to be there.

So sometimes it is more important to protect 22 pronghorn goats on this land who are endangered than it is to consider definitely more than 22 young men and women in America who are obviously subject to the suffering and the pain that comes from the use of illegal drugs, which are coming through that exact same territory. It is almost as if we have this attitude within the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service that because those are their lands, they will allow the Border Patrol to go in there under certain circumstances. And yet, at the same time, we have had the criticisms filed with us that allowing the Border Patrol to go in there and monitor these lands and protect the border for this country sometimes takes up to 6 months just to get the permits to run the programs that they need.

Now, we were told the other day that, Well, this is changing. We are working together better, that now we are coming together as Homeland Security and Interior Department and Forest Service. We have worked those out. No longer does it take 6 months to get the permits for the activities to take place. We're now doing those within 30 days, sometimes 60 days, occasionally a bit longer. Here is the question. We're talking about securing this border. A drug cartel does not wait 90 days from the entrance into the country before they continue on. They are not waiting for the bureaucratic wheel to spin so slowly in this country to get together and work together to solve this particular problem. And until we can come up with a new way of doing these issues, it will continue.

We had a meeting with these three groups again the other day in which they were proud that a communication tower, which was essential for the Border Patrol to be able to do their work in guarding the access and monitoring the access into this country, was not allowed to be put on the site the Border Patrol wanted because that would have been on wilderness designation. And once again, because of the laws we have passed, you may not put any new structure on a wilderness designation. So they were very proud. They were very proud that they had, after several months of negotiation, came up with a deal to move the tower to an area that was acceptable to Homeland Security and acceptable to the Interior Department. Now that sounds great that they did the deal—with one small caveat. The tower doesn't work in that area. There is now, by everyone's admission, a 3-mile hole in the coverage, which means in this effort to try to monitor what is coming in and out of American territory, there is now a 3-mile black spot where no one will ever know what is coming in or coming out. And I'm sorry, that's causing a problem.

It is not unusual for the drug cartels, who are very sophisticated, to understand this concept. Therefore, with this 3-mile hole, that becomes the primary route of entrance. And the only reason

that that 3-mile hole exists is because, to obey our laws and to have, first of all, the concept of protecting the land upper most, you didn't put the tower where the tower would work. You put it on an alternative site.

□ 1445

Now once again, perhaps years ago when only a few people were coming over occasionally, perhaps years ago when people who were there coming over to try and get jobs to milk cows or to change sheets or to pick tomatoes, occasionally that would not have been a problem. But as I have said, we are no longer talking about that group, those kinds of people coming in. We are now talking about effective, organized drug cartels having running battles with themselves as well as Mexican authorities on that side, and they are the ones who are now in increasing numbers coming through those black holes on the Federal land that we have simply created because we have not taken the blinders off to look at the overall picture.

It is human traffickers and all the violence against women who are coming over in increasing numbers through areas that we are not allowing to be regularly patrolled. And the potential of a terrorist coming into this country through these areas that no longer have any kind of security simply because we are giving precedence to a land concept of wilderness or endangered species, and that takes precedence over securing our border and trying to protect the citizens of this country.

Now, most people when you talk about this just shake their head in amazement and say, That is silly. That violates common sense.

The only thing we have to say to those citizens who say that is, You are right, it is silly. And it does violate common sense. And that is why this Congress needs to do something about it because only we have the ability of taking all three agencies and making them work to see the large picture, the overall goal, and not simply what their narrow focus may be in their job requirement or their job vision.

The question was made on whether the Border Patrol can do routine patrols along our southern border. Without dropping a beat, the representative from the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior said, Well, of course not. Only under certain circumstances, only when there is evidence of incursion will they be allowed to go into these areas because that is when they need to. Once again, if we are now inviting people to use these areas because we are stopping them other places so now they are coming on Federal land, one of the things that we need to do is make it much more difficult for someone to come onto this land illegally, and that means you need to have Border Patrol doing routine patrols.

I think in the back of everyone's mind if we start thinking about what

the Border Patrol could or should be doing as we envision it personally, we would obviously see a bunch of people in a motorized vehicle, armed, going up and down the border making sure that they are checking for signs of incursion and making sure that those who want to come into this country are having a second thought and saying maybe there is a better route that is not across Federal lands.

So the first question one should ask is, Why not? Why aren't they allowed to be in there? For, indeed, if the bottom line means that our Border Patrol is not allowed to go on Federal lands to do their job, we are creating our own problem. Initially last week, I believe, or maybe 2 weeks ago, the President announced a new initiative to send 1,200 National Guardsmen down to the border. I am encouraged by his commitment to do something about it. However, once again one has to ask: If the Border Patrol are not allowed to go onto Federal lands, the National Guard will not be allowed to go onto Federal lands. I don't care how many thousands of people you send down there, if they are not allowed to do their job, if they don't have the access so they can do the patrolling, it doesn't make a difference. That is silly. It is not going to work. And that is the concept that somehow some way we ought to recognize. We ought to figure out.

There is also one other issue that goes along with that that should be a special concern to this Congress in the way that we operate here because in one of the oddities that has developed over the years, we have Congress appropriating money to agencies of government who are then extorting that money from other agencies of government, i.e., for the Border Patrol to do their work, one of the things and conditions that is put upon them by the Department of the Interior is that they have to pay mitigation fees, which means this Congress, without knowing the details, appropriates money to Homeland Security for the Border Patrol who will then have to pay that money to the Department of the Interior for mitigation fees or to buy other lands to compensate.

This Congress has no control over that process. That's wrong. This Congress has no say over that process, and that is wrong. And the idea of transferring money from one group to another without the oversight of Congress is wrong. It is illogical. It should not happen.

Here is the irony: as a Member of Congress, when the Homeland Security budget is brought to this floor, I as a Member of Congress do not have the ability to come in here and transfer some of that money from Homeland Security over to the Interior budget. But the agencies are doing it, and they are doing it without reporting it to Congress, without understanding what Congress is about. Those agencies, by one extorting money from the other, have the ability to do something that Members of Congress cannot.

And I am sorry, Madam Speaker, this is illogical. And I am sorry that we are going to authorize up to \$50 million in this year's budget to give to Homeland Security so they can send it over to the Interior Department or the Forest Service, and the Interior Department or the Forest Service will, without ever checking on why we are doing that, what we are doing, and how this money is supposed to be spent. The money all comes from the same pot, and it should be Congress' decision on where that money is spent and how that money is spent. It should not be a matter of internal negotiations between the haves and the have-nots between different agencies, and that is a practice that has been going on in this administration and in the prior administration and the prior administration before that.

The difference, though, is today the dollar amount is much more significant, and the issue is much more significant.

Some of the news agencies made a major brouhaha yesterday by reporting a new sign that has been put up by the Department of the Interior. I believe this is on the Buenos Aires National Wildlife Refuge. And what the sign says to Americans coming down to this American spot for wilderness protection for endangered species, as well as recreation opportunities, is very clear. And amazing. It tells Americans danger, there is a public warning, travel is not recommended because the area of American land owned by the Federal Government in which they would be entering is active drug and human smuggling areas. Down here the BLM encourages visitors to use public lands north of Interstate 8.

How many other places in the United States do you have the United States Government putting up signs telling Americans not to enter into American territory because it is too dangerous for Americans to go into American territory, that drug cartels from foreign nations have taken over control of this territory, and you enter at your own risk? Unfortunately, this is not unusual. This sign went up this last week.

For years, both the Interior Department and Forest Service have been recommending for people not to travel in these areas. And if you do, you go at your own risk. Ninety-five percent of the Organ Pipe National Monument is a wilderness area, and 90 percent of that wilderness area is controlled by Mexican drug cartels, and no American is allowed to go into that without some kind of armed escort.

Further north I went to the Ironwood Monument. Once again, we were told and warned that it is a dangerous area, don't stop along the roads; continue on driving; try not to get out of your car and continue on foot in those particular areas.

These are areas well within the border of the United States. And, sadly, this is not atypical. Going back to the year 2006, once again a different administration, but in 2006, the Department

of the Interior issued a report about this that was never released to the public. But in it it indicated that in the year before, 2005, there were at least five murders, two rapes, 39 armed robberies, and they are estimating somewhere between 200,000 and 300,000 illegal incursions on this piece of property. I want you to know, those are the only ones that the Federal Government investigated; anything that was reported to local law enforcement was not included in those figures.

Now, because this has now been spun out in the national media, and because the sheriff in Pinal County simply said there are areas in his jurisdiction that are out of control, and that area that is out of his control where he cannot provide protection are all Federal lands that are owned by the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service where he nor the local law enforcement nor the Border Patrol had the ability to do what they need to do to try and control that particular area, Interior Department sent out a memo today, a media advisory trying to put this into some kind of perspective.

And what they said is that don't take this out of perspective. It is only a small area of the land that is closed to Americans. In fact, they put out this sign which is somewhat blurred, but they simply said, and this is the Buenos Aires National Wildlife Refuge, they are not closing all; they are only closing this portion down here that is the portion of America that no Americans can go into because it is too dangerous for Americans to go down there. They also then said that the amount of violence that takes place here annually year after year after year is decreasing, so we should be heartened.

I think there should be another question that should be asked. As a policy for this Congress or this administration, How much of America's land should we accept as uninhabitable for Americans? What percentage of American property should we just say, okay, foreign entities, foreign substance groups, drug cartels, you can have 5 percent of our land as yours, we just won't bother you in that? Maybe 10 percent, 2 percent? What percent is acceptable to say that America can turn over our control of American land to cartels and groups from outside this country and it is acceptable? How many murders are acceptable before we are happy? Is five murders too many? If we only have three murders a year happening on Federal land, is that enough to satisfy what we are doing?

Look, the bottom line is quite simple: what we have been doing is failing, and we have to do something different. We have to do something different.

Part of it is to use common sense and say the Border Patrol should be allowed to go where the Border Patrol needs to go.

I have here a picture of one of our Federal lands, once again in Arizona where you see traffic barricades. These traffic barricades, nicely put here, are

cool; except the goal of these traffic barricades is to prohibit the Border Patrol from going into Federal land that has wilderness categories and wilderness designation. This is not to stop the bad guys from coming in, this is to stop our guys from coming in.

At Organ Pipe National Monument, these fence barriers used to be our border between the United States and Mexico. These used to be put in there to stop Mexican cars from coming into the United States. Well, we have a different wall there now that is much more effective, so we don't need those. So instead, the public land manager in this particular area took these barricades and put them inside his territory, once again not to stop foreigners from coming in, but to stop the Border Patrol from going in. Somehow we have to realize that what we need to do is to allow the Border Patrol to have routine access, routine patrols, and not stop them from going into these territories.

Now, once again, we have met with them and they say we are working these things out; everything is going to be fine. In fact, some of the gates we are now putting up have locks on them, and we are giving the Border Patrol keys to the locks; besides, if they really need to, they could just push through those gates. However, local security, the local law enforcement doesn't have a key to those locks. If a deputy sheriff in one of those counties is chasing a bad guy into that area, they are prohibited from that pursuit. Somehow we have to get common sense back into the situation because what we are talking about simply does not work.

And there is an irony in this. The sole purpose of trying to stop the Border Patrol from securing our borders is because of the fear that they may cause damage to the environment, that a motorized Border Patrol truck could actually screw up the land or chase away an animal or do something else. So, therefore, we are prohibiting them from doing that except for some extraneous and unusual circumstances. But the irony is the bad guys, the drug cartels, the human traffickers, potential terrorists, they are not inhibited by any of that. So they go into that area, and they don't care what kind of environmental damage they do.

Madam Speaker, you have probably seen these pictures before. This is a picture of Federal land. This is wilderness land where Americans are not supposed to go: no motorized vehicle is supposed to go; no wheeled vehicle is supposed to go; only on foot with backpacks or on horseback. That is for us. Unfortunately, the drug cartels and the human traffickers come in here and they leave all of their stuff behind. They change clothes so they can get picked up along the highway and go further inside the United States illegally.

□ 1500

This is what is left behind. This is what the landscape looks like in these areas that we are trying to save for their environmental purpose. The irony is we are failing. We are failing because the people that need to be kept out are not being kept out and the people who could solve the problem are.

One of the unique finds we found is that once again the Border Patrol—trying, I guess, to come up with some pocket change and pocket money for their activities—are going into these areas, and this cacti that has been cut down is an endangered species, which means it is illegal to cut it down. They didn't care; they cut it down, anyway. It is placed across a road, the purpose of which is to stop an American traveler in this Federal territory because they can't go over the cactus. Once they get to that spot, they are then robbed with armed gunmen.

The irony once again is if the Federal Government were to go in there and try to pick up this cactus and move it off the road, that's a felony. That's illegal under our Wilderness Act. Sometimes, once again, we have to come up with other areas, what to do. We have placed water towers within Federal territory in an effort to try and make sure that those illegal visitors coming in here who happen to run out of water will not die. That's a humanitarian effort. However, what is so bizarre is the Border Patrol can't go anywhere near those water towers for fear of running off an illegal alien that may need the water. We are doing that.

We have done this kind of stuff, once again, going back through several administrations. But the cost is higher now, the issues are higher now, and the danger is higher now. We can no longer afford to continue on with that particular pattern. I would also warn you that right now, as we speak, in the Coronado National Forest, there is another wildfire.

Most of the wildfires that are taking place on Federal land in the southern border area are not accidental wildfires; they are started by the bad guys, the drug cartels and the human traffickers, for two reasons: either they will start the wildfire as a diversion to take Federal forces to the fire so they can go the other way, or, much more practically, if they're in deep trouble, they'll start a fire to get somebody to come and rescue them. Most of the fires are started that way.

We have one now in Coronado, which is called the Horseshoe Fire. Estimates are \$10 million that it will cost the taxpayers to fight this fire caused by illegal aliens trying to come into this country, not for jobs or for family but to do harm; illegal trafficking, drugs and, once again, the potential of terrorism. That's what we need to deal with. That is the issue that is at hand.

There is one last concept with this. Arizona passed a law dealing with illegal immigrants. It has been highly controversial. The merits or the rationale

of Arizona's laws notwithstanding, I have no intentions of even talking about whether I think it is a good or bad law. It is insignificant. What is the reality is that the law was produced because of the anger, the angst, and the anxiety that is caused by the funneling of thousands and thousands of drug dealers and human traffickers into the State of Arizona. Because we have done such a good job in the other area, we are now funneling them through those Federal lands. The Federal Government's action caused that law. And I would think it would be wise, before this Federal Government decides to go to Arizona and tell Arizona what they should or should not do internally with their laws, for the Federal Government to realize we are causing the problem and for the Federal Government to simply go down there on Federal lands and say, It is a Federal responsibility. The Federal Government will stand up. The Federal Government will ensure that we have control over this territory. The Federal Government will stop the worst possible invasion of this country by the people who are trying to do harm; mainly, once again, the drug traffickers, the human traffickers, and the potential terrorists. That should be what the 10th Amendment is about. That's the concept of Federalism. We are causing the problem and now we are criticizing local government who is trying to react to it; whereas, local government wouldn't need to do that form of reaction if we simply did our job first.

Once again, look at the map. That's the territory, everything that's colored. That's an open invitation for people to come into this country because it is so easy. And that's the problem. And because it has been exacerbated, because it's happening to a greater extent, because the damage is worse than ever before, and because the potential harm to this country is so great, this Congress has to step up and decide that we will get these entities together and we will establish what the standards are. The standards should be very simple: that not 1 inch of United States property should be given over to a cartel, and Americans should never be told not to go into parts of this country because it's too dangerous for America. We should come up and establish a policy that the Border Patrol will have open and complete access and no other agency, especially Interior or Forest Service, will tell the Border Patrol what their job is and how they will do it; and that there will be continuous and routine patrols of our border until such time as the drug cartels realize that it is no longer easy to come into this country that way. That they will find some other route is obvious, but that this is our responsibility, our land, and that we clearly are failing, and that the problem is getting worse every day is our fault and our responsibility, and we must take control definitely on that.

I hope this country recognizes what we're talking about, but, more impor-

tant, I hope this Congress recognizes what we're talking about. I will say, I think this Congress has. The language in House bill 5016 which would solve this problem was passed in this body overwhelmingly on a bipartisan vote on a motion to recommit. The bill to which it was voted and attached is waiting over in the Senate with very little likelihood of being moved. Senator COBURN in the Senate attached similar language that would help solve this problem to an appropriations bill. It was passed by voice vote in the Senate, and then before it came to final passage over here in conference committee, the language was removed. Both bodies of this Congress have said what they believe should take place, and common sense from Americans tells us what should take place.

Now is the time for us to realize we can no longer simply ignore this situation, and it's our fault. What we have been doing does not work. We need a better approach. We need to make commonsense situations. We need to have our land managers see the higher picture of what is important for this entire country, and we need to do it now, because the situation gets worse every day, every day we wait.

AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, thank you.

I appreciate very much the privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives in this great deliberative body that we have. I appreciate the gentleman from Utah who so eloquently spoke in the previous period of time.

I have a number of things on my mind that I came here to impart to you, Madam Speaker, and anyone that would like to overhear our conversation. Maybe this would be a good day to solve a lot of the problems that we have before us and just generally address this situation. I won't go through all the history of the world to get here, but I may have to refer once in a while back to the history of the world to make a reference point so that we can understand what we're doing now.

This is an America that has been built upon the foundation of a good number of things—the pillars of American exceptionalism. Now, some of these are pretty simple. They are in the Bill of Rights: freedom of speech, religion, and the press; the freedom to assemble and petition our government for redress of grievances, all in the First Amendment there. Property rights that are clearly defined in the Fifth Amendment; freedom from double jeopardy. Then we have a whole series of other rights.

But there are a couple of things that we don't talk about very much in this country, and, that is, if you would go

to the USCIS stack of flashcards, and these are glossies about, I suppose, 2½ inches by about 5, like a deck of them. When we have legal immigrants that come to the United States that are studying so that they can pass the citizenship test and receive their naturalization to become an American citizen, they study the flashcards, very much like students study the flashcards in, say, math: 2 plus 2 is 4, 3 plus 3 is 6. I won't go on any further, Madam Speaker, so I don't make a math error, but these cards that test the applicants for American citizenship have a series of questions on them and an answer on the other side.

There will be questions such as, who is the father of our country? You snap it over and the other side of that card says George Washington. You need to know that if you're going to be a citizen of the United States of America. Who emancipated the slaves? Flip the card over, Abraham Lincoln. Next question—actually, this is question No. 11: What is the economic system of the United States? Free enterprise capitalism is on the other side of that card. I don't think it's arguable. I don't think it's refutable. But neither do I believe that the administration believes what I have just said. I don't think they have endorsed free enterprise capitalism. I don't think they've been active in it. A small, small percentage of this administration has signed the front of the paycheck and handed that payroll check over to one of their employees. I am one of the people that has done so. I have started a business and created jobs and I have met payroll for, I believe the number is 1440 consecutive weeks.

You learn some things doing that, Madam Speaker. You understand and appreciate the free enterprise system. We know why people take risks. People go to work so they can make some money. They punch the time clock and they punch in and they punch out, and they get their paycheck and the benefits package that comes with that job because they want to feed their family. They want to have some walking-around money. They want to save up for the future. They want to have the flexibility to go and get some living in doing some things that cost a little money.

This is taking advantage of the liberties and freedoms that we have here in the United States. That's getting a job and going to work. That's contributing generally to the free enterprise system. But when an entrepreneur comes up with an idea to start a business or buy an existing business, maybe transform that business into something different, a vehicle for them, that really launches our free enterprise system.

We have seen success models of that across the history of America, across the United States of America. We might think of the Carnegies, for example, back in another era, or J.P. Morgan in another era, or we can be

thinking also of some of the Rockefeller's. Or in today's world, we can think of Bill Gates, Steve Jobs, the founders, respectively, of Microsoft and Apple. Yes, they made a lot of money, and there's not one dime of it that I begrudge them because their creativity and their discipline, their attitude, their hard work, yes, but their smart, hard work has done a lot for all of us. Our lives are far better today because we had creative people who injected ideas and stimulated this economy; Bill Gates and Steve Jobs being two of them. There are many more out there in the dot-com industry.

There are also failures out there, if you define failure by starting a business and watching it go broke; although, I think there are many times there are lessons learned there that are built upon, and those heretofore failures become successes. But my point is that we are a Nation that has embraced free enterprise capitalism. It should not be arguable here in the United States.

We should not have a knee-jerk reaction that we should go towards a government takeover of the private sector in order to solve a temporary economic problem. Our default mechanism should be to free enterprise, to freedom, and we have to let some entities fail if we're going to allow our economy and our Nation to succeed. That's the risk. You have to, once in a while, let the child fall off the bicycle, because when they get up, they'll be a lot better at it. And you have to, once in a while, let people achieve and be rewarded for their successes to the fullest extent, because that's what inspires more entrepreneurship, more challenges, and more success.

When you think of the United States of America, and this is the historical lesson now that goes back. We look at 1776 as our year; the Fourth of July, 1776, as our year. Think of that time. What was going on in that period of history? What was going on in the culture of Western civilization?

□ 1515

Well, let's see. Not only did the 13 original colonies declare their independence from Great Britain, from the king, but that was the year that Adam Smith published his great work called "Wealth of Nations." My book, I believe, is 1,057 pages long, and you can read through there carefully and learn what it's like to make pins and nails and how to utilize the division of labor to get more efficiency, and everybody benefits. Adam Smith had the industrial revolution figured out in 1776 at the beginning of the first signs of the dawn of the industrial revolution.

We had here in the United States the free enterprise capitalism, part of the culture. We had a Nation of shopkeepers and a Nation of small farmers that were free to succeed or fail on their own merits or demerits. And we know that some of our earlier Presidents had real difficulty with their fi-

nances, Thomas Jefferson among them. George Washington had some of those struggles as well. There were others that had difficulties with their finances. It wasn't something that they were handed something they didn't have to make work or something that didn't require them to be a manager. Their management of their finances and the production of their operations had a lot to do with their successes or failures.

In 1776, Adam Smith touched a nerve and educated the marketplace of Western civilization, and they began to embrace the idea of free enterprise capitalism, division of the invisible hand managing our economy rather than the king ordering it to be done or, in a later century, the next century, Karl Marx directing that it all come out of central command, from top down.

Adam Smith's vision was this, that if you have only one brand of bread on the shelf and you have a set price for that loaf of bread, you can take the price up well above what it's worth. If people are going to eat bread, they will have to pay more than it might be costing, if there's competition. As soon as company A is competed against by company B, what can you use to get a market share? Well, you can bake a loaf of bread that you sell a little cheaper. You can bake a loaf of bread that's a little better loaf of bread. You can package it up a little nicer or provide a little better service or provide it to be a little fresher. Some of the things, cheaper, better, better advertising, service, packaging, and maybe a little fresher. And when you do that, if you can sell at a lower price a better quality product, the invisible hand would come into that grocery store and instead of paying \$1 for a loaf of bread, buy that 95 cent loaf of bread that's a little better bread than the \$1 bread. Pretty soon, company B at 95 cents is outselling company A who's selling their bread for \$1.

And so what happens? The quality of the bread for company A goes up, the freshness goes up, the price goes down, and this competition goes on day-by-day constantly, transaction-by-transaction, the invisible hand making that selection of a brand of a loaf of bread or a gallon of milk or a can of beans or a T-shirt or a pair of sneakers or a car on the lot or a plane ticket on the Internet or any transaction that you can think of that a consumer would use if there's competition out there and the calculus of the consumer. Well, selection-by-selection, select market shares and set the prices and provide for the production, directions, and the availability of products because free enterprise capitalism reacts. They have to compete so they react to market demands.

That's just a few minutes to explain what that is, and I'd like to have that time in the Oval Office to explain this also to the person that sits behind that desk because I see a lot of signs that tell me that there isn't a deep natural

conviction that supports free enterprise, and this includes the nationalization of three large investment banks, AIG, the insurance company, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, General Motors, Chrysler, the entire student loan program in America, and now the takeover of our own body, our skin, and everything inside it called ObamaCare.

Then in the speech about how to deal with the gulf oil spill, which is a disaster and a tragedy that I don't think we can point our finger at an individual who's to blame at this point, we haven't found out yet what caused it, but in that speech, the President raised the issue that he would like to move forward on cap-and-trade or cap-and-tax.

Now, we have a financial reform bill that is in conference right now that's being hammered out. I will add these up again, and I will take this, Madam Speaker, to a percentage so that we have an understanding of how much of the private sector of this economy has been swallowed up by decisions made, beginning in the Bush administration, all of those decisions supported wholly by candidate-then and now President Obama. Three large investment banks, AIG, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, General Motors, Chrysler, now that totals to one-third of the private sector activity as described by Professor Boyle at Arizona State University some months ago. When you added to that 17½ percent of our economy, which is underneath the—now the ownership, management or control of this administration called ObamaCare, now we're up to 51 percent, rounds to 18, remember, 33 and 18, 51 percent. The financial services package, which looks like it's very difficult to block and most likely to end up on the President's desk, as much as I would like to stand in its way, represents by some accounts another 15 percent of our economy. So now we're up to 66 percent of our economy swallowed up if the financial package gets to the President's desk.

Behind that, cap-and-trade or cap-and-tax, a tax on everything that moves in America. It takes energy to move anything. It takes energy for me to raise my hand, so many calories burned up per pushup. I suppose somebody knows that number, Madam Speaker. But some say that cap-and-trade is about 8 percent of our economy. I think it's larger. I think it grows into being larger. It may well start out at 8 percent. So 66 percent that we're at now, the total, and we add 8 percent, the cap-and-trade. If the President is successful in what he would like to do, we will have seen 74 percent of the private sector economy swallowed up and being under the ownership, management or control of the Federal Government, 74 percent of our economy. That leaves—bright math students—26 percent of the economy left over.

The engine of our economic growth is free enterprise capitalism, this little simple thing that you can't pass the

test to be naturalized as an American citizen without at least the risk of having that being one of the questions on your test. We want everybody in America to understand free enterprise capitalism is our economic system that we have here in the United States, but our free enterprise is being swallowed up. The margins that are left are 26 percent, if this falls in the way the President is driving it, and we're going to expect that 26 percent to provide the taxes and the growth and the economic foundation to support all of this government on the other side.

Meanwhile, we're watching irresponsible spending out of this Congress to the tune of trillions of dollars. Let me just say that I believe I could pull out of the top of my head \$2.34 trillion in irresponsible spending that's taken place in about the last year-and-a-half or a little more. That would be wrapped up in the \$700 billion in TARP spending, the \$787 billion in the economic stimulus plan which 6 percent of Americans think works out for the positive, 96 percent of Americans think it didn't work and better off if we hadn't done it. There are other components out there with the Fed rolling out funds, et cetera, that rolls it up to that number of \$2.34 trillion.

And I listened to and submitted to debate after debate that came out of this side of the aisle over the last several years of Democrats, and many of them self-professed Blue Dog Democrats, that said we've got to have PAYGO rules, we're going to be PAYGO, we're going to pay as we go. If we have to increase spending in one area, we'll have to go find someplace to pay for it by decreasing spending in another area. That's a philosophy that I agree with and I endorse. In fact, I'd go a little further than that if there's a way to do it.

But the Blue Dogs have essentially dropped out of sight. They're not standing there fighting on a budget. They may be fighting behind the scenes because what we're finding out is this Speaker is not going to bring a budget to the floor of this Congress. Since we've had budget rules that began in 1974 this Congress has always passed a budget, always brought a budget to the floor. As difficult as it is to pass it, it is a framework, a spending constraint, that at least you can point to those line items in that budget and argue that an appropriations bill that spends money beyond that breaks our budget, but if you don't have a budget, any kind of irresponsible spending works just as good, and that's what's going on.

There's not a conscience, there's not a challenge, there's not a means to try to figure out how to get us back to a balanced budget. There is no path to do that. In fact, the President has driven this. He's advocated for trillions of dollars of spending. He has signed trillions of dollars of spending. He has said that in order to grow out of this to solve our economic problem we need people

spending money, and he is a Keynesian economist on steroids. This is a guy who didn't see it Adam Smith's way.

John Maynard Keynes was the economist that believed that you could take Federal money, the greenbacks, cash, and put it into the hands of the American people and they would take it out and spend it, and that would stimulate the economy, and you could grow out of an economic crisis just by simply spending government money. Well, I've always thought that that was a ridiculous proposal. I think you have to produce things that have value and market them for a competitive price and build your efficiencies. I believe this is an economy that's built on production, not on consumption. And if that's all it was, we could embrace John Maynard Keynes' idea who actually spoke and wrote about how he would solve the economic problem in the United States this way.

Keynes said, I want to find an abandoned coal mine. He said, I can solve all of the unemployment in America. I just go to an abandoned coal mine and drill a whole series of holes into the ground in that abandoned coal mine, and I would put American dollars, cash money, down the holes, fill the holes up with cash, and fill the coal mine up with garbage, garbage, fill the coal mine up with garbage, and then just turn America's entrepreneurs loose. They would go to work digging up that money through that garbage. That would give them jobs, that would keep them busy, and they would have cash to spend, and they would go out and spend it. That was Keynes.

It may have been tongue-in-cheek, in all fairness. I hope it was tongue-in-cheek, but it accurately reflects Keynes' economic theory, and the President of the United States told me and others a year ago last February 10 that he believed that Franklin Delano Roosevelt lost his nerve and didn't spend enough money. If he had spent enough money, he would have, according to the President, spent our way out of the Great Depression and we wouldn't have had to wait for World War II to come along to be the largest stimulus plan ever. It's pretty close to verbatim.

So FDR lost his nerve in spending. Today's President has not lost his nerve. He has spent money way beyond any previous President. I think that the cumulative total of it all would be more debt and deficit that has been accumulated by all the Presidents put together all the way back to George Washington. Someone said that here on the floor. I'm not going back to read the source of it. I expect it's true, and I think I should have to verify it before I tell you I know it's true.

But huge debt that's been run up by this President and this Pelosi House and the Reid Senate down that hallway without regard to how we ever get back from it. And the argument was that we needed to get money spent into the economy, the stimulus plan, remember

\$787 billion rolled up, over \$800 billion in reality. Now, they're coming back and asking for another few dozen billion dollars, whatever that might be. Two score and \$10 billion perhaps is what their target money is to stimulate the economy some more.

But the President said a year-and-a-half ago spend money, spend money, spend money, that's what will help the economy. People are hanging onto their dollars because they don't have confidence. You've got to spend money.

□ 1530

Some months later, the President said, No, now we're going to have to be careful, we can't overspend. We're going to have to be frugal, as if we could—one time borrowing a lot of money and giving it to people and getting them to spend it was going to stimulate the economy and solve the problem. And then, according to who, I don't know, the navel gazers in the White House, then you shift gears, and at a certain point, you spend less. But whenever you feel the urge to spend more, go ahead. "If it feels good do it" seems to be what's going on with the economic strategy of the White House.

So now we have these multiple trillions of dollars, the interest of which right now consumes 10 percent of our budget. The interest on these deficits that are projected today under the proposals of the President by the year 2020, 10 years from now, will not be 10 percent; it will be 20 percent of our overall budget.

Now, can we understand what this means? When we start tapping into that—it's the pie chart we're talking about here. A 10 percent slice is our interest today; a 20 percent slice of the pie chart becomes the interest in 2020; and if interest rates go up and double, you will see an economic decline that's brought about because of higher interest rates, and you will see a bigger chunk right away. If interest rates double today, our 10 percent slice would be at least 20 percent, and that could happen in a matter of a few weeks or months.

So this is serious business, passing this debt along to our children. We need to figure out how to recover from where we are today. All of this toothpaste can't be put back in the tube; some of it can. Many of the things that have been passed and signed into law need to be repealed right down to their roots. Much of the money that has been spent is gone, we can't get it back, but we're going to have to figure out how to service the debt; that means pay the interest and pay the principal down and pay the principal off.

This Nation shouldn't be carrying debt, debt that meets or exceeds that which we see in countries like Greece or Spain or Ireland or Italy. The European Union threatens to collapse under the financial stress that they have because they have loaned money; it's almost like they're sitting at a poker

table playing for chips and writing each other IOUs around the table. At some point, you have to pay for the drinks and the food that's coming along. Those chickens are coming home to roost in Europe.

We don't need to be there in America. We're a different kind of people. We have a unique vitality in our character, in our soul. One of the things that is part of that vitality is that we've skimmed the cream off of the crop of every donor civilization in the world. Everybody that sent their immigrants to the United States, they didn't go out and get the people that were sitting out there on the porch that didn't go to work; these were the industrious ones. These were the entrepreneurs, the creative ones, the ones that had a dream, that were frustrated because they had the shackles of a dictator that kept them from using freedom to grow their own lifetime success.

Can you imagine if you couldn't worship freely, if you couldn't go out and get a job, if you couldn't start a business, if you couldn't even put money in a bank and trust that you could go get it when you needed it? If you couldn't trust the rule of law? If you had to think that there was a different form of justice for one person because they were connected better with government than another person, wouldn't you look at America? Even though they advertise the streets are paved with gold, some of them didn't realize that that was figurative, not literal; some of them came here and were a little disappointed to find out our streets aren't paved with gold. But in a way they are, Madam Speaker, they're paved with gold because we have the rule of law. You can pretty much count on the law treating you the same regardless of who you are, what you look like, or what your particular net worth might be or who you're connected to. Lady Justice is blind. If you remember her standing there with her hands out holding the scales of justice, weighing the justice with a blindfold on. In this country, Lady Justice is blind, the rule of law has to apply, and we must defend and uphold the rule of law.

You've got to give everybody an opportunity to compete in the marketplace for a job or start a business, and we need to hold them accountable to produce and earn and carry their own weight. We've drifted over into a society now where—when my grandmother came here over a century ago by now, she arrived in a meritocracy, where they rewarded smart, hard work, and people could succeed without penalty. In fact, when she walked across the floor of the great hall at Ellis Island, she would have been one of those arriving immigrants where they took a little hook and peeled her eyelids back to look and see if those little white spots were in there to indicate an eye disease. They looked people over and checked them to see if they were good physical specimens. If they had a limp or a bad arm, or even if they came in

and they were obviously pregnant, they put them back on the ship and sent them back to Europe.

And this isn't Steve King that is telling you these narratives, except that these came directly from the park officer at Ellis Island the day that she did the tour for us. About 2 percent of those that arrived at Ellis Island got back on the ship, and they were sent back to their home country because they didn't meet our standards. Even when they met our standards, there wasn't a welfare program for them; they either needed to have some family or some friends to take them in and get them started, or it was simply that you have to survive on your own. Go out and get a job, go to work, start a business. Offer yourself to do anything, wait tables, sweep the floors, clean out the sewers, grab a hammer, or whatever it might be, and go to work and help build America. And they did.

But we got the dreamers. We got the passionate ones. We got the smart ones that could understand what America was and is and is to become yet beyond this point where we are today. And that vitality and that vigor that beat in the hearts of the willing immigrants that came here legally is a great big reason for American exceptionalism. It's almost unwritten, it's almost unspoken about, but it is a characteristic that is an essential component in American exceptionalism, coupled with free enterprise, capitalism, and the rule of law and religious freedom, and a moral society that is built on Judeo-Christian values—yes, that's our history and our culture and our heritage. It's our modern reality, too, perhaps to a smaller degree, but the core of the character of who we are is based on our religious faith.

And so we have a rule of law and a people that respect God's laws, so you don't need as many law enforcement officers. We can use our labor to produce more that has value because we pay fewer people to put on a badge and a gun and go try to control folks that are not willing to abide by the law. It's another one of the reasons why America has risen up and another one of the reasons why we've been more successful.

And so the vigor that we are in America is being challenged today. Two hundred years ago, you had free enterprise capitalism; you had these freedoms. And by the way, it was the dawn of the Industrial Revolution. We had the transfer of the Age of Enlightenment that arrived here in the new world at the dawn of the Industrial Revolution. And remember that from the Greeks, we got the Age of Reason, which flowed from Europe. It had to go over to Ireland where the Irish could save civilization by being the scribes that actually copied and preserved the classics that came from Greek and Roman literature. We know something about the Greeks and the Romans because the Irish monks and scribes made sure that they gathered all of that data

and reproduced it, copied it over, and stored and saved it during the Dark Ages, when nothing happened.

Madam Speaker, I sometimes tease my family on the Irish side of the family—which actually seems to be my wife and my side—I ask, what is it that the Irish are so proud about? What is good about being Irish? Why is it that on St. Patrick's Day, everybody's Irish? They didn't have very many good answers for me, and so I would tease them a little bit and say, well, I know what they did. I know what the Irish did that was unique that no one else did. A people that, according to Freud, couldn't be psychoanalyzed, but the Irish did something nobody else did. They're the only ones on the globe to record history during the Dark Ages when nothing happened. Now that diminishes their contribution.

Their contribution is great because we received, through their contribution of being the monks and the scribes and collecting that data and reproducing it and storing it and saving it from the barbarians who burned the books and burned the writings when they could, they saved the knowledge base that came out of Greek and Roman civilization. That knowledge base is rooted back—out of the Greeks is the Age of Reason, the foundations for our science and our technology today, the theorem, the hypothesis, the axiom, the list of those Greek foundational thoughts where Socrates and Plato and Aristotle and others sat around in the square in Athens in their togas and analyzed and used the version of knowledge that they had to test each other's ability to be logical and to be able to reason. That foundation of reasoning was preserved by the Irish.

And as they deployed back across Europe with that message, they actually taught Western Civilization how to think again, how to think beyond our emotions and our reactions, and how to take empirical data and crunch that data and turn it into something that could follow a logical thought and we could act and react according to actual facts rather than the high blood of emotion. It seemed like an odd thing for the Irish to contribute, to overcome your emotions and use reason, but they did.

And from the Romans—and thanks again to the Irish scribes—we had the Roman rule of law. Roman law had spread over most of Western Europe. It spread through Great Britain, through England, and it spread into Ireland. Even though the Irish had been conquered a number of times, they never really changed their character very much, but they helped preserve Roman law, which was reestablished in England as old English common law. So the common law that we use today to evaluate—and the case law that's being decided by our courts across this land is rooted back in old English common law, which is rooted back in Roman law. And the Age of Reason from Greece arrived, coming the same way,

but arrived here in the new world with the English-speaking side of the Age of Enlightenment.

I also have to couple with that, in these foundations for American greatness, Madam Speaker, two more very profound things that took place: The birth of Christ, where his teachings transformed the civilized world as we knew it then. And we know that faith and those core values are in our culture and our civilization today. And the Catholic Church might not have been—the Roman and Eastern Orthodox, but the Roman Catholic Church that is today might not be and likely would not be what it is today if it had not been for the Protestant Reformation, from Martin Luther, who taught us the Protestant work ethic. And the Catholics competed very well with that in this country.

So I couple the Age of Reason with the Roman law, and pass that over to Ireland and spread it back across all of Western Europe. And we have the Age of Enlightenment, which began in France, but the sister to it was the English-speaking side of it in England where free enterprise capitalism emerged and came to this country at the dawn of the Industrial Revolution, arriving in a country that had low or no taxation, no regulation, unlimited natural resources as far as they could comprehend them at the time, a continent to settle from sea to shining sea, and a vision of manifest destiny for this country.

And look what's been accomplished in this giant petri dish of freedom and liberty with the components in that giant petri dish that I've talked about. We have become the unchallenged greatest Nation in the world with a vigor and a vitality and a character all our own.

There is something unique about being an American, we need to understand that; it's not something to apologize for. We have an extra blessing here, and that comes about because of the things that I've talked about and others that I haven't mentioned yet tonight. We have an extra blessing, an extra vigor.

□ 1545

There is something about us. Maybe there is a little bit of an American attitude. You know, I don't know. It may be Muhammad Ali who said, If you can do it, it ain't bragging. We should be ebullient of our character and of the things that we do. We should also have confidence.

I have a constituent who has since passed away, who was a man of high values and faith and character—World War II veteran Arrie Oliver. I got to know him well. I interviewed him on his World War II experience in a video that, I believe, we have now stored over at the archives in the Library of Congress. He served in Germany in World War II for the United States Army.

At the end of the invasion of Berlin, he was there in the American sector

where he was taken captive by the Russians. The Russians put him and three others into their Russian prisoner of war camp, American soldiers. They had to eat, and they had to peel the potatoes for the Russian soldiers. Then they got to eat the dirty potato peelings while the potatoes went to the Russian soldiers. There were some stories there that told me how poorly he was treated.

I said to him, Tell me the circumstances by which you were taken captive.

He said, Well, you know, the war was over. The German soldiers were gone. We were walking down the street in Berlin, and the Russians came and picked us up and arrested us. This was he and three others.

As he told the story, he said that the Russians claimed that there were women in one of the adjacent houses and that no soldier was to go near the women. Well, that wouldn't be the history of the Russian soldier, or of the American for that matter, but that was the pretense for picking them up. He pointed out that they were all in civilian clothes.

So I asked, How did the Russians know you were American enough to pull you over and arrest you?

Now, I thought he might say it was because of our clothes. I thought he was going to say it was because of the uniform, actually, but his answer was really interesting.

It was, Well, they knew us by our walk.

They know American soldiers, even from a distance, because of the way we walk, the way we carry ourselves. When you think about that, you know, if you see a shadow of a bird hopping out on the grass, you know that a robin hops differently from some other kind of a bird. If you watch them in flight, you see their gait, and you know. Yet you would think that human beings would have a similar gait. Americans have a distinct gait about the way we handle ourselves and especially during that period of time when America had complete confidence in everything that we were doing.

So there is something unique about being an American, and we need to keep these precious gifts that we have. We've got to do our work. We've got to take our responsibility. We've got to bring this country away from the welfare state that we have become. We've got to hold people accountable with the rule of law and apply the law equally to everyone regardless of race, ethnicity, national origin or any other privilege that there might be—the O.J. version of justice, as we see it, if you juxtapose the criminal case versus the civil.

I think most of America knows the facts of what happened; but to me, there appeared to be a different version of justice for O.J. Simpson in the criminal case than he might have gotten if he hadn't had the money, the notoriety or the fame as compared to the

civil case where he pretty much lost everything that he had.

I think there was justice delivered at least once there, Madam Speaker.

So we want equal justice under the law. We want all of these foundations, these pillars of American exceptionalism, refurbished and built back up again because America is not done. We've not reached the apex of our flight. Even though we may have had the malaise II speech a couple of nights ago, that's not the American spirit. We don't apologize for who we are, nor do we back up from people who challenge us.

We look down at the Gulf of Mexico, and we see an environmental disaster, a mess down there. It is a tragedy. It is a tragedy especially for the people who live in that gulf area and any place that that oil might drift. Boy, do we all feel bad, especially for those in Louisiana and beyond, but something went wrong 5,000 feet below the surface of the ocean and 18,000 feet below that which caused that well to blow out.

The spill that is coming now will be stopped one day. Going into last weekend, they were down to 13,800 feet with their relief well, and if they hit the column right, they will be able to shut off the leakage in that well. They are drilling day and night. There is no question about that. I expect they're drilling two holes simultaneously with the Discovery Enterprise, which is the drill ship that is sitting there to drill the relief wells that they're doing. They'll get it shut off.

There is a lot of oil out there on the surface, and a lot has drifted into the marshlands and onto the beaches. We will get it cleaned up. I don't know how long it will take, nor what it will look like. But I do know this, that in 1979 there was a massive spill of an oil well, a blow-out down off the Yucatan Peninsula. That well spilled about three-and-a-third million gallons of oil. Now, as of a few days ago, the calculus was about one-and-a-quarter million gallons of oil that had come out of this hole down off the gulf. Now we're seeing numbers that are way beyond that, and no one knows who to believe, whether it's BP or the government or somebody who is looking at those numbers.

Though, I can tell you this: it has been a decade or two since people have worried about going down to the Yucatan Peninsula because of that oil leak. They've gotten it cleaned up. The impact of it has been minimized dramatically. We will get Louisiana cleaned up. We will get our coasts cleaned up. We will look back on this time.

What I'm interested in is stopping the leak and, yes, in cleaning up the mess. I want to bring every ship in here that can go out there and set up a sweep system, and I don't see any reason for the President not to suspend the Jones Act and to go around and do a mea culpa to America and bring in every ship we can to recover as much oil as possible off the surface of the

ocean rather than having to vacuum it up out of the wetlands and to clean it and take it out of the sand on our beaches. We need to get it while it's on the surface of the water, and that means surrounding the oil slick in the plume and starting to herd that back in.

Maybe you'll remember the comedy routine that Emmett Kelly did, the circus clown, where he went out—and many of us have seen the movie—and he didn't know what his show was going to be or what he was going to do. He walked out into the spotlight under the big top at the circus, and he took a broom, and he began to sweep the edge of the spotlight in. The person running the spotlight figured out what was going on, and he cut a cardboard cut-out, and put it over the light, way up on top of the big top, and he began to shrink that light up on the inside where it was emitted, and he shrunk it as Emmett Kelly swept the circle. When it was done, they were able to coordinate where he swept the light under the rug and eliminated it.

That's what we need to do with this oil spill. We need to take that oil spill and start on the outside and start bringing that together and bring enough rigs in so we can get it done and so we can recover the oil that can be recovered from the surface. We need to take it off of the surface of the ocean. If we don't have every ship there, doing that that we can do now, we need to bring them.

If the Jones Act stands in the way, the White House, of course, is going to be protective. They're less inclined than President Bush to waive the Jones Act. I think there needs to be a powerful call for the President of the United States to waive the Jones Act.

So we have some things to do to fix up America—free enterprise, lower taxes, lower regulations, and more inspiration for people to have opportunities to go out and earn, save, invest, and succeed. People need to be held accountable for their actions. People need to be rewarded for the things that they do well and punished for the things that they do bad. That's the America we need to be in. Today, we are in a welfare state. It is a fact.

This is a report that was done by Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation. He studied families, families of four, that were headed by high school dropouts. This is without regard to their immigration status. So they could have been legal, illegal, natural born or naturalized; but they were high school dropouts. They would, on average, draw down \$32,000 a year in public benefits—a family of four, headed by a high school dropout. They would on average pay \$9,000 a year in taxes. The difference to the dollar, I remember, is \$22,449 a year as the net cost to a taxpayer for a household headed by a high school dropout, because, at their skill levels, no matter how hard they work, they can't earn enough money to sustain themselves in this society.

This is a society that we've built. We have poured millions of people into this country illegally who have suppressed the wages of the lower skilled so that the high school dropouts can't find places to punch the clock to earn enough money so that they don't have to go on some type of public assistance. There will be food stamps there. There will be a rent subsidy. There will be a heat subsidy. There will be at least 69 other Federal programs. We thought that we reformed welfare here in the mid-1990s. It only brought things to a plateau. Then the welfare spending started to grow again.

So we are a dependency society. The President of the United States and the members of his party know full well that expanding the dependency class in America expands their political base. They are cynically growing the dependency class in America so that they have a stronger political foundation so that they can stay in power—so that the elitists can stay in power.

Well, I happen to have a good friend on the floor of the House right now who is anything but an elitist, unless there happens to be some kind of company that would be made up of smart people, well-educated judges from Texas who will stand and fight, who are naturally born with a spine, who have been refurbished by education and life's experiences and, hopefully, a little bit by the friendship of mine.

So I offer as much time as may be consumed by the gentleman of Texas, Judge GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I thank my friend from Iowa so much. In fact, I had some dear friends—and I, actually, have them here present—one whom my wife and I taught in Sunday school 20 years or so ago and who is here with her mom. Anyway, she was saying she really enjoyed Steve King's Special Orders, and so I thought I might pass that on.

I also had heard my friend mention the Jones Act and how President Bush was able to suspend it. It's interesting, when you put things in perspective, how sometimes they appear different. Back at the time that Hurricane Katrina hit, some people thought he waited too long. Hurricane Katrina hit on August 29, 2005. On September 1, President Bush suspended the Jones Act so foreign ships could come in and help. They helped put people up. They helped bring things that people could use to help clean up. So there was Katrina on August 29. On September 1, he suspended it through September 19. I know there are some who say, well, it probably takes a lot of things. Actually, it has to be signed off on by Customs and Border Protection, by the Department of Energy and by the Maritime Administration.

But guess what? Those are all White House appointments, so it's just getting the people who work for him to sign on. That's no big deal.

Apparently, the Netherlands offered within a few days of the disaster, of the

big blow-out, to bring in equipment, to dredge up and set up, and to create barrier islands. Yet this administration said, No, thank you. Not only didn't he suspend the Jones Act. He said, No, thank you, and sent them on their way. No, we don't want you coming over here.

The truth is the Jones Act would be so easy to suspend. Back during these past months, it would have been so easy to suspend. All you'd have to do is to make one phone call; get your staff to have DOE, Customs and Border Protection, and Maritime sign off. Then they could bring it to you, and you could have it right there on the golf course so that when you'd finish the ninth green putting, you could just sign off on suspending the Jones Act before you'd tee off on the tenth tee. It would be that easy to do.

In the meantime, if that had been done early on when the Netherlands and England and others volunteered, it would have meant the saving of the livelihoods of thousands upon thousands of people on the gulf coast. It would have meant the saving of wildlife all through those marshes where oil is getting up in there. It would have been a terrific and a tremendous help had they been willing to just tell the unions, Look, we know you don't want the Jones Act suspended. It won't be for long, but we're talking about saving countless lives of wildlife in the area as well as the livelihoods of so many.

I don't know if my friend from Iowa has heard, but I read here on the floor an article regarding British Petroleum's relationship with the global warming bill. It makes sense why they would have waited so long to jump on BP, to get mad at them and to say, We've got our feet on their neck, and all this stuff, because it turns out that BP was the one Big Oil company that was signing on to all the global warming stuff.

I'm sorry. I say "global warming," but we know, since apparently the planet has started cooling, they've changed the name and have said, Please call it "climate change," because it doesn't do to be pushing global warming bills when it turns out the world may be cooling, as South Africa found out this week with the snow down there.

□ 1600

But, anyway, turns out that on April 22, Senator JOHN KERRY, Democrat from Massachusetts, was on the phone with allies in his push for climate legislation and telling them he was rolling out the bill that very day with three oil companies, including British Petroleum. They were supporting him on his climate change, global warming bill, and they were supporting the White House. And so, of course, they were reluctant to jump on the oil company that was being such a big help to them. But what we found is once they saw that the United States was angry and

that this was going to be nothing but trouble, well, they were willing to throw their friends under the bus and then talk about boots on their throat and wanting to kick some rear ends.

We had a hearing today in our Natural Resources Committee and we had the new Acting Director of Minerals Management Service. We had the new Acting Inspector General of the Department of the Interior, and I was asking that, since we'd had hearings a few years ago on why the price adjustment language was pulled out of the offshore leases in 1998 and 1999—this was a few years ago, the prior Inspector General—the Inspector General said, Well, we can't get to the bottom of why the price adjustment language was pulled out, but clearly, at the time, it had cost our country hundreds of millions—and I'm informed now that that's billions and billions of dollars—that should have gone as revenue from the offshore rigs but has gone into the pockets of some of the big oil companies that executed those lists in 1998–1999. And it turns out, the Inspector General said, But I haven't been able to question the two people with the most information—because they could probably explain this—because they're no longer with the government. And I said, Well, where are they?

They're not with the government.

Well, why can't you call them?

They're not with the government.

When you're talking about hundreds of millions and now billions of dollars, you would think they would want to know their version of what happened. Because if there's billions and billions of dollars that have gone to Big Oil that should have gone in our Federal Treasury because it should have been royalty if these people had not pulled that language out of those leases, then you would figure somebody would want to know if they got something in return for that. What made you pull that language? Because the best we could tell from hearing a few years ago, it appeared they were given information that, Look, the language is not in here on price adjustment. Don't you want that in there? And they never talked to them. They weren't with the government anymore.

Well, it turns out one of the two had gone to work for a company—perhaps you've heard of them—called British Petroleum. Went there in 2001, when the Clinton administration left, and served in different positions; one as director of British Petroleum Shipping Limited in London, vice president for British Petroleum North America in L.A., and also one other position with BP before she came back.

So I asked the Acting Inspector General, Now that we have found out that Ms. Baca is back with the Interior Department, now you surely have asked her why that language was pulled out. What did she say?

Oh, I didn't know she was part of any of that.

And what struck me, and call me cynical, but we found the press release

from Interior, June of 2009. How ironic. That's 10 years after the 1998–1999 leases during the Clinton administration had that language pulled out. Ten years later, she comes out from British Petroleum and goes to work for the Interior Department for Minerals Management. It's really interesting because, well, 10 years. That always rings a bell. Oh, yeah. Unless it's murder, the statute of limitations is normally a maximum of 10 years, unless anything.

So that's probably good news if there was anything that went wrong back there, that was done that shouldn't have been done. Ten years.

So just answer the question. Why did you pull that language out before you went to work for British Petroleum and helped big oil companies make so much money? So that's a matter of concern, continues to be a matter of concern.

I did ask the Acting Director of MMS, since we know that the only entity within Minerals Management that is allowed to be unionized is the offshore inspectors, I asked, Now, we know you're dividing MMS up into three groups, three parts. The prior Director had indicated that she didn't know if they might all unionize or not, didn't really know. So I asked the new Acting Director. He didn't know. That may happen. Now, there's only one little part of MMS that's unionized—the offshore inspectors. Now they may unionize all of those, and they'll have three different agencies to do it with. So that was interesting to find out today.

And when I asked if he thought it was a good idea that a father and son team were the last two inspectors to go out to Deepwater Horizon before the blowout, he said he didn't seem to see anything wrong with it being a father and son. I'm going, This is your check and balance. This is what we were told. This ensures that both inspectors are doing their job, because they know the other is watching them and will report them if they don't do their job. And he didn't have a problem with that being father and son, didn't see that that was a problem.

I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, when the heads of these agencies don't see a father and son as a problem being the last two inspectors to go to Deepwater Horizon and they are their own checks and balances to make sure that those inspections are properly done, we've got a problem. And it's not British Petroleum. They're one problem, and they need to be dealt with—and should be. Because we've already seen the administration now willing to throw their good friends under the bus. But we do need to clean up this cozy relationship that the President's talked about and that he helped create in the Minerals Management Service.

I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

I am standing here thinking that I started down this subject matter, and a

statement that I needed to make was this: I'm looking forward to the interception of the hole in the relief wells that are being drilled down almost 14,000 feet, just going into last weekend when I last went back and checked, so I presume that they are approaching their goal. But it's very difficult to thread that needle and be 4 miles away and hit that. It's a very difficult thing to do. But when they do get it done, when they cap this well off and get the relief well drilled and successfully seal this off, doing what they actually did in 1979 when they had that huge oil spill when they had the blowout in the well off the Yucatan Peninsula down in southern Mexico, when they shut that off, then I expect—and I haven't had a conversation with anybody in BP or anybody that's more knowledgeable than me, but I expect then we will be able to go down with robotics and cut the casing off and recover the blowout preventer. If that can come, if we can bring the blowout preventer up to the surface and then test that BOP, at that point we will at least be able to have a more effective theory on what went wrong. That's what I am interested in more than anything else.

I want the well shut off. I want it cleaned up. But I want to know what went wrong. And the President has frozen and issued an order to stop all drilling offshore for 6 months. Even if we find out what went wrong and find out it was human error, mechanical error, they still seem to be determined that they're going to crush the economy in that part of the country.

The economic damage of oil drifting to shore is a heavy load economically, and environmentally it takes a long time to recover, but also the economic damage of shutting off all of those jobs that are supported by the drilling is a painful thing to watch that kind of judgment from the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that we must have run out of time. For that cause, I will be happy to yield back.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KISSELL). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1928

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona) at 7 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 21, 2010

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Monday next and further, that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 22, 2010, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

SUPPORTING AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 879) supporting the goals and ideals of American Education Week, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMENDING HOLLYWOOD WALK OF FAME ON 50TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 1357) commending and congratulating the Hollywood Walk of Fame on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING 235TH BIRTHDAY OF U.S. ARMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 286) recognizing the 235th birthday of the United States Army.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Thursday, June 17, 2010 at 4:24 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits to the Congress a copy of a notice filed earlier with the Federal Register continuing the emergency with respect to Russian Highly Enriched Uranium first declared in Executive Order 13159 of June 21, 2000.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE RISK OF NUCLEAR PRO- LIFERATION CREATED BY THE ACCUMULATION OF WEAPONS- USABLE FISSILE MATERIAL IN THE TERRITORY OF THE RUS- SIAN FEDERATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111- 123)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the Federal Register for publication the enclosed notice stating that the emergency declared in Executive Order 13159 of June 21, 2000, with respect to the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation is to continue beyond June 21, 2010.

It remains a major national security goal of the United States to ensure that fissile material removed from Russian nuclear weapons pursuant to various arms control and disarmament

agreements is dedicated to peaceful uses, subject to transparency measures, and protected from diversion to activities of proliferation concern. The accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation and maintain in force these emergency authorities to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA,
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 17, 2010.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of family business.

Mr. CHILDERS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business in district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRAVES of Georgia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, June 24.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WESTMORELAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, June 24.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, June 24.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 21, 2010, at 11 a.m.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 5297, AS AMENDED PURSUANT TO H. RES. 1436 AND H. RES. 1448—Continued

[In millions, by fiscal year]

	Net Impact on the Deficit ^a													
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010-2015	2010-2020	
Miller of NC/Baca, pursuant to H. Res. 1448	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	10,137	19,369	-1,226	-1,563	-1,902	-25,188	2,792	-974	-1,118	-1,018	-965	-380	-1,662	

^a Positive numbers indicate increases in the deficit, negative numbers indicate decreases in the deficit

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

7947. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tree Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AH96) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7948. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Emerald Ash Borer; Addition of Quarantined Areas in Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Wisconsin [Docket No.: APHIS-2009-0098] received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7949. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Black Stem Rust; Additions of Rust-Resistant Varieties [Docket No.: APHIS-2010-0035] received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7950. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conservation Reserve Program; Transition Incentives Program (RIN: 0560-AH80) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7951. A letter from the President, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter in response to Section 717 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2008 (Pub. L. 110-181); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7952. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Reserve System, transmitting Report to the Congress on Reductions of Consumer Credit Limits Based on Certain Information as to Experience or Transactions of the Consumer; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7953. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment to Municipal Securities Disclosure [Release No. 34-62184A; File No. S7-15-09] (RIN: 3235-AJ66) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7954. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-045, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7955. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-052, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the

Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7956. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-054, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7957. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the semi-annual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2009 to March 1, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7958. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-431, "SOME, Inc., Technical Amendments Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7959. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-430, "UNCF Tax Abatement and Relocation to the District Assistance Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7960. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports for the period October 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7961. A letter from the Chairman, Postal Service, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period of October 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7962. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting notification that funding under Title V, subsection 503(b)(3) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, has exceeded \$5 million for the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3286-EM in the State of Ohio, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7963. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Calcasieu River and Ship Channel, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0317] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7964. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Chester River, Chestertown, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0081] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7965. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmit-

ting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Lake Havasu Grand Prix, Lake Havasu, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0116] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7966. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 2010 Veterans Tribute Fireworks, Lake Charlevoix, Boyne City, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0177] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7967. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inland Navigation Rules [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0948] (RIN: 1625-AB43) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7968. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Model S-76A, B, and C Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2006-24587; Directorate Identifier 2006-SW-05-AD; Amendment 39-16281; AD 2010-10-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7969. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A340-200 and A340-300 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0476; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-036-AD; Amendment 39-16298; AD 2010-10-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7970. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model ERJ 170 and Model ERJ 190 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0614; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-045-AD; Amendment 39-16286; AD 2010-10-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7971. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; FRONTIER DISCOVERER, Outer Continental Shelf Drillship, Chukchi and Beaufort Sea, Alaska [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0955] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7972. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Patasco River, Northwest and Inner Harbors,

Baltimore, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0133] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7973. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Neuse River, New Bern, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0256] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7974. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast (ADS-B) Out Performance Requirements to Support Air Traffic Control (ATC) Service [Docket No.: FAA-2007-29305; Amdt. No. 91-314] (RIN: 2120-AI92) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7975. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1897-DR for the State of New Jersey; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Appropriations, and Homeland Security.

7976. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1896-DR for the State of Delaware; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Appropriations, and Homeland Security.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana (for himself and Mr. HALL of New York):

H.R. 5549. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for expedited procedures for the consideration of certain veterans claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona:

H.R. 5550. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to include a definition of "loss of use" for purposes of evaluating disabilities and providing adapted housing and automobiles under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. KOSMAS (for herself and Mr. DRIEHAUS):

H.R. 5551. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to make a certification when making purchases under the Small Business Lending Fund Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. TANNER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. HILL, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROSS, Mr.

SALAZAR, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 5552. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that the payment of the manufacturers' excise tax on recreational equipment be paid quarterly and to provide for the assessment by the Secretary of the Treasury of certain criminal restitution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAO:

H.R. 5553. A bill to extend the National Flood Insurance Program until December 31, 2013; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. DENT, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. LEE of New York):

H.R. 5554. A bill to provide tax relief for, ease the regulatory burden on, and provide expanded access to credit to small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Appropriations, Energy and Commerce, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JONES, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. COLE, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 5555. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for eligibility for housing loans guaranteed by the Department of Veterans Affairs for the surviving spouses of certain totally-disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 5556. A bill to support the establishment and operation of Teachers Professional Development Institutes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. GIFFORDS (for herself and Mr. LATHAM):

H.R. 5557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an increased credit against tax for tuition and related expenses of certain individuals age 55 and older; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. GIFFORDS (for herself and Mr. LATHAM):

H.R. 5558. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the eligibility of older workers for the work opportunity credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. MURPHY of New York):

H.R. 5559. A bill to revise the National Flood Insurance Program to more fairly treat homeowners who purchase insurance under the program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MOORE of Kansas (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CAO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CON-

YERS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. KILROY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SPRATT, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 5560. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve quality of cancer care and quality of life for patients and survivors by coordinating development and distribution of information about relieving pain, symptoms, side effects, and stress; increasing awareness of treatment and post-treatment health risks for survivors; enhancing research into symptom management and survivorship; increasing health care professional education and training; reducing health disparities in cancer treatment, symptom management, and survivorship care; and expanding and enhancing cancer registries; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 5561. A bill to establish a public education and awareness program relating to emergency contraception; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (for herself, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DENT, Mr. BOYD, Mr. HILL, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SPACE, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. TANNER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. WAITT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. CHU, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. JONES, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WU, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.J. Res. 90. A joint resolution expressing support for designation of September 2010 as "Gospel Music Heritage Month" and honoring gospel music for its valuable and long-standing contributions to the culture of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Texas:

H. Res. 1450. A resolution congratulating the Texas A&M University Aggies for winning the men's and women's NCAA Division I Outdoor Track and Field Championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. BONO MACK (for herself and Mr. KENNEDY):

H. Res. 1451. A resolution expressing support for designation of June 26, 2010, as the International Day against Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Ms. NORTON):

H. Res. 1452. A resolution expressing support for the goals and ideals of National Infant Mortality Awareness Month 2010; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DRILEHAUS (for himself and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H. Res. 1453. A resolution celebrating the 29th Congressional Art Competition and commending the winners of the Competition on achieving a high level of artistic scholastic aptitude; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. HALVORSON:

H. Res. 1454. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Chiari Malformation Awareness Month" and "Chiari Malformation Awareness Day" in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H. Res. 1455. A resolution directing the Attorney General to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of certain communications relating to certain recommendations regarding administration appointments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

311. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 19 memorializing the Congress to utilize the power of technology to boost American productivity and performance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

312. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 239 urging the President of the United States to ensure that recreational fishing and boating are national priorities in the Interagency Ocean Policy Task Force's final report; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 197: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
 H.R. 333: Mrs. EMERSON.
 H.R. 442: Mr. GRAYSON and Mr. LUJÁN.
 H.R. 571: Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 614: Mr. GRIFFITH and Mr. BOEHNER.
 H.R. 1021: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 1079: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 1207: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
 H.R. 1625: Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 1964: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 2057: Mr. OLVER and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 2067: Ms. WATSON.
 H.R. 2204: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. ELLSWORTH.
 H.R. 2262: Mr. CUELLAR.
 H.R. 2296: Mr. LUJÁN and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 2381: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 2425: Mr. REHBERG.
 H.R. 2483: Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 2766: Mr. MAFFEI.
 H.R. 3227: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3336: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H.R. 3359: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 3412: Mr. LAMBORN.
 H.R. 3470: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3652: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 3668: Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 3752: Mr. BOREN.
 H.R. 3764: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 3790: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
 H.R. 3839: Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 4051: Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 4116: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4123: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 4296: Mr. LOEBSACK and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 4364: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 4405: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 4505: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 4530: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 4538: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 4594: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 4638: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
 H.R. 4684: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. PETRI, Mr. COLE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 4687: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 4733: Mr. PASCARELL.
 H.R. 4785: Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 4787: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 4790: Mr. POLIS of Colorado.
 H.R. 4844: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 4870: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 4908: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 4993: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. TONKO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. KOSMAS.

H.R. 4995: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H.R. 5015: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 5032: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 5083: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 5089: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 5090: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 5141: Mrs. BONO MACK.
 H.R. 5241: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 5283: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 5304: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 5336: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 5384: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 5400: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 5409: Mr. PIERLUISI and Mr. PERRIELLO.

H.R. 5418: Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 5424: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 5426: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 5434: Mr. LANCE, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 5443: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 5462: Mr. SABLAN and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 5478: Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 5480: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 5481: Mr. SESTAK, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 5492: Mr. STARK, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 5503: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 5509: Mr. CARNEY and Mr. CRITZ.

H.R. 5513: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 5523: Mr. CARTER, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 5539: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. PAUL.

H.J. Res. 86: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 224: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 259: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. COBLE.

H. Con. Res. 266: Mr. COBLE.

H. Con. Res. 275: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WALZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, and Mr. MAFFEI.

H. Res. 173: Mr. STARK.
 H. Res. 252: Mr. MICHAUD.

H. Res. 536: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BOUCHER, and Ms. DELAURO.

H. Res. 546: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H. Res. 771: Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H. Res. 1056: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H. Res. 1207: Mr. POE of Texas.

H. Res. 1209: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H. Res. 1226: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 1241: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H. Res. 1251: Mr. TAYLOR.

H. Res. 1309: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H. Res. 1343: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 1348: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H. Res. 1386: Mr. HIMES.

H. Res. 1401: Mr. HODES, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 1412: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MACK, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H. Res. 1420: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

149. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Santa Ana, California, relative to Resolution No. 2010-09 opposing the State of Arizona SB 1070 and urging for comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

150. Also, a petition of Miami Beach, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 2010-27380 supporting the passage of the "Uniting American Families Act"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

151. Also, a petition of City of Auburn, Washington, relative to Resolution No. 4590 requesting the Congress to provide for immediate appropriation of 44 million dollars for interim grout work and related repairs to the Howard Hanson Dam; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and Transportation and Infrastructure.