



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2011

No. 21

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 10, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JASON CHAFFETZ to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

EGYPTIAN ORPHANAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) for 1 minute.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, as I rise today, I am mindful of events occurring in Egypt. And I want to extend my congratulations to the Lillian Trasher Orphanage of Asyut, Egypt, which is celebrating 100 years of service this month. As our ally Egypt stands on the cusp of a new future, one hopefully based on respect for democracy and human rights, we honor the people who have worked for decades to build an educated and productive civil society there.

The Lillian Trasher Orphanage, begun in 1911 by an American from Jacksonville, Florida, is one of the oldest and longest-serving charities in the world. It currently serves over 600 children, along with widows and staff. This pillar of the community has been home to thousands of children who needed food, shelter, and a family. Orphanage graduates serve around the world as bankers, doctors, pastors, teachers, and even in the U.S. Government.

Despite many challenges over the years, the wonderful staff, now led by George and Fathia Assad, has continued serving the children no matter what the circumstances. We applaud that cloud of witnesses over the past 100 years who have supported this organization through service, friendship, prayers, and donations. And we support and stand with this great institution and voice our ongoing support for this and other similar Egyptian grassroots organizations during this critical period in the nation's history.

HONORING BEV RENS

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

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, there are 435 Members of the House of Representatives. We come from all over the country, and every one of us encounters people from the towns and cities and rural parts of our district that inspire us through the heroic action that they exhibit every day of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to talk about one of those heroic people that I've known for 35 years. Her name is Bev Rens, and I met her when I was working with her husband at a grain elevator in the small town of Hartwick, Iowa. I later got to know her better playing softball for a team called the Front Street Tap located in Brooklyn, Iowa, and Bev's voice was always the

loudest voice on the field because that's the kind of person that she is. She is passionate, she is fierce in her dedication to her friends, and she has devoted her entire life to making her community, her State, and her country a better place for all Americans.

Bev recently had a curveball thrown at her when she was diagnosed with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, also known as ALS—Lou Gehrig's Disease. Bev has always taken life head-on, and that's how she addressed this challenge, the same way she has lived her life every day that she has spent on this Earth. She didn't get into self-pity. She started thinking about what she could do to stay connected to her friends, her family, and the important issues that she has cared about all of her life.

Those of us who have known Bev have known her as a nurse, as a community volunteer, and a political activist. And, in fact, her start in politics began in 1988 in the Iowa caucuses when she went to caucus for a candidate named Jesse Jackson. And she participated in her last Iowa caucus for another political candidate named Barack Obama. Bev recently celebrated her birthday on February 3, and you can see her surrounded in this picture by friends and family, including a granddaughter that is the light of her life.

But one of the things that Bev's life teaches us is that we face challenges every day, and no challenge is too great for us to solve if we come together in a spirit of cooperation and a belief in the common good, that we can solve the problems that we face as a country. And that's why I am here talking about my friend Bev Rens, because she is an inspiration to all of us in terms of what we can do to fight for a better America.

She decided a long time ago that access to health care was an important priority being denied millions of Americans, and she knew that from her

☐ 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.

H603

work as a front-line care provider taking care of sick people and trying to take care of them in their end of life experiences, which is one of the most precious times that a family gets to spend together. So as a nurse, Bev fought for health care improvement that would improve quality of care to patients and expand access to care so that no American family could say that a loved one died because they didn't have access to the type of care that all Americans deserve.

It's important for those of us who are struggling with this issue of how we provide quality, affordable health care to Americans to think about inspirational people like Bev and what she has done her entire life to help people in need, whether as a community volunteer, as a nurse, as an activist. What is the legacy that we will leave to our children and grandchildren when they look back at this Congress and say, What did you do to help me in my time of need? Because Bev never worries about that question. She says, I'll be the first one in, and I will fight until I don't have any breath in me left to give. That's why you'll still find Bev on her computer every day, networked with friends around the country, talking about issues of vital public importance, trying to be part of the important discussion that Americans have every day about improving the quality of this country.

And predictably, in the wonderful small town where I grew up, Brooklyn, Iowa, Bev's story has inspired many others to pick up the cause, and they formed what has been called Bev's Brigade, an army of loyal volunteers who show up at her house every day to take care of her basic needs after a lifetime of helping others. It's one way we pay it forward in this country, through the example that others have given us, to think every day about what we can do to help each other. And that's why Bev is an example to all of us of what the American spirit is all about.

REMEMBERING AMANDA ROS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I lost an irreplaceable part of my family. My mother, Amanda Ros, passed away from complications due to Alzheimer's. She was a warm, loving, and caring woman who led an extraordinary life. She was my father's rock, soulmate, best friend, and companion for 65 years. They led a unique and joyous life. She always kept him company and guided him with her wisdom and her kindness.

It was her strength that helped our family transition as we fled the Castro regime and settled in south Florida. It was her determination and sense of purpose that inspired my father and her to start a small freight forwarding company in Miami that they ran together for over 30 years.

Abu Mandy, as we called her, was an amazing grandmother. When I was first elected to Congress, my kids were very young, and my mother was an unwavering source of support, taking care of them and traveling with me whenever I was in D.C. Her actions made my transition to Congress all the more manageable. My most ambitious goal was never to be a Member of Congress or to be chair of an important committee; it was to be for my children the kind of mother that she was to me.

□ 1010

She always taught me to be proud of my Cuban heritage and of my Jewish legacy.

My mother had many causes that were near and dear to her heart. First and foremost, both my parents championed the cause of a free Cuba. They participated in many projects to achieve this noble goal, and it saddens me deeply that my mother did not live long enough to see this goal of a free Cuba become a reality.

Her other passion, Mr. Speaker, was promoting organ donations. My mother believed in a world where individuals would help and care for one another. She believed that organ donation was the least that one could do for others, and I hope that others heed my mother's passion and become enthusiasts of organ donations.

Losing someone we love to Alzheimer's is sadly becoming all too common in our country. They call Alzheimer's disease "the long goodbye," and it is something that no family should have to go through. You see a person whom you remember to be full of life, wonder and passion become a shell of her former self.

It destroys brain cells and causes memory changes, erratic behaviors and loss of body functions. It slowly and painfully took away my mom's identity, her ability to connect with others, to think, to eat, to talk, to walk, to find her way home.

Every 70 seconds someone new develops Alzheimer's. Too often Alzheimer's falls under the wrongly held belief that it's an expected part of aging. We must raise awareness of the disease and provide a voice to the voiceless. We must improve early screening and detection, giving families and loved ones a better chance to prepare for and slow the onset of this disease.

Families living with an Alzheimer's loved one need all the support that they can get. My mother was fortunate to have our entire family rallying around her, as well as outstanding medical personnel who helped us manage the disease.

Eighty-seven percent of the time, it is family members who are the primary caregivers. Family members need assistance. It is tough for families to deal with everyday struggles of caring for loved ones with this disease, and the emotional stress is quite high. One-third of caregivers develop symptoms of the disease. The financial toll is significant.

My mother may be gone, but her legacy and love will forever be a constant presence in our lives, and we must all work together for a cure for Alzheimer's.

EMPLOYMENT FOR OUR VETERANS

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, let me first identify with the two previous speakers and offer my sincerest condolences and heartfelt feelings.

Mr. Speaker, there is no higher sacrifice in our Nation than military service. Our men and women in uniform serve honorably, whether they are stationed at a base here in the United States or serving in a combat zone far from home.

Some join the military out of patriotism. Some join in order to see the world. But for many, those motivations are coupled with another factor: the lack of jobs in our communities. Facing shaky prospects, many young people turn to military service as an honorable, good-paying career.

But too many veterans end up unemployed when they leave the military. After dodging bullets on the battlefield, they find themselves jobless in the marketplace.

In the last few weeks, I've issued a call for unemployed Americans to send me their resumes at resumesforamerica@mail.house.gov so that I may enter their stories into the RECORD as a way of dramatizing the shameful unemployment problem in this Nation. I've heard from thousands of Americans, including a number of veterans, who are struggling under the weight of unemployment.

Mushi Israel of San Diego, California, is a Navy veteran who served for 20 years. He's an information technology specialist who's been out of work for an entire year. As Mr. Israel said, "There are a lot of great people who are out of work like myself who believe in the American Dream and society and just want to do an honest day's work for an honest day's pay."

David Reinke of Burbank, California, was an Army lieutenant who received an honorable discharge in 1980. Although Lieutenant Reinke said in an email to me that his service was "brief and undistinguished," I beg to differ. Anybody who puts on a uniform is distinguished and has the right to a good life right here in America.

David worked for an event staging company for over 20 years. As he put it, "Unfortunately the economic downturn forced our company to lay off 50 percent of the staff in an attempt to remain economically viable. I was one of those casualties."

So after serving our country, Lieutenant Reinke became an economic casualty. He lost his job in January of 2010 and has been substitute teaching, where he tries to make ends meet.

Andy Lang, a retired disabled veteran from Snow Hill, North Carolina, who's been out of work since last January, wrote, "You don't know how scared I am, Congressman. Some days I don't eat. Americans need help and they need it now."

Ms. Harmony Leonard of Bradford, Pennsylvania, wrote to me. She served in the U.S. Navy from 1975 to 1979 and was honorably discharged. Ms. Leonard has worked as a teacher, a grant coordinator, a development officer, a general manager of a restaurant. She's active in her community and said, "I did everything I could to be a vital part of my community, and now that I have accumulated experience and education I seem to be invisible and of little use to society."

She continues, "My saving grace is that I am a veteran, so I have medical care should I need it. And I am not starving because my partner is working in the natural gas industry. But what about me? What about my self-esteem? What about the stigma attached to not working?"

Mr. Speaker, there's not a Member of this body who has a good answer for Ms. Leonard. How can we look our veterans in the eye, thank them for their service, and then tell them they are fresh out of luck when it comes to finding a job? How can we let them down like that?

I want to hear more stories like this because I know they're out there, and I know there are more veterans who serve our country with honor and dignity and now find themselves unemployed.

So I'm calling on unemployed and underemployed veterans to send me your resume and your story to resumesfromveterans@mail.house.gov. I'll submit them for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the unemployment problem among our veterans can be put front and center before our government. Sending me your resume will not get you a job, but it can help force Washington to end the unemployment problem once and for all.

Again, veterans and servicemembers can send their resume to me at resumesfromveterans@mail.house.gov.

Mr. Speaker, service to our Nation is an honorable profession, and we should honor that service by seeing to that every veteran has a job when their service is over. When you risk your life for your country, we should make sure you have a life when you return. No veteran should be left questioning how they will feed their family, wondering about their self worth, or fretting about their financial future.

It's time, Mr. Speaker, we did something to end unemployment once and for all for everybody, especially our veterans.

RESUME—MUSHI ISRAEL

Hello Resumes for America, after seeing Rev. Jesse Jackson on CNN this morning in discussion about the state of unemployment in the U.S., I decided to send in my resume. And I hope this will bring light to the gov-

ernment as to the real conditions of the country. There are lots of great people who are out of work like myself who believe in the American dream and society and just want to do an honest days work for an honest days pay.

I am a Navy veteran who served 20 years for my country. I have a BS degree in Information Technology, and my background in Naval Telecommunication is my expertise. I'm currently working on a Masters Degree in Information Technology Project Management. I'm also working on Cisco Certification Network Associate (CCNA), Cisco Information System Security Professional (CISSP) courses.

I believe it's so unfair for people like myself to be out of work when there are so many jobs that are outsourced to third world countries just for the profits of companies. What are we to do? I realize we are of a globalization for products and services around the world, but to the expense of US workers that help build this country and help to defend for the rights and privileges for all.

Help.

MUSHI ISRAEL.

Mushi Israel,
PO Box 86714
San Diego, CA. 92138
Phone: (619) 843-2270
Email: mushi003@gmail.com
<http://www.linkedin.com/pub/mushi-israel/a/72/85>

Monday, January 17, 2011

JOB OBJECTIVE

Information Technology Project Management, Naval Telecommunication Data Link Analyst, Crypto Logic Management Technician, C4I System Integration, Acquisition Support, Information Technology System Networking Test and Evaluation Analyst, Fiber Optics Maintenance/Installation.

SUMMARY

Exceptional professional with over 20 years experience of service working with Naval Telecommunications equipment with the US Navy.

Information Technology Project Manager. Communications Data Link-Navy Systems Analyst.

Microsoft 2000 Server System Administrator.

Technical Control Supervisor US Navy Telecommunication Systems.

Crypto, (EKMS) Electronic Keying Material Systems Management.

Certified Fiber Optics Installer.
DELPHI Connection Systems.
Current Secret Security Clearance (SBI).

EXPERIENCE

CDL-N System Analysts, SAIC, San Diego, CA, 10/2006 to 02/2010.

Performed as Project Program Management for tactical line of sight radio networks and wireless wide area relay networking systems.

Assisted in the development and research of Communications Data Link (CDL-N) system, revised system design/test procedures, and developed quality control standards.

Fiber Optic Installation and Test Certification on tactical Navy terminals and cables.

Perform shipboard installation, testing, Casualty Report (CASREP) activities, System Operational and Verification Testing (SOVT) documentation.

Develop training materials and provided operator/maintenance instruction. Performed Crypto operation/maintenance, managed EKMS material inventories and destructions.

Management Analyst, Telecom Network Team, San Diego, CA, 10/2004 to 10/2006.

Assisted in system analyst in joint operational testing with Navy, Army, Air Force, and Marine telecommunications engineers.

Project Manager for Tactical Line of Sight Wireless Wide Area Relay Network System; coordinated and organized research and development, analyzed and gathered data, and developed solutions.

Documented findings of study and prepared recommendations for implementation of new system procedures according to organizational policy.

Organized and assisted in development of test plans for tactical communications systems in support of research and analysis.

Communications System Analyst and Network Administrator, Information System Support, INC., San Diego, CA, 05/2003 to 10/2004.

Naval Telecommunications Computer System Administrator designed and implemented network architecture, configurations including hardware and software technology for Network Operating Center.

Utilized connectivity to include Frame Relay Devices, High Speed Data, Bandwidth Efficiency Satellite Transmission (BEST), INMARSAT, NERA-B terminal equipment and associated peripherals to support communications for USNS ships and support shore stations.

Help desk support with Naval Telecommunications messaging service for the Network Operating Center supporting USNS ships.

EDUCATION

BS Information Technology
Certified Fiber Optics Installer
Forklift Operator Qualified
National University
KITCO Fiber Optics
Naval Base
San Diego, CA

U.S. NAVY ENLISTED CLASSIFICATION (NEC)
TRAINING

IT-2736 Information System Administration

IT-2306 Computer Based Training Technician

IT-2379 Transmission System Technician

IT-2318 Communication System Technician Control Operator

IT-2313 Communication System Manager

IT-2358 Super High Frequency/Satellite Communications System Operator

IT-2346 Low-Level Keying Teletype Repair

IT-2342 MOD 28 Teletype Repair

IT-9710 Electronic Equipment Repair

IT-2782 Defense Message System Administrator

ADDITIONAL TRAINING EXPERIENCE

Naval Aviation Logistics Database Administrator (NALCOMS)

Naval Global Positioning System Operator (GPS)

Communications Quality Monitoring System Operations

Common High Bandwidth Data Link (CHBDL) Terminal

Communication Data Link-Navy (CDL-N) Terminal

Video Integration Group (VIG) Terminal

Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS)

AN/VRC-99A/B Radio Subject Matter Expert (SME)

Rave Computer and Sun Microsystems Wideband Networking Waveform (WNW) Radio System

Naval Tactical Data System (NTDS)

UNIX Based Computer Operating System Administrator

Automated Digital Network System (ADNS)

Integrated Shipboard Network System (ISNS)

Advanced Narrowband Digital Voice Terminal (ANDVT)

Demand Assigned Multiple Access (DAMA) Global Command and Control System (GCCS)

Navy/Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI) Gig
(Global Information Grid)
COMSEC Security Operator
Naval Acquisition System
Navy Data Environment (NDE)

RESUME—REINKE, DAVID L.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: This is an interesting project you have undertaken. Perhaps it will put a human face on the statistics, perhaps it will even do some good. As a so-called "99'er" I must admit to a sense of desperation as the end approaches.

For the past 20+ years I have worked in the Event Staging industry providing audio/visual support to various clients and events. Unfortunately the economic downturn forced our company to lay off over 50% of the staff in an attempt to remain economically viable. I was one of those casualties.

By way of background I would note that I was commissioned as a Lieutenant of Armored Cavalry in the Regular Army of the United States and received an honorable discharge in 1980. While my service was brief and undistinguished, my father, on the other hand, retired from the US Army as a full Colonel after 30 years including service in World War Two and Vietnam. My mother, who was an AAU age group swimming coach for over 30 years, had ancestors who fought in the American Revolution. Her two brothers and brothers-in-law all served in World War Two (one in Europe and three in the Pacific).

My wife's family too has a long record of service to our Republic. Her father is a civilian veteran of the attack on Pearl Harbor, while her two uncles served in both Korea and Vietnam (one a Marine and the other an Army NCO) as did her brother who served in Vietnam with the US Army and then joined the Air Force which he served in for 20 years.

Today my wife, who holds an MFA in Theatre, teaches Drama, Reading and Speech as a volunteer at a local school, while I work as a substitute teacher when occasion calls.

We are not asking for any special favors, just an opportunity to go back to work full time.

My resume is attached.
Best of luck to you with this project.
Respectfully,

DLR.

David L. Reinke
2312 West Verdugo Avenue
Burbank, California 91506-2129
Voice: 818-726-4581
Email: dreinke0624@gmail.com
Monday, January 17, 2011

EDUCATION

Master of Arts, Asian Theatre. University of Hawai'i, Honolulu, Hawai'i.

Bachelor of Arts (Cum Laude), History, Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas.

SCHOOLS ATTENDED

Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, VA, History.

Trinity University, San Antonio, TX, History/Asian Studies.

Trinity Graduate School, San Antonio, TX, History.

Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, CA, Asian Studies.

University of Hawai'i, Honolulu, HI, Asian Theatre.

ACADEMIC HONORS

Four-Year Army ROTC Scholarship.
Dean's List (3 Years), Trinity University.

Academic Excellence Scholarship, Trinity University.

Distinguished Military Graduate (academics), Trinity University.

Claremont Graduate Fellowship, Claremont Graduate School.

Kabuki Hawai'i Scholarship, University of Hawai'i.

MILITARY SERVICE

Commissioned, Second Lieutenant of Armored Cavalry.

Served, as Support Platoon Leader and Assistant Battalion Supply Officer for the 1st Battalion, 72nd Armor, 2nd Infantry Division, Korea.

Awarded, Parachute Wings.
Honorable Discharge.

WORK EXPERIENCE

Feb 09-Jan 10, Freelance AV Project Manager/AV Tech.

Feb 07-Jan 09, Manager Project Development, Videocam Inc Anaheim, CA.

Apr 04-Aug 06, IC Controller Operational Support, AVSC Long Beach, CA.

Feb 03-Jan 04, Equipment Return, Video Equipment Rentals Inc. Glendale, CA.

Sep 02-Feb 03, Freelance AV Technician.

Mar 01-Jul 02, Director of Operations, Creative Technology Van Nuys, CA.

Nov 87-Mar 01, Director of Operations, AVHQ Carson, CA.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

1979 Delivered a series of lectures/demonstrations on Kabuki Theatre to elementary and secondary school students throughout the state of Hawai'i.

1979 Organized and presented a series of demonstrations on Kabuki Theatre to high school and university students in conjunction with the US tour of the Kabuki play 'Chushingura—The 47 Samurai.'

1980 Delivered a series of lectures/demonstrations on Kabuki Theatre to students and professional actors at the invitation of the South Carolina Arts Commission.

1981 Organized and presented a lecture/demonstration on Kabuki Theatre to secondary school teachers in Honolulu, Hawai'i.

2006 30-Day Substitute Teaching Credential granted by the CCTC—Current thru 2010.

2009 Delivered a lecture on the Roman Army to the Ancient Civilizations Class at the Johns Hopkins University Center for Talented Youth, Pasadena Campus.

2010 Substitute Teacher 3rd-8th Grade on an As Needed basis.

References and Other Supporting Documentation Upon Request

RESUME—ANDY LANG

Mr. Jackson, I am sending you my resume. I am a 24 year disabled Veteran retired. I served my country but it seems as though my country is not serving me! There is so much bickering and an unwillingness from the people we elected in Washington to help us. The price of gasoline keeps going up its over 3.15 a gallon where I live in North Carolina its hard to go look for a job. Something HAS to be done NOW to solve the problem not 5-10 years from now. Get rid of the tax on gasoline across the board. Even when they finally change over to another form of energy for automobiles how will the poor and middle class and older people be able to afford the change? I'm 55 now with no job, I fear soon I will be living on the street. Our elected officials in Washington say they care about us but in reality all they care about is themselves! You don't know how scared I am! Somedays I don't eat! We need to stop sending the millions of dollars to other countries! Americans NEED Help NOW!

TSGT ANDY LANG RET,
Sent from Yahoo! Mail
on Android.

Andy Lang
4797 Hwy 903 North
Snow Hill, NC 28580
(252) 292-3777
(252) 558-6961
Ablang@live.com

EDUCATION

Macon Area Vocational College—Macon, Ga., Business Education—January 1980-May 1982.

Middle Georgia Technical College—Warner Robins, Ga., Accounting, Associate Degree.

Rose State College—Midwest City, Ok., Music, Associate Degree.

EMPLOYMENT

Army Corps Of Engineers—Deck Hand
August 2009—January 2010

I performed a variety of work in the maintenance and repair of the deck and general housekeeping functions on dredges, towboats, barges or other floating plant vessels.

Midcoast Aviation—Aircraft Painter—July 2008—January 2009

I was a aircraft painter my many duties included taping, wrapping, washing of the airplane, wiping down the airplane with solvent, priming, applying the top coat with a HVLP gun.

Strom Aviation—Aircraft Painter—June 2008—July 2008

I stripped paint from Coast Guard C-130's by applying with high pressure hose. Let the stripper set for a while till paint blister then removed with high pressure washer till all paint was gone from airplane.

Areotek—Industrial Painter—April 2006—June-2008

I worked as a contractor as a Industrial Painter for Oklahoma Gas & Electric. I painted all of the states Power equipment. I also was responsible for the upkeep of the paint shop as well of the disposal of the hazardous paint booth filters, dirty floor paper, waste paint cans and the upkeep and everyday maintenance on my paint guns, sanders and other tools I used in the shop.

Adecco—Industrial Painter—November 2001—April 2006

I worked the same job site as the above! Oklahoma Gas & Electric just changed Temp services so I stayed in the same place but got paid by different people.

Tinker Air Force Base—August 1984—October 2001

I started out as a Corrosion control specialist. I painted Air Force F-4's and F-16 jets. Later the Air Force sent me to Sheet Metal School and I became a Aircraft Sheet Metal Mechanic.

Robins Air Force Base—April 1980—August 1984

I was a warehouseman. I issued tools, took daily and weekly inventories, built pallets to be shipped out daily. Drove a electric and gas powered fork lift. Was involved with daily shipping and receiving.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

I served in the United States Coast Guard—April 1975—April 1979.

I served in the United States Air Force Reserves—April 1980—Oct 2000.

Attended Air Force NCO Leadership Academy Air Force Aircraft Airframe Repair Warehouseman Training school.

RESUME—HARMONY J. LEONARD

Attached is my resume.
Yesterday I received yet another rejection letter. I could paper a wall with them.

I moved to Bradford PA to combine households with my partner after dating long distance for 5½ years. With our youngest children graduating we thought it time. Before moving here the only job I could find was managing a health food coop in Virginia. At \$10 an hour I supported my son and myself. Poverty level? Absolutely. My son joined the Navy for job security and because there was no money for college.

Since moving I have given up finding employment. I have discovered I have several strikes against me: Education; experience;

age; and I am a woman. While the first two can be addressed outwardly the last two I can not prove but I suspect.

Yesterday I had an interview with a local non-profit organization. Sitting with the director and two managers I was told, "We wanted to talk with you but we can't afford you." We talked for an hour and a half with me acting as a consultant. Should I send them a bill for my services?

My fear is that I will never work again; that I will age out before I find employment.

I feel betrayed by our society. I worked through college as a single parent in the hopes I could earn a better living for my children. I volunteered in my community. I did everything I could to be a vital part of my community and now that I have accumulated experience and education I seem to be invisible and of little use to society.

I was very disappointed during the recent State of the Union address that President Obama did not address the employed. There are over 30 million of us with no income, and in my case no unemployment. The vision of the speech seemed to skip over the current reality. At my age I probably will not see the future he predicts. What will happen to those of us who are caught between being productive citizens and retirement? We are the invisible people falling through the cracks.

My saving grace is that I am a veteran so I have medical care should I need it. And I am not starving because my partner is working in the natural gas industry. But what about me? What about my self esteem? What about the stigma attached to not working?

Thank you for all you are doing to bring the plight of the unemployed to light.

Sincerely,

MS. HARMONY LEONARD.

Harmony J. Leonard
549 W. Washington Street
Bradford, PA 16701
814.362.3348
lavendergrits@yahoo.com

EXPERIENCE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

ANNUAL GIVING

Planned and implemented the Annual Giving program soliciting alumni, parents and friends giving by direct mail and phone. (Catawba College and Mansfield University.)

Wrote and coordinated the production of segmented direct mail solicitations and outgoing correspondence to alumni, parents and friends. (Catawba College and Mansfield University.)

Hired, trained and supervised 10-25 student callers per semester for phonathon fundraising. (Catawba College and Mansfield University.)

Stewardship of donors through ongoing communication and relationship management. (Catawba College, Texas Woman's University and Mansfield University.)

Responsible for the stewardship of foundation and university endowment funds including ensuring timely distribution of funds as indicated by fund criteria, compiling yearly report and stewardship of donors. (Catawba College, Texas Woman's University and Mansfield University.)

GRANT FUNDING

Conducted the full range of activities required to prepare, submit and manage grant proposals to foundation and corporate sources. (Catawba College and Rowan Salisbury Schools.)

Wrote successful grant proposals to private and public funding sources. (Catawba College and Rowan Salisbury Schools.)

Performed research on foundations and corporations to evaluate prospects for grants. (Catawba College and Rowan Salisbury Schools.)

SPECIAL EVENTS

Co-founded and managed the Bath County Farmers' Market in rural Bath County, Vir-

ginia that grossed over \$18,000 in vendor sales the first year.

Planned, executed and evaluated a wide variety of special events. (Rowan Salisbury Schools, American Cancer Society, Mansfield University, Catawba College, American Heart Association.)

Planned and managed volunteer driven special events resulting in revenue of over \$125,000, an increase of 78%, in a 15 county rural area of Northeastern Oklahoma. (American Heart Association.)

VOLUNTEER MANAGEMENT

Recruited, trained and supervised adult and youth volunteers including board formation. (The Science Place, American Heart Association, and American Cancer Society.)

Designed and produced volunteer recruitment materials and newsletter. (The Science Place.)

Created and managed summer volunteer program for over 60 youth ages 10 to 18 from the Dallas area. (The Science Place.)

TRAINING/TEACHING

Substitute teacher. (Bath County Schools, Warm Springs, VA; Mercer County Public Schools, Mercer County, WV.)

Long-term substitute teacher fourth grade. (Tazewell Public Schools, Tazewell, VA.)

Increased Food I and II student achievement test scores by 20%. (Rowan Salisbury Schools.)

Presented professional development workshops for central office, administrative and school staff in the areas of grant writing and grant development. (Rowan Salisbury Schools.)

Co-presented three day Facilitative Leadership, Tapping the Power of Participation, training to school system employees, school board members, and parents throughout the state of North Carolina. (Rowan Salisbury Schools.)

CAREER HISTORY

General Manager. Healthy Foods Coop and Café. Lexington, VA, 2009-2010.

Substitute Teacher. Bath County Schools, Warm Springs, VA, 2007-2008. Tazewell County Schools, Tazewell, Virginia and Mercer County Schools, Princeton, West Virginia. 2006 to 2007.

Teacher, Foods I and II. West Rowan High School, Rowan Salisbury Schools, Salisbury, North Carolina. 2005-2006.

Income Development Specialist. American Cancer Society, Williamsport, Pennsylvania. 2004-2005.

Director of the Mansfield Fund. Mansfield University Foundation. 2003 to 2004.

Development Officer, Major Gifts and Charitable Gift Planning. Texas Woman's University, Denton, Texas. 2002 to 2003.

Grant Coordinator. Rowan-Salisbury Schools, Salisbury, North Carolina. 1999 to 2001.

Trainer. Facilitative Leadership: Tapping the Power of Participation, Interaction Associates, and North Carolina Network. 2000 to 2001.

Director of the Catawba Fund. Catawba College, Salisbury, North Carolina. 1997 to 1999.

Manager, Volunteer Department. The Science Place, Dallas, Texas. 1995-1996.

Regional Director. American Heart Association, Oklahoma Affiliate. 1993 to 1995.

EDUCATION

Degrees

Bachelor of Science, Family Life and Marketing, Texas Woman's University, Denton, Texas. May 1991. Graduated Magna Cum Laude.

Associate of Applied Science, Small Business Management, Tarrant County College, Fort Worth, Texas. August 1990.

Professional Certificates

YMCA Personal Trainer Certification, 2008.
Long Term Substitute Permit, Business Education, State of West Virginia, 2007-2010.
ServSafe Certification and Instructor Certification, National Restaurant Association, 2005.

Training and Development Certificate, University of North Carolina at Charlotte and American Society for Training and Development, Charlotte Area Chapter, 2001.

Facilitative Leadership Trainer Certification, Interaction Associates, North Carolina Network, 2000.

Volunteer Mediation Certification, Cabarrus County Mediation Center, Concord, North Carolina, 2000.

Professional Training

RESA-1 Substitute Teacher Training, West Virginia, 2006.

PG CALC Training Program, Standard and Advanced Planned Giving Manager Training Courses, 2002.

Seize the Opportunity, Major Gift Seminar, The Institute for Charitable Giving, 2002.

Grant Proposal Writing Workshop, The Grantsmanship Center, Charlotte NC, 1999.

Facilitative Leadership, Interaction Associates, 1999.

COMMUNITY SERVICE

Bath County Farmers Market, Millboro, VA, 2008 to 2010.

Rockbridge Grown, Lexington, VA, 2008.

Community Fitness Center, Millboro, VA, 2007-2010.

Moomaw Madness Triathlon, Warm Springs, VA, 2008.

Rowan Helping Ministries, Salisbury, NC, 2006.

Rowan County United Arts Council, Salisbury, NC, 2000-2001.

Leadership Rowan, Class of 2001, Salisbury, NC.

MILITARY SERVICE

U.S. Navy, Radioman, 1975 to 1979. Honor-able Discharge.

REFERENCES

Mrs. Donna Campagna
Bath County Farmers Market, Co-Founder
415 Mountain Creek RD
Millboro VA 24460
540.997.5452
donnac@bath.k12.va.us

Mr. John Green
Community Fitness Center Director and
Pastor

Calvary Baptist Church
Millboro VA 24460
540.997.5026
jmowryg@hotmail.com

Ms. Bonnie Johnson
Bath County Administrator
Bath County Courthouse
Warm Springs, VA 24445
540.839.7221
bathadmn@tds.net

GET DOWN TO THE BUSINESS OF PUTTING PEOPLE BACK TO WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a question for my friends on the other side of the aisle: When will we get down to the business of putting people back to work?

My constituents in the First District of Rhode Island sent me to here to do everything I can to get our economy

back on track, pave the way for sustained recovery, and get Rhode Islanders back to work. And that's why my colleagues and I in the Democratic minority are focused on job creation, economic development and debt reduction.

However, the first actions by the new Republican majority during their first month have not been consistent with these principles.

Unfortunately, my constituents, like Rhonda Taylor, for example, from North Providence, Rhode Island, whom I met with yesterday, do not have months and months to wait for my Republican colleagues to get their priorities straight. She's already been waiting and waiting. And that's because Rhonda lost her job in the information technology field due to outsourcing almost 3 years ago. And her unemployment compensation benefits were exhausted nearly a year ago.

Rhonda is a mother of three. She's liquidated her savings and sold all of her possessions, and now she's afraid she'll become homeless.

Rhonda proves why there is no time to spare. We need to focus on policies that create jobs today. The struggles of our unemployed friends and neighbors are heartbreaking and, unfortunately, all too common. People like Rhonda have no time to wait. The partisan games have to end.

Unfortunately, Rhonda's story is not unique. I've been hearing similar messages for the past year from men and women all across Rhode Island. But instead of working on policies that will help real Americans like Rhonda, my friends on the other side of the aisle are playing politics with the Federal budget and the national debt, a budget that even Republican economists say could lead to double-digit unemployment and reverse the economic growth that is starting to take hold.

Blind budget cuts my colleagues in the majority are pursuing won't help people like Rhonda but would, rather, do more to cut jobs than save or create them. What my friends fail to recognize is that partisan political games will not solve our Nation's unemployment crisis which plagues nearly 14 million of our friends and neighbors.

The fact of the matter is the challenges facing us as a Nation are not Democratic challenges or Republican challenges. They are our challenges, and they require American solutions.

□ 1020

The work is demanding, yes, and it will test the will of both parties to make difficult choices. But as a Congress, we need to both responsibly reduce the deficit, cut spending, but also make the smart investments that will create jobs now and guarantee the prosperity of our great Nation.

Our Nation must make the investments in education, innovation, infrastructure, science and research that are critical to rebuilding our economy and putting people back to work because we cannot compete in the short

term if we cannot innovate. And we cannot innovate in the long term if we fail to provide our children with access to a high-quality education. We cannot move goods and services throughout the economy if our infrastructure is crumbling. And America cannot make things again if we do not support the research, the entrepreneurs, the small businesses and manufacturers that transform ideas into new products.

People like Rhonda back home in Rhode Island, and hardworking people all across this Nation, have suffered for too long. We must have the courage to set the right priority, cut what doesn't work or isn't needed, live within our means, and make the right investments that ensure our ability to compete in the global economy today and into the future.

I call on my Republican colleagues to join me so we can focus on putting Americans back to work by developing commonsense solutions and focusing on jobs.

INGERSOLL-RAND OF MOCKSVILLE NAMED "BUSINESS OF THE YEAR"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to hear my colleagues start talking about the need for jobs. For the last 4 years, since they have been in control of the Congress, Republicans have been talking about that and how their job-killing policies have worked against the American people.

But, Mr. Speaker, today I want to speak about an outstanding industry in the Fifth District of North Carolina that has gone about creating jobs.

Businesses that create jobs and invest in their communities are our ticket to economic growth and recovery in today's economy. That's why it's impressive that Ingersoll-Rand's manufacturing facility in Mocksville, North Carolina, recently received the Davie County Chamber of Commerce's Business of the Year award.

The hardworking people at Ingersoll have brought about 200 jobs to Davie County in recent years, which, during these difficult economic times, is a tangible boost to the community. These are good jobs that are strengthening the local economy.

Ingersoll's major investment in Davie County is a tribute to the fact that the area's skilled workforce is composed of men and women who are dedicated to producing the best products in the world. The hundreds of workers at Ingersoll in Mocksville are the driving force behind this award, and I tip my hat to everyone at Ingersoll-Rand in Mocksville for this important recognition for their hard work and investment in Davie County, North Carolina.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, next week President Obama will send his budget to Congress, and news coming from the White House will not be good. But the rumors of a budget war from the Republican leadership promises to make a bad situation much, much worse.

From what we are hearing, all of us can expect the same Republican policies which took an over-\$5 trillion surplus that Democrats and President Clinton sacrificed to create and turned it into the dream-crushing deficit that we are faced with today.

They have made cutting spending sound like a good thing, but it is not when you look at where the cuts will come from. They will not come from the tax cuts for the wealthy and not from the wars we need to end, but they will come from programs that communities and families need now more than ever. This is Bush *deja vu* all over again. And every economist that I have read says that with this economy in such a fragile state, with the country only at the beginning of recovery, and with far too many of our fellow Americans hurting, this is not the time to cut spending.

It is not that I am against making prudent cuts to reduce the deficit, but the cuts I am hearing about so far will hurt those the President said should not be hurt: the most vulnerable, children, the poor, the majority of whom are racial and ethnic minorities, and our disabled and elderly.

We in the Congressional Black Caucus have placed ourselves in the breach on behalf of those who would otherwise remain nameless because no one is willing to name them. They are Native Americans, Alaskan Natives, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian and Pacific Island Americans, and the poor and rural Americans of every race and ethnicity.

As we do every year, we will develop a budget that treats all Americans fairly, does not leave anyone behind, but gives a helping hand to those who need it, and also reduces the deficit.

We agree with President Obama that his budget must put the country on a firm path to winning the future, and we know that winning the future means creating opportunity for everyone who lives in this country. But the CBC is further committed to making sure that everyone means everyone, to making sure that those who have been most hurt by this recession and those who have long been marginalized even in the good times have the special help they need to be a part of creating that future and benefiting from it.

I cannot believe that there could be one Member of Congress who does not support our country being number one, who does not want to win the future. But we can't win the future without ensuring that every child has access to a quality education and that those schools which have lagged behind because they lack resources and adequate

and well-trained staff are helped to meet the standards that are required to do that. And we cannot win the future if we turn back all of the newly gained benefits and savings in the Affordable Care Act. We will never win the future if we allow the Republicans to pass a budget that causes us to lose those provisions which enable minorities, rural residents, and the poor to achieve better health, to be more productive, and to have a better quality of life. These health equity provisions will begin to end the inequality and injustice in health care that Dr. King called shocking and inhumane.

And we cannot win the future if we don't do all that we can to make sure we address the mortgage crisis and help families keep the homes they need to raise their families in. We cannot win the future without jobs and more jobs. And I'm talking about good jobs.

So we know that there will have to be limits of spending, but we want to make sure that it starts at the most effective time and that the sacrifice is fairly spread, that those who have sacrificed over the last decade while corporations and the rich made off like bandits will not be the ones that continue to bear the brunt of the cuts and continue to suffer while Big Business and the wealthy continue to amass more wealth at their expense. That is an affront to the principles of fairness and equity that this country was founded on.

And so we want a realistic budget, not one that the Republicans are preparing that will cause us to lose more jobs, send more people into dire poverty, that will deny education and health care to those who need it most, that will continue the loss of homes, that will weaken programs like Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security which so many depend on, and one that will decrease the deficit and continue to drive this country into decline, continuing what the Republican policies over the last decade have done.

That is not what we want. That is not what the country needs. That is not the kind of budget that will win the future.

And so we in this Congressional Black Caucus are willing to roll up our sleeves, put on our thinking caps and work with our President and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to pass a different, a better budget, one that will create jobs, that will give people the tools to lift them and their families out of poverty and keep them in their homes, one that will create an educational system that will put all of our children first, and a health care system that ensures quality health care to all Americans, a budget that will provide the retirement security our seniors deserve and keep our country competitive and strong and number one in the world, a budget that will win the future. We know it can be done because we have shown how it can be done every year with the CBC budget.

Working together, I know we can create a budget worthy of this country,

one that lives up to our ideals, one based not on political ideology, but one that responds to the needs of our country and the needs of the people who are waiting and depending on us.

CBC BUDGETARY PRIORITIES

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to debate the budget, and as we have already begun to debate, it is a budget that in many instances and in many ways spells gloom and doom for people who have been expecting and looking for some opportunity to move our government and our country forward.

In order to really understand how we got to where we are, I think it is important for us to remember that President Clinton left President Bush with a 10-year projected surplus of \$5.6 trillion in 2001.

□ 1030

Whereas President Bush on January 20, 2009, left President Obama with a \$1.2 trillion deficit. And let's keep in mind that this was the deficit on day one of the Obama administration, weeks before the President enacted a single piece of legislation and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

The failed economic policies of the Bush administration led to this enormous deficit: the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts totaled \$1.3 trillion over 10 years, in which most of the tax relief went to the top 1 percent of income earners; a Medicare prescription drug benefit with a 10 year cost of nearly another \$1 trillion that was not offset; two overseas war that are near a cost of \$1 trillion; a \$700 billion bailout of Wall Street banks.

And all of these unpaid-for policies were compounded by the worst economic recession in 70 years that began in 2007, which led to huge shortfalls in Federal tax revenue and increased reliance on unemployment insurance and other Federal social safety net programs.

In order to get these huge deficits under control, we have some tough decisions to make. We have some very serious and some difficult decisions as we attempt to balance the budget and as we attempt to continue to promote and project economic recovery.

I have always been told that you can measure the greatness of a society by how well it looks after its young, how well it looks after its old, and how well it looks after those who cannot look after themselves effectively. So as we begin to talk about cuts, where I come from, I have been told that if all that you do is cut, cut, cut, all that you are going to get is blood, blood, blood; and, of course, the blood of the people will be on the hands of those who have the knives.

So as we cut, let's look seriously at the Community Services Administra-

tion, the one little program, one little agency, one little area that still provides resources to fund programs like those established during the OEO War on Poverty days, when we took a good look at poverty and what was causing it.

As we begin to cut, let's understand that health is essential for wealth, so let's make sure that we don't tamper with what I consider to be one of the most effective ways of providing primary health care to large numbers of poor people in this country, the community health centers, that provide primary care to more than 20 million low-income Americans without regard in many instances to their ability to pay.

And let's understand that our prison system has become the largest in the world. More than 2 million people are incarcerated, so let's not cut or decimate the little justice programs that we are funding to help these individuals try and successfully reintegrate back into society.

So, I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I urge that when we cut, let's make good cuts, and not those that cut the poor.

How much longer can we afford to extend the Bush-era tax cuts? The President and Congress extended all of them through 2012 at a two year cost of \$800 billion. A ten year extension of all these tax cuts will cost \$3.8 trillion—\$3 trillion of which are the popular middle-class tax cuts.

Earlier this week, the Congressional Budget Office released its latest projections of the Social Security Trust Fund. It was previously projected to go into a cash deficit in 2017, but now CBO has projected that the trust fund is now running a deficit. The trust is expected to be exhausted in 2037.

We can no longer operate under the assumption of the last decade, that we can increase spending and reduce taxes without having to pay for it.

The last Congress took important steps to restore some important tools that were used to produce the first budget surplus in more than a generation in the late 1990s, such as Statutory Pay-As-You-Go—meaning if Congress wants to increase mandatory spending, we have to offset it by reducing spending elsewhere in the budget or increase taxes to cover the increase.

Unfortunately, the new Republican Majority has changed House rules gutting PAY-GO's effectiveness in the Congressional budget process. The so-called CUT-GO rule prohibits offsetting any new mandatory spending with a revenue increase. This makes it nearly impossible to offset any new spending or tax cuts with revenue increases and will require only spending cuts.

In another unprecedented change, the House last week voted to give the House Budget Committee Chairman the sole responsibility for setting discretionary spending levels for the remainder of Fiscal Year 2011. The House of Representatives as a whole will be deprived of the right to vote up or down the Budget Chairman's levels.

We have to remember that what we do with Federal budget touches everyone. Our fiscal problems are very complex and they need to be addressed, but there is no simple, one-size-fits-all solution.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 34 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Cardinal Donald Wuerl, Archdiocese of Washington, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Let us take ourselves in the presence of God.

Good and gracious God, You call us to make our way through this life with You and challenge us to walk arm-in-arm with each other. As we confront the human condition, You bless us with intellect and free will to establish institutions to guide our human affairs, to confirm the possibility of freedom, personal development, and prosperity for the common good.

We ask You to bless and strengthen all who strive to improve the human condition and foster a caring respect for each person. In Your goodness, bless the Members of our Nation's House of Representatives. May all their deliberations and discussions be inspired by the wisdom and vision of Your kindness. And may the work conducted here today bear rich fruit that nurtures all of the citizens of this Nation and our dreams for a better world.

All of this we ask in Your Most Holy Name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania 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.

WELCOMING CARDINAL DONALD WUERL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to welcome His Eminence Cardinal Donald Wuerl, Archbishop of Washington, D.C., and to thank him for offering the opening prayer as we begin our work today.

Like many of his parishioners, I know Cardinal Wuerl to be a man of generous spirit and immense gifts, a true leader of the faithful. When he was elevated to the College of Cardinals last fall by Pope Benedict, it was a proud and humbling moment for all of us. His elevation came nearly a quarter of a century after being ordained a bishop by His Holiness John Paul II. Cardinal Wuerl went on to serve as Bishop of Pittsburgh, where he was born and raised, until his appointment here in Washington, D.C.

Around the world, Cardinal Wuerl is respected and admired for his efforts on behalf of Catholic education. He currently serves as chancellor of the Catholic University of America and is a champion of the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, which helps disadvantaged students gain access to quality education.

Again, on behalf of my colleagues, it is an honor to welcome Cardinal Wuerl to the People's House.

WELCOMING CARDINAL DONALD WUERL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a Member who represents the area of Pittsburgh that is also part of the Pittsburgh diocese, I would also like to welcome Cardinal Wuerl to the House of Representatives. He is a great leader in the faith community and a friend, and certainly a friend to everybody in the Nation now as well as those in the Pittsburgh region.

He began his career as an assistant pastor at Saint Rosalia Parish in Pittsburgh. There he became secretary to Pittsburgh Bishop John Wright. Then at Saint Paul's Seminary in Pittsburgh, he worked as a rector. In 1988, Bishop Wuerl was installed as the 11th Bishop of Pittsburgh, where he led 18 years. He led 800,000 Roman Catholics in 214 parishes throughout southwestern Pennsylvania.

I should say we also knew him from his television series called "The Teaching of Christ," which was distributed throughout the Christian Associates cable channel, and his best-selling catechism of the same name, which is now I believe in its 30th year of publication, translated into over 10 languages.

I echo the comments made by our Speaker in terms of the Cardinal's leadership and the esteem we all hold him in. We are most grateful that he came here today and led us in prayer.

COMMUNICATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, OFFICE OF THE PARLIAMENTARIAN,
Washington, DC, February 10, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Attached is a facsimile of a letter of resignation submitted by Rep. Christopher J. Lee to the pertinent Executive authority in the State of New York. It was received in the Capitol last evening. The facsimile previously laid before the House was addressed to the Governor rather than to the Secretary of State. This document will round out the papers of the House on this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN V. SULLIVAN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 9, 2011.

Hon. RUTH NOEMI COLON,
Acting Secretary of State, State of New York,
Albany, NY.

DEAR SECRETARY OF STATE COLON: I hereby submit my resignation as United States Representative of the 26th District of New York, effective 5:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, Wednesday, February 9, 2011. Attached is the letter I submitted to Governor Andrew Cuomo.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER J. LEE,
Member of Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

NEED TO WORK ON CREATING JOBS

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to roll up its sleeves and begin to work together. Democrats and Republicans must come together to create new jobs for the American people, strengthen our recovery, and reduce the debt.

Yet instead of finding some common ground solution, Republicans have put forward an agenda that only serves to divide the American people. Yes, we must lower the deficit and national debt, but it is wrong to balance the budget on the backs of honorable Americans with dangerous cuts that may lead to double-digit unemployment.

In my district in California in the Inland Empire, our unemployment rate is nearly 14 percent. My constituents can't afford to have Congress play politics with the budget and the national debt. They need jobs. They need to make sure that they are putting food on the table and paying their mortgage, not another government shutdown.

I urge all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to focus on the big picture and get to work on creating jobs. Let's build our future.

JUST ANOTHER DAY ON THE TEXAS BORDER, PART II

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, American missionaries Nancy and Sam Davis ran a charity in poor villages in Mexico. Recently, Nancy and Sam were driving home to Texas from Mexico when they were ambushed near the border by a roadblock of masked gunmen who opened fire on them. Nancy was shot in the back of the head. Sam bravely raced against oncoming traffic to the border while Nancy sat in the passenger seat bleeding to death. Nancy did not survive and died in McAllen, Texas.

The Mexican government has already said they will not investigate this homicide, and the American government must hold Mexico accountable. The narcoterrorists continue to murder Americans in lawless Mexico, and they will continue their terror on our side of the border if they are not stopped. They are international bandits. Meanwhile, our Federal Government continues to whistle by the graveyard of victims while the people in the border towns live in constant fear and danger. But it is just another day on the Texas border.

And that's just the way it is.

JOB CREATION, ECONOMIC RECOVERY, AND DEBT REDUCTION

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, as I listen to the debate in this House, we need to put politics aside and pursue policies that move America forward. I encourage my Republican colleagues to focus on legislation that creates jobs, economic recovery, and debt reduction.

While cutting spending is an important aspect of reducing the deficit, we must ensure that it is done in a way that will not threaten jobs, economic growth, and the security of our middle class. I am particularly troubled by recent proposals that would slash long-term investment in transportation, clean energy, innovation, and education. Spending cuts in these areas are unwise for our economic future, especially when it comes at the expense of the American workers. We need to continue to foster investment in these fields in order to expand private sector growth and put America back to work.

The situation in this country is such that every bill that comes before this House must be measured by whether it creates jobs, strengthens the middle class, and reduces the deficit. It is imperative that we come together to meet these goals in order to lay the

foundation for future prosperity in this country.

□ 1210

FEDERAL RESERVE CHAIR BERNANKE: BIG DEFICITS COULD HURT THE ECONOMY

(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, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke of Dillon, South Carolina, is the latest leading economist to admit that out-of-control deficits could hurt our national economy. Last week, Mr. Bernanke warned, "Sustained high rates of government borrowing would both drain funds away from private investment and increase our debt to foreigners." This borrowing would lead to higher lending costs for small businesses and consumers. This threatens small businesses across America trying to create jobs.

At the same time, House Republicans are proposing billions in spending cuts. House Budget Chairman PAUL RYAN called this is a "down-payment" in attacking Washington's spending spree. This is just the beginning. As Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has stated, "There's no limit to the amount of spending we're willing to cut." Republicans made a pledge to America, and we're now making good on it.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

HOCKEY IS FOR EVERYONE MONTH

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I come from Chicago, home of the world champion Chicago Blackhawks, and I rise today in support of the National Hockey League's designation of the month of February as "Hockey is for Everyone Month."

"Hockey is for Everyone" is a nationwide initiative that works to break racial and economic barriers that prevent children from playing ice hockey. It reaches more than 300,000 underprivileged boys and girls annually across North America and includes programs for veterans and the disabled. I believe that no matter your background, every child should have the opportunity to play the greatest sport in the world. Increased access to healthy exercise will aid in the fight against childhood obesity and continue to decrease high school dropout rates.

On behalf of kids all over the continent, I thank the National Hockey League and "Hockey is for Everyone" for putting more hockey sticks in more hands—and more pucks on those sticks.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Here we are, it's mid-February. The Republicans took control. They won the election in November on an agenda of trying to create jobs for the American people. Two months into after being sworn in, here we are now—still haven't created a job. We haven't put a single bill on the floor of the House of Representatives to create jobs for the American people. With over 9 percent unemployment—among African Americans, 16 percent unemployment—communities across this country hemorrhaging, corporations in this country sitting on \$2 trillion in cash—and still no jobs.

So what are the Republicans doing instead? Here's what they're trying to do. They're trying to further restrict a woman's right to choose—not creating jobs, but want to get in the middle of your doctor's office to restrict your right to choose. Hours and hours of debate to direct committees to oversee regulations. Well, that's our job, to oversee the regulatory process. We don't need hours of debate to give us permission to oversee the regulatory process. Still no jobs.

What else are the Republicans doing? They're reviewing, reviewing. Well, that's safe. What do we have to review? Our job, of course, is to review. But our job is to create jobs for the American people. That's what they expected out of the election. That's what we need to deliver them.

TITLE X FAMILY PLANNING FUNDING

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

Ms. CHU. So far the Republican majority hasn't created a single job. In fact, they haven't even put a jobs bill on the House floor. Instead, they are focusing on partisan priorities that just don't help the country come out of this recession. Instead of putting people back to work, they are restricting women's reproductive rights.

Next week they will gut Title X funding for family planning. This Federal money is a critical health care safety net for women around the country. It has helped improve the quality of women's health, given women free choice, and also saved lives. Title X helps low-income women afford Pap smears and STD testing. It helps reduce unintended births and abortions. And who doesn't want to do that?

It's month 1; and instead of working on the economy, they are working to limit women's personal choices. Instead of doing the bidding of ideological extremists, let's join together and address the real needs of the American people—jobs.

BEADING TO BEAT AUTISM

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, it takes real heroes and real leaders to believe in the possibility of what we can do through hard work, perseverance, and commitment to make the world a better place. I'm proud to say that my hometown of Louisville has many of these leaders, and this week, one of them, 13-year-old Michala Riggle, was recognized nationally with the Gloria Barron Prize for Young Heroes. It's a well-deserved recognition, and I rise to applaud Michala's work with Beading to Beat Autism, which has been nothing but miraculous.

Three years ago, after learning that an underfunded treatment program could help thousands of kids in Louisville with autism, like her brother Evan, Michala stepped up. She planned to enlist her friends and family to raise \$200,000 by making beaded bracelets and selling them for \$3 each. People told her it was impossible, but she said, It's just like a ball game. If you don't believe you can win, it's game over before you start. You gotta believe. And after 6 months, Michala had reached her goal. To date, she's raised \$350,000 to help children with autism. Now, through BeadingtoBeatAutism.org, she hopes to raise \$300 million to finance an autism research center in Louisville. And I don't doubt that she can accomplish that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the House to join me to salute her. I'm proud to wear her bracelets and proud that she's a resident of the Third District of Kentucky.

Congratulations, Michala.

JOBS CRISIS ON OUR HANDS

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

Mr. DEUTCH. In a time of great economic strife, Americans deserve more from their leaders than recycled attacks on their constitutional rights. Let's not deny women access to birth control and wellness care provided by Planned Parenthood, or the Presidential Women's Center in my district, or the many other providers instrumental in reducing unwanted pregnancies in America. Let's not levy special taxes on women who have never had an abortion, but pay for a private health plan that covers these procedures. Let's not subject any citizen to government intrusion in the doctor's office because of their gender.

The retired women in my district who were on the front lines of the fight for equality in reproductive rights know what path these policies will lead us down. Let's not create a crisis in America—a crisis of public health, of back-alley abortions and accidental sterilization, of less education and more sexually transmitted diseases, of

fewer routine screenings and more cervical cancer.

We already have a crisis on our hands in this country—a jobs crisis—and in November, Americans voted this Congress to address it.

TURN TO THE FUTURE OF OUR CHILDREN

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with my colleagues for one reason—to talk about jobs. My constituents are hurting. They need help. They want to work. I've been here for almost 2 months, and I'm still waiting to hear a Republican plan for jobs. So far this week, the only things I've voted on are our renaming of a courthouse and taking back money that we have already given to the United Nations. When are we going to talk about jobs? I came to Washington to focus on jobs. My constituents sent me to Washington to focus on jobs.

All across the Nation, the high school class of 2011 is getting ready to graduate. Some will go on to higher education, and some will enter the workforce. What type of world are they entering? What type of jobs will await them? I propose that we invest in the class of 2011. Instead of political games and bills that cut jobs, I propose that we invest in education, innovation, and infrastructure. Please, I urge all of my colleagues to turn toward the future of our children—turn toward creating jobs for them.

DON'T IGNORE THE MIDDLE CLASS

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

Mr. TONKO. I rise today on behalf of the regular, everyday American families and those who work for a living. Just yesterday, my friends on the other side of the aisle released their job-killing spending policies. Make no mistake about it, these policies will deeply hurt the middle class and will not help grow jobs.

Let's look at these statistics: 83 percent of all United States stocks are in the hands of 1 percent of the American public; the bottom 50 percent of income earners in the United States now collectively own less than 3 percent of our Nation's wealth. I encourage my Republican colleagues in this House to stop in their efforts to take money away from those who use it to stay warm in the winter and cool in the summer, to stop in their efforts to take away money from those who keep our air safe and our water clean, and to stop in their efforts to take investments away from technology and jobs of the future.

Mr. Speaker, the middle class has been ignored for far too long. As the backbone of our country, it is time

they get their fair share. I stand for empowering our middle class, not reducing jobs in America.

□ 1220

ADVICE TO THE MAJORITY: KEEP YOUR PROMISES

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give some advice to the Members of the majority party. My grandmama used to tell me, "Son, keep your promises."

As we all know, the majority promised to be focused on job creation; but the 11 bills that have passed this body thus far, in 2 months, have failed to create a single job.

Watch out for these budget cuts that these Republicans are proposing also. I'm going to tell you, if you are a firefighter or a police officer or a teacher, you are out of luck. This recovery needs to work for the working people of this Nation, not just for the Wall Street bankers.

Today, we should be voting for investing and making products in America, not on toothless resolutions. If we continue on this path much longer, the American people will see for themselves that they've been lied to.

To the majority party, you need to keep your promises and stop shrinking the middle class. You need to be about job creation like you promised. Don't turn America into a pink slip Nation.

WHERE'S THE BEEF?

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, about 15 years ago, there was a commercial that is really applicable to today. It was about a woman who looked through hamburger buns and asked, "Where's the beef?" The American people are asking us, Where's the jobs?

We managed to survive and avoid the Great Depression of this century. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, what we need to do to continue with our recovery is to build public confidence. The only way we are going to build that public confidence is for people to feel that we are looking at what is so essential to their futures, so essential to the building of their confidence back in themselves and in government, and that is the creation of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all Members of this Congress must look to that. We must get down and address jobs. That is what we are here to do. That is what we need to do, or we will have failed the people who have sent us here.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Can any Member rise, Mr. Speaker, and move to suspend the rules and pass H. Res. 72 prior to the rule being called up?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is within the Chair's discretionary power of recognition. In addition, today is not a suspension day.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. If a resolution can pass with unanimous support, is there any provision in the House rules that would allow the House to bypass 9½ hours of debate proposed in House Resolution 73, agree to House Resolution 72, and begin to consider other legislation dealing with job creation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot respond to hypothetical questions.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Is there any provision in H. Res. 72 that will create jobs?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Is it in order to ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. Res. 72, ask for its immediate consideration, and for it to be adopted?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is constrained not to entertain such a request.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. Res. 72 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House, so that we can move on creating jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the announced policy of previous Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain that request.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. Res. 72 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House, so that we can move on creating jobs.

Isn't the appropriate response, Is there objection?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the announced policy of recognition for such unanimous-consent requests, that request is not entertained.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 72, DIRECTING COMMITTEES TO REVIEW REGULATIONS FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 73 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 73

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 72) directing certain standing committees to inventory and review existing, pending, and proposed regulations and orders from agencies of the Federal Government, particularly with respect to their effect on jobs and economic growth. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Rules now printed in the resolution shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as amended, to final adoption without intervening motion except: (1) nine hours and 30 minutes of debate, with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their respective designees, eight hours equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Oversight and Government Reform, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means, and one hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Small Business; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. House Resolution 73 provides for a closed rule for consideration of H. Res. 72. It provides 9½ hours of debate, divided by the committees outlined in H. Res. 72, and provides the minority a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. This legislation is simple, direct, and easy to understand. The text of the three-page bill was posted last week on the Rules Committee Web site. This legislation is an attempt and an effort to provide more transparency and ac-

countability in the government regulatory process, something that my colleagues and I have called for numerous times over the last two Congresses.

The legislation before us today calls for 10 House committees to review existing, pending, and proposed regulations and orders from agencies of the Federal Government, particularly with respect to their effects on destroying jobs and economic growth.

With the current high unemployment rate, it is essential we do everything reasonably possible that we can to look at and to reduce government rules and regulations that impede job creation and economic growth, that discourage innovation, hurt or harm global competitiveness, limit credit, create economic uncertainty, impose unnecessary paperwork and cost on small businesses, and that result in large-scale and often unnecessary unfunded mandates on employers.

That is exactly what this legislation would do, and we are on the floor today to talk about this as an important component of allowing America to get back to work and to highlight these rules and regulations that stifle not only investment but also job creation.

Every single Member of Congress understands and believes that regulations are needed to provide the rules, safety, and structures for this society to function properly. While regulations are important, they can also cross that fine line and can become too burdensome. It is essential to strike a balance to ensure that the imposed rules and regulations do not lead to higher costs and less productive societies.

□ 1230

The Federal Government creates an average of 4,000 final regulations each year with about 500 to 700 that are reviewed by the White House.

According to a recent report from the Small Business Administration, the total cost of Federal regulations has increased to \$1.75 trillion a year from the U.S. economy; \$1.75 trillion is what this burden is on the free enterprise system. Additionally, the study shows that regulatory and paperwork costs were found to be more onerous for smaller firms than their larger counterparts. More specifically, the costs of regulations per employee for firms with fewer than 20 employees is now \$10,585, a 36 percent difference between the costs incurred per employee by a larger firm.

This is absolutely outrageous. This is outrageous because small business is the backbone and the engine of our economy. It represents 99.7 percent of all employers. Small businesses, according to the Small Business Administration, have generated 64 percent of net new jobs over the past 15 years while employing over half of all private sector employees. One of the fastest ways to put Americans back to work, Republicans believe, is to limit the regulatory expenses that these small firms have to comply with simply to satisfy Federal Government regulations.

Regulatory burdens are hindering job growth. Regulatory burdens are hindering investment and innovation while eroding some of the most basic and fundamental freedoms in America. Congress and this administration must work together to do more than prevent harmful new regulations. They must also review, study, and eliminate unnecessary rules that are already on the books.

On January 18 of last month, President Obama signed an Executive order to provide a government-wide review of the rules already on the books to remove outdated regulations. In an op-ed placed in the *Wall Street Journal* last month by the President, he clearly states that “sometimes, those rules have gotten out of balance, placing unreasonable burdens on business, burdens that have stifled innovation and have had a chilling effect upon growth and jobs.” Mr. Speaker, I applaud and I appreciate the President for recognizing this, and I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to understand what we are attempting to do today, and that is to support as best as we can not only the ideals that the President talked about but also a focus on these rules and regulations that stifle innovativeness, create costs, and ruin jobs in America.

Mr. Speaker, while the President is now taking a step in the right direction when it comes to regulation, in the last fiscal year alone the Obama administration unleashed 43 major new regulations that will cost America more than, new, \$28 billion annually. These costs will affect Americans in many ways, from raising the price of cars, where we buy food, where we eat, and every single one of these stands in the way of making the free enterprise more efficient and somehow does not help in creation of jobs.

The President will have to take a step back from some of the major bills that he signed last year, and I believe he can do that by employing the ideas that he had in this op-ed. He can do something about it, and that is join Republicans who today are attempting to work with the President. If the President is serious about reducing regulatory burdens impacting every American, we can do this job together. Fifteen of the 42 regulations proposed last year were from the Frank-Dodd financial regulatory bill. Another five stemmed from the ObamaCare bill, and 10 others come from the Environmental Protection Agency, or what is known as the EPA, including the first mandatory reporting of greenhouse gas emissions.

The annual compliance costs constitute only a part of the economic burden of regulations on business. Many of these new rules curtail the purchase of new equipment, conversions of industrial practices, and are about revising data collection and reporting procedures. One example is the new restriction on short sales from the Frank-Dodd bill that requires the Se-

curities and Exchange Commission to make modifications to computer systems and surveillance mechanisms for gathering and managing this information that will cost over \$1 billion. Mr. Speaker, that defies balance and I think ultimate accountability of what the regulations should be about.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity today to direct our committees to take the first step in reining in Big Government, reducing our deficit, and encouraging job growth and economic prosperity. This simple bill is three pages long, and it shines the light on the regulatory process and provides the necessary transparency and accountability on Federal agencies that has been lacking for years.

My Republican colleagues and I remain committed to putting America back to work through creation of new jobs. This legislation is a way to be a part of that good start. I encourage all my colleagues to vote “yes” on the rule and “yes” on the underlying resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 73, the rule providing for consideration of H. Res. 72, which directs certain standing committees to inventory and review existing, pending, and proposed regulations and orders from agencies of the Federal Government, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The resolution isn't objectionable in and of itself. We all agree that regulations that do more harm than good should be eliminated. The President has said that, Democrats have said that, and Republicans have said that. And the rules of the House already require committees to carry out this sort of oversight. So I question, Mr. Speaker, why my friends on the other side of the aisle insist on spending 9½ hours debating a resolution that is entirely redundant. We're committing the same offense that Republicans claimed to abhor about government: wasting time, effort, and taxpayer dollars.

Devoting 9½ hours to this exercise is squandering yet another opportunity. We could be using this time to pass legislation that will create and retain jobs right here in this country instead of telling the committees of jurisdiction to continue to do what they are already mandated to do. What's next, Mr. Speaker? Nine-and-a-half hours of debate instructing the House to close for Thanksgiving or Christmas?

Republicans marched into the majority over a month ago vowing a laser-like focus on job creation, and they've done nothing towards that end since. Today's debate is yet another reminder that Republicans care more about their lockstep, anti-government ideology than they do about getting down to the business of improving the lives of hard-working Americans.

Democrats did offer to improve today's rule by adding language instructing the committees to make job creation legislation their highest priority

and for such legislation to be considered under an open amendment process. In other words, Mr. Speaker, Democrats made the effort to work in agreement with Republicans on this matter and to ensure that this body emphasizes legislation to create jobs and improve the American economy, but the Republicans said “no.” They said “no” to working with Democrats. They said “no” to prioritizing job creation. They said “no” to fulfilling their promise for an open and transparent legislative process.

My friend from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) declared at the end of last year that, and I quote him, “Open rules will make a triumphant return to the House floor,” unquote, and that all Members, and I quote him again, “will have a chance to fully contribute in this legislative process.”

□ 1240

The House has been under Republican control for 5 weeks. In that time, we have voted on 11 bills. None of those bills went through their respective committees and none of those bills had actual open rules. One had a modified open rule. That's not very triumphant in my opinion, Mr. Speaker.

It is already the second month of this Congress and Republicans are still dodging a real debate on real legislation that will create real jobs and improve the American economy. And Republicans are still refusing to address exactly what these cuts will mean to the lives of the American people. Which regulations do Republicans propose to get rid of? The ones for clean drinking water? The ones preventing financial abuse on Wall Street? I was here, Mr. Speaker, along with my friend on the other side of the aisle when Republicans assumed control and that we did not provide the necessary regulation at the Securities and Exchange Commission. I for one thought when a friend of ours who served with us went to be the chair of the Securities and Exchange Commission that finally we would get some regulations there. We did not get regulations. What we got—and there's no secret about this, no finger to point at anybody—the simple fact of the matter is by not having adequate regulation of Wall Street, this country came to the brink of disaster in November of '08. Do they want to get rid of the ones that protect against massive oil spills and mine collapses?

So far this year, Republicans have moved to repeal health care, they've moved to restrict a woman's right to choose, and they've moved drastically to cut spending for a huge range of essential government services that ensure public safety, economic opportunity and national security. It seems the Republicans want to use their majority to settle old scores. But I don't think that's what the American people have in mind as a national priority.

Republicans seem to think that if we spend 9½ hours debating a resolution

that simply remarks on what House committees are already doing, they will suffice to convince the American people that Republicans have a plan for improving the economy.

It is clear that this resolution is really about demonizing Federal regulations. But the Republicans ignore the benefits of regulations, the importance of protecting existing jobs, and the necessity of leveling the playing field to ensure economic growth and prosperity for all Americans. If our constituents had the choice of whether to spend this time practicing our rhetorical skills or actually passing meaningful legislation that creates more jobs, I believe they would vote for jobs. Let's get back to what the American people need from us, and that is to improve the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of my friend the gentleman from Florida. I would like to state that the bills we have done in the Rules Committee during these 12 bills have been about original jurisdiction by the Rules Committee, which is what this bill is. This bill is a jurisdictional issue where the Rules Committee, through the legislation that my name sits on as the chief sponsor, is directing other committees to have hearings, to be part of an open process, to do the things that will be necessary not only for minority participation but any Member who chooses in these committees to come and have their voices heard, for hearings to be held, for thoughtful people across this country to come and provide us information about the way they see the regulatory burdens that are being placed upon them. If someone thinks that what we are doing today is all about trying to stifle regular order, it's completely the opposite. Nine-and-a-half hours of debate, which is unheard of for a three-page bill, is all about regular order and is exactly what I've been arguing for for years. That's what the Republicans are delivering today on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Notwithstanding that the gentleman brought up some good ideas about job creation, I would like to just put it into some bit of context. Today what we are trying to do is to gather steam behind rules and regulations that stifle the ability for the free enterprise system to employ people. But in the larger scheme of things, our friends on the other side are upset because what we as Republicans are going to do is to find a way to live up to our campaign promises to cut spending during the year by \$100 billion.

Now some people say, oh, that's not enough amount, or it's too big of an amount because it will mean all these draconian cuts across the government. Well, I would remind this House that \$100 billion is a small part of the \$3,000

billion spending plan that the Congress has already given to government—\$3,000 billion—and what we are talking about not just today and not just over the past few weeks but taking \$100 billion and trying to take that as a burden off the American people. The reason why is because 30 percent of all government spending today or more ends up as debt, meaning that we have to borrow it from somebody else.

"But this is so important, we've got to make sure we do it." Well, Republicans disagree. We think not only a review of regulatory process but a review of spending is important in Washington. Mr. Speaker, I refer to what might be a sheet of paper that was in print described as Obama Announces Review of Government Regulations. Within this paper, there is a paragraph, a short paragraph that I would like to read which perhaps embodies exactly why we are here today:

"Business leaders say government regulations, including those being written for health care overall and financial reform, have hurt job creation at a time of high unemployment."

In fact, the Department of Treasury describes where we are as chronic unemployment for today and our immediate past for as far as the eye can see. Last year at some point even the longest projection by this government showed no net new job creation. That is what Republicans have inherited. We intend to be serious about what we're doing, and we intend to make sure that the American people see this for what it is, and that is an opportunity by Congress to work on the issues that they're demanding.

[From FoxBusiness.com, Jan. 18, 2011]

OBAMA ANNOUNCES REVIEW OF GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS

President Barack Obama said on Tuesday he would order a government-wide review of regulations with the goal of eliminating those that hurt job creation and make the U.S. economy less competitive.

In an op-ed piece in *The Wall Street Journal*, Obama said some government regulations have placed "unreasonable burdens on business—burdens that have stifled innovation and have had a chilling effect on growth and jobs."

He said he would require that in the future government agencies "ensure that regulations protect our safety, health and environment while promoting economic growth."

The president has recently ratcheted up efforts to soothe relations with the business community, after alienating corporate America through rhetorical attacks against Wall Street and an agenda heavy on regulation.

Business leaders say government regulations, including those being written for the healthcare overall and financial reform, have hurt job creation at a time of high unemployment.

"It's a review that will help bring order to regulations that have become a patchwork of overlapping rules, the result of tinkering by administrations and legislators of both parties and the influence of special interests in Washington over decades," Obama wrote.

Noting that small businesses create most new jobs in the economy, he said he would direct the government to make a greater effort to reduce the burden regulations place on them.

While vowing to eliminate rules that are "not worth the cost, or that are just plain dumb," the president said his administration wouldn't shy away from writing new rules to address obvious gaps in government oversight.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we need more jobs and less speeches. And what we will get from this bill on the floor is more speeches and no jobs.

It is very disappointing in the current economic context that what we bring to the floor for 9½ hours is a bill that simply instructs the committees to do what we've already instructed them to do. This is already in the rules, it's already required, we all agree on it. What are we doing here wasting 9½ hours? If we just produced a thousand jobs an hour, we could have produced 9,500 jobs. Instead, we're going to produce 95 speeches. That's not what we need.

If you want to look for waste in government, take a look at this bill: 9½ hours down the tube doing something we're already doing. We had a hearing yesterday in the Commerce Committee. We're already talking about these regulations.

But let me give a warning to people about what happens when the Republican Party wants to look at regulations. You know the first thing they did, they're trying to repeal the Clean Air Act. They're trying to gut the Clean Air Act which is the guardian angel for the air that our kids breathe.

□ 1250

You know, they have introduced a bill, and we had a hearing yesterday. The first hearing we had was to pass their dirty air act. They have a dirty air act that would gut the ability—that would eliminate in total the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to regulate harmful gases, carbon dioxide, ozone, and a host of other dangerous chemicals.

Now, can you believe that? Their dirty air act will eliminate the ability of the EPA to do things to try to prevent our kids from having aggravated asthma attacks. Their dirty air act would eliminate the ability of the EPA to deal with dangerous gases that exacerbate the respiratory problems of our senior citizens.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. INSLEE. If you think I'm just blowing smoke here, go take a look at their bill. Their bill doesn't try to fix the regulation. It absolutely eliminates in total the ability of the EPA. The EPA was started under a good Republican, Richard Nixon, and it is a sad story that the first bill out of the box

they want to go backwards on clean air.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am joined by the chairman of the Rules Committee, and I will tell you that he is so pleased that we have not only this bill that has been brought to the floor, but he is so pleased that we are taking the time to speak about the facts of the case. And one fact is that the first bill that we took up was the bill to repeal ObamaCare. It had nothing to do with the Clean Air Act. It had everything to do with a bill which has caused an amazing number of regulations.

And I would like to quote, if I can, a fact that, since the passage in March 2010, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which is known as ObamaCare, has added 6,123 pages of regulations, and the Federal Register has printed those just over the last 9 months. Secondly, according to a September 2010 report from the Small Business Administration, total regulatory costs amount to \$1.75 trillion annually, which is nearly twice as much as all individual income taxes collected last year. That means that the ability for a person to have to fill out all of their paperwork, the cost of that is twice what we even collected in taxes. There is a balance here that's been overrun.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS: IDENTIFYING AND REMOVING ONEROUS JOB-DESTROYING REGULATIONS

This week, House Republicans are bringing a resolution to the floor directing the committees to inventory and review federal agency rules and regulations that may unfairly harm the ability to create jobs and grow the economy.

While the nation suffers from 21 straight months of unemployment at 9 percent or higher, President Obama and congressional Democrats have doubled down on their strategy to burden job creators with more government red tape.

With the U.S. economy struggling and American families hard pressed to pay their bills and put food on the table, the costs of federal regulations have never been more significant. The fact is that federal regulations increase the cost of doing business and destroy jobs.

Undue and archaic government red tape takes money out of the hands of families and businesses. Agencies should not be authorized to heap billions in new added costs on the economy without reducing another burden elsewhere.

JOB-CRUSHING REGULATIONS—BY THE NUMBERS

During the Democrats' leadership of Congress, unemployment skyrocketed from 4.6 percent to 9 percent as the economy has lost more than 6.8 million jobs.

With 243 expected rulemakings from the Democrats' permanent bailout of Wall Street law, and the inestimable number of regulations to come from ObamaCare's government takeover of healthcare, the President's newfound concern for the regulatory burdens facing employers does not match his actions over the past two years.

The Obama administration has not shied away from flexing its regulatory muscle since taking office. A recent study by the Heritage Foundation found that an unprecedented 43 major regulations were imposed in fiscal year 2010 with a total economic cost of

\$26.5 billion, the highest total since at least 1981.

Since passage in March 2010, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ObamaCare) has added 6,123 pages of regulations and Federal Register notices in just its first nine months.

According to a September 2010 report from the Small Business Administration, total regulatory costs amount to \$1.75 trillion annually, nearly twice as much as all individual income taxes collected last year.

WHO IS PAYING FOR THIS REEULATORY BURDEN? AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESSES AND AMERICAN WORKERS

The cost of regulations is felt even harder by America's small business owners, the engine of our nation's economy. According to the Small Business Administration, the average small business with less than 20 employees faces a cost of \$10,585 in federal regulations each year per worker they employ.

Businesses with fewer than 20 employees spend on average 36 percent more per employee than larger firms to comply with federal regulations. These small employers represent 99.7 percent of all businesses and have created 64 percent of all new jobs over the past 15 years.

The cost of federal regulations to small businesses must either be passed on to the consumer or workers, either in the form of lower wages or a shortage of jobs that would have been otherwise paid for with money spent complying with federal regulations. Imagine if small businesses could put the \$10,000 they spend on federal regulations directly back into new jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), my good friend.

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we meet this afternoon, there are 15 million Americans who are unemployed, and for them, this is another day of searching the Web or the want ads to try to find a job they've been unable to find after months of diligent searching. So what is the Congress of the United States doing about this? We are wasting yet another opportunity to work together, Republicans and Democrats, to create an environment in which small business people and entrepreneurs can create jobs for our country, the way we did work together at the end of last year and passed legislation that 80 Senators voted for, 270-some House Members voted for across party lines.

The majority says that this process will somehow help to create jobs. It is important to understand what this resolution really says. It says, in response to the 15 million unemployed people we have in this country, let's have a bunch of politicians have a bunch of meetings they were already scheduled to have; right? So their response, Mr. Speaker, is let's spend 9½ hours debating a bill that says a bunch of politicians should have had a bunch of meetings they would have had anyway to talk about the problem.

You know, if we called 911 to report a fire in our home, we wouldn't be very

happy if the fire department said, "We are going to immediately have a meeting to decide whether to put the fire out at your house." We would expect the fire company to come put the fire out at your house.

The majority is not putting on the floor regulations they want to repeal. That would be a worthy debate. We should have that. What they are doing is saying let's, for 9½ hours, talk about whether to have a bunch of meetings to talk about the problem.

In the last 5 weeks, there has not been one word in one bill or 1 hour of debate about a plan to create jobs for the American people. So now we are going to spend 9½ hours talking about whether to have a series of political meetings.

Why don't we put on the floor and argue the pros and cons of a plan to put our people back to work building schools and bridges and highways? You can be for or against that, but it's a real plan that would actually put people back to work.

Now, the majority says that they do want to create jobs by cutting spending and reducing the deficit. But of course the very first bill they passed increased the deficit by more than \$1 trillion over the next 20 years. Then they ran on a promise—a promise—to reduce the current year's budget by \$100 billion, but 2 days ago, the Appropriations Committee reported out a bill that reduces it by \$32 billion.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. The American people are placing a 911 call to Washington that says this country needs help. It needs a real plan to produce real jobs for the American people. What they are getting from the majority once again is wasted words, wasted time, wasted opportunities.

Yes, looking at regulations is a good thing to do. We support that. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between analysis and paralysis. The majority is giving us paralysis. All talk, no jobs. The right vote on this resolution is "no."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) coming down to the floor. I would like to let him know that we are doing 9½ hours of debate, and at the end there will be an opportunity for a motion to recommit with or without instructions that has been lacking for the previous 4 years by my colleagues on the other side, that they extended to us. So you will have every single opportunity, if you want, just to use your brainpower and put together that great jobs bill that you want to talk about.

But I would say to the gentleman, we have chosen to talk about the things which stifle jobs, and we believe that as we talk about these that a lot of the American people will get it. For instance, if you lived out in the country—I will just bring up one example.

The EPA has issued a draft policy doubling the stringency of the standard by which dust is regulated—dust. Now, the Speaker would understand dust because he is from a rural State. I understand dust from some perspective, being from Texas. But the EPA regulates dust, and they are going to issue a draft policy—or already did—that doubles the stringency of the standard. Many farming activities kick up dust: tilling the field, operating a feed lot, driving farm vehicles, even dusty roads.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend.

I think we can have a very worthy debate about whether that rule is a good one or a bad one. Why aren't we having that debate? Why don't you just put on the floor a bill that says let's repeal that rule and have a debate? Why aren't we doing that?

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, that's a good point. I don't think the gentleman was up in the Rules Committee yesterday to hear this, but the Rules Committee has original jurisdiction on this bill. We are sending this bill, when passed on the floor, to 10 committees, asking them to look at specifics, and dust will be one of those issues. It will be in front of a committee, probably the Agriculture Committee. Perhaps it could be in front of the Resources Committee, where they will look at what this proposed ruling is.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I continue to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. It still seems to me to be all windup and no pitch, that if you really believe that that regulation should be repealed, why don't you put a bill on the floor that repeals it and let's do something rather than just talk about it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, the answer is because this floor is the wrong place to do it, and we need to do it in reverse order. We need to go—and I know this is a new concept to a lot of people on your side. We are going to send it to the committees. We are going to let there be hearings about it. We are going to let the Democrats and the Republicans have an opportunity—for instance, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. COLLIN PETERSON, as the former chairman of the Ag Committee, will have an opportunity in working with Mr. LUCAS, the chairman of the Ag Committee now, on who those witnesses will be who are experts.

□ 1300

I don't think we have enough intellectual content because we don't spend time on farms, I don't, to where I can make an accurate decision. But if I review the transcript and listen to what happens in the committee of jurisdiction, regular order, like the 10 other committees, then it gives us a chance

to realistically understand, study, talk about, and receive feedback.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. I appreciate his courtesy.

The gentleman just makes a very good point about the importance of hearings before legislation takes place. How many hearings have there been on the renewal of the Patriot Act?

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, and I do appreciate the gentleman. This House of Representatives, after 9/11, debated to the fullest extent not only the issues of the Patriot Act, but we have had continuing hearings and dialogue on that. There's a requirement that these be looked at, and we intend to make sure that there's a full debate on this.

Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the gentleman engaging me. I would also make my point that the economic impact of the regulation of dust that it will have on farmers, that it will have on people who live in rural areas, is enormous. And this is part of that overall cost. It's not a hidden cost; it's a real cost that makes us unproductive and costs consumers a lot of money. And this is the kind of discussion we're going to have.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to tell both sides the remaining amount of time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 17 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Texas has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rules to provide that immediately after the House adopts this rule, it will bring up H.R. 11, the Build America Bonds to Create Jobs Now Act.

To explain that further and to explicate as she so desires, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for his leadership in calling up H.R. 11, the Build America Bonds, later.

Mr. Speaker, it's very interesting to watch this debate because what you see here is that we are talking about jobs. The American people want us to create jobs now. And what you see on the floor of the House now today and tomorrow is a make-work project.

The Republicans have no job initiatives; so they need to fill time, and they're filling time with a resolution that we all recognize the committees have the jurisdiction to do, and some of the committees already have.

We should subject every dollar, every initiative to the harshest scrutiny to make sure it fills its purpose, that we bring common sense to what we are

doing. But we don't need to spend 10 hours on the floor of the House because we have no job proposal on the side of the Republicans and make it look as if this is a job creation bill.

This is a make-work product for Republicans who are without an agenda for job creation. However, we hope they will join us in renewing the Build America Bonds to build America to create jobs now.

In every district nationwide, our constituents, many of them struggling without a paycheck, tell the same story. They're waiting for us to create jobs, to focus on jobs and economic growth before we do anything else. Today I rise to echo their call and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to act in the best interest of America's families and put people back to work.

In his State of the Union address, President Obama encouraged us to do what it takes to out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build the rest of the world. In that statement he continued his job-creating initiative. From day one, President Obama has been a job creator. We had to dig our way out of a deep recession, but, nonetheless, the Recovery Act created or saved over 3 million jobs, and other initiatives like Cash for Clunkers and other initiatives that this Congress took, working with President Obama, spared us an even worse unemployment rate.

Now, that isn't good enough if you don't have a job. And it isn't good enough for us who are responsible for creating them. And that is why the effort that the President started at the beginning of his administration, reiterated in his State of the Union address, starts with creating more jobs here at home, and in this Congress there should be no higher priority. Yet, the Republican leadership has not met that challenge.

Since taking charge of the House more than 1 month ago, they have yet to propose a single jobs bill. They have yet to unveil a concrete plan, and Americans are still waiting.

This week is no different. Instead of focusing on job creation, this Congress is spending 10 hours on the floor, a filler, as concrete evidence of the fact that they have nothing else to fill the time with, directing our committees to conduct oversight, a very appropriate instruction. The committees are already doing that.

These committees don't need a partisan resolution in order to start their work, and this House does not need a long floor debate that only diverts us from our purpose, which is to create jobs.

Instead, we should focus on investments that work, that create jobs, that build America and grow our economy. And that is why we are proudly putting forth the Build America Bonds to Create Jobs Now Act. This legislation would leverage public dollars probably 40 to 1: For every public dollar spent, \$40 of investment to strengthen the private sector and spur job creation at

home by supporting projects to rebuild schools and transit projects.

Last week we had a hearing on this subject following the President's State of the Union address and his pronouncements about innovation, education, infrastructure, et cetera. We had a hearing on infrastructure to which the Build America Bonds directly relates. A representative of the Society of Civil Engineers told us that our country has trillions of dollars of deficits; that our roads and bridges get D's and C minuses in terms of their safety and effectiveness.

In addition, our water projects, some of them are ancient, made of brick and wood, and that's a health problem.

In terms of innovation for the future, our investments in infrastructure such as broadband are also essential to the growth and creation of jobs in our country. And so there's every reason for us to do this in the best of times. But we're not in the best of times. And so in this not good time, as far as jobs are concerned, it's absolutely essential that we make a decision as a Nation to put forth the greatest social initiative ever, job creation.

The initiative to Build America Bonds and leverage dollars for encouraging the private sector has the support of mayors, governors, and local businesses. It is good for taxpayers, using Federal investments, to unleash billions from private businesses in our neighborhoods. That's why Governor Martin O'Malley came to testify for this, and Mayor Nutter of Pennsylvania, giving us their direct experience on what a difference the Build America Bonds initiative, which was in the Recovery Act, makes, and which needs to be renewed.

Most significantly, Build America Bonds keeps our promise to stay focused on jobs, and it helps put Americans back to work.

Both parties agree that we must stay focused on reducing our deficit, and that's exactly what Build America Bonds do. You cannot achieve the goal of deficit reduction unless you invest in growth and job creation. Vigorous oversight is critical to that effort, and Democrats remain committed to doing our part. We are ready to eliminate waste, fraud, abuse, duplication, and obsolescence in our budget, and we would subject every dollar, taxpayer dollar, to the harshest scrutiny.

□ 1310

We are prepared to make tough decisions to get our fiscal house in order, but we will not sacrifice key investments that are helping our economy grow, our small businesses expand. And we need to make more investments in small business, not less, and help our workers find jobs.

We said from the beginning of this Congress Democrats will measure every effort by whether it creates jobs, strengthens the middle class, and reduces the deficit. The resolution before us today does none of the above.

I think it's interesting just to make a contrast between the first month of this Republican majority and our first days here in the Congress. Most of what we proposed is along the line, some of it signed by President Bush in a bipartisan way.

H.R. 1 enacts the 9/11 Commission recommendations. This is 2007. The 9/11 Commission recommendations had not been enacted by the Republican Congress. We know our first responsibility is to keep the American people safe. H.R. 1, now the law of the land.

Raise the minimum wage. Economic fairness. It hadn't been raised in over a decade of Republican rule, and we raised the minimum wage and it became the law. Making college more affordable, which is now the law of the land. We also had the Energy Independence Act as part of our Six for 06, much of which is signed into law by President Bush at the end of that Congress and his term.

A couple initiatives did not become law. One of them was to remove the subsidies we give to Big Oil to give them an incentive to drill. Big Oil, which has made \$1 trillion in profit over the last 10 years, does not need billions of dollars in taxpayer money to have an incentive to drill for oil.

And so on this side, H.R. 1, instead of enacting the 9/11 Commission recommendations, lowering the minimum wage, making us more energy independent, making college more affordable, H.R. 1: repeal the health care bill. No prospect of success in doing that, no hearings leading up to it; but, nonetheless, a filler for the floor, red meat for those of the health insurance industry, which opposes giving leverage to America's patients and consumers by saying that they will not be deterred from having coverage because they have a preexisting medical condition, or keeping kids on their parents' policies until they are 26 years old. That's what they wanted to repeal. Again, red meat for the industry, for the special interests, no jobs for the American people.

In the weeks ahead, we must renew our focus on job creation. Let's vote on bills that grow our economy through innovation, public-private partnerships, and tackle unemployment head on. Together, we can help Americans create jobs, rebuilding America in a very green way; and the technologies we will develop will make us and keep us number one, investing in transportation and manufacturing and clean energy and new technologies and industries and in small businesses.

As my colleague Mr. HOYER reminds us every minute: If we make it in America, America's families can make it in America. Let's set our path on doing that, instead of frivolously using 10 hours that are unnecessary, but they are for only one purpose: you have nothing else to offer.

Today, we can keep our recovery on track and put Americans to work. I urge our colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution, not that we don't think

we should subject regulation to scrutiny, but because we think we shouldn't waste the public's time on this when it's already being done in committee and we should be having a debate, a lively debate, on what the best approach is to create jobs, grow the economy, reduce the deficit, and strengthen the middle class.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California, my friend, Ms. SANCHEZ.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of Florida. And, Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to focus their priorities on saving and creating jobs, instead of spending 10 hours debating what Congress already has the power to do. We already have the power of oversight over the Federal agencies. And if 10 hours were not enough to debate this, imagine the 54 hearings already scheduled by the Republicans to focus on redebating the health care reform. Americans remember, we debated that for almost 2 years, but they took the vote on getting rid of the health care reform before they are ever even doing the 54 hearings.

Listen, we do oversight. Actually, a legislative and authorizing committee like the ones I sit on, be it Homeland Security or the Armed Services Committee, we already have the power to do that; and the Republicans hold the chairmanship. The chairman gets to decide what the committee does. Just tell your chairman, let's do oversight. It's really straightforward.

We don't have to spend 10 hours on C-SPAN telling the American people, oh, my gosh, we've got to pass a resolution telling the committees to do oversight. We already have that. We are already doing that. We have already got subcommittees. On Armed Services Committees, we have an oversight committee. I hope your chairmen know what they're doing. They don't need a resolution telling them to do their job. Or do they? We need jobs. Americans want jobs. That's what we want. When I go home, we want jobs.

Build it in America. The Build America Bonds, I am a cosponsor of that. Mr. HASTINGS, I'm so glad you're going to bring that up. Let's pass that. For every dollar that we spend in that program, \$40 at the local, State, and private levels is used towards that.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me thank the gentleman from Florida and as well my good friend from Texas on managing of this time.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there's a great opportunity to be redundant sometimes. And I would imagine that

any American would consider 9 hours of debating the authority of oversight, which is vested in all of our committees, to be redundant. But let me share just a few points of opportunity.

First of all, in the Homeland Security Committee, having served as the chairwoman of the Transportation Security Committee, we introduced H.R. 2200, which would heighten the security for the Nation's mass transit. Jobs being created, of course, but also securing the homeland. The idea of increasing the professionalism of TSA or TSO officers, again, providing enhanced training for jobs, but also in essence protecting the homeland. These are quick and ready issues that could be addressed in the time allotted for debating redundancy.

Let me also congratulate my good friend on the infrastructure bank, because infrastructure creates jobs, the high-speed rail that our President is announcing, hearings to be able to assess how we can move quickly on investing in high-speed rail to create jobs.

Or, for example, as one of my colleagues and I mentioned in a hearing as well, a number of our airlines are using overseas airline repair stations. Bringing those back to the United States would create and provide more jobs. Again, an action item that could be done through this Congress, creating jobs.

So my question is, When will we get to the discussion of how we rebuild America? When will we get to answering the question, why, in some of our cities, huge sink holes exist where trucks, buses, and cars fall into sink holes because of the lack of resources in infrastructure. When will we fix the flooding that goes on in this country to avoid natural disasters?

So let me thank you for this time, but I'm ready to go to work in creating jobs for America.

□ 1320

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, thanks for the opportunity to be here today on this important bill. What I want to say to you is continually we need to make the point that this bill is all about referring to committees the opportunity for them to look at onerous rules and regulations.

I would like to bring up just one more burdensome regulation. Milk contains animal fat, and the EPA has suggested that milk storage could be regulated under the Clean Water Act as large oil tanks. It is estimated that it would cost U.S. dairy farmers thousands of dollars to come into compliance with such a regulation that would be exactly the same as large oil tanks. The EPA, only after congressional pressure, has signaled that it would finalize an exemption for milk. However, it has yet to do so and continues to drag its feet. Meanwhile, farmers are having to face what is a burdensome regulation.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Rules Committee.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is true that this is all about creating jobs. Job creation and economic growth is our number one priority.

I have been listening to this debate over the last few minutes and have come to a really striking conclusion. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to believe that Democrats believe that the government creates jobs, and we believe that the American people create jobs, and our goal is to get out of the way so that in fact that can happen. We want the government to get out of the way so that that can happen.

Now, my friend from Santa Ana earlier was talking about the fact that this institution has the ability to proceed with oversight to deal with these onerous regulations. Everyone seems to acknowledge that the regulations are great, but the fact of the matter is, in 2009, the Obama administration promulgated 59 major new regulations; in 2010 it was 61; and under the permanent bailout bill, it is projected there will be 218 new regulations dealing with 11 agencies that will be impinging on the ability for economic growth.

We know that the average cost per employee for small businesses, businesses with 20 or fewer employees, is \$10,585. That is the average per employee cost for businesses with fewer than 20 employees. That is a study that came out last September from Lafayette University. So it is obvious that we have been talking about this regulatory burden undermining the potential for job creation and economic growth. This is all about creating jobs, contrary to what so many of my friends on the other side of the aisle are making.

We had in our pledge—we said we are going to rein in the red tape. That is the priority we established last summer when we came forward with our Pledge to America, and I am very gratified to see that the President has followed through with his Executive order to try and deal with the regulatory burden.

We know that in *The Wall Street Journal* he penned a very important piece in which he recognized that this regulatory burden is very great and needs to be reduced, and, of course, we saw the President's speech before the United States Chamber of Commerce in which he talked about the problems of regulation and his priority of ensuring that we do that.

Why is it that we have this resolution? Let me say I greatly appreciate the fact that my good friend, the vice chairman of the Rules Committee from Dallas, Mr. SESSIONS, has authored this important resolution. Why? Because we believe that this institution, with the

strength of a strong, bold, bipartisan vote, saying to committees that we understand that when you have a \$10,585 per employee cost for small businesses with fewer than 20 employees due to regulation, that we need to have a laser-like approach on dealing with that regulatory burden. That is why we are here. That is why we are doing this.

So we believe that the signal that this resolution will send, Mr. Speaker, will go a long way toward letting the American people know, the marketplace know, that we are going to be committed in a bipartisan way to getting input from both Democrats and Republicans to try and rein in this regulatory burden that exists and undermines the potential for job creation and economic growth. So I think that we will have a strong bipartisan vote on the measure, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

I say that I look forward, as I have upstairs in the Rules Committee, to continuing my effort to reach out to Democrats, to working with them on thoughtful proposals that they have, because there are good ideas that come from both sides, and I believe that as we tackle the issue of regulatory reform that both sides will be able to participate.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in the Rules Committee, the chairman and two other Members cited repeatedly the January 18 article offered by President Obama that appeared in *The Wall Street Journal*. Interestingly, they leave out one section of what the President did, in fact, say. They do say, and I agree that he said in the article, "Sometimes those rules have gotten out of balance, placing unreasonable burdens on business, burdens that have stifled innovation and had a chilling effect on growth and jobs." That is where they stop. But the President in that article goes on: "At other times, we fail to meet our basic responsibility to protect the public interest, leading to disastrous consequences."

If you recall, Mr. Speaker, earlier I began by saying what a lack of regulation caused at the Securities and Exchange Commission. The President, in *The Wall Street Journal* article, says, "Such was the case in the run-up to the financial crisis, from which we are still recovering. There, a lack of proper oversight and transparency nearly led to the collapse of the financial markets and a full-scale depression."

Now, that began before Barack Obama was President of the United States. Most of us, especially those of us on the floor that are senior Members, were here in November when Secretary Paulson came here and cited with 3½ pages in his hands that the whole financial system of this country was about to collapse; and I, along with countless others, thought that that was the case, and we worked in a bipartisan fashion, I might add, to do what we could to shore it up.

“Over the past 2 years,” the President said, “the goal of my administration has been to strike the right balance, and today I am signing an executive order that makes clear that this is the operating principle of our government.”

Then what else do we need? Here is what we did one month ago, just one month ago. We approved the rules under which committees must, and I repeat, one, lay out a written plan for overseeing Federal regulations; and, two, conduct oversight through hearings and investigations and provide the American people a written report on the results of that oversight twice a year.

The rules even specifically tell committees to review, and I am quoting from the rules that we passed for the House of Representatives for the 112th Congress, they tell the committees “to review specific problems with Federal Rules, regulations, statutes and court decisions that are ambiguous, arbitrary or nonsensical, or that impose severe financial burdens on individuals.”

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, I find it passing strange, then, that we would come here today and say that we are doing something constructive and substantive for the membership. My friend Mr. SESSIONS said earlier that we’re going to give every Member of the House of Representatives who so chooses during that 9½ hours an opportunity to speak out on the regulations and to have what they would offer to the committees for regulation oversight. But what he fails to say is that we’re proceeding under a closed rule.

Now, it isn’t that the American public always understands this Washington inside-baseball closed rule, open rule, modified rule. He was going to fix it, he says, by offering the Democrats a motion to recommit, as if that would then provide all the substantive input that Members could have. One of the reasons we have a Rules Committee is so that Members of the House of Representatives can come to the Rules Committee to offer amendments to proposals. The proposal that we are here on today is regulatory reform. Not one amendment was permitted nor will be permitted under this rule. We can come down here and talk all we want, but it won’t change anything substantively about this rule. As I have indicated, Democrats are not opposed to conducting proper oversight. If there are superfluous or excessive regulations clearly of no benefit to the American people, then we ought to take a hard look at how best to eliminate them.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my good friend from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, we’re more than 5 weeks into this Congress and the majority has yet to bring to the floor even a single bill aimed at job creation. Yesterday I asked, Where is the job creation agenda? The American people have said loud and clear job creation should be our top priority, and the Republicans have pledged a “laser-like focus” on the issue. Today they’re planning 10 hours of meaningless debate to instruct committees to do oversight which they should be doing anyhow. Let me offer an alternative.

Today I introduced H.R. 11, legislation to extend the successful Build America Bonds program—a jobs bill. During the last 2 years, \$4.4 billion from the Recovery Act leveraged \$181 billion in new bonds at the State and local levels. And \$181 billion is needed in construction, bridge, and road repairs—\$181 billion in job creation. My own State of Virginia issued \$3.3 billion of those bonds in 45 distinct projects, and Nationwide, hundreds of thousands of jobs were created. We can create hundreds of thousands more if we extend this program. So I ask my colleagues, if you’re serious about job creation, support H.R. 11.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my colleague Mr. SESSIONS, as a matter of comity, it was pointed out to me by the chairman that I could have asked him. I was of the opinion that the Speaker would give the direction you did, and therefore I apologize to Mr. SESSIONS for that.

But Democrats now stand for the wholesale undertaking of what is necessary to provide essential public safety measures and crucial economic benefits. We will not stand for Republicans eliminating rules that prevent polluters from dumping toxic waste into drinking water resources. We will not stand for Republicans eliminating rules that prevent Wall Street greed from forcing people out of their homes. And Democrats will not stand for Republicans eliminating rules which ensure that Americans can purchase food at the grocery store without worrying about getting life-threatening illnesses.

While we won’t object to Republicans wanting to debate the efficiency of Federal regulations, we do object to spending 9½ hours debating what everyone has already agreed to. House committees are already required to conduct oversight. They already examine Federal regulations. And they already promulgate legislation making changes to Federal law. Wasting this body’s time debating this matter only serves to underscore that Republicans still have no plan for improving the economy and no interest, it does appear, in prioritizing legislation that will create jobs and best serve the American people.

In the 9½ hours this body will debate today and tomorrow this entirely unnecessary, inconsequential resolution, not a single regulation will be im-

proved, not a single law will be changed, and not a single job will be created. The American people watching know that this is simply a waste of time. They know it is nothing but empty rhetoric. And they know that a 9½-hour ideological rant is no replacement for the job-creating measures our Nation so desperately needs.

If we defeat the previous question, Mr. Speaker, as I announced earlier, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide that immediately after the House adopts this rule, it will bring up H.R. 11, the Build America Bonds to Create Jobs Now Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, Big Government is still alive and well on the floor today. Big Government is going to spend people’s money from back home. Spending, spending, spending—all about the government.

Well, that’s why the Republican Party is the majority party on the floor of the House of Representatives now, because the American people saw the effects of huge government, bigger government, and rules and regulations.

Mr. Speaker, you heard me earlier say that my Republican colleagues and I are committed to putting Americans back to work. We believe that what happens in Washington can aid and help the free enterprise system by telling the story, putting the spotlight, showing the light of day on the rules and regulations that are costing business \$1.7 trillion a year, which takes resources away from the activities that they would have of job creation and keeping our job growth, innovation, and our economy stable.

While small businesses are getting hit harder than any other firms in the United States, now is the time to provide that relief to these businesses so that they can reinvest in themselves, create jobs, and level out the economy. This Republican Congress remains committed to scaling back some of the 43 major regulations imposed in the last year by the Obama administration that would add \$28 billion annually.

Mr. Speaker, it’s obvious to me that we must do better.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 73 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon 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. 11) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Build America Bonds program. 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 Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against

provisions in the bill are waived. 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 recommit 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.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2—of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

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 Republican 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 Republican 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 Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In 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 Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. 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.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 514, EXTENDING COUNTERTERRORISM AUTHORITIES

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 79 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 79

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 514) to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 relating to access to business records, individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers, and roving wiretaps until December 8, 2011. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend and Rules Committee colleague, the gentleman from Boulder (Mr. POLIS), pending which I

yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, 18 days from now, three key provisions of the Patriot Act are set to expire, leaving a gap in our national security framework. Today's underlying legislation would temporarily—and I underscore the word, Mr. Speaker—temporarily extend these provisions to allow for the development of a long-term solution, with the many questions that are out there.

□ 1340

With strong bipartisan support, the previous Congress simply passed a blanket 1-year extension without addressing any of the underlying challenges, questions and controversies. I am the first to admit that there are challenges, questions and controversies that relate to the Patriot Act. Unfortunately—and again, it was by a vote of 315-97 on February 25 of last year, Mr. Speaker—we went through that entire year. But guess what. Not a single hearing was conducted subsequent to the passage of that extension. Not a single hearing over the past year has been held.

I feel very confident that my colleagues who have joined me on the floor here from the Judiciary Committee—Mr. LUNGREN, who is here right now, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, who chairs the Crime Subcommittee, and Mr. GOHMERT—I mean, these gentlemen and I have just had a conversation, Mr. Speaker, in which they have made an absolute commitment that this Congress will not make the mistake that was made over the past year. Following this short-term extension, we will have a thorough oversight process in which the committees of jurisdiction will take a very close look at how we pursue the terrorists who threaten our homeland.

Now, everybody acknowledges that this is not only controversial, not only filled with questions and not only filled with challenges, but that it is very, very complicated. The individuals and networks who seek to do harm to Americans change and adapt every single day. Mr. LUNGREN and I were just having a conversation in which we were looking at the situation that existed a decade ago, right after September 11. The threat is much different today than it was 10 years ago, and that's why we need to recognize that they are constantly changing and adapting their tactics to try and undo the United States of America and the free world. Staying one step ahead requires a tremendous amount of flexibility, ingenuity, coordination, and of course the right law enforcement tools.

Just today, Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano said that the threat that exists today—and Mr. GOHMERT just showed it to me on his iPad; it's on the front of one of the

newspapers around here—is as great as it has been since September 11. Then when I said it to Mr. LUNGREN, he reminded me that it's a different threat, a different threat today than the one that we faced in the past. That's why flexibility, ingenuity, and coordination are absolutely essential if we are going to proceed.

We need to ensure that we are taking all necessary steps while fully protecting the rights of all Americans. I want to underscore that this is one of the reasons that, going back 10 years, as we were legislating through the prism of September 11, I was very insistent that we have the ability to have oversight and to look and make sure that we are not undermining the rights of the American people. We need to ensure that that is a priority as we proceed.

This process is going to be a lengthy process over the next 10 months. It is not a process that can be resolved in the 7 legislative days that exist between now and February 28 when this is scheduled to expire. In the immediate term, it is imperative that we temporarily extend the expiring provisions to ensure that we do not suddenly create glaring loopholes in our national security. It is imperative that we commit to a comprehensive and, yes, transparent process. I had a conversation downstairs with my California colleague, Mr. ROHRBACHER. All the way to when this measure comes to the floor, we want to ensure that we have an open and transparent process when it comes to changes/modifications to the Patriot Act, and we want amendments to be considered. We want there to be a free-flowing debate as we proceed.

Mr. Speaker, the last piece of legislation, the resolution that we were just discussing, has to do with job creation and economic growth because we want to unleash the potential of American workers by freeing them from the onerous regulations that have been imposed on them. Some might ask, Is this in fact a jobs bill? Well, I think about what happened to our Nation's economy following September 11 of 2001. We all know the devastation that took place. The New York Stock Exchange had to close down for a week. We saw tremendous disruptions in our economy and the job force.

This measure is designed to ensure our national security. Without national security, we won't have the potential to save and create jobs in this country. So as we are enjoying economic recovery today, I see this measure as being critical to our quest for sustained job creation and economic growth, and believe that they are so inextricably tied that it is essential that we put this extension in place so that, over the next 10 months, nothing will be done to undermine the security and the safety of our fellow Americans.

The five most important words in the middle of the Preamble of the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, are "provide for the common defense."

That is what priority number one is.

Mr. LUNGREN and I were talking about this yesterday morning at the Republican Conference. It is absolutely essential that we recognize that as our number one priority because providing for the common defense and ensuring our security ensures that our economic security with the potential for job creation will be able to be sustained.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in a bipartisan way—since we had a vote of 315-97 on February 25 of last year and with, again, strong bipartisan support from many, many, many Democrats who, unfortunately, chose to vote "no" when we had this under suspension of the rules, now we are considering it under a process. This is bipartisan, by the way. When a measure is not successful under suspension of the rules, Democrats and Republicans alike bring measures to the floor under this process that we are considering this measure today.

So I urge my colleagues to support this so that we can proceed with the very important work that Messrs. SEN-SENBRENNER, LUNGREN, GOHMERT, and others will be pursuing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Patriot Act is a bill that has been plagued with abuse since it was first passed, and today's rule is yet another example of short-circuiting the system that our Founding Fathers set up. If there were ever the need for the close supervision and congressional oversight of a law, it is a law that discusses how and under what conditions a government can spy on its own citizens. After 10 years of public record, we all agree there are some clear sections of the law that can be improved; but instead of debating these sections of the law to better find that balance between protecting what makes it special to be Americans and protecting our national security, the Republican leadership has decided to ram through this bill with as little debate as possible.

Mr. Speaker, we spent an hour earlier discussing how we will spend 9½ hours discussing the organizational aspects of the House committee structure. Yet, for something that cuts to our core identity as Americans, we only have an hour under the rule and an hour under the bill to discuss it in its entirety.

This bill would reauthorize three of the most troubling provisions in the Patriot Act. Again, instead of actually debating the merits of these provisions and coming up with solutions that both sides can agree on to protect what it means to be an American, the Republican leadership has attempted first to force it through under the suspension calendar and now under a closed rule, the most restrictive kind of rule.

In spite of their plethora of promises to change the culture of Congress, this bill looks like it's being done under old business. On such an important issue, one that affects our national security and the civil liberties of every American, one that goes right to the heart

of what it means to be an American and to our identity as citizens of this great Republic, the Republican majority has reverted to short-circuiting the system and closing down discussion.

Just yesterday, they held the vote open for more than half an hour, pressuring Members to switch votes. Thankfully, the effort failed to muster the majority, and that's why we are here before you today with an additional hour to discuss the Patriot Act, which is woefully insufficient; but I think the American people can be grateful that Members on both sides of the aisle stood up and said at least let's have more discussion about this. Only after failing to jam through the bill as a suspension bill did the Republican leadership bring it up under a rule.

The Judiciary Committee, which the Republicans argue has not had time to look at this or to consider this under the normal process, has actually already had several hearings in the past few weeks on other topics. Apparently, the topic of abortion was important enough on which to have a discussion by the Judiciary Committee but not the topic of the security of the American people and our civil rights as Americans.

□ 1350

So why can't the Judiciary Committee find the time to even hold a hearing to discuss an issue this important that cuts the very definition of what it means to be American? Even if a little more time is needed, a month, 2 months, why isn't there a 30-day extension, a 60-day extension before us instead of a 10-month extension? It should not be used as an excuse to prevent all proceedings from moving forward.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I will explain why it is that we have more than a 30-day extension. As I said, with the controversies, the challenge and the absolute humongous task that is faced, we know that the legislative process takes a while, and to have that 10 months' extension is essential for them to do their work.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, I think there would be broader agreement perhaps if there was a 60-day extension and then perhaps a need for another 60-day extension if there was no legislative business completed, but putting it off 10 months or a year can actually give an excuse not to bring to the forefront these very important issues that need to be dealt with.

This body can produce results. The single most significant bill was H.R. 2, the repeal of an entire body of health care law, and somehow there was the ability to bring that to the floor within days of the opening of the new Congress.

You know, both parties want to ensure that the government has the tools

we need to fight terrorism. We can all agree that the Patriot Act has issues that need to be resolved. If we can move this bill through the regular order, I'm confident that the Judiciary Committee can make improvements that they've already discussed in prior session. In fact, just last year, the Judiciary Committee reported out by voice vote reform measures that would improve the Patriot Act and add real oversight.

It's clear that there is bipartisan support to improve this bill. Even as we speak, the Senate is debating three different versions of the reauthorization bill, and yet here in the House, we have only this one, originally scheduled with hardly any debate and now with a very closed structure and no ability for Members of either party to offer amendments.

Apart from its procedural flaws, the reauthorization fails to provide the administration the tools and support it truly needs. The administration, which does support reauthorizing the Patriot Act, has repeatedly asked for a real reauthorization rather than the short-term extensions that increase the uncertainty surrounding long-term planning, intelligence, and law enforcement as they carry out this mission. Instead of a patch that will get us through another few months at the expense of the civil liberties of the American people, we need the opportunity to truly work together to fix this bill.

Specifically, this bill would reauthorize three provisions: section 215, 206, and 6001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act.

Section 215 allows the government to capture any tangible thing that might be relevant to terrorist investigations. This includes your medical records, your diary, even what books you've checked out of the library and what Web sites you visited. In the past, these orders were limited to narrow classes of business and records, but the specific facts pertain to any agent of a foreign power, and the Patriot Act has swept away these basic requirements. In fact, it was reported by a bookstore that the information regarding everybody who purchased biographical books about Osama bin Laden had been requested.

The justification used for this provision is that the government needs to have the ability to protect our national security, and yet this goes against the basic constitutional notions of search and seizure. We ought to seriously consider making changes to this section instead of blindly giving the government the ability to spy on its citizens.

Let me just give a few examples—and I think this will come as some surprise to many people—of the transgressions that have already occurred, the affronts to our civil liberties and freedoms as Americans that have already occurred under the Patriot Act.

Perhaps some of us have taken Christmas vacations to Las Vegas. Well, there is a list of 300,000 people

that visited Las Vegas in Christmas of 2003 that according to an article in the Las Vegas Review Journal said the casino operators said they turned over the names and other guest information on an estimated 270,000 visitors. Now, I think a lot of people don't expect that to happen when they visit Las Vegas.

There needs to be an oversight process in place to ensure that, when extreme measures are necessary that interfere with our privacy, it goes through the right channels. This particular incident, even the FBI conceded that the personal records had not borne out a particular threat.

The Patriot Act has been used more than 150 times to secretly search individuals' homes, and 90 percent of those cases have had nothing to do with terrorism.

The Patriot Act was used against Brandon Mayfield, a Muslim American, innocent of any crime, to tap his phones, seize his property, copy his computer files, spy on his children, take his DNA, all without his knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

It's been used to coerce an Internet service provider to divulge information about Web surfing and Internet activity and then gagged that provider, preventing them from even saying that their information had been compromised.

It's been used to charge, obtain, and prosecute a Muslim student in Idaho for posting Internet Web site links to materials that were found objectionable by some, even though those same links were available on a U.S. Government Web site.

Mr. Speaker, part of what makes America special is the balance between our civil liberties and our rights as Americans and our national security. When so many Members of Congress, so many Americans on both sides of the aisle, of all ideologies, feel that we can do better, I think we owe it to the people of this country to do better and have a better process as a Congress, to improve the Patriot Act to help protect our liberties and keep us safe over the long term.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that I agree with much of what my friend from Boulder has said.

I will say this. It was February 25 of last year that a 1-year extension was provided and not a single hearing held. It is very important that we deal with these questions that my friend has raised, and we have them as well. They need to be addressed.

The administration has come out in strong support of this extension. They'd like to have the extension not a 30- or 60-day; they'd like this extension to go to December of 2013 if they had their way. That's what the Statement of Administration Policy says.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I've got to say that I believe that we are very much on the right track to ensure that we get those issues addressed.

I now yield 4 minutes to my friend from Menomonee Falls (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the author of this extension and the chairman of the Crime Subcommittee, who will be explaining in great detail the challenges that we face.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, first of all, the argument that has been advanced by my colleague from Colorado just doesn't mesh with the facts, and maybe I can give him a little bit of historical background.

First of all, I was the chairman of the full Judiciary Committee on September 11. When the Patriot Act was introduced, we had two hearings and a full committee markup. The Senate didn't have that, even though it was controlled by the Democrats, and there were long negotiations to come up with the original Patriot Act that the President signed.

At that time, I insisted that there be a sunset provision on all of the 16 additional provisions of the Patriot Act that expanded law enforcement powers, and I gave the commitment as chairman of the committee I would hold hearings on each of these 16 provisions, subsequently increased to 17, before the sunset expired, and I did.

At that time, the testimony was very clear that there was no controversy over making permanent 14 of the 16 provisions, and the Patriot Act extension did that. The three provisions that were not made permanent were the ones that were in controversy, and most of the complaints advanced by my friend from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) were on the 14 provisions, that there were no abuses that were brought out during the 2005 hearings.

Now, let me talk about the three provisions that do expire that are the subject of the underlying bill.

First of all, section 206, the roving wiretap authority. Law enforcement has had this authority on organized crime and drug pushing since 1986. The Patriot Act expanded it to include terrorism. There has been no constitutional challenge that has been filed against section 206.

Section 6001, which was the 17th provision and the lone wolf provision, says that someone who can be investigated under the Patriot Act doesn't have to be a member of an identifiable group like al Qaeda in order for the Patriot Act's provisions to come into play. Constitutionality of that is unchallenged.

□ 1400

Now section 215, which is the business records provision, there was a constitutional challenge and it was withdrawn. The challenge was in the case of Muslim Community Association v. Ashcroft which was filed in the Eastern District of Michigan. The plaintiff in that case alleged that section 215 violated the First, Fourth and Fifth Amendments to the Constitution. The 2005 reauthorization of the Patriot Act amended section 215, and as a result of

the amendment, the plaintiffs withdrew their complaint. We had solved those problems.

So, much of what we hear today are about issues that were made permanent because there really wasn't an issue, or something that involves other types of law enforcement activity other than the Patriot Act.

This Congress, I am the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, and we will have those hearings before this extension expires on December 8, and we will give everybody a chance to thoroughly air their complaints just like I promised and just like I delivered in 2005. And when the record is brought up to date, I hope that the Members will confine their debate to what is actually in the expiring provisions of the Patriot Act rather than talking about a lot of other things, some of which don't even involve the Patriot Act whatsoever.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the historical account that was just delivered by my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, former Chairman SENSENBRENNER, and I have abundant respect and admiration for him and his motives and his desire to protect the civil rights that we all hold dear. But I find it disturbing that today we're going to start out on a 9½-hour debate on a meaningless, redundant measure that simply instructs Congress and its committees to review regulations and we could be spending that time dealing with such a very important, serious issue such as reauthorization of this so-called Patriot Act.

This bill is too serious, it's too important, to be reauthorized without any hearings, no markups, no opportunity for amendments. I was glad to be one of the true patriots to vote against this measure when it was brought to the floor yesterday on a suspension of the rules without due consideration by our Judiciary Committee.

There is bipartisan consensus that these provisions need some improvement—roving wiretaps, the lone wolf provisions, especially business records. While the threat of terrorism is real and law enforcement must have the right tools to protect Americans, any counterterrorism measure must have a solid constitutional footing and respect the privacy and civil liberties of the American people.

If Congress reauthorizes these provisions with no changes, Americans will remain subject to warrantless intrusions into their personal affairs and a gross overreach of Federal investigative authority that could be and has been abused. It's just not how we do things in this country, ladies and gentlemen.

Rather than taking the time to craft reforms that will better protect private

citizens' communications and privacy from overbroad government surveillance, the Republican Party simply wants to ram this bill through without providing any opportunity for anybody to offer amendments that would improve the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. We all acknowledge that law enforcement needs new tools to keep up with 21st century threats, but surely it's our responsibility in Congress to reexamine legislation that was hurried through Congress in the wake of 9/11 to make sure it lives up to our national ideals.

Because this bill fails to contain any checks and balances to prevent law enforcement abuses and protect civil liberties, I must oppose the rule and the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to my good friend from Georgia that no one is trying to ram anything through at this point. President Obama strongly supports this extension, I would say to my friend. He, in fact, wants it to go to December of 2013. We had a 1-year extension that was put into place, passed here by a vote of 315-97 on February 25, 2010.

There was a commitment then, and certainly people inferred, that we would have hearings. There was not a single hearing held during that entire period of time, and we've made an absolute commitment. We've just heard from the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER). We are about to hear from the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN), the chairman of the Cybersecurity Subcommittee, that we are going to, in fact, have the process that my friend desires.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Gold River, California (Mr. LUNGREN), the chairman of the Cybersecurity Subcommittee.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for granting me this time.

I sit on this floor as the author of the sunset provision that requires us to consider these three portions of the Patriot Act. I offered that when we had the reauthorization of the overall bill because I thought these were three sections that were at that time controversial and that we ought to be required to review it. So I did support the authorization for a year that we had last year, but I fully expected that the Judiciary Committee would hold hearings so that before this date we would have acted on any changes that anyone deemed necessary.

I would say, I am not aware of any changes that are necessary, and I have followed this ever since they put the sunset provisions in. But nonetheless I had thought that during the last year

while my friends on the other side were in charge, we would have acted. As a matter of fact, I believe our committee passed out a full reauthorization of the Patriot Act, that is, the Judiciary Committee, under the leadership of Chairman CONYERS, but it was never brought to the floor for us to consider, under any rule, open or closed.

So what we are asking for, in concert with the President of the United States, is to extend it to the end of this year so that we can carry out the constitutionally mandated obligation of oversight.

Chairman SENSENBRENNER, chairman of the Crime Subcommittee, has a track record. I believe it was 13 hearings that we held on these subjects. We went through chapter and verse. We had the FBI before us. We had the Attorney General before us. We had the head of the criminal division before us. We had the ACLU before us. We had classified briefings as well as public hearings. We made some changes in 2005 pursuant to requests and information that was presented to us.

Now, I know some of our members said after they voted against this on the suspension calendar, "Well, look this bill's been in effect for 10 years. Times have changed." Yes, they have. And if we would examine the changes, we would see that these three provisions are more necessary today than they were when we first put them into the law. Why? Because as Secretary Napolitano, the Secretary in the Obama administration, stated just today, we are on as high alert today, as far as she's concerned in terms of the threat, as we have been at any time since 9/11. And as the two cochairs of the 9/11 Commission said in testimony last year, which is basically repeated by Secretary Napolitano and the head of the NCTC in testimony this week, we have a different threat today.

□ 1410

We have the continuing threat of those of al Qaeda on the international scene, still attempting to probe and find where they might be able to provide a catastrophic event against the United States. But the new facts show that the greater threat to us today is, as they have said, less consequential attacks from smaller groups, some not even officially allied with al Qaeda, sometimes inspired by them, sometimes incited by them. And these three provisions go directly to the investigations that are necessary for us to deter that.

This is not the regular criminal justice system where you examine the evidence after the crime has been committed to try to convict the individual. This is in the essence of deterrence, to make sure that we're not collecting body parts after the attack has occurred. As a result, we have tried to make changes in the law that will allow us to do what the 9/11 Commission said we couldn't do beforehand, connect the dots.

Why do we have the lone wolf provision in here? Because that is more and more the concern we have to have. Now, this would not apply to Major Hasan because he is an American citizen. We are talking about lone wolf provisions for those who are not U.S. citizens. But he was a lone wolf, if you want to understand what a lone wolf is. He wasn't officially connected with al Qaeda or anybody else, but he was in conversation. He was incited by or inspired by. And if anybody doesn't believe that he committed a terrorist attack, they don't know what terrorism is.

You talk about a lone wolf. How about the guy who was on the airplane on Christmas a little over a year ago? That would be a lone wolf. We might have been able to collect information on him had we had an opportunity to get some of this information.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have the benefit of having my friend from Gold River, my friend from Menomonee Falls here on the floor, and I would like to ask each of them, if I might, if they would underscore the commitment that was raised by the gentleman from Georgia.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

I would like to inquire of both my friends what kind of commitment they are prepared to make in dealing with this, in light of the fact that we have gone for an entire year following the 315-97 vote passage of this measure without a single hearing being held.

First, I yield to my friend from Menomonee Falls, the chairman of the Crime Subcommittee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I plan on doing, with this reauthorization of the Patriot Act, the same thing I did with the 2005 reauthorization of the Patriot Act. Examine every one of the expiring provisions, let everybody speak their piece, and let the House of Representatives work its will.

There have been no civil liberties violations on these three expiring provisions. They have all been upheld as constitutional or not challenged. And we did have a problem with business records, and we solved that in 2005. So all of the fears that the gentleman from Colorado is making I think are a red herring. We did it when we were in the majority in the Judiciary Committee; and unfortunately, when the other side was in the majority, they didn't do it. That's why we are here today.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, I would say to my friend that I think it's very important to note that, as those hearings proceed, issues that relate to

civil liberties will clearly be part of the hearing process and part of the debate.

Am I correct in concluding that?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. You are absolutely right. I did it 5½ years ago, and you have my commitment I will do it again.

Mr. DREIER. I appreciate that.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 45 seconds.

And I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Gold River to respond to the question I propounded earlier.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Absolutely. I mean, the reason I came to the House of Representatives was in response to 9/11, to try to make sure we had the tools necessary to protect this country from these kinds of attacks and, at the same time, as someone who has devoted his entire life to enforcing the law but with the protection of civil liberties, to make sure that is done in this case as well.

Let me just say one last thing about the roving wiretap. It is not controversial. It has been used in domestic criminal cases since at least 1980. And all it does is respond to new technology.

You have a wiretap that now grants authority—once proven—grants authority to follow the person with whatever device he uses because—guess what?—most people are not confined to a single landline today. That's all this does. And you would think that we would have the same provisions we use against criminals, that we could use those against those who would want to destroy Americans and America, terrorists.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

I would just like to say in response to my friend on the roving wiretap issue, it is fascinating. As I began my opening remarks, I was talking about the fact that Mr. GOHMERT showed me his iPad, which had the headline on that iPad that the Secretary of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano, has indicated that the threat that exists today is greater than it has been at any time since September 11, 2001. That technology didn't exist back in 2001 or certainly back in 1980. The roving wiretap is designed to focus on the potential terrorist and not on some antiquated technology that we have.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned that he is not aware of abuses under section 215. I would remind my colleagues that most of the uses are classified under 215, and there has not yet been a briefing for Members this Congress for us to make our assessment of whether there have been abuses of section 215. I have not had a

briefing nor has there been one offered here to the Members of the 112th Congress. And I think before we make a decision about section 215, we need to know how it has been used. That's a very simple request.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. I would like to get back to first principles here. The First Amendment, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

This Patriot Act represents a wholesale abandonment of the right to assemble peaceably, of the right of freedom of association. This Patriot Act is a square violation of the Fourth Amendment, "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures."

Now, I can trust my friends on the other side of the aisle. They are decent people. This isn't about Democrat versus Republican. It's not about a Democratic President. It's not about if there was a Republican President or if we will have one in the future. This is about something actually much more important than all of us and then whoever might be an executive. It's about the Constitution of the United States.

Congress made a mistake when it passed the Patriot Act. Instead of sunseting it and being done with it, we kept the provisions going. Some of them were made permanent. This law today, we seek to reauthorize certain sections of the Patriot Act. What I maintain is that what we have here is a destructive undermining of constitutional principles. We can't just say, well, let's trust our friends to do the right thing. This is about the Constitution. This is beyond friendship. This is beyond party. This is beyond who is the President. So I disagree with President Obama on this.

It's interesting. At this very moment that our President is on television celebrating the tremendous movement towards the free will of the people of Egypt who have suffered real repression and suppression of their basic liberties, we can celebrate something happening thousands of miles away, but it would be much better for America if we celebrated our Constitution.

What we have done with the Patriot Act, we have given the government enormous power. We have given the government the authority to reach deeply into people's private lives, into their business affairs without a court order. We need to think about that. Some people say they don't want government involved in certain things. Well, government is involved in a way that is devastating when you come to the devastation of constitutional principles, you give the FBI the ability to reach into people's private lives without a court order.

□ 1420

I'm telling you, whether you're a Democrat or Republican, this is a very dangerous thing that we're doing here. Stand up for the Constitution.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 9, 2011]
 TWITTER SHINES A SPOTLIGHT ON SECRET
 F.B.I. SUBPOENAS
 (By Noam Cohen)

The news that federal prosecutors have demanded that the microblogging site Twitter provide the account details of people connected to the WikiLeaks easel including its founder, Julian Assange, isn't noteworthy because the government's request was unusual or intrusive. It is noteworthy because it became public.

Even as Web sites, social networking services and telephone companies amass more and more information about their users, the government—in the course of conducting inquiries—has been able to look through much of the information without the knowledge of the people being investigated.

For the Twitter request, the government obtained a secret subpoena from a federal court. Twitter challenged the secrecy, not the subpoena itself, and won the right to inform the people whose records the government was seeking. WikiLeaks says it suspects that other large sites like Google and Facebook have received similar requests and simply went along with the government.

This kind of order is far more common than one may think, and in the case of terrorism and espionage investigations the government can issue them without a court order. The government says more than 50,000 of these requests, known as national security letters, are sent each year, but they come with gag orders that prevent those contacted from revealing what the agency has been seeking or even the existence of the gag orders.

"It's a perfect example of how the government can use its broad powers to silence people," said Nicholas Merrill, who was the first person to file a constitutional challenge against the use of national security letters, authorized by the USA Patriot Act. Until August, he was forbidden to acknowledge the existence of a 2004 letter that the company he founded, the Calyx Internet Access Corporation, received from the F.B.I.

Mr. Merrill is now free to speak about the request, but part of the gag order remains in place, and he is still barred from discussing what information he had been asked to provide. As a result, he said, before he gives a talk he consults a six-page guide prepared by his lawyers at the American Civil Liberties Union to be sure that he complies with the order to avoid risking a punishment of five years in prison.

The government cites national security as the reason the contents of the letters—even their existence—are kept secret. The F.B.I. is trying to prevent plots as they are being hatched, according to Valerie Caproni, the general counsel of the agency, and thus needs stealth.

In the case of a small Internet service provider like Calyx, which was located in downtown Manhattan and had hundreds of customers, even mentioning that the F.B.I. had been sniffing around could harm an investigation, she said, especially if "the target is any way."

Mr. Merrill, a 38-year-old from Brooklyn who studied computer science and philosophy, said he created Calyx in 1994 when it was "really pretty easy, there wasn't really any competition." His clients included "dozens of nonprofit organizations and alternative media outlets."

Mr. Merrill challenged the constitutionality of the letter he received in 2004,

saying the request raised "red flags" of being politically motivated. As a result of his suit and two later ones, the law governing the letters has been overturned and then revised by Congress.

In 2007, the F.B.I.'s inspector general found that the agency had abused its own guidelines by including too many peripheral people in its searches. The letters now receive the "individualized scrutiny" of the agents who are filing them, Ms. Caproni said.

All sides agree that it has become significantly easier to challenge the letters' requests as well as their secrecy. At the moment, there are no new challenges in the court system, the government and the A.C.L.U. say.

The program, whose use has "ticked up" a bit in recent years, Ms. Caproni said, is humming along. She added, however, that the government had become more selective about the types of companies to which it sent letters. "All other things being the same, one of the things investigators think about is, 'Who are we serving this? Are they comfortable with this?'" she said. "Most of these N.S.L.'s are filed on large companies. Why would they want to disclose that? Most companies view it as good corporate citizenship."

One critic of the law, former Senator Russ Feingold, said in a statement that it was long past time for Congress "to rein in the use of national security letters."

"This is not a partisan issue," Mr. Feingold said, "it is about the legislative branch providing an adequate check on the executive branch. Republicans advocating limited government should take a close look at these statutes and consider supporting changes."

Mr. Merrill argues that the blanket gag orders have prevented a full public debate on the subject. He himself largely left the I.S.P. business in 2004, independent of his legal case, and only now has returned to hosting a couple of clients as part of a nonprofit project, the Calyx Institute, which aims to study how to protect consumers' privacy.

Regarding the news about Twitter, he wrote in an e-mail: "I commend Twitter's policy of notifying their customers of government requests for their private data and for their challenging and subsequently removing the gag order. This is a great example of the government's misuse of secrecy provisions and of exemplary privacy ethics on behalf of Twitter."

Ms. Caproni, who has testified before Congress about the program, said that it had been more than amply debated. "People at the A.C.L.U. and the press" think the letters are "a bigger deal than the companies."

To one of Mr. Merrill's A.C.L.U. lawyers, Jameel Jaffer, the smooth operation of the system is a sign that it is not working. The privacy rights at stake are not those of the companies who hold the information, Mr. Jaffer said, but "about people whose records are held." And those people should be told, he said.

"People used to be the custodians of their own records, their own diaries. Now third parties are custodians of all that," he said. "Everything you do online is entrusted to someone else—unless you want to go completely off the grid, and I'm not even sure that is possible."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 13, 2008]
 F.B.I. MADE 'BLANKET' DEMANDS FOR PHONE
 RECORDS

(By Eric Lichtblau)

WASHINGTON.—Senior officials of the Federal Bureau of Investigation repeatedly approved the use of "blanket" records demands to justify the improper collection of thousands of phone records, according to officials briefed on the practice.

The bureau appears to have used the blanket records demands at least 11 times in 2006 alone as a quick way to clean up mistakes made over several years after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, according to a letter provided to Congress by a lawyer for an F.B.I. agent who witnessed the missteps.

The F.B.I. has come under fire for its use of so-called national security letters to inappropriately gather records on Americans in terrorism investigations, but details have not previously been disclosed about its use of "blanket" warrants, a one-step operation used to justify the collection of hundreds of phone and e-mail records at a time.

Under the USA Patriot Act, the F.B.I. received broadened authority to issue the national security letters on its own authority—without the approval of a judge—to gather records like phone bills or e-mail transactions that might be considered relevant to a particular terrorism investigation. The Justice Department inspector general found in March 2007 that the F.B.I. had routinely violated the standards for using the letters and that officials often cited "exigent" or emergency situations that did not really exist in issuing them to phone providers and other private companies.

In an updated report due out on Thursday, the inspector general is expected to report that the violations continued through 2006, when the F.B.I. instituted new internal procedures.

The inspector general's ongoing investigation is also said to be focusing on the F.B.I.'s use of the blanket letters as a way of justifying the collection of large amounts of records at one time. F.B.I. officials acknowledged the problem Wednesday, calling it inadvertent, and said officials had been instructed that they could no longer issue blanket orders. Instead, officials have to determine why particular records are considered relevant.

A letter sent last week to Senator Charles E. Grassley, Republican of Iowa, provides new details on the F.B.I.'s use of the national security letters, including the practice of issuing the blanket demands.

A copy of the letter was provided to The Times. It was written by Stephen M. Kohn, a Washington lawyer representing Bassem Youssef, an F.B.I. agent who reported what he thought were abuses in the use of national security letters and was interviewed for three days by the inspector general. In a separate matter, Mr. Youssef is suing the F.B.I. in a discrimination claim.

Mr. Grassley said Wednesday that he was concerned by the issues raised in Mr. Kohn's letter.

"In the past, the F.B.I. has shown a propensity to act as if it were above the law," he said. "That attitude clearly needs to stop. Part of the way we can help the F.B.I. clean up its act is to pay close attention to information from whistle-blowers like Bassem Youssef. We need aggressive follow-up from the inspector general to ensure accountability and reform."

By 2006, F.B.I. officials began learning that the bureau had issued thousands of "exigent" or emergency records demands to phone providers in situations where no life-threatening emergency existed, according to the account of Mr. Youssef, who worked with the phone companies in collecting records in terrorism investigations. In these situations, the F.B.I. had promised the private companies that the emergency records demands would be followed up with formal subpoenas or properly processed letters, but often, the follow-up material never came.

This created a backlog of records that the F.B.I. had obtained without going through proper procedures. In response, the letter said, the F.B.I. devised a plan: rather than

issuing national security letters retroactively for each individual investigation, it would issue the blanket letters to cover all the records obtained from a particular phone company.

"When Mr. Youssef was first informed of this concept, he was very uncomfortable with it," his lawyer, Mr. Kohn, said in his letter to Senator Grassley. But the plan was ultimately approved in 2006 by three senior officials at highest levels of the F.B.I., and in the process, Mr. Kohn maintains, the solution may have worsened the problem.

"They made a mistake in cleaning up a mistake," Mr. Kohn said, "because they didn't know the law."

An F.B.I. official who asked for anonymity because the inspector general is still examining the blanket warrant issue said the practice was "an attempt to fix a problem."

"This was ham-handed but pure of heart," the official said. "This was nothing evil, but it was not the right way to do it."

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, the Patriot Act has been the law for over 9 years, and not one of those 17 sections has been declared unconstitutional by any court in the United States. The argument that has been advanced by the gentleman from Ohio is just plain wrong. There has been plenty of opportunity to sue and to get parts of the Patriot Act declared unconstitutional. Most of these provisions haven't been challenged. So let's stick to the facts, rather than making up arguments that simply do not exist with the Patriot Act.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are not the judiciary. We are the people's voice. We are the United States Congress. The issue of whether a court has ruled any of this unconstitutional is the prerogative of that court, but we have the prerogative to address the issues dealing with the people's voice. And so I am disturbed that this comes to the floor, first, as a suspension, which was defeated by the people's voice, and then now through some unique trickery to come with a closed rule so that the people's voice is shut down. This Constitution deserve more.

The Founding Fathers were wise enough to establish three branches of government. This House is called the people's House and, therefore, we have the right to have a voice. That voice was already expressed by Members on both sides of the aisles, Republicans and Democrats, who voted this down because of the lack of opportunity to engage on behalf of the people. What more needs to be said?

Now, let me say this about the Constitution and about this process. First of all, we have been in some very difficult times, and we understand the crisis of terrorism and the aftermath of 9/11; but let us be reminded that in those early stages when we developed this Constitution, those men who were on

this floor had to be concerned about the oppressiveness of the state that owned and dominated this country before it was. Yet they did not yield to not putting in the Constitution the Fourth Amendment, which says that we should not be subjected to unreasonable search and seizure.

I want to remind my friends that when the Democrats attempted to have open hearings in 2005, the Republicans shut us down. They would not allow us to have people of a different perspective. They turned off the lights. They sent us home. They wouldn't let the people be heard. Is that what we're going to get now?

And so I raise the question about the roving wiretap. My friend on the other side of the aisle is incorrect. This is more restrictive than general criminal law, and all we ask is allow us to amend it so it conforms to general criminal laws. That is the point.

I offered an amendment with Mr. CONYERS that talks about requiring a different standard other than the knowledge requirement when someone breaks into your house. When they come into your house and come into your office, we need to have a standard that is articulated so that innocent persons are protected.

We realize that we live under a cover of terrorism. We are patriots as well. We join with the Patriot Act.

And I must say to my good friend from Wisconsin, the most shining moment of the Judiciary Committee was after 9/11 when we constructed together, Republicans and Democrats, I believe, the best Patriot Act going forward. But, unfortunately, his majority at that time took that bill that we had developed in the Judiciary Committee in a responsible bipartisan manner with the emotion and the backdrop of 9/11 behind us and skewed it in a way that, frankly, narrowed the rights of Americans.

It doesn't matter whether these cases have been selected.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman another 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. It doesn't matter if these cases have been challenged by the court, Mr. Speaker. It matters whether the people of this place, the people's House, have a time to respond.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman for a few seconds.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. And I would just say, first of all, I appreciate the bipartisan support for the effort led by our friend from Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin, which I think is terrific.

The question that I would propound to my friend is, if we look at the February 25 passage of this measure by a vote of 315-97 and the 1-year period of time, I know that the gentlewoman, as a member of the Judiciary Committee

and the Homeland Security Committee, certainly would have wanted to have hearings or support the notion of hearings. I wonder why there weren't hearings held during that 1-year period of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman another minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. As the gentleman well knows, February 25 is coming up. So the very fact that hearings had not been held—

Mr. DREIER. I am talking about February 25 of last year. Last year was when this was passed, a year ago.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Hearings had not been held as of December 2010. He knows that if we were in charge we would have had the appropriate hearings necessary to go forward before February 25.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman another 15 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if hearings were not held by December 31, 2010, the gentleman knows that he cannot question whether or not we would have had the appropriate hearings before February 25 because we are not in charge. And why we're asking you to let the voice of the people speak, and 2 days ago the voice of this House spoke, Republicans and Democrats voted this down because they believed the voice of the people should ensure that the Fourth Amendment of unreasonable search and seizure has not been violated. And by the passage of this bill today we thwart that and we fly in the face of those constitutional supporters that we can still have freedom.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The point is, February 25 of 2010 there was an entire session of Congress. It was when the Democrats were in the majority. During that period of time, through the entire 1-year extension, there was not a single hearing held; and I know that my friend, as a member of the Homeland Security Committee and the Judiciary Committee, would have been a strong proponent of holding those hearings. And that's why it just surprises me that, assuming that she did insist on them, that she was unsuccessful, Mr. Speaker, in the quest to get those hearings.

And I should add that the organization for the 112th Congress is just under way today, in fact, due to the fact that the minority has refused to allow the organization to take place. So there has been a year period of time. And I wish very much, Mr. Speaker, that there had, in fact, been hearings over the last year.

I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend from Tyler, Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), the vice chairman of Mr. SENSENBRENNER'S Crime Subcommittee.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there have been some great questions raised about these provisions in the Patriot Act; but it's hard to believe that for all of last year, when Democrats had the majority in this body, that if those same arguments had been made to Speaker PELOSI and to Chairman CONYERS, that they would have just continued to deny for an entire year the chance to have a hearing on these things. Either, surely, they were not asked for the hearings on those things when they had the majority and could have done it, or they did ask. But if they did ask, why would they elect the same Speaker to be their leader going into this term if she was so entirely nonresponsive to their pleas like they've made on the floor this year?

Now, look, going back to 2005, for that first extension, we had some very heated debates, as Chairman SENSENBRENNER will remember, in private over what we should do. And there were a couple of us that fought hard in private to have sunsets on those provisions.

And my friend, Mr. LUNGREN, happened to have the amendment there that would allow the sunsets on these.

□ 1430

And some of those concerns are the very concerns that have been brought up by my Democratic friends here. We want to make sure the abuses are not occurring, but so far we have not gotten the information from this administration to tell us what they have been doing. And one of the reasons we have sunsets on there is so that we can force them to be accountable as they have not for the last 2 years.

I want those hearings. You have been assured we will have those hearings that you couldn't get from your own party last year. We are going to have them. We are going to find out if there are any abuses, and then we will be able to know what should be done.

But please know, under the Fourth Amendment, of course, a person has the reasonable expectation of privacy in their own person, house, or place. And that does not apply here. This is not to an expectation of privacy in somebody else's property. That's not what the Fourth Amendment addresses. But I want to find out how this has been used.

Please know that last year in the extension, all the things that my friends across the aisle are screaming about, we didn't have a chance to amend; we didn't have a chance to recommit. You have got that on this bill.

And as far as the vote on Monday, it was under suspension, had to be two thirds. I think it was stupid to bring it under suspension, because if they had brought it under a rule it passed because the vote was 277-148. Now they are doing what they should have done the other day. They are new at leadership. They are living and learning; hopefully, they are not just living. But we will have the hearings. We will ad-

dress these matters, and we will find out if it should be done for more than 1 year. But in the meantime, we appreciate the concern and hope you will express it this year.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself 1 minute to respond.

At this point in the 112th Congress, the Judiciary Committee has found time to hold several hearings. I have been informed that they have held hearings on topics that are certainly important—immigration, relating to health care and malpractice—and yet this topic that is being discussed today, something that is so fundamental to our identity as Americans, has not benefited from a single hearing in the 112th Congress.

And one cannot say, oh, it's because they haven't had hearings or they're just reconstituting themselves. I have been informed that they have actually had several hearings to date; they have just simply been on other topics. Apparently, this hearing isn't important enough to warrant a hearing in the early part of the 112th Congress.

One of the difficulties in exercising oversight with regard to section 215 is that the orders are prohibited from being disclosed that they got an order to anyone but their attorneys. So we have very little ability, absent a classified briefing, which we have not been offered, to even find out if section 215 has been abused or not.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. The gentleman makes a point; and that is, if you are under a gag order, how are we supposed to know if there are any abuses? Hello.

What Mr. GOHMERT said a moment ago, I want to associate myself with much of his remarks. And I have here, to submit to the RECORD, correspondence that I submitted on November 3, 2009, asking for review of the provisions of the Patriot Act that actually we are looking at today.

We create government to secure our rights, not to give them away. The Patriot Act represents giving away rights, not securing them. It's said, well, it hasn't been adjudicated.

The laws that we make derive from our constitutional authority, and that's not just a matter of political will but it's about moral reasoning. And when we look at section 215, which lets the government obtain orders for private records or items from people who are not connected to any investigation—

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KUCINICH. When we look at section 206, which allows the FBI to obtain an order from FISA to wiretap a target without having to specify the target or device; when we look at section 6001, which authorizes the government to conduct investigations of non-U.S. individuals not connected to a foreign power or terrorist group, effec-

tively allows the government to circumvent standards that are required to obtain electronic surveillance orders from criminal courts; when we look at these things, these provisions are divorced from our constitutional experience. They are divorced from what we know are commonsense provisions of what our rights ought to be. That's why I'm opposed to the extension of the Patriot Act and why, if we had any sense, we would repeal the whole thing.

NOVEMBER 3, 2009.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CONYERS: I applaud you for your leadership on reconsideration of various provisions of the Patriot Amendments Act and FISA Amendments Act of 2009. These bills provide a number of significant reforms that are important steps toward restoring Congressional oversight of government surveillance and civil liberties protections. I urge you to protect the Constitutional rights and the civil liberties of all Americans by ensuring that the legislation includes the following essential reforms:

Enact stringent requirements for obtaining "Roving Wiretaps": Section 206 of the USA PATRIOT Act, known as the "John Doe wiretap" currently allows the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to obtain an order from the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC) to wiretap a target without having to specify the target or the device. Any reauthorization must include reforms that require the FBI to identify the device(s) to be wiretapped and to provide evidence that the person they are targeting is "an agent of a foreign power" and is using the device prior to wiretapping the device(s).

"Lone Wolf" surveillance provision must not be reauthorized: Section 6001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 authorizes the government to conduct investigations of non-U.S. individuals not connected to a foreign power or terrorist group. The government has never had to use this provision. The likelihood of someone acting alone while engaging in international terrorism is highly unlikely. This provision must not be reauthorized.

Repeal blanket authorities in Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act: Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act, known as the "Business Records" provision, allows the FBI to order any entity (person or business) to turn over "any tangible things" as long as it specifies it is for "an authorized investigation." Section 215 orders constitute a serious violation of Fourth Amendment and First Amendment rights by allowing the government to demand access to records often associated with the exercise of First Amendment rights such as library records and medical records. Authorization that allows the FBI to demand information from or about innocent Americans who are not a target of an investigation or who are not "agents of a foreign power" must be repealed.

Reform National Security Letter (NSL) Issuance: The Justice Department's Inspector General has found that upwards of 50,000 NSLs are issued every year, many against innocent people two and three times removed from a terror suspect. The Department of Justice Inspector General report in 2008 on the FBI's use of NSLs stated that 57 percent of all NSLs were issued to gather information on Americans. Judicial review must be reinstated and any legislation that includes this powerful tool that can collect communication, financial and credit information must only be used against suspected terrorists.

Reform NSL Gag Orders: NSLs come with a draconian gag order that is almost impossible to fight in court because they simply are not allowed to communicate about it. If the government certifies to a judge that national security would be harmed without a gag on the recipient of an NSL, the court must find that certification conclusive. This bill must force the government to justify a gag order to a judge and permit that judge to engage in long standing First amendment analysis before ruling.

Reform Material Support Statute: The government has used the material support statute of the USA PATRIOT Act to criminalize humanitarian aid by penalizing individuals or groups that provide aid to communities in conflict zones. Inside these zones, groups that are often included on the Treasury's Foreign Terrorist Organization (FTO) list control schools, refugee camps and hospitals. The statute as currently written does not require the government to prove the individual or group accused of supporting an FTO had any specific intention of directing aid to the FTO. This statute must be reformed by requiring the government to provide "specific and articulable" facts that make the case that there was a specific intention to direct aid to an FTO.

Repeal de-facto immunity to telecomm companies for illegal spying: The FISA Amendments Act of 2009 repeals de-facto immunity afforded to telecommunication companies that spy on Americans as allowed by the FISA Amendments Act of 2008. The government and telecommunication companies must be held accountable for violating privacy and First Amendment rights of Americans. This year's reauthorization must ensure that immunity for telecommunication companies is repealed.

Enact a ban on "bulk collection" under FISA: The FISA Amendments Act of 2008 allowed the dragnet collection of all international phone calls and emails of U.S. residents without warrants or even suspicion. We must ensure that the surveillance of suspected terrorists abroad does not infringe the civil liberties and Fourth Amendment rights of Americans. Any language regarding surveillance of international phone calls and emails of U.S. residents must ensure that the government is required to provide evidence that the targeted communication pertains to a foreign power.

Thank you for consideration of these legislative benchmarks. I and my staff stand ready to work with you in your efforts to restore Constitutional protections and civil liberties to the American people.

Sincerely,

DENNIS J. KUCINICH,
Member of Congress.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished chair of the Intelligence Committee, our friend from Brighton, Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am excited at my colleague's renewed interest in the Constitution. This is a good day for this House and this country, but I can't think of a bill and provisions that have been more misrepresented than what happens in this Patriot Act extension. And, A, I think they make all the arguments in the world why we don't make this permanent: Let's give this an extension so you have time to talk about it. But there is an inescapable fact at hand: By the end of this month, these provisions will expire.

There are agents in law enforcement and our intelligence community who

are preparing briefs to go to the court, the FISA court, to use these provisions. They will not be able to do it on March 1. Why would we let that happen? Let me give you a great example.

I used to be an FBI agent. I worked organized crime. When they were involved in drugs, we went out. We built a case. We did a brief. We took it to the judge and we got a court order to do whatever, roving wiretaps. Yes, before this bill, roving wiretaps. Why? Because they would use different phones to conceal the criminality of their efforts.

Well, guess what? We have that happening now with terrorists. They go and buy a thousand—a thousand phones that you buy that are already preprogrammed. They will use it for one call and throw it away.

What you are saying is we don't care that somehow it's okay for you to go after a drug dealer, a Mafia don who uses his brother-in-law's phone, but you don't want to use this provision to go after a terrorist who is trying to hide their identity and their conversations and their contents to build a radiological bomb. It's ludicrous. Why would we do that to ourselves? And make no mistake; you are putting Americans in danger when you let this expire.

On the roving wiretap, the FBI Director today said, in an open hearing, less than 500 times it has even been used. It is hard to get a wiretap. But what you are saying is, after March 1, well, we can continue to do it for a drug dealer, but you can't go to the FISA court and get a wiretap on a terrorist who is using these phones for God knows what. Why would we do that to ourselves? Why would we jeopardize American safety?

When it comes to business records, at the New York Times, if you got him before he wanted to do his event, you could actually go to the hardware store and get those business records where he was buying materials to assemble a bomb, under the FISA court and Patriot Act. But what you are saying is we would rather wait until it explodes and kills thousands and thousands of people, and the FBI can go to the same hardware store and use a criminal subpoena to get the same records.

It makes no sense whatsoever that we would let this bill expire at the end of the month and jeopardize the safety and security of the United States.

When you look at the lone wolf provision, if you heard what the Director of the NCTC today and yesterday was talking about, that the most dangerous threat that we have is somebody like Awlaki from Yemen trying to radicalize an individual and get them to do something God awful, like The New York Times Square bomber, like the Christmas Day bomber, like the Hasan shooting at Fort Hood. That's their interest. If you take away the lone wolf provision and the government can't quite prove that they are a part of al Qaeda but we know they are doing

something, you have handcuffed them to stop it before it happens.

One of the reasons that we don't have an attack here is because this act has been in place and they have used it judiciously. There have been no civil liberties violations, Mr. Speaker.

I urge this body's appreciation to pass this rule.

□ 1440

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. POLIS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a hardworking new Member of this body, my friend from Drexel Hill, Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to be here as a Congressman, but before I came here, I served as a prosecutor, both a Federal prosecutor and a State prosecutor, and I have actually been probably one of the few people who has actually been involved in investigations who have used the Patriot Act, used the Patriot Act against the proclaimed Imperial Wizard of the KKK in plotting to take handgrenades to blow up an abortion clinic. It helped us to be able to resolve a case and see a just sentence.

But what is happening today by virtue of these provisions is the ability for us not to just use what was important then in 2003, but to appreciate the changing nature of technology and the need for law enforcement to be able to keep pace with that.

This roving wiretap simply allows law enforcement to be able to track the individual rather than the phone. You have to appreciate that law enforcement is operating in real time. I have heard many references as well to the idea of the sort of lack of due process, and because we are dealing with the issue of a potential terrorist, we are looking at it differently from the context of the probable cause context, but we are going before the FISA court.

Mr. ROGERS explained specifically about the need to take this same information of probable cause before a court, and even if that phone is changed after the fact, we have to report back to the judge about what has been done with that phone. The protections have been built in with what Congress did. I was in the Justice Department when we came before you, and you fixed these provisions significantly.

Lastly, I now chair a subcommittee of Homeland Security dealing with the issue of terrorism and the lone wolf provision. It was Janet Napolitano who talked about the changing nature of the threat and this being one of the most serious times since 9/11.

Mr. Speaker, we must stand together and support those that are on the front line with these commonsense changes that have already been put into the bill. We are not going over new territory here. What we are doing is allowing those on the front line to use the

tools before them to keep America safe. I urge support for this provision.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to again bring your attention to section 215 and the difficulty which we in this body and the American people as a whole have with regard to exercising oversight over abuse of government authority.

An example that I gave earlier, the American Library Association confirmed that the Federal Government went into a library and asked for the list of everybody who checked out a book on Osama bin Laden. Now, recipients of 215 orders can't even disclose that they received such an order to anybody but their attorneys. So what ability do we have as the People's House to exercise oversight about whether there are abuses?

It has been brought out by several people on the other side, my colleague from Wisconsin, oh, there aren't abuses. Well, if there is a secretive process that prevents us from knowing about abuses, how are we to know in fact whether there are abuses?

I also want to discuss section 206 that we are discussing the renewal of here today, the provision of the bill that allows the government to conduct the roving wiretaps. This allows the government to obtain surveillance warrants that don't even specify the person or the object that is being tapped. It could involve tapping an entire neighborhood of telephones that a suspect might use—an unnamed suspect—might use or might not use. There is nothing even to specifically prohibit it from being an entire city of telephone calls being tapped. And we don't know how it has been used. The Fourth Amendment clearly states that warrants need to specify the person and places to be seized and searched with particularity.

Mr. Speaker, we began this session of Congress by reading the United States Constitution, including the Fourth Amendment, here in the House of Representatives. We did that to help make sure that the executive branch or the legislative branch don't have unfettered power to decide singlehandedly who and how to search private citizens and seize their properties.

The Founding Fathers were rightfully worried about the possibility of the central government issuing general warrants that would give it far-reaching power to spy on its citizens and intervene in their private lives. We should honor the Founding Fathers' clear wishes expressed in our Constitution instead of authorizing our Federal Government this kind of power.

Now, the justification used for this provision is that the government needs to have the ability to spy on a suspect as they move from phone to phone. No, no one objects to that authority when the security of the American people is at stake. But that doesn't mean that the government shouldn't have to specify who they are going to spy on and under what conditions. In fact,

under Federal criminal law, the government is already required to state either the person or the place that is subject to the wiretap.

It is these sorts of commonsense revisions that I think we could achieve bipartisan consensus on to provide a longer-term stability with regard to the necessary provisions of the Patriot Act.

The final section that will be reauthorized in the bill, section 6001, deals with the "lone wolf" provisions which were alluded to by the last two speakers which allows secret surveillance of noncitizens in the U.S. even if they are not connected to any terrorist group or foreign power.

Now, this authority is only granted in secret courts and again threatens our understanding of the limits of our Federal Government's investigatory powers within the borders of our own country. It blurs the line between domestic national security and foreign intelligence. It is clear that we allow a process to improve this.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say they are worried about the growth of government, yet in spite of all the rhetoric about how the government is trying to take over your lives, this, their fifth bill under a rule, actually gives the government the ability to spy on innocent Americans. No wonder so many Republicans joined so many Democrats in voting against this bill earlier this week.

I urge all of my colleagues who are worried about the unchecked growth of the state, anyone who seriously believes in protecting the rights and liberties of Americans, or anyone who simply thinks that we need to take some time to seriously look at these issues to debate them, to vote "no" on this bill, to force a discussion of these issues, rather than vague promises of future hearings or markups to improve this bill. Let's accelerate that timeline, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the concerns of the American people to help protect what it means to be an American, what is so close to our identity as Americans, protecting our individual liberties according to the Founding Fathers as articulated in our Constitution, we can reconcile that with the need to protect the American people's safety, and let us begin that work.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the only way for us to guarantee the rights of every American and to ensure that we will be going down the road to be a safe nation is to pass this extension so that these very able gentleman can proceed with the kinds of hearings that are necessary so that we assure that all the rights we need are protected and that we are a safe and secure country.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 79 will be followed by 5-minute votes on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 73 and adopting House Resolution 73, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 176, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—248

Ackerman	Flake	Lungren, Daniel
Adams	Fleischmann	E.
Aderholt	Fleming	Mack
Akin	Flores	Manzullo
Alexander	Forbes	Marchant
Altmire	Fortenberry	Marino
Amash	Fox	McCarthy (CA)
Austria	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (NY)
Bachmann	Frelinghuysen	McCaul
Bachus	Gallegly	McCotter
Barletta	Gardner	McHenry
Bartlett	Garrett	McIntyre
Barton (TX)	Gerlach	McKeon
Bass (NH)	Gibbs	McKinley
Benishek	Gingrey (GA)	McMorris
Berg	Gohmert	Rodgers
Biggart	Goodlatte	Meehan
Bilirakis	Gosar	Mica
Bishop (GA)	Gowdy	Miller (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Granger	Miller (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Miller, Gary
Black	Graves (MO)	Mulvaney
Blackburn	Griffin (AR)	Murphy (PA)
Bonner	Griffith (VA)	Myrick
Bono Mack	Grimm	Neugebauer
Boren	Guinta	Noem
Boswell	Guthrie	Nugent
Boustany	Hall	Nunes
Brady (TX)	Hanna	Nunnelee
Brooks	Harper	Olson
Broun (GA)	Harris	Palazzo
Buchanan	Hartzler	Paulsen
Bucshon	Hastings (WA)	Pearce
Buerkle	Hayworth	Pence
Burgess	Heck	Peters
Burton (IN)	Heller	Peterson
Calvert	Hensarling	Petri
Camp	Herger	Pitts
Campbell	Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)
Canseco	Huelskamp	Pompeo
Cantor	Huizenga (MI)	Posey
Capito	Hultgren	Price (GA)
Carter	Hunter	Quayle
Cassidy	Hurt	Reed
Chabot	Issa	Rehberg
Chaffetz	Jenkins	Reichert
Chandler	Johnson (IL)	Renacci
Coble	Johnson (OH)	Ribble
Coffman (CO)	Johnson, Sam	Rigell
Cole	Jones	Rivera
Conaway	Jordan	Roby
Cooper	Kelly	Roche (TN)
Costa	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Cravaack	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Crawford	Kingston	Rogers (MI)
Crenshaw	Kinzinger (IL)	Rohrabacher
Culberson	Kissell	Rokita
Davis (KY)	Kline	Rooney
Denham	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Dent	Lance	Roskam
DesJarlais	Landry	Ross (AR)
Diaz-Balart	Lankford	Ross (FL)
Dold	Latham	Royce
Dreier	LaTourrette	Runyan
Duffy	Latta	Ryan (WI)
Duncan (SC)	Lewis (CA)	Scalise
Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Schilling
Ellmers	Long	Schmidt
Emerson	Lucas	Schock
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert
Fincher	Lummis	Scott (SC)
Fitzpatrick		Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner	Terry	Westmoreland
Sessions	Thompson (PA)	Whitfield
Shimkus	Thornberry	Wilson (SC)
Simpson	Tiberi	Wittman
Smith (NE)	Tipton	Wolf
Smith (NJ)	Turner	Womack
Smith (TX)	Upton	Woodall
Southerland	Walberg	Yoder
Stearns	Walden	Young (AK)
Stivers	Walsh (IL)	Young (FL)
Stutzman	Webster	Young (IN)
Sullivan	West	

NAYS—176

Andrews	Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)
Baca	Hanabusa	Paul
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Barrow	Heinrich	Pelosi
Bass (CA)	Higgins	Perlmutter
Berkley	Himes	Pingree (ME)
Berman	Hinchev	Polis
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Hirono	Quigley
Braley (IA)	Holden	Rahall
Brown (FL)	Holt	Rangel
Butterfield	Honda	Reyes
Capps	Hoyer	Richardson
Capuano	Inslee	Richmond
Cardoza	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Rush
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Ciilline	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (MI)	Keating	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schiff
Cleaver	Kucinich	Schrader
Clyburn	Labrador	Schwartz
Cohen	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costello	Lee (CA)	Sewell
Courtney	Levin	Sherman
Critz	Lipinski	Shuler
Crowley	Loeback	Sires
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Cummings	Lowey	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lujan	Speier
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Stark
DeFazio	Maloney	Sutton
DeGette	Markey	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Matheson	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Matsui	Tierney
Dicks	McClintock	Tonko
Dingell	McCollum	Towns
Doggett	McDermott	Tsongas
Donnelly (IN)	McGovern	Van Hollen
Doyle	McNerney	Velázquez
Edwards	Meeks	Visclosky
Ellison	Michaud	Walz (MN)
Engel	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Eshoo	Miller, George	Schultz
Farr	Moore	Waters
Fattah	Moran	Watt
Filner	Murphy (CT)	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Weiner
Fudge	Napolitano	Welch
Gibson	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Gonzalez	Oliver	Woolsey
Green, Al	Owens	Wu
Green, Gene	Pallone	Yarmuth
Grijalva	Pascrell	

NOT VOTING—9

Becerra	Giffords	Platts
Bilbray	Harman	Ryan (OH)
Garamendi	Lewis (GA)	Shuster

□ 1511

Messrs. **INSLEE**, **LARSON** of Connecticut, and **RANGEL** changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. **MACK** changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Illinois changed his vote from “present” to “yea.”

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.

DIRECTING COMMITTEES TO REVIEW REGULATIONS FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 73) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 72) directing certain standing committees to inventory and review existing, pending, and proposed regulations and orders from agencies of the Federal Government, particularly with respect to their effect on jobs and economic growth, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 180, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—240

Adams	Flake	LaTourette
Aderholt	Fleischmann	Latta
Akin	Fleming	Lewis (CA)
Alexander	Flores	LoBiondo
Altmire	Forbes	Long
Amash	Fortenberry	Lucas
Austria	Fox	Luetkemeyer
Bachmann	Franks (AZ)	Lummis
Barletta	Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel
Bartlett	Gallely	E.
Barton (TX)	Gardner	Mack
Bass (NH)	Garrett	Manzullo
Benishke	Gerlach	Marchant
Berg	Gibbs	Marino
Biggert	Gibson	McCarthy (CA)
Bilirakis	Gingrey (GA)	McCauley
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	McClintock
Black	Goodlatte	McCotter
Blackburn	Gosar	McHenry
Bonner	Gowdy	McKeon
Bono Mack	Granger	McKinley
Boren	Graves (GA)	McMorris
Boustany	Graves (MO)	Rodgers
Brady (TX)	Griffin (AR)	Meehan
Brooks	Griffith (VA)	Mica
Broun (GA)	Grimm	Michaud
Buchanan	Guinta	Miller (FL)
Bucshon	Guthrie	Miller (MI)
Buerkle	Hall	Miller, Gary
Burgess	Hanna	Mulvaney
Burton (IN)	Harper	Murphy (PA)
Calvert	Harris	Myrick
Camp	Hartzler	Neugebauer
Campbell	Hastings (WA)	Noem
Canseco	Hayworth	Nugent
Cantor	Heck	Nunes
Capito	Heller	Nunnelee
Carter	Hensarling	Olson
Cassidy	Herger	Palazzo
Chabot	Herrera Beutler	Paul
Chaffetz	Huelskamp	Paulsen
Coble	Huizenga (MI)	Pearce
Coffman (CO)	Hultgren	Pence
Cole	Hunter	Petri
Conaway	Hurt	Pitts
Cravaack	Issa	Poe (TX)
Crenshaw	Jenkins	Pompeo
Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Posey
Davis (KY)	Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)
Denham	Johnson, Sam	Quayle
Dent	Jones	Reed
DesJarlais	Jordan	Rehberg
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Reichert
Dold	King (IA)	Renacci
Dreier	King (NY)	Ribble
Duffy	Kingston	Rigell
Duncan (SC)	Kinzinger (IL)	Rivera
Duncan (TN)	Kline	Roby
Ellmers	Labrador	Roe (TN)
Emerson	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)
Farenthold	Lance	Rogers (KY)
Fincher	Landry	Rogers (MI)
Fitzpatrick	Lankford	Rohrabacher

Rokita	Sessions	Upton
Rooney	Shimkus	Walberg
Ros-Lehtinen	Shuler	Walden
Roskam	Simpson	Walsh (IL)
Ross (AR)	Smith (NE)	Webster
Ross (FL)	Smith (NJ)	West
Royce	Smith (TX)	Westmoreland
Runyan	Southerland	Whitfield
Ryan (WI)	Stearns	Wilson (SC)
Scalise	Stivers	Wittman
Schilling	Stutzman	Wolf
Schmidt	Sullivan	Womack
Schock	Terry	Woodall
Schrader	Thompson (PA)	Yoder
Schweikert	Thornberry	Young (AK)
Scott (SC)	Tiberi	Young (FL)
Scott, Austin	Tipton	Young (IN)
Sensenbrenner	Turner	

NAYS—180

Ackerman	Fudge	Owens
Andrews	Gonzalez	Pallone
Baca	Green, Al	Pascrell
Baldwin	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Barrow	Gutierrez	Payne
Bass (CA)	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Berman	Heinrich	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Peterson
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Pingree (ME)
Blumenauer	Hinchev	Polis
Boswell	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Hirono	Quigley
Braley (IA)	Holden	Rahall
Brown (FL)	Holt	Rangel
Butterfield	Honda	Reyes
Capps	Hoyer	Richardson
Capuano	Inslee	Richmond
Cardoza	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Rush
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Chandler	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Chu	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Ciilline	Keating	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schiff
Clay	Kissell	Schwartz
Cleaver	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Langevin	Scott, David
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Sewell
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Cooper	Levin	Sires
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Costello	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Loeback	Speier
Critz	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Crowley	Lowey	Sutton
Cuellar	Lujan	Thompson (CA)
Cummings	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Tierney
Davis (IL)	Markey	Tonko
DeFazio	Matheson	Towns
DeGette	Matsui	Tsongas
DeLauro	McCollum	Van Hollen
Deutch	McDermott	Velázquez
Dicks	McGovern	Visclosky
Dingell	McIntyre	Walz (MN)
Doggett	McNerney	Wasserman
Donnelly (IN)	Meeks	Schultz
Doyle	Miller (NC)	Waters
Edwards	Miller, George	Watt
Ellison	Moore	Waxman
Engel	Moran	Weiner
Eshoo	Murphy (CT)	Welch
Farr	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Fattah	Napolitano	Woolsey
Filner	Neal	Wu
Frank (MA)	Oliver	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bachus	Giffords	Platts
Becerra	Grijalva	Ryan (OH)
Bilbray	Harman	Shuster
Crawford	Latham	
Garamendi	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1519

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 255, nays 169, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—255

Adams	Gerlach	Miller, Gary
Aderholt	Gibbs	Mulvaney
Akin	Gibson	Murphy (PA)
Alexander	Gingrey (GA)	Myrick
Altmire	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Amash	Goodlatte	Noem
Austria	Gosar	Nugent
Bachmann	Gowdy	Nunes
Bachus	Granger	Nunnelee
Barletta	Graves (GA)	Olson
Bartlett	Graves (MO)	Owens
Barton (TX)	Griffin (AR)	Palazzo
Bass (NH)	Griffith (VA)	Paul
Benishkek	Grimm	Paulsen
Berg	Guinta	Pearce
Biggert	Guthrie	Pence
Billirakis	Hall	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Hanna	Peterson
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Petri
Black	Harris	Pitts
Blackburn	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Bonner	Hastings (WA)	Pompeo
Bono Mack	Hayworth	Posey
Boren	Heck	Price (GA)
Boustany	Heller	Quayle
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Rahall
Brooks	Herger	Reed
Broun (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Rehberg
Buchanan	Huelskamp	Reichert
Buchson	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Buerkle	Hultgren	Ribble
Burgess	Hunter	Richardson
Burton (IN)	Hurt	Rigell
Calvert	Issa	Rivera
Camp	Jenkins	Roby
Campbell	Johnson (IL)	Roe (TN)
Canseco	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Capito	Jones	Rogers (MI)
Carney	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Carter	Keating	Rokita
Cassidy	Kelly	Rooney
Chabot	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Roskam
Chandler	Kingston	Ross (AR)
Coble	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross (FL)
Coffman (CO)	Kline	Royce
Cole	Labrador	Runyan
Conaway	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Connolly (VA)	Lance	Scalise
Costa	Landry	Schilling
Cravaack	Lankford	Schmidt
Crawford	Latham	Schock
Crenshaw	LaTourrette	Schrader
Culberson	Latta	Schwartz
Davis (KY)	Lewis (CA)	Schweikert
Denham	LoBiondo	Scott (SC)
Dent	Long	Scott, Austin
DesJarlais	Lucas	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
Dold	Lummis	Shimkus
Dreier	Lungren, Daniel	Simpson
Duffy	E.	Smith (NE)
Duncan (SC)	Mack	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (TN)	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Ellmers	Marchant	Southerland
Emerson	Marino	Stearns
Farenthold	Matheson	Stivers
Fincher	McCarthy (CA)	Stutzman
Fitzpatrick	McCaul	Sullivan
Flake	McClintock	Terry
Fleischmann	McCotter	Thompson (PA)
Fleming	McHenry	Thornberry
Flores	McKeon	Tiberi
Forbes	McKinley	Tipton
Fortenberry	McMorris	Turner
Fox	Rodgers	Upton
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Walberg
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Walden
Gallely	Michaud	Walsh (IL)
Gardner	Miller (FL)	Webster
Garrett	Miller (MI)	West

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder

Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

The text of the resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H. RES. 72

Resolved, That each standing committee designated in section 3 of this resolution shall inventory and review existing, pending, and proposed regulations, orders, and other administrative actions or procedures by agencies of the Federal Government within such committee's jurisdiction. In completing such inventory and review, each committee shall consider the matters described in section 2. Each committee shall conduct such hearings and other oversight activities as it deems necessary in support of the inventory and review, and shall identify in any report filed pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI for the first session of the 112th Congress any oversight or legislative activity conducted in support of, or as a result of, such inventory and review.

SEC. 2. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION.

In completing the review and inventory described in the first section of this resolution, each committee shall identify regulations, executive and agency orders, and other administrative actions or procedures that—

- (1) impede private-sector job creation;
- (2) discourage innovation and entrepreneurial activity;
- (3) hurt economic growth and investment;
- (4) harm the Nation's global competitiveness;
- (5) limit access to credit and capital;
- (6) fail to utilize or apply accurate cost-benefit analyses;
- (7) create additional economic uncertainty;
- (8) are promulgated in such a way as to limit transparency and the opportunity for public comment, particularly by affected parties;
- (9) lack specific statutory authorization;
- (10) undermine labor-management relations;
- (11) result in large-scale unfunded mandates on employers without due cause;
- (12) impose undue paperwork and cost burdens on small businesses; or
- (13) prevent the United States from becoming less dependent on foreign energy sources.

SEC. 3. COMMITTEES.

The committees referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows—

- (1) The Committee on Agriculture;
- (2) The Committee on Education and the Workforce;
- (3) The Committee on Energy and Commerce;
- (4) The Committee on Financial Services;
- (5) The Committee on the Judiciary;
- (6) The Committee on Natural Resources;
- (7) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform;
- (8) The Committee on Small Business;
- (9) The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and
- (10) The Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 9 hours and 30 minutes, with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and minority leader or their designees, 8 hours equally divided and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Oversight and Government Reform, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means, and 1 hour equally divided among and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Small Business.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all

NAYS—169

Ackerman	Green, Gene
Andrews	Grijalva
Baca	Gutierrez
Baldwin	Hanabusa
Barrow	Hastings (FL)
Bass (CA)	Heinrich
Berkley	Higgins
Berman	Himes
Bishop (NY)	Hinche
Blumenauer	Hinojosa
Boswell	Hirono
Brady (PA)	Holden
Brale (IA)	Holt
Brown (FL)	Honda
Butterfield	Hoyer
Capps	Inslee
Capuano	Israel
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)
Carnahan	Jackson Lee
Carson (IN)	(TX)
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)
Chu	Johnson, E. B.
Cicilline	Kaptur
Clarke (MI)	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee
Clay	Kind
Clyburn	Kissell
Cohen	Kucinich
Conyers	Langevin
Cooper	Larsen (WA)
Costello	Larson (CT)
Courtney	Lee (CA)
Critz	Levin
Crowley	Lewis (GA)
Cuellar	Lipinski
Cummings	Loeb
Davis (CA)	Loeb
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe
DeFazio	Lowe
DeGette	Lujan
DeLauro	Lynch
Deutch	Maloney
Dicks	Markey
Dingell	Matsui
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)
Donnelly (IN)	McCollum
Edwards	McDermott
Engel	McGovern
Eshoo	McIntyre
Farr	McNerney
Fattah	Meeks
Finer	Miller (NC)
Frank (MA)	Miller, George
Fudge	Moore
Gonzalez	Moran
Green, Al	Murphy (CT)
	Nadler
	Napolitano
	Neal
	Oliver

NOT VOTING—9

Becerra	Garamendi	Platts
Bilbray	Giffords	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Harman	Shuster

□ 1527

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.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 73, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 72) directing certain standing committees to inventory and review existing, pending, and proposed regulations and orders from agencies of the Federal Government, particularly with respect to their effect on jobs and economic growth, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 73, the amendment printed in the resolution is adopted and the resolution, as amended, is considered read.

Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I often see the impact that regulations have on small businesses. Harmful Federal regulations can put serious hurdles in the way of entrepreneurship, making it difficult to create jobs and expand businesses. As we try to encourage a lasting, stable economic recovery, it is critical we review and analyze the impact of proposed and existing regulations on small businesses. We must make sure regulators are not making irreversible decisions that could strain the competitive ability of small businesses, prevent expansion, reduce access to capital and harm the overall growth of the American economy.

□ 1530

Not only are regulations potentially harmful to small businesses, there are simply too many regulations for businesses to follow. In 2010, the Federal Register, the daily digest of the Federal agency regulatory announcements, contained about 82,000 pages, in comparison to the roughly 42,000 pages in 1980.

President Reagan and every President since ordered Federal bureaucrats to review regulations. Despite this, very few rules are ever repealed. President Reagan and every President since has ordered the Office of Management and Budget to review new regulations. And despite this review, Federal agencies continue to issue new regulations. President Reagan and every President since has issued an Executive Order mandating that agencies only promulgate rules in which benefits exceed the costs. Despite this, agencies continue to issue regulations imposing undue costs on small businesses. President Reagan and every President since has sought to strengthen the enforcement of the Paperwork Reduction Act. But despite this, reporting and record keeping requirements continue to bury small business owners.

Ultimately, what is at stake is whether small businesses will succeed in the free market or have their success determined by the whims and dictates of Federal bureaucrats. If the President and agencies are unable to stem this tide and allow small businesses to do what they do best—that is create jobs—then Congress has to act. The resolution before us today is just that, a call for Congress to act.

I strongly endorse this resolution and look forward to the Committee on Small Business reviewing agency regulations that are duplicative, unnecessary, or otherwise inhibit small business expansion.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses are central to the economic recovery currently underway. Unfortunately, there are many obstacles for entrepreneurs to overcome in order to be successful. One of the most notable is regulatory burden, the hours upon hours it takes an entrepreneur to navigate and complete Federal, State, or municipal government paperwork.

This impediment has grown dramatically in recent years. According to the SBA's Office of Advocacy, rules imposed from the Federal Government now cost Americans some \$1.75 trillion each year. This is 50 percent higher than the \$1.1 trillion in costs reported in 2005. We know that this burden falls heaviest on small firms. Research shows that small businesses face an annual regulatory cost of \$10,585 per employee, an amount that is 36 percent higher than those facing large firms. And Federal agencies continue to release tens of thousands of pages of regulations each year.

With this problem getting worse, it is certainly worth Congress' time and attention. In the Committee on Small Business, we have been reviewing regulations in a bipartisan fashion for years. As a result of this examination, we have called on Federal agencies to modify or eliminate regulatory requirements that adversely affect small firms, whether they are related to medical equipment at CMS, accounting requirements at the SEC, real estate procedures at HUD, or environmental regulations at the EPA.

The reality is that we already do what this resolution calls for. As a result, today's resolution does not help one small businessperson. It sets up a bureaucratic process here in Congress with the goal of producing a list of regulations. How does a "list" help small businesses? It doesn't. Anyone that has spent 5 minutes with a small business owner knows that this is a top problem for them. This resolution is nothing more than a vehicle to rehash old politically motivated fights and just creates more paperwork here in Congress.

Instead of approving this green eyeshade bookkeeping resolution, what we need to do is make sure that the actual tools already available to reduce regulatory burden are effective. This includes the Regulatory Flexibility Act, which mandates that Federal agencies consider the potential economic impact of Federal regulations as well as conduct periodic reviews of rules that have a significant economic impact on businesses. Making these laws work better—or expanding them further—is what we should be doing instead of passing this resolution. Requiring tougher and more agency reviews of regulation as well as considering broader economic effects of regulations are necessary. Here in the House, our committee reported bipartisan legislation in the 110th Congress to do just that.

As we navigate this issue over the next 24 months, we cannot lose sight of who we are trying to actually help. It is the small business owner that needs our assistance. Unfortunately, if this resolution is the best we can do, small businesses may have to wait a long time for real and meaningful relief.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all time on the resolution be yielded back and that H. Res. 72 be adopted so we can move to consider legislation creating jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the majority manager, the gentleman from Missouri, yield for the purpose of that unanimous consent request?

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield for the purpose of that request.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, we will continue this debate that will end up not creating one single job.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS), the chair of the Subcommittee on Health Care and Technology.

(Mrs. ELLMERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, in all of my years in business, I can honestly say that I have never seen an administration so prepared to regulate nearly every ailment, either real or perceived. Nearly every segment of industry has been subjected to increased regulation, whether it be banking, energy, automotive, services, and of course, health care. Ronald Reagan once said, "Government exists to protect us from each other. Where government has gone beyond its limits is in deciding to protect us from ourselves."

As a nurse and small business owner, I worked with my husband as a clinical director of the Trinity Wound Care Center in Dunn, North Carolina, where I saw firsthand the damage that government regulations can do to the growth of small businesses. The costs of these rules pile up. It's easy to understand why businesses are reportedly sitting on \$2 trillion in cash. Businesses don't know the true cost to comply with the rules just imposed and are concerned about the costs and rules yet to come.

No business can properly plan with roaming regulatory activity. This halts job growth and investment in its tracks. Just yesterday, a small business owner in my district testified in the Small Business Committee about this issue. He said working through a recession is tough, but adding to the burden with cumbersome and confusing new laws and regulations makes a recovery twice as hard. The uncertainty being created by Washington is stifling his small business recovery. He testified that the new health care law and the uncertainty it is creating for small business owners makes it harder for

him to determine what his costs are. This is a time when he is struggling to meet the most basic costs of running his business. Another witness, a restaurant owner, even stated that if he had to start his business today, he would probably decide against starting.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

He even stated that he wouldn't start his business. He further stated that he still may have to close his doors. Beyond existing businesses, regulations may prevent new firms and startups from entering the market. These startups are the very businesses that create the jobs in America.

□ 1540

According to a study using business dynamic statistics between 1977 and 2005, in their first year new firms add an average of 3 million jobs. My message today is simple. We must remove burdensome regulations so that businesses can grow and entrepreneurs can start new businesses.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, the rapidly expanding Federal regulatory burden is a bipartisan problem, and I commend the chairman of the committee, my friend from Missouri, for his efforts in working, not just in his time as chairman, but working with the committee in the previous years.

And I know that he understands that this is not a Republican or a Democratic problem, because the regulatory burdens on small businesses increased by \$30 billion from the years 2001–2008, and Federal regulations now cost Americans \$1.75 trillion each year, which is up 50 percent from the \$1.1 trillion in annual costs just in 2005.

And last year, the Federal Register contained 80,000 pages. In its first year in print, the Federal Register contained 2,355 pages. And each year, Federal agencies continue to release thousands of pages of new regulations and accompanying information. And I know that the gentleman understands that, and we share the goal of reducing this burden because the burden is detrimental, and it affects small businesses.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, studies indicate that adhering to Federal rules cost \$10,585 per worker for small businesses with 19 or fewer workers, but only 78 percent of that amount for businesses with 500-plus workers. It affects small businesses disproportionately.

Overall, on a per-employee basis, it costs \$2,400, or 45 percent, more for small businesses to comply with Federal regulations than their larger counterparts.

Small businesses face the greatest disadvantage in complying with envi-

ronmental and tax regulations. Compliance with environmental regulations cost 364 percent more in small firms than large, and 67 percent more for the cost of corporate tax compliance.

So we agree on the problem. The question is, Where do we go from here?

And this is where I have a concern with what Chairman GRAVES is putting forward. What does H. Res. 72 call for that we're not already doing?

The Committee on Small Business has been reviewing regulations in a bipartisan fashion for years. The gentleman has been involved in that. And as a result of these examinations, it's called on Federal agencies to modify or alter regulatory requirements that impose costs on small firms. This has included regulations pertaining to medical equipment at CMS, accounting requirements at the SEC, real estate procedures at HUD, environmental regulations at the EPA, and on it goes.

So the reality, Mr. Speaker, is we've already done, as a committee, what this resolution calls for. And I will include in the RECORD the 112th Congress Small Business Committee's Oversight of Federal Regulatory and Paperwork Burdens administrative plan, what the committee has already passed.

So my question for the gentleman from Missouri to answer during the course of the debate is: What exactly does this resolution do for small businesses that we're not already doing? Is there anything in this that's not already being done now? Does it actually reduce any real regulatory burden on small businesses? Does it reduce paperwork? Does it limit government requirements on the small business community?

I would submit that this particular resolution does not. It sets up a bureaucratic process here in the Congress with a goal of inventory of regulations, a long list of inventory regulations. But this list will be submitted as part of an administrative reporting process. It does nothing for small businesses.

So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that instead of approving this bookkeeping resolution, what Congress really needs to do is strengthen the tools it already has available to reduce regulatory burdens. This includes the Regulatory Flexibility Act, which mandates that Federal agencies consider the potential economic impact of Federal regulations, strengthening the requirements and increasing agency reviews and regulations, regulatory relief that we passed here in the Congress during the 110th Congress, reported out by the Small Business Committee related to bipartisan regulatory reductions.

And as we continue to revisit these issues here in the 112th Congress, we must remember that small businesses are who we're trying to help.

So, in closing, I'm concerned, Mr. Chairman, that what this legislation does is add an unnecessary step to getting down to the business that we can all agree on, which is actually reducing

the regulations that we all agree are a problem.

OVERSIGHT OF FEDERAL REGULATORY AND PAPERWORK BURDENS

The Committee will conduct hearings and investigations into unnecessary, burdensome, and duplicative federal rules, reporting and recordkeeping requirements affecting small businesses that may include any or all of the following, as well as matters brought to the attention of the Committee subsequent to the filing of this Report:

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.
Consumer Safety Products Commission.
Department of Agriculture.

Department of Energy, particularly the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

Department of Interior, particularly the Bureau of Land Management and Minerals Management Service.

Department of Labor, particularly the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

Department of Homeland Security, particularly the Transportation Security Administration.

Department of Transportation, particularly the Federal Aviation Administration and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

Environmental Protection Agency.
Federal Communications Commission.
Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council and its constituent agencies.

Food and Drug Administration.

Office of Federal Procurement Policy.

Securities and Exchange Commission.

The Committee will identify specific rules and regulations already issued or at the proposed rule stage to assess the impact on small businesses. The Committee will pay close attention to the effect that regulations have on the implementation of advanced technologies including, but not limited to, the deployment of broadband communications (either by wireline or wireless services) throughout the United States. Oversight of the regulatory process also will, to the extent relevant, examine the work of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs at the Office of Management and Budget. Special attention will be paid to the work performed by the Chief Counsel for Advocacy at the United States Small Business Administration to ensure that Office is fulfilling its mission to advocate vigorously on behalf of America's small business owners in regulatory matters at federal agencies. Finally, this oversight will entail an examination of compliance by federal agencies with amendments to Executive Order 12866 and memoranda on regulatory flexibility and regulatory compliance issued by the President on January 18, 2011.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

(Mr. LANDRY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, our government is working against us. Dana Dugas in St. Martinville wanted to continue to live the American Dream. He wanted to start his own small business.

Mr. Dugas had all the credentials needed to secure a loan: he had run a small successful business before, creating jobs and helping fuel coastal Louisiana's economy. He had the approval from two banks in St. Martinville,

\$200,000 in cash, a prime location, \$205,000 worth of renovations to bring the building up to code, \$205,000 in equipment and fixtures that he needed.

Mr. Dugas had an 800-plus credit score and 20 percent-plus cash in the bank for the down payment. He had a sound business plan with projections showing a 14 percent profit. His business would employ 10 to 15 full-time employees, and 10 to 20 part-time employees. His appraisal came in at \$605,000, \$200,000 more than he needed.

Everything looked great. Right? So you'd think. Everything looked great until his community small bank told him they could not make that loan. Due to new regulations, they directed him to work with a larger bank and through SBA.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. LANDRY. Then the Feds needed him to prove that he could pay back the loan without the income of his restaurant. That sounds like someone buying a house and having to prove that he can pay the note without a job.

Mr. Speaker, we need to get our government back on the side of Mr. Dugas and the American people, back on the side of free enterprise, back on the side of small businesses, and back on the side of the job creators.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Res. 72. H. Res. 72 is basically a solution in search of a problem. The House Small Business Committee already has a long bipartisan legacy of providing oversight and, when necessary, calling on government agencies to alter regulatory requirements that adversely affect small businesses.

H. Res. 72 does nothing to assist small businesses to create jobs, nor does it reduce Federal requirements on small businesses. All it does is order committees to do what they already do anyway.

Instead of distracting the American people's attention with this ploy disguised as a resolution, we should be focusing on doing what the American people want from us, which is to focus our efforts on the sorely needed real job-creation measures.

We are currently in our fifth week of the 112th Congress, and the new majority has not brought one bill to the floor that specifically focuses on job creation. How much longer must the job seekers of Brooklyn's 11th Congressional District wait before the new majority begins bringing legislation to the floor that promotes meaningful job creation?

If this is the best we can do, we are falling woefully short of the expectation of America's small businesses.

President Obama has made it clear that his primary objective is to pro-

mote job growth. We should be working with President Obama for the American people by bringing to the floor substantive legislation specifically targeted towards our small business entrepreneurs and meaningful and substantive job growth.

□ 1550

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy and Trade, Mr. TIPTON.

Mr. TIPTON. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, regulations cost the American people \$1.75 trillion annually. And just last year, the Obama administration unleashed 46 new regulations that will place an additional \$26.5 billion drain on the American economy.

Of those 46 new regulations, 10 came from the EPA, including job-killing regulations of carbon emissions and increased CAFE standards. The cost of these new EPA regulations alone total \$23 billion annually. These EPA regulations run counter to the free market principles and directly impact rural communities, small businesses, and families in my district. We simply cannot continue down the path of creating unnecessary regulatory traps that drain our economy and do little more than penalize small businesses and discourage job creation.

To be clear, not all regulations are unwarranted. Commonsense rules play an important role in our economy and in keeping the American people safe. However, common sense has been lost in the regulatory process that has become politicized and wrought with bureaucracy and overlap.

As a small business owner, I know firsthand the negative impacts that unnecessary regulations and excessive government involvement can have on entrepreneurs. Just yesterday, I participated in a hearing with the Small Business Committee where we focused on one such example of the job-killing government interference of the 1099 reporting requirement included in the President's health care law.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. TIPTON. Repealing the 1099 requirement is a good start, and our focus must remain on restoring a stable climate in our economy so it will not be rife with uncertainty and overregulation so small business, the backbone of our economy, can do what it does best: create jobs and grow our economy.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy and Trade for the Small Business Committee, I will take action. The fact that the Federal regulation targets on small businesses more than on any other sector is not acceptable. It's time we change the way that

regulation is enacted and increase congressional oversight.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how much time each side has.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Missouri has 7¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak on behalf of small business men and women all across America in their fight to survive and grow. Winston Churchill once said: If you have 10,000 regulations, you destroy respect for the rule of law. And that is exactly what our government is doing. We are destroying respect for law and losing the respect and trust of those who sent us here to do our job, not dictate through regulations how they do their jobs. Government regulations are putting a stranglehold on businesses in America, and it must be reined in.

I just returned from spending 12 days across the Third District of Tennessee, and I heard the same thing over and over again: CHUCK, please get the Federal Government out of our lives. It's destroying our businesses and preventing us from growing.

As a member of the Small Business Committee, I was proud to cosponsor the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act that does away with the onerous 1099 reporting regulation found within ObamaCare. It is long overdue for the government to get out of the way and allow the American entrepreneurs to do what they do best: create jobs and produce capital.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. I rise today to oppose House Resolution 72. This is a meaningless gimmick that only wastes time.

While I do not oppose its spirit, I do oppose spending House floor time debating a bill that is wholly and completely redundant. It is already the job of committees to review Federal regulations and laws, and, in fact, the Committee on Small Business has been actively doing this.

But this bill doesn't do one thing to help small business. It does nothing to actually reduce real regulatory burden on small businesses. It does not reduce paperwork nor limit government requirements on the business community. In fact, it only sets up a bureaucratic process here in Congress with a goal of producing an inventory of regulations, something we already do.

We have already passed strong bills, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, and, most recently, the Dodd-Frank bill, which sets up a very strong protection,

something that has not been done before. The Consumer Protection Agency must meet with small businesses before any new regulation is passed.

So why aren't we doing something to actually help small business come out from this tough recession? Why haven't we voted on a single bill creating jobs since the Republicans took over the majority? Why haven't we voted on a single bill to help small businesses?

Small businesses are responsible for two-thirds of net new jobs. But if this resolution is the best we can do, small businesses will have to wait a long time for real relief, and that's not good enough for our economy or the American people.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, the chair of the Subcommittee on Investigation, Oversight and Regulations, Mr. COFFMAN.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 4, the Small Business Paperwork Mandate Elimination Act of 2011.

Yesterday, we heard testimony in the Small Business Committee from the bill's author, Representative DAN LUNGREN of California. In addition, small business owners, including a constituent of mine, Mark Eagleton of Golden, Colorado, also testified.

House Resolution 4 would repeal the provision from the recently passed health care reform law that requires every business to file a 1099 form with the IRS for every vendor with which they conduct business transactions of \$600 or more on an annual basis. This requirement will force businesses to use scarce resources to comply with this burdensome government mandate, and it will take away from their ability to grow and create jobs.

In these tough economic times, it is important for government to take proactive steps that will foster small business expansion and job growth. Unfortunately, the recently passed health care reform law will lead to the opposite. Increased government mandates, such as the 1099 reporting requirement, will lead to reduced revenues, job losses, and will only extend this economic downturn with its high levels of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Small Business Paperwork Mandate Elimination Act of 2011, which will rid American businesses of this job-killing requirement. We must start over and pass meaningful reforms that will lower the cost of health care for all Americans while supporting growth of America's small businesses.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 3½ minutes remaining.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the resolution that we are considering today will not help one single small business. It will not reduce paperwork for entrepreneurs nor will it result in a less intrusive government.

□ 1600

This resolution will do none of this.

The previous speaker was talking about the fact that yesterday we held a hearing in the Small Business Committee discussing the burden of 1099s. We know that there is bipartisan agreement on this issue, so let's fix it instead of wasting time, hours here that will take us nowhere. Why can't the Republican leadership bring the issue of the 1099, where there is bipartisan agreement, and get it done? That will help small businesses, and it will create jobs. But this resolution will not achieve that.

What it does do is create bureaucratic bookkeeping requirements for House committees. I guess for some this might be a good sound bite, but this does not provide any concrete solutions for our Nation's small business owners who are drowning in government regulations.

If we want real change, we have to transform how executive branch agencies create and approve regulations. This means ensuring that businesses are given meaningful involvement in the process, not just a token role. It also means that agencies should consider the impact on the business community before they begin writing the regulation, not when it is nearly complete.

Changes like this are long overdue. The reality is that the regulatory burden has grown dramatically under both Republican and Democratic administrations, rising by over \$30 billion under George W. Bush's administration alone.

This is a bipartisan problem that needs a bipartisan solution. With this in mind, I look forward to working with anyone that is interested in bringing real regulatory relief to small businesses.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST).

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

As we are seeing unfold throughout our country and also especially my 22nd Congressional District in Florida, this health care bill has been detrimental to the survival and growth of our small businesses. Employers are choosing to drop health care for their employees, which will flood this government-run health care system, eventually leading to a lower quality of health care.

According to the Small Business Administration, the smallest firms spend 36 percent more per employee than larger firms to comply with Federal regulations. It comes out to about \$10,585 per employee for all Federal regulations. The multitude of rules, restrictions and mandates imposes a heavy burden on Americans and the U.S. economy and could destroy an untold number of jobs.

The Obama administration promulgated 59 major regulations in 2009, 62 in

2010, another 191 regulations are in the works, and the Dodd-Frank permanent bailout bill alone requires no fewer than 243 new rules by 11 agencies over a dozen years.

The SBA also estimates the total cost for all Federal regulations is roughly \$1.75 trillion each year. All of the Federal red tape is a tax and regulatory straightjacket that is crippling our economic recovery.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to say that this resolution before us, as has been said, it is not a Democratic or a Republican issue; rather, it is an issue of good government and it identifies those irrational rules that represent barriers to job growth.

Mr. Speaker, the last Congress and this administration passed bill after bill after bill that either taxed or regulated businesses and small firms right out of business, and it is going to take time to unravel that mess. With this bill, again, we are going to identify a lot of those irrational rules that represent those barriers.

With that, I would strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the pending resolution, particularly with respect to the effect on jobs and the economy.

My colleagues on the other side are going to oppose this effort, claiming we are seeking to strip basic public health and safety protections. No one is in favor of hurting those in those areas, but that is not the purpose of us being here today.

We have had numerous hearings over the last couple of days on rules and regulations and how they hurt job creation. This gives power back to the committees to then do that, fine-tooth comb through rules and regulations and address what the President talked about in his State of the Union; where there are rules and regulations that don't make sense, we need to eliminate them, because we need to focus on job creation. We can't regulate existing businesses into the ground on the hope that better ones will come later. We must protect the jobs currently we have and open the doors for new businesses as well.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, I am particularly interested in the activities of the EPA. I am going to talk about three examples, one we heard yesterday in testimony.

United States Steel came before us and said imagine a regulation where we have to decrease the heat in the preparation of steel to comply with NO_x, but as we move to EPA rules and regulations on greenhouse gasses we actually have to use the same process and heat

that process up. So U.S. Steel will be caught in a catch-22. Under one reg, they have to keep the heat low to comply with nitrous oxide regulations; on the other hand, in the same process, they have to heat it up to meet the greenhouse gas rules.

Now, what is a steel company going to do? They are going to move to China. You can't develop rules and regulations that cannot be complied with by existing known technologies, and that was just a perfect example.

Another one that I find, and a lot of these things not only hurt jobs, but they are going to hurt the environment. The example is the redefinition of used oil as a solid waste. Now, this sounds like, what are they talking about?

Many of us, and there are times when many of us, when we were young, we changed our own oil. We would get underneath the car, pull the plug and drain the oil. Fortunately, in today's world, you can take it to an auto repair shop, you can take it to maybe a parts store, and you can then recycle that used oil.

Not if the EPA has its say, because what they do in the redefinition of this is the only way you can dispose of this off-brand, off-used oil is to burn it. Oh, that is real great for the environment, burning the used oil. And what will the home do-it-yourselfer do? They are probably going to pour it on the ground. So EPA regs not only hurt job creation, but they have a great effect in hurting and harming the economy.

The next one, one of the issues we will address next week in the committee is coal ash byproducts. This is another one that is curious in which the EPA is trying to meddle in. Despite EPA's own testing and admittance that these coal byproducts do not qualify as hazardous waste based on their toxicity, EPA wants to label them as toxic material.

What does that mean? Any byproducts used will then be required to be disposed of in special landfills or dumps and not recycled. Coal ash can't go into concrete. Gypsum can't go into wallboard. Wallboard that has to be disposed of or you are going to remodel your home, what happens to that wallboard? The cost of doing business increases, and these all are things that hurt job creation.

□ 1610

We applaud President Obama in his State of the Union when he says there's too many regulations and we need to ease the regulatory burden. That's the importance of what we're doing here—one of the few things we agree on with the administration. And this will allow us committee by committee to go through the process and identify those hindrances and start to move legislation to address those.

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

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

Our highest priority should be to put America back to work. We need jobs, investment, and growth; but that's not what we're doing in Congress. Yesterday the Energy and Commerce Committee held one hearing attacking women's reproductive rights and another promoting legislation to roll back the Clean Air Act. And today we're spending all day debating a meaningless resolution no one disagrees with. None of this will create any jobs or make our economy stronger.

The resolution we're debating directs several committees, including my committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, to conduct oversight of government regulations. Well, I support oversight and reforming unnecessary or outdated regulations. That's part of our job. We don't need a resolution to do our job.

But we need to be honest with American families. Our economy is not in a recession because of regulations. We are in a recession because Wall Street ran amok and Federal regulators were asleep on the job. It is too little regulation of Wall Street—not overregulation—that caused our economic woes. And that's why this resolution is going to do nothing to get our economy growing again.

I ask my colleagues to remember the collapse of Wall Street in 2008. This meltdown in the financial markets threw our economy into the deepest recession since the Great Depression. Millions of Americans lost their jobs, and it cost U.S. taxpayers billions of dollars to bail out AIG and Wall Street banks. The cause wasn't regulation. As Alan Greenspan, the head of the Federal Reserve Board, testified before me and other members of the Oversight Committee, he had "made a mistake" in promoting deregulation. He said he had "found a flaw" in his free-market ideology and was in "a state of shocked disbelief."

The Deepwater Horizon oil spill wreaked havoc on the economies of the Gulf States. It wasn't caused by too little oversight and too much regulation. It was because there wasn't enough oversight and regulation. Thousands of jobs were lost in the gulf because Deepwater Horizon was not subject to proper safety and environmental regulations.

No one disagrees that ongoing oversight of regulations is necessary. In his address to the Chamber of Commerce on Monday, President Obama said that Federal agencies are already conducting a comprehensive review of existing regulations to identify and fix those that are outdated and unnecessary. As the President said, we should design regulations intelligently and "get rid of regulations that have outlived their usefulness or don't work."

But this isn't going to create new jobs, reduce our deficit, or make the middle class stronger. To grow our economy, we need to invest in new clean energy jobs; we need to bring

broadband connections to all parts of America; and we need to continue to make health care more efficient. That's what we should be talking about on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), and I ask unanimous consent that she be allowed to control the time for the Energy and Commerce Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I now yield 2½ minutes to the chairman of the Health Subcommittee, JOE PITTS.

Mr. PITTS. The United States is in danger of losing its status as the world leader in medical device innovation. Multiple studies have shown that regulatory uncertainty and a delay and inefficiency at the Food and Drug Administration are damaging this critical industry.

Shorter, more predictable and more transparent approval processes in Europe have led many device companies to seek to market their products in Europe before submitting them to the FDA. This hurts American patients who, on average, have access to innovative medical devices 2 years later than patients in European countries, and, in some cases, never have access to these devices. And does a longer, more uncertain regulatory process by FDA result in making American patients any safer? The answer is no.

According to recent studies, medical devices marketed through the shorter and more transparent European regulatory processes are statistically as safe as FDA-cleared and -approved devices and have comparable patient outcomes. Regulatory uncertainty also hurts American competitiveness as innovative device companies are moving jobs overseas.

And these are good jobs. Nationally, jobs in medical technology pay almost 40 percent higher compared to the national earnings average. San Diego-based NuVasive, a medical device company, is a case study of what regulatory burdens and delays can do to a company. NuVasive reports that in the last 18 to 24 months, "longer FDA approval times have directly resulted in significant revenue loss estimated at \$70 million, increased operating expenses of over \$2 million, hundreds of new jobs eliminated, and less investment in research and development."

The company continues: "It is becoming far more efficient and faster to innovate outside the U.S.A. in such places as Europe. Non-U.S.A. systems have more timely, predictable, and transparent process. We have seen U.S.A. delays of 3 to 70 months, which has forced NuVasive to rethink longer-term strategies around where to place research and development jobs and even whether or not to invest in innovation of new products."

This is just one company, but this scenario is playing out nationwide. Unfortunately, this scenario also is playing out in prescription drugs space. The uncertainty and lack of transparency in the drug approval process is hurting American job creation and hurting American patients. We need to improve these problems at FDA so American patients have timely access to life-saving, life-improving drugs and devices and American workers have access to these good jobs.

Ms. DEGETTE. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to get going. We were sworn in over a month ago now, when the highest priority in this country, everybody agrees, is creating jobs. And, frankly, with unemployment still hovering around 9 percent, we have no time to waste dithering around arguing about what we should do.

This resolution does not do one thing to create one job. So, once again, what are we doing? We're standing on the House floor debating for 9½ hours, wasting the American people's time, which is time we could be using to sit down on a bipartisan basis and bring jobs, investment, and growth to this country. What we're doing here is time-consuming, but it really means nothing in the end. It's a resolution. It's a resolution that directs certain standing committees to look at regulations and to decide if they think that it has some impact on jobs. It lists a number of matters for consideration. It gives no deadline by which the committees have to investigate these issues. It gives no standards for the various matters for consideration, including impede private sector job creation, et cetera. So you can bet we'll have long debates over each one of those criteria.

But, then, what is most unbelievable about this resolution, it really doesn't say what we should do about it. Let's say all the committees meet month after month determining day after day, hearing after hearing that there's some impeding on business. Then what do they do? And that's what's so frustrating, because the American people don't want more review, inventory, or compilation of regulations. They want their families to have jobs. And so that's why we really need to sit down and talk about how will we create jobs.

This resolution won't save one home from foreclosure, it won't help repair one crumbling bridge or potholed road, it won't extend a mile of broadband. It wouldn't ensure one school lunch for our children or provide a patient greater access to hospitals or doctors. It won't do any of that.

□ 1620

What's worse, Mr. Speaker, is that, as we take this debate on today, we need to remember the committees are already bound by the rules of the House to provide proper oversight. We don't need 2 days to debate a resolution

that tells the committees what they already have a constitutional duty to do.

Frankly, I am concerned, too, because there is nothing this Congress has done today to give us any indication that the majority intends to spend any time creating jobs. We had 7 hours of debate on a bill to repeal health care, which everybody knows is not going anywhere in the other body and which doesn't create one job. This week, today—it's Thursday—we passed exactly one piece of legislation, and we are done voting for the day.

While this resolution does nothing to create jobs and nothing, frankly, to make Congress expeditiously use its already existing regulatory oversight, at the same time it neglects the fact that laws and regulations can be important to protect our constituents' health.

For example, when we had insufficient laws and regulations to deal with outbreaks of foodborne illness, we acted on a bipartisan basis to reduce 76 million foodborne illnesses, 300,000 hospitalizations, and 5,000 deaths a year in the United States. This type of regulation and oversight is important. It keeps Americans safe. It reduces the cost to our economy, and it ultimately helps save jobs. There are billions of dollars of lost productivity for workers, damage to our economy, and lost profits due to foodborne illnesses, which this Congress acted on a bipartisan basis to reduce.

Mr. Speaker, I've also introduced legislation to foster the development of a clear and predictable regulatory pathway that enables better approval of safe and effective products and the support of regulatory research to promote the understanding of regenerative medicine. These types of regulatory initiatives can actually help create jobs in the future and are a critical part of our work in this body.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Look, there is nobody on either side of this aisle who thinks we should have an unnecessary or overly burdensome regulation, but that's not what this is about. We have a long history of regulatory review, and we can do that without spending 9 hours debating a resolution like this. A few hours ago, we all stood here and read the Constitution aloud together. I am sure everybody remembers that the authority for committees in this Congress to review and inventory regulations is already provided.

So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what we do is bring this debate to an end, that we focus on the regulations that we can repeal, and that we really focus on what the American people want us to talk about, which is creating jobs for the American public.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. It is business that creates jobs. Easing the regulatory burden helps create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman

from California, Congresswoman BONO MACK, who is the chairman of the Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade Subcommittee.

Mrs. BONO MACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to rightfully hear a lot today during this debate about how excessive government regulations are hurting our economy, but there are other forces at work as well, and they are just as damaging, even, perhaps, more insidious.

Shortly after taking office, President Obama issued an executive order encouraging Federal agencies, which was really sort of a wink and a nod, to require project labor agreements on government construction projects costing more than \$25 million.

Mr. Speaker, with unemployment in my California district over 14 percent and unemployment in the construction industry above 20 percent, these so-called "crony contracts" are not only wrong; they are immoral. Instead of an executive order, what we really need from the White House is a cease and desist order.

Simply put, project labor agreements mandating "union labor only" are anticompetitive. The infamous Big Dig in Boston is clearly the biggest boondoggle of them all. Originally projected to cost about \$3 billion, this 3-mile tunnel project turned out to be one of the most expensive Federal highway projects in U.S. history. At last count, the meter was still running: \$15 billion in construction costs and another \$7 billion in interest alone. Put another way, when it's all said and done, the Big Dig is going to cost us about \$1.2 million per foot.

Not only do these PLAs waste taxpayer money, but they are also un-American. Today, less than 15 percent of construction workers in our Nation are unionized. So every time a PLA is mandated by some government bureaucrat, 85 percent of America's construction workers, some 8 million hardworking men and women across the country, are told either tough luck, too bad, or maybe next time. Since 2007, nearly 2 million construction workers across America have lost their jobs.

Enough already. Let's put an end to political favoritism. Let's demand the best deal for the taxpayers. Let's say "no" to the "wink and nod" culture in Washington.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mrs. BONO MACK. As the new chairman of the House Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade, I am going to do everything to make "made in America" matter again. That starts by taking a critical look at what we do here at home to foster competitiveness. Today, with the economy still struggling to recover, it is time to do what is best for all Americans, not what is best simply for a select, favored few.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution being offered by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is a simple waste of time, and it doesn't address job creation, which must be the number one priority of this Congress.

Today, we are literally coming to the floor to spend nearly 10 hours of debate telling the committees of the House to do what they already should be doing. Since January 5, when this Congress was sworn in, we have not voted on one bill that will strengthen our economy or create jobs—not a single one. While we're doing this, the Republican leadership is putting together a spending bill that will cost our economy jobs. The bill makes sweeping cuts in research and development, cuts that will jeopardize America's position as a world leader in innovation.

In the State of the Union, the President set the right priorities with his focus on job creation, economic recovery, debt reduction, and economic opportunity for all Americans.

I am here with my Democratic colleagues from the Energy and Commerce Committee where we worked over the last 4 years to keep America at the forefront of the world in clean-energy technologies and quality health care, so I am trying to understand why our committee is down here today, wasting our time, when we could be having hearings to generate new ideas on how to create jobs and strengthen our economy.

Republicans simply don't get it. They don't have a clue. Democrats have lots of ideas. Investments in clean energy will not only reduce greenhouse gas emissions and keep our environment healthy, but they will also create countless new jobs.

I am encouraged by the President's announcement this week that he is going to prioritize offshore wind development in areas off the Atlantic coast, including in my State of New Jersey. This is exactly the type of clean energy America should be investing in, which will reduce our dependence on foreign oil and gas and create jobs. That's why I oppose the Republican plan to cut almost \$900 million from energy efficiency and renewable energy programs that create jobs and move America towards a more self-efficient energy market that doesn't rely on foreign oil from volatile places like the Middle East.

Another important issue that we could be discussing in our committee is health science and innovation. The health science industry, which includes pharmaceuticals, medical devices and biotechnology, plays a critical role in our national economy as well as in New Jersey's economy. A recent report by Research America noted that New Jersey is the third largest research and development employer in the U.S., with more than 211,000 jobs supported by health R&D, including 50,000 direct jobs in health R&D.

Federal R&D investments are critical for continued economic growth. For example, the National Institutes of Health award many grants to universities, which, in turn, bring money and jobs to States. In 2007, New Jersey received \$280 million in research grants from NIH, which helped create and support 3,738 new jobs.

We need to continue to make smart, disciplined, forward-looking investments in innovation. Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have proposed cutting \$1 billion from NIH funding in the spending bill they plan to bring to the floor next week. This is not the solution to keeping America at the forefront of R&D in the world, and it is going to hurt our ability to create high-quality high-tech jobs.

□ 1630

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, Chairman STEARNS.

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. I thank my distinguished colleague.

My colleagues, recently the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce held a hearing, and I chair this subcommittee. It was one of the first hearings on the rapid pace of regulations that are coming from the Obama administration. We made clear to the witness, regulation czar Cass Sunstein, that we objected to the fact that the administration is considering and issuing regulations with regard not to jobs and the economy, but is simply using as a standard such ridiculously amorphous terms as equity, human dignity, fairness, and distributive impacts. I asked him what this meant and he said, well, basically distribution of income. What? The administration is making a decision on regulation on the basis of distribution of income? I thought the market was supposed to decide that, not a government czar.

In fiscal year 2010, Federal agencies promulgated 43 major rules that impose costs that are estimated to cost industry \$28 billion, the highest annual level since 1981. Along with all these major rules come daunting levels of red tape, the cost of which cannot easily be counted. The Obama administration's regulatory agenda released this past fall identifies 4,225 rules under development.

Now, the EPA alone has finalized almost 1,000 new regulations since the start of the administration and has also proposed a number of expensive and complex new rules affecting our energy system, our industrial and manufacturing infrastructure, and even the electric power we rely upon every day.

Now, with this Nation suffering from 21 straight months of unemployment at 9 percent or higher unemployment, our focus should be on jobs. Unnecessary

and burdensome regulations act as a de facto tax on every American family and small business in this country; yet there's no end in sight for all the regulations that are coming from the Obama administration. From our health to our wealth to the freedom to live our lives the way we want, the Federal regulatory state continues to grow and grow and intrudes.

It's time for Congress to reduce this burden and get our economy growing again.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I would just say that in this hearing with Professor Sunstein, the evidence was that the regulations that came out in the first 2 years of the Obama administration were less than the regulations that came out in the last 2 years of the Bush administration.

With that, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Resolution 72. This resolution does nothing to actually create jobs and is a distraction from what should be our focus: creating jobs here in this country. Instead of spending time debating and creating legislation that would create jobs and further our economic recovery, we are here debating legislation that basically reiterates what the Energy and Commerce Committee is currently doing.

In contrast, I believe that the American people have been clear. They want this Congress to focus on jobs, and that should be our number one priority. In fact, I recently sent a survey to my constituents asking them what they thought should be the top priorities of this Congress. Not surprisingly, 81 percent responded that creating jobs should be our top priority.

Mr. Speaker, I routinely hold clean energy roundtable forums in Sacramento with CEOs and with other local leaders, including one just last week, and they consistently tell me that they need real incentives and assistance in expanding their manufacturing base and finding new markets abroad for their products and services. In doing so, they recognize that new jobs will be created. They will have additional revenues to purchase new equipment, invest in R&D, and benefit our economy. Perhaps, instead of debating today's resolution, we could instead be focused on debating legislation that would create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we need to be focussing on moving our economy forward by creating new jobs in different sectors of our economy. Just as the President emphasized in his recent State of the Union address and announced in his Startup America initiative, America must continue to lead the way in innovation in order to both rebuild today's economy and bolster the industries of tomorrow.

The clean energy manufacturing sector is a critical area where most leading economists believe our Nation can

experience the highest job growth potential. In fact, the Department of Energy has found that continued investment in the U.S. clean energy sector could create more than 750,000 jobs over the next decade. However, it is one area where the U.S. is unfortunately falling behind many of its competitors, including China and Germany. Mr. Speaker, we must change that.

America has an historic opportunity to become a leader in clean technology manufacturing and creating new, good-paying jobs in this country. That is why I, along with Congressman JOHN DINGELL, recently introduced legislation to bolster the U.S. clean energy and manufacturing industry with the goal of creating jobs and advancing our Nation's standing in the ever growing clean energy economy.

As part of the Make It In America agenda, this legislation, H.R. 502, the Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Act of 2011, would help boost U.S. innovation and competitiveness by promoting the manufacturing of clean energy technology at home and supporting its exports abroad. The bill helps strengthen America's domestic clean tech manufacturing industry by directing the Commerce Department to provide specific tools and resources to those companies that need it most: America's small and medium-sized manufacturing businesses.

Mr. Speaker, manufacturing jobs are the fabric of our country that could put millions of Americans back to work. But we must manufacture the products that are in demand and that have an exponential potential to grow, and the clean energy sector is that ever growing industry. But in order to create those jobs, this Congress must pass legislation that will help us do just that.

Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House last Congress with bipartisan support, and it is my hope that it will be considered again soon during this new Congress so we can move our Nation's clean energy economy forward and create new, good-paying jobs here in this country. Unfortunately, H. Res. 72 fails that test.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the resolution before us.

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

We don't care which administration created all these burdensome regulations. If they do not protect public health and harm job creation, we want to review them. I don't see what's the big damage of that, and every time you hear the word "incentives" you know what that means? Tax dollars. That means borrowing money from China to incentivize who knows what.

We want capital formation through the private sector to create jobs. The government can no longer do that.

I now yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), who is the vice chairman of my subcommittee.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You know, we now have 29 million people in America who are either out of work or looking for work, and we also are facing a problem of trillions of deficit spending that affects those jobs. There's four pillars to what we need to do to turn our economy around.

One is the issue of cutting government spending and turning that deficit around. Two is to deal with making sure we're keeping taxes low and regulations fair that promote growth of jobs and not hinder that growth. We must also have trade enforcement law changes that allow us to grow in another way.

China alone, for example, is exploiting loopholes big enough to sail a freight ship through. They tax and embargo the export of raw materials and rare Earth minerals. They mandate local content requirement so American companies can't build in the U.S. and ship to China. They steal patents, copyrights, and reverse-engineer U.S. technology and products. They offer below-market government loans to their companies, and they manipulate their currency. All of this has created a great wall of illegal and unfair manufacturing trade practices, and we cannot sit by while they undermine our jobs.

But a fourth pillar has to do with how we need to grow our resources, an important issue for the Energy and Commerce Committee. While the Outer Continental Shelf of this country is off limits for oil drilling, we are passing by massive amounts of jobs and massive amounts of economy for our Nation.

□ 1640

If we were allowed to have drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf, the Federal revenue alone, without borrowing money, without buying from OPEC, without increasing our trade deficits, would yield \$2.5 trillion to \$3.7 trillion in Federal revenue, and all of that based upon 1970s estimates of how much oil is out there.

In addition to that, even though there is not supposed to be a moratorium on drilling off the Gulf of Mexico, there is in effect a "permatorium" because all of these wells which previously have been permitted are now told they can't drill. Regulatory agencies dither, which means higher oil prices at the pump for American families, greater reliance on OPEC, and with the threats of Egypt and the worries about the Suez Canal, we are sitting by as American families wondering what's going to happen next. Let's deal with all these issues and grow American jobs.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady from Colorado.

Three points. Number one, any regulations that aren't doing their job, they're imposing excessive burdens,

let's change them. I agree with that. The President agrees with that. You're arguing that. You're right. The American people want regulations that are limited to achieving legitimate goals and not imposing unnecessary burdens.

Second, and this is a question, why are we going to debate this? Why are we going to substitute words for actions? The Committee on Energy and Commerce and all the other committees that are being charged to act on this resolution are free to act. And rather than have a discussion and debate about it, ask those committees to come in with what their specific recommendations are. Let the House of Representatives vote yes or no on any proposed action.

But third, jobs. Both sides have been saying we've got to focus on jobs. A couple of very good speeches, Mr. MURPHY from Pennsylvania, Mr. STEARNS from Florida, we agree with that. Why don't we dust off a proven and bipartisan job-creating bill, Home Star, which the Energy and Commerce Committee passed out on a bipartisan basis last year, and bring it forward to this Congress this year? It's something that saves money for our homeowners on their energy bills, it's something that puts local contractors who are reeling from the decline in homebuilding back to work retrofitting our homes, and it saves \$10 billion in energy bills, creates 170,000 jobs and it's all about using less, not more. It's about efficiency. And that's common ground. We're not having a debate about whether we should or shouldn't be drilling, or what's the preferred energy source, whether it's coal, nuclear or solar. It's really whatever energy source you're using, if you use less of it, as a business or as a consumer, you're going to save money. So it's something we can do together. The new majority would have the final say on how we would pay for this. It could be designed in a way to take care of the capital formation concerns that the other side has expressed.

What we're talking about here is important. Regulations should be limited to the legitimate purpose for which they're intended. They shouldn't be excessively burdensome. If there are specific regulations that ought to be adjusted and it requires statutory action, come back with the specific statute, let this body vote on it and move on. That's action. It's not words. But then the common goal that we have, even if it's a significant debate and disagreement about how best to get from here to there, is we've got to create jobs in this economy. Home Star is a way we can do it with the new majority working with the new minority.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues, we'll have a chance next week to vote on greenhouse gas regulations, which will kill jobs. Those bills are coming.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think our colleagues across the aisle

are showing their displeasure. They think that it requires passing a law to create jobs and they want to tax and spend so that they can use the term “invest.” But I think the American people have really wised up to what is going on. They know that every time a law is passed, rules and regulations start to pile on. They also know that if money is coming to D.C., then they can’t use that money there in their communities to create jobs. Because the way it really works is this: Government does not create jobs. Government creates the environment in which the private sector can create jobs.

Last week, as we were home, I visited, I worked with my Chambers of Commerce and with job creators to tell us, what is getting in the way. We heard a lot about regulation and the overreach of regulation. From bankers, we heard about auditors and regulators and the FDIC. From builders, we heard about OSHA and the EPA. From small business manufacturers, we heard about the EPA and carbon emissions. From retailers, we heard about the FTC. From our implement device manufacturers and biotech community, we heard about the FDA overreach. From our high tech innovators and our health informatics, we heard about the overreach of the FCC.

Regulation is stifling job growth. It is time for us to cut back on this \$1.75 trillion a year hit that the business community, the job creators, are taking; rein this regulation in; and, yes, my friends, let’s repeal some of these laws and rules and regulations, get them off the books and free up the private sector so they do what they do best—create the jobs that the American people want to see.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs).

Mrs. CAPPs. I thank my Colorado colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I’m sort of troubled that we’re here this afternoon. Americans are still facing staggering unemployment rates and our economy has not yet fully recovered. But instead of focusing on job creation, we’re wasting 2 days—and taxpayer dollars—on a resolution directing committees to conduct oversight on government regulations.

I have been a Member of Congress for over a decade and I know that committees already do oversight on government regulations. Without prompting, a well-run committee will make sure the government’s regulations are necessary and effective at protecting the American people. In fact, the Energy and Commerce Committee, under the leadership of HENRY WAXMAN in the last Congress, did just that. Our committee conducted oversight on the failures that led to the BP oil spill in the gulf and the reckless Wall Street behaviors that caused a near meltdown of our economy.

When insurance companies announced that they would pad their

profits with huge rate increases on American families—after they dropped individuals from coverage just because they got sick—it was our committee that stood up to them. I’m afraid, though, that in this new Congress, American families won’t get that same kind of protection.

Yesterday, our committee held a hearing on legislation that would insert the government into private decisions between a patient and her doctor. We also held a hearing on legislation that would put the interests of polluters ahead of the health of millions of Americans, including our children, our seniors and the most vulnerable among us. That wasn’t oversight to help create jobs or to help the American people; it was just examples of promoting an extreme agenda that puts the public’s health at risk.

Mr. Speaker, instead of telling committees how to do their jobs, we should be creating jobs for the American people—health care jobs, clean energy jobs, high tech jobs, manufacturing jobs. This is America’s top priority. This is what we should be talking about here on the House floor today.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from Ohio who is from the largest manufacturing district in the country, Mr. LATTA.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the EPA has indicated they intend to overturn 30 years of precedent and designate coal ash as a hazardous waste, despite findings from the Department of Energy, the Federal Highway Administration, State regulatory authorities and the EPA itself that the toxicity levels in coal ash are well below the criteria that requires a hazardous waste designation. In fact, in the EPA’s May 2000 regulatory determination, they concluded that coal ash does not warrant regulation as a hazardous waste, and that doing so would be environmentally counterproductive.

About 45 percent of the coal ash generated is recycled, being used as an additive in cement, concrete, wallboard and roofing materials, road-based fill materials, and snow and ice control. While all of this is completely safe, designating coal ash as a hazardous waste would halt these beneficial uses, which the EPA estimates will lead to \$16.7 billion in increased costs per year, further damaging our economy.

□ 1650

Finally, the increased cost of coal ash disposal will lead to the closure of up to 18 percent of current coal-generated power, resulting in lost jobs, higher electricity costs, and further increasing our dependency on foreign countries for our energy needs, which we cannot afford.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with having our committees review regulations. But the problem is we are wasting 9½ hours when we are involved in a great race, a great competition.

We are in a race with China and other places in the world to build a clean energy economy that can create millions of new jobs in solar and wind and electric cars and lithium ion batteries.

And you can be assured that the Chinese are not wasting 9½ hours when it comes to figuring out how to form capital formation for solar power companies. That’s what we should be doing.

You can be assured the Chinese aren’t wasting 9½ hours trying to figure out how to site high-density transmission lines so we can have clean energy plants and move that electricity across their country. That’s what we should be doing on a bipartisan basis.

You can be assured that the Chinese aren’t wasting 9½ hours figuring out how to create a demand for new wind energy so we can put people to work building wind farms. That’s what we should be doing.

And you know what, last year the Republicans passed a clean energy standard which we could be talking about this year on a bipartisan basis. Instead, we’re wasting 9½ hours talking about something all of us agree to do.

Now, how do the Republicans intend to do this going out of the gate next week? We’re told that their first act is to remove from our Federal law the ability to create jobs in the green, clean energy sector because they want to pass their dirty air bill. Their dirty air bill will strip the Environmental Protection Agency of the ability to create an incentive for 1.5 million jobs: jobs in the solar sector industry, jobs in the wind industry, jobs in the enhanced geothermal industry. These are jobs.

Don’t let them pass the dirty air bill.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington, CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, the vice chairman of the Republican Conference.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 72.

Last week, I met with a company who said the only way to comply with the regulations is to not operate. Just last month, America slipped in its economic freedom rating. We are no longer an “economically free” society but a “mostly free” society because of the costly and duplicative regulations—not labor costs, but regulations. We don’t have to look any further than the hard rock mining industry, many of which operate in eastern Washington.

Despite effective safeguards implemented by States, the Federal Government, through the EPA, has decided

that it needs to step in and add regulations that will all but certainly drain this industry of capital, forcing businesses to cut jobs, not invest in America, and ultimately make us more dependent upon foreign countries for these important minerals.

Mr. Speaker, regulation is not what our Nation is all about. America is about entrepreneurialism, innovation, and living the American Dream.

Let's get these oppressive rules and regulations off the books. A good first step is the passage of the resolution we are considering today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 10½ minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from Colorado has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DEGETTE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Houston (Mr. OLSON) the former Navy fighter pilot.

Mr. OLSON. I thank my friend from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 72. In this economic environment, it is critically important for this Congress to find and eliminate government regulations which are damaging to the economy and are destroying American jobs.

According to the Heritage Foundation, the current administration has imposed 43 major regulations in fiscal year 2010 alone, with an estimated cost of \$26.5 billion. A prime example of this senseless regulation is the EPA's new greenhouse gas regulations which will adversely affect every business and energy consumer in America. The increased costs associated with the new EPA regulations will be passed on to consumers in the form of higher energy costs. Those impacted include small businesses and individuals still struggling to make it out of the current recession.

The EPA's regulations will eliminate American jobs and send them overseas. It's just plain and simple. The bureaucratic EPA permitting process will cause countless construction delays on new projects, and the increased compliance costs will drive many companies abroad where the regulatory environment is more favorable. Again, American jobs heading overseas to foreign soil.

America has suffered 21 straight months of unemployment above 9 percent. Our top priority should be to reduce the cost of doing business so companies can expand their operations and hire new employees.

The new EPA greenhouse gas regulations are a tax on energy. They will only serve to drive up energy costs, reduce economic activity, and destroy American jobs. Most importantly, under the Constitution, it is Congress—not unelected EPA bureaucrats—who determines whether and how greenhouse gases are regulated.

The Energy and Commerce Committee will soon be reviewing existing

regulations to determine if they make sense. If so, we will keep them. If not, we will throw them in the dustbin of history.

Ms. DEGETTE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to one of our new colleagues from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER).

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 72 and of Congress' new emphasis on oversight. Over the past few years, Federal agencies have promulgated a litany of rules and regulations with little regard for their impact on American businesses, jobs, and everyday American workers.

Last week, I met with a business in my district that employs nearly 1,000 people. They expressed their concern that the onslaught of rules and regulations threaten our energy infrastructure, power stability, and electricity costs. In other words, reckless regulation threatens their very existence.

I met with a business that employs 53 people, whose owners said they won't expand because they don't know what the cost of health care regulations will mean to their business.

At a committee hearing just yesterday before the Energy and Commerce Committee, businesses stated that the regulatory environment is hindering investment in our economy, not promoting it.

In Colorado, Federal regulations that could usurp the State's role over energy production may stop the creation of jobs that are set to employ thousands of people in northern Colorado.

It's time for Congress to listen to the voices that are America, that move our country, feed our country, power our country, and make our country great. It is time to put an end to reckless regulation.

If there are 1.5 million jobs to be created, then let's get started creating them. But let's not turn to the role of government to regulate people out of business to create other jobs. That's not the job of the Federal Government. Let's put an end to reckless regulation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concerns about attempts to undermine one of our country's most cherished and effective environmental policies, the Clean Air Act.

Simply put, recent attacks against environmental protections threaten the health, safety, and quality of life of the American people. All credible scientific evidence proves that emissions of carbon and other pollutants change our climate and harm our environment, posing risks for our communities and our children. Americans deserve to breathe clean air and drink clean water.

□ 1700

We know beyond any doubt that pollution can increase asthma, heart attacks, and cancer. I do support legitimate efforts for regulatory reform. But the majority's attempt to pass a new dirty air act by gutting needed health provisions is a travesty.

Now, the majority party, on the other side, my friends, will try to tell you that we have to make a choice between clean air and jobs. And that is a false choice. We can create, in fact, if we create clean air we will create jobs, we will create an environment where businesses will want to do business in our country. So our country needs forward-thinking energy and environmental policies that create jobs and protect public health. And we will not tolerate a return to the pollution allowed before the Clean Air Act.

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

I'm glad my colleague talked about the Clean Air Act. The Clean Air Act was passed in the 1990s, and it identified six criteria pollutants. And we know a lot of what those are—nitrous oxide, sulfur dioxide, particulate matter. Carbon dioxide was never identified in the law. In fact, Chairman Emeritus DINGELL said numerous times the Clean Air Act was never designed to regulate carbon.

Even as the EPA now moves in the direction of climate, they've changed the rules. They are not complying with the Clean Air Act because of their tailoring rule, thus picking winners over losers.

If we go down the road to regulate carbon, we raise the cost of creating jobs. Jobs move overseas. That's what the Waxman-Markey debate was last year. That's why the majority last year could not pass a bill to regulate carbon, because of the impact on jobs.

So why are we here?

We're not trying to end regulation. We're trying to make sure that there's an economic analysis on what occurs on jobs. What's the job impact?

Administrator Jackson, throughout the entire process, could not tell us. In fact, they only do it in silos and never the cumulative effect of what are the jobs lost based upon regulation.

What is the compliance cost?

We ought to know that because the more there is a requirement to comply with the rules and regulations when we're competing against China, who has no rules and regulations, we are less competitive, we lose jobs.

Is it so harmful to ask where's the benefit, a cost-benefit analysis of all these regulations?

So we'll get a chance. I know I was asked by the other side earlier in the debate, where is the legislation to affect rules and regulations that will create jobs?

Well, it's coming next week, and it's the greenhouse gas rules and regulations, which does not affect the Clean Air Act, which does not change, after all their portrayals on dirty air, it does

not affect a single criteria pollutant in the Clean Air Act.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any further requests for time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I was expecting a few Members, but I don't expect them to come now.

Ms. DEGETTE. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it has now been 36 days since we were sworn in in the 112th Congress. Yet, in the Energy and Commerce Committee, which I know Mr. SHIMKUS and I will both agree is the most illustrious and powerful committee in the U.S. House of Representatives, the committee with broad-ranging jurisdiction, everything from energy policy to food safety to health care, even to national league sports, we have not passed one legislative bill in those 36 days. We haven't passed one bill to repeal an onerous regulation. We haven't passed one bill to create one new job.

In fact, the first subcommittee markup in the Energy and Commerce Committee is tomorrow. This markup is of an extreme bill which will restrict a woman's right to choose. This is a divisive bill that has nothing to do with repealing one onerous regulation, and, in fact, it doesn't create one job, except maybe a job for lawyers who, if this actually became law, would have a field day litigating the legislation.

Look, Mr. Speaker, we all agree that if there are burdensome regulations, they should be repealed. But let's not let this discussion devolve into a partisan debate under the guise of regulatory reform.

So we know our colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't like the new EPA greenhouse gas regulations. We know that they don't like the new health care bill. But just because those bills have been passed and are being implemented does not mean that the regulations, per se, cause a loss of jobs.

So what I would suggest the American people would like us to see, what they told us in the election, what they've told us since the election, what all of my constituents told me when I was home last week is, when are you going to stop the partisan bickering? When are you going to create jobs?

I believe that if my colleague from Illinois and I, and all of the rest of us got together, we could identify a number of regulations, regulations passed under Democratic and Republican administrations that are burdensome, that are outdated, and that we could repeal. But in the meantime, let's just call it what it is. Let's have the debate if we're going to have it. But let's not call it a debate about burdensome regulations. Let's create jobs.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I think this has been a great debate. And DIANA DEGETTE is a great friend of

mine. We've served here in the Chamber for a long time. And I think it's good for the public to understand that we can have strong disagreements without being disagreeable. And I'm probably one of the strongest, outspoken loudmouths on the committee. And I have been recently. But I think it's also good to know that we can continue, even on very controversial issues on life. She has very strong opinions, and I have very strong opinions. But Congresswoman DEGETTE has my respect, and she's a friend.

During last fall, businesses kept coming to me and saying, all we want to be is left alone. That's really part of this debate.

The Democrat majority, in fact, in the last 2 years, they had the whole shooting match. These are the same debates you had about us. You could have addressed the regulatory burdens on business, but you didn't. You had the House, you had the Senate, you had the Presidency. Not one bill to ease the regulatory burden.

So now the pendulum has shifted. We're into job creation. One of the burdens of job creation is excessive regulation. Businesses want to be left alone. There's too much uncertainty.

What have we done to bring to the floor to help provide certainty? We voted to repeal the health care law. If you want to talk to businesses, both large and small, one of the biggest things that has created uncertainty is Obamacare. And that was on the floor.

The second thing that created the most uncertainty is climate and a carbon tax, raising the cost. That's going to come to the floor.

So here are two major provisions passed in this Chamber, hurt jobs, we get a chance to address on the floor. And so this is an important exercise. We're going to be doing it in the committee. We've had four hearings in the committee on issues all around the regulatory burdens.

I gave you the example of U.S. Steel. Here they've got a NO_x requirement so they keep the burners on low. But a carbon requirement would require that the burners are on high. How do they comply? I'll tell you how they comply. They move the steel mill to a country that does not have those regulations. Or we import it.

Should we look at these and address these? The answer is yes.

I see my colleague from Louisiana has shown up. If my colleague from Colorado doesn't mind, I yield the balance of my time to my colleague from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Let's talk really quickly about just what's so important about this resolution.

□ 1710

As my colleague from Illinois talked about, we have had those hearings. In fact, we had the EPA administrator yesterday in committee, and she actually tried to state that her regulations are helping create jobs. The only prob-

lem is that, right after that, we had panelist after panelist of American job creators talking about how those exact EPA regulations are running jobs out of the country. So there must be some parallel universe that these bureaucrats are living in. They think they are creating jobs. And I guess, if you want to really look at it, they are creating jobs, in China, in India, in other places around the world instead of in America.

We just had another hearing today on the problems with what is happening with the administration not issuing permits in the Gulf of Mexico. They are actually making our country more dependent on Middle Eastern oil at a time when you are seeing the Middle East in total disarray with what is happening in Egypt. There was just another super tanker that was hijacked by Somali pirates right off the coast of Oman, just yet another example that this is a volatile world. Yet you have got an administration that's using regulations to run more jobs out of this country. This is a time when we should be creating jobs.

I'm really glad that we are actually focusing under this Republican Congress on exposing what those regulations are doing to destroy jobs in America. We can create jobs. We have got to get ahold of these regulations.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, before I give my opening remarks, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. We have all heard the expression, Keep It Simple, Stupid, the KISS formula. Our government needs to do a better job of adhering to this phrase.

In the transportation sector, there are numerous examples where the regulatory process is burdensome and impedes private enterprise.

The Department of Transportation has regulations pending that classify lithium cells and batteries as hazardous materials. If implemented, this could create an impediment in getting batteries to consumers, the military, and government agencies. As a result, this could jeopardize manufacturing jobs in my district, jobs we cannot afford to lose.

DOT has also put forth regulations that would implement changes to hours of service regulations. This proposal is soliciting comments on whether to retain the current 11-hour time limit, or reduce the maximum driving time to 10 hours, something the agency prefers. If implemented, it will create ramifications for goods movement and likely affect consumers' wallets and private enterprise.

Finally, the National Mediation Board recently published a rule that alters how labor elections occur. Under previous guidelines, a majority of the eligible electorate must vote in favor of unionization. Under the new proposed rules, this majority is defined by

those who actually vote in elections, meaning the outcome could form a union when the majority of persons affected did not express the desire to do so. This is simply another way for the labor movement to gain traction and dictate an outcome that they cannot achieve otherwise.

We support reducing the number of regulations, Mr. Speaker. But that is not to say that we support compromising safety. Indeed, we do not.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. We can provide oversight that is simple and straightforward without impeding private enterprise. Our economy will benefit if we bear in mind the saying, *Keep It Simple, Stupid*.

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

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 72. Under both Democratic and Republican administrations, Federal agencies can, and do, abuse their regulatory powers.

For the last 2 years, in my own district, coal miners in communities that depend on coal have been struggling with the uncertainty created by the Environmental Protection Agency that has pushed its regulatory authority to extremes.

As a result of EPA's extensive intervention in Clean Water Act section 404 permitting for service mines, miners in my district and their families are in an untenable limbo, wondering from week to week whether their mines will get a permit and whether their jobs will end.

EPA is setting new timelines and new criteria for permits, timelines and criteria that differ from what is in statute and regulation. And they are doing so not through the proper regulatory procedure, but through interim guidance, skirting the rulemaking process that would provide for greater transparency and public comment.

The agency is setting a terrible precedent that opens the door for further abuses in future administrations. So I stand here today supporting the contention that Congress ought to check overzealous executive agencies. We ought to be conducting rigorous oversight and siphoning off regulations that hamstring our economy and the wellbeing of Americans. And I fully expect our committee, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to soon review the EPA's actions with respect to coal mining permits throughout central Appalachia.

But I also remind my colleagues that this is not a new responsibility. It is the duty placed on Congress, the people's branch, by the Framers of the Constitution, who knew firsthand the abuses of an all-powerful executive.

Nothing in this resolution changes or enhances that responsibility. Rather than expending so much time, energy, and taxpayer dollars in a display on this floor that provides the Members of this body and the American people not a single ounce of new or enhanced benefit, we ought to be concentrating on the real work. We ought to be moving legislation that creates jobs, good family-wage jobs.

There is no better way to create family-wage jobs than investing in our Nation's transportation and water resources infrastructure. These investments create and sustain millions of American jobs and generate billions of dollars of economic activity.

According to the Federal Highway Administration, for example, each \$1 billion of Federal investment creates or sustains 34,799 jobs and \$6.2 billion of economic activity. Moreover, these investments strengthen our ability to compete in the global marketplace.

It is for these reasons, creating family-wage jobs and strengthening our global competitiveness, that the presidents of the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO have linked arms in support of increased infrastructure investment. Yet, in the first six weeks of this Congress, the only action to date has been to wipe away the legacy of former Republican Chairman BUD SHUSTER, the budgetary firewalls that ensured that we invest the revenues of the Highway Trust Fund in highway and transit infrastructure. We have abolished the "trust" in the Highway Trust Fund.

In the last Congress, the House passed a Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization bill that significantly increased airport investment, including runway, terminal, and tarmac construction. The bill also authorized and accelerated the FAA's next-generation air transportation system, which will be an engine of economic growth. It will benefit airlines, workers, the traveling public, and the FAA over the long term, providing greater job security and opportunities for the Nation's 567,000 airline workers and the 624,000 employees that work for companies that manufacture aircraft and components.

We also passed a bill to help cash-strapped States and communities invest almost \$14 billion in wastewater treatment facilities and sewer lines.

In addition, the committee, on a bipartisan basis, approved a \$500 billion Surface Transportation Authorization Act to significantly increase investment in highway transit and rail infrastructure. The bill would create and sustain an estimated 6 million jobs.

Finally, our committee on T&I approved a water resources development bill to invest in our Nation's water resources infrastructure and an Economic Development Administration reauthorization bill that provides grants to economically distressed communities to help them build the necessary infrastructure to foster business investments and create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, these are the bills that we should be debating on the floor today. These are the bills that make a difference in people's lives.

We cannot wait. The construction season is upon us, and 1.9 million construction workers are still out of work.

□ 1720

They need a job, not another feel-good resolution from this Republican majority.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all time on the resolution be yielded back and that H. Res. 72 be adopted so we can move to consider legislation creating jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the majority manager, the gentlewoman from Ohio, yield for the purpose of that unanimous consent request?

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I do not, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman does not yield for the purpose of that request.

Mr. RAHALL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I thank the gentlelady from Ohio for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 72.

I thank the Speaker and the House leadership for giving us this time to help call to the attention of the Nation something that has become a very serious problem, and that is the explosion of rules and regulations and red tape that has taken place over these last several years at a very rapid pace.

In 2005, a study by the Small Business Administration found that businesses spent approximately \$1.1 trillion to comply with Federal Rules. Confirming that, another study in 2009 by the Competitive Enterprise Institute said Federal regulatory compliance had reached \$1.2 trillion for businesses.

The annual outflow of rules has meant that nearly 60,000 Federal rules have been issued just since 1995. Regulatory agencies issued over 3,500 final rules in 2009. Today's Code of Federal Regulations contains an astounding 157,974 pages. They haven't designed a computer that can keep up with all of that, much less a human being. And the average family, according to another study by the SBA in 2010, they said the cost of Federal rules and regulations now costs the average family over \$15,000 a year, and that has increased by more than \$4,000 just in the last 5 years.

George Mason University put out a report earlier this year which said that U.S. regulations "are now more onerous than those in other countries, particularly countries that offer similar property rights and infrastructure," and that "the United States risks losing investment capital and jobs."

Speaking more specifically about the Transportation Committee, according to a GAO report the typical transportation project now takes between 9 and 19 years to plan, gain approval of and construct a new major federally funded highway project.

Let me give you two examples. Several years ago when I chaired the Aviation Subcommittee, we had a hearing in which they said the main and newest runway at Atlanta airport at that time took 14 years from conception to completion. It took only 99 construction days. They were so happy to get all the

final approvals they did those in 33 24-hour days. It was all environmental rulings and regulations and red tape.

Four years ago, we had a hearing in the Highways and Transit Subcommittee, and they said that a highway project in Southern California, a 9-mile project, took 17 years from conception to completion, from 1990 until 2007.

What these delays and rules and regulations have done is driven up the cost. We now take on average three times as long and three times the cost of any other developed nation.

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. What this does is it hurts the poor and lower-income and working people of this country because it destroys jobs, it drives up prices, all these regulations. It even kills people, when you delay for years widening and improving highways and making them safer. So it is causing problems for everything that comes out of our committee.

This is a very important resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the former chairman of the Transportation Committee, the gentleman from the great State of Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the good lady for yielding.

Mr. and Mrs. America, our economic growth is being stifled by 165,000 pages of regulations; 1.4 million laws were never voted on by this body. They are the law of the land, passed by the bureaucracy. We are to blame for this ourselves.

As you can see from the chart—I venture they will get it up here—the number of environmental laws and executive orders affecting the construction industry has exploded since 1965. Just take a look at this. Here is where we are. Look at what they have to go through here. All these things have to be met by the construction company. This is why it takes 17 years to build a highway.

I want to keep in mind now—you keep hearing about creating jobs. You do not create a job; you allow a job to be created, and regulations prohibit that. We see regulations every day that prohibit the growth of industry and jobs in this country. You mentioned, Mr. Ranking Member, who was chairman, we can't even mine coal because of regulations.

So let's start thinking about the money. By the way, it costs \$1,000,100,000,000 a year to implement these regulations that were never voted on. We can balance the budget in 13 years if we eliminate these regulations.

The agencies keep going forth each day spending more money. Their idea of success is having another law that

has never been voted on. It gives an untold power to the executive branch. This is the House of the people, and if we don't address this issue, shame on us. It is absolutely important.

I just got a regulation proposed at Alaskan Airlines. They had to get a permit. By regulation, they are required to apply to the Pipeline Hazardous Materials Safety Administration before they could fly it. You know what it was? It was whipped cream. You can't fly whipped cream without a permit. Another regulation from an agency. Who thought that up?

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The second one, the newest one to come out is a regulation by EPA under the oil spill liability clause where the EPA is proposing a regulation to apply to dairies because milk has fat in it. They want to apply the oil spill liability regulation to a dairy. That means each cow costs \$600 per life of the cow because they want to clean up milk. The saying "don't cry over spilt milk" is now going to cost you money, a regulation by an agency that makes no sense at all.

Wake up, Mr. and Mrs. America. Let's eliminate these regulations that prohibit job creation in this country. That is what we ought to be talking about.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve.

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

Mr. Speaker, the American voter spoke loud and clear in November. They said they are tired of business as usual in Washington. They want less government intrusion and more freedom to prosper. This resolution begins that journey. It ensures freedom from government overregulation.

The buck stops here in this Chamber. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee alone, in this committee there are overregulations in every mode of transportation and in every area of infrastructure.

Specifically, our committee is going to look at a recent rulemaking by the National Mediation Board; arbitrary revocation of environmental permits by the EPA; new hours of service regulations for truckers by DOT; costly implementation of positive train control by DOT; the overly broad lithium battery rule; an extremely burdensome EPA rule to comply with the Cotton Council versus the EPA decisions; EPA's regulation of leaded general aviation fuel and airport de-icing fluid; EPA's expanded regulations of storm water discharge; and EPA's jurisdiction grab while they claim to implement the Clean Water Act.

An issue of particular concern to me and others are the actions taken over by the National Mediation Board.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, under the current administration, unelected and unaccount-

able political appointees at the National Mediation Board have been bullying hardworking airline employees. As many of us know, Delta Airlines merged with Northwest Airlines in 2008. Northwest employees were represented by unions and traditionally most Delta employees were not. To complete the merger, employees have to decide whether they will elect union representation or not.

Beginning in 2008, Delta repeatedly urged the unions to seek elections so that the issue could be resolved one way or another. The only way to start that process was for the employees who wanted a union to call for an election. Many of the merged Delta working groups had already made their decision about representation. Pilots, mechanics, dispatchers, and meteorologists had all chosen, and the mediation board affirmed those decisions promptly.

In August of 2009, everything was in place to allow votes to proceed for the remaining work groups. The mediation board, however, dragged its feet and did not act on these requests, despite receiving and acting on three other requests from three other employee groups at other airlines in the intervening time.

The reason became clear in September of 2009, when the AFL-CIO asked the mediation board to change the rules in the middle of the merger. With no consultation or transparency, the mediation board rushed through new rules which makes it much easier to join a union. The new rule does so by only requiring a majority of those voting—not the majority of the work group, as required under the Railway Labor Act—to decide whether or not employees would be represented by a union. This meant that if, of a workforce of 20,000 people, only 1,000 people voted and 501 wanted a union, the entire 20,000 would be then represented.

At the same time, the new rule, while making it easier for unions to gain a foothold among employees who might not want them, didn't provide any mechanism for decertifying the union. In other words, the mediation board made it easier to get the union in and nearly impossible to get it kicked out.

With these new rules proposed, the unions which represented Northwest employees withdrew their request for votes while they waited for the new, easier rules to be finalized. The rules change was then finalized. They refiled for elections under the easier rule, and the mediation board promptly acted on those requests.

So what the unions wanted and got was the chance to have their vote under the new, more favorable rules. It begs the question, Mr. Speaker, of how much the mediation board is mediating on behalf of workers as opposed to coordinating with special interests.

If the mediation board were reasonable, it would have allowed Delta and Northwest flight attendants and airport workers to decide whether or not

they wanted union representation as soon as the unions filed. The NMB let three other airline elections go forward under the old rules but not Delta.

I would hope that the mediation board is watching out for workers' rights and not just union dues. Nothing appears to have been done to enhance worker rights and protections, and many feel that their rights are being trampled on by the very agency that is supposed to be looking out for them.

Despite the rule change, Mr. Speaker, when votes were eventually held late last year, a majority of the employees in fact voted not to join the union. The unions now have filed a complaint with the mediation board, asserting that Delta interfered with these elections and asking for new elections under—guess what?—another new set of rules. The National Mediation Board has not yet responded, but there are rightfully concerns with how it will proceed based on its past behavior.

It should be up to the employees and no one else to decide whether or not they will have a union—not the company and certainly not the Federal Government. Forcing employees to unionize through regulation is not why the National Mediation Board exists.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with many of my newly elected colleagues, as one of the Members that came to Washington to stop the "red tape" factory of regulations and help businesses get back to creating jobs.

In every community I visit in my district, I have met a business owner who is fed up with spending tremendous amounts of money to comply with unlimited, burdensome regulation—or have invested dollars that are tied up for months or even years waiting for Federal agencies to make the decisions held up by regulations and also the permitting process. This is what I came to Congress to stop. These rulemakings create uncertainty and costs, as the details of the regulations take extensive periods of time to finalize. At a time when job creation is paramount to economic recovery, businesses are being forced to postpone decisions on hiring and expansion.

A prime example of these harmful regulations is a company in my district that asked the EPA in 2001 to make changes to the Land Disposal Restrictions to ensure proper treatment and promote recycling. EPA decided to take a different track on their request, and 10 years later that company is still waiting for an answer—10 years later. This has to stop.

Another example, EPA has over-extended its authority over 404 permits by allowing a permit to be issued, then years later, retroactively vetoing the exact same permit. By doing so, it not only leaves the business questioning the worth of the permit, it leaves in-

vestors wondering if they can commit funding to a project without fear of the EPA arbitrarily revoking the permit. EPA has fundamentally changed the term from "permit" to "perhaps." This has to stop.

We need to hold our regulators accountable and make sure they are carrying out the intent of the law, not enhancing their own agenda or stifling economic and job recovery.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to our distinguished leading Democrat on the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for the generous grant of time.

So here we are trying to fill up space while America is in crisis. Now, why do I say that? One of the most important and ongoing obligations of the United States Congress is oversight. We don't need to pass a meaningless hortatory resolution to tell the committees to do oversight. I've observed a number of the Republican-led committees are already vigorously engaged in oversight. I held dozens of hearings in oversight of the bureaucracy and programs when I chaired the Surface Transportation Subcommittee. That's something we have not done enough of and we should do more of. But spending 10 hours on the floor instead of a few hours marking up some bills that could create jobs in America is a waste of time and meaningless.

We had two commissions that were named when the Republicans controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House in the Bush era. Both of those commissions, Republican-led, Republican-authorized commissions, came to the same conclusion: We are dramatically underinvesting in our Nation's infrastructure. We are becoming Third World: 150,000 bridges on the National Highway System need substantial repair or replacement; 40 percent of the pavement on the National Highway System fair or poor, causing blow-outs, axles broken, accidents. It's a mess. Talk to anybody. A \$60 billion backlog on capital investment in our transit systems. And you know what? When we make these investments, there's a great thing about it. We have strict buy America requirements—buy America requirements I intended to make more strict, and I hope the Republicans will now that they're in charge, when we reauthorize the Surface Transportation Bill.

You get a phenomenal multiplier of jobs out of those investments. Instead of the stupid stimulus bill we passed, if we had taken one-fifth of the money that went into that stimulus bill and we had invested it in surface transportation in this country, we could have created another couple of million jobs a year; because they aren't just jobs of people out there building the bridges and the highways and those sorts of things; they're the people that make the things that we use to build the bridges and highways—the steel indus-

try. They're the people who make the tires for the buses or the engines for the buses or the streetcars that we now make in Oregon again, made in America for the first time in 70 years. A huge multiplier effect. Inadequate.

□ 1740

So what they said is, the amount of money we're currently investing won't even keep the Eisenhower-era system up. Now the Republicans are refusing to look at enhanced investment in transportation infrastructure, and we haven't even begun a discussion of authorizing that legislation.

As for the Federal Aviation Administration, we are wasting billions of gallons of fuel and people's time in the air because we don't have an adequate aviation system in terms of air traffic control and the tools that our controllers need. They're focused on the controllers: Oh, those controllers, they just earn too much money.

They're working with 1950's equipment. You can't get vacuum tubes anymore.

Let's focus on the things people need in order to do the jobs more efficiently, to get our planes where they're going as safely as we do today but more efficiently. Let's stop the congestion in the skies. Allow our airports to expand. Get the jobs out of construction. Let's talk about those things.

Today, the Democrats introduced a bill, our first major bill, H.R. 11, to authorize more Buy America Bonds. Now, this doesn't cost the Federal Government anything in the end. What we are trying to do is help the local jurisdictions, the States, and others who are strapped now—their bonding authority is either tapped out or they don't have good credit because of other problems—to do needed projects and give it to them at interest rates they can afford. Yeah, there's a little subsidy there in the interest rate—but guess what? With the jobs we generate, we're going to get more than that back in the taxes.

The best way we can deal with the deficit in this country is to put Americans back to work. Thirty to 40 percent of our deficit could be dealt with if we had full employment and reasonable rates of taxation like in the Clinton era. But no. The Republicans want to sit here and pretend they really care about these things.

We're going to get rid of those job-killing regulations and we'll start to do something new—oversight.

Well, good as to the oversight. You're already authorized to do oversight. Don't pretend you aren't, and don't pretend that this meaningless resolution is going to make any difference at all. Why are we wasting this time? Why are we wasting this time? Because you want to put on a show. Well, good for you. You're putting on a show. You're in charge. You can put on a show whenever you want, but someday, you're going to come to account for it, and if you haven't delivered on the jobs, and

you're not doing much so far that I've seen to produce any jobs. You can pretend this is about jobs.

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

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentleman an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. What this is really about is your day-in, day-out agenda, which is big business. This isn't about independent truckdrivers who struggle to make a living. This isn't about small, independent businesses that go out and get contracts through the States with Federal money to build highway projects and some of the paperwork they have to deal with. I'm all with you on that stuff. Let's streamline that stuff. Let's get rid of that junk.

Just today, I had some people in my office who I've helped to get some money to reopen a rail line that was closed by some hedge fund in my district that bought it out, and they're being hung up on getting a Federal grant, which I helped them get one of those horrible earmarks we get around here to further enhance that short rail line, by some paperwork at the Fish and Wildlife. It just happened that the regional guy from the Feds for Fish and Wildlife was there in my office to talk to another staffer. I put them together, and we solved the issue in a couple of minutes, but it shouldn't have happened. We can streamline the paperwork. We can do that in a transportation bill and deal with those sorts of things.

So if you want to do real stuff to help real people, small business, Main Street, I'm with you, but not if this is yet another ruse to either engage in some sort of political, you know, pursuit of the administration, or if it's just something else to help your big business allies or something else to coddle Wall Street. Get rid of those burdensome regulations on Wall Street. Why, they can regulate themselves. Look what a great job they did over the last 10 years in regulating themselves. Well, they did crater the U.S. economy and the world economy and cost a few million people their jobs, but they would never do anything that would jeopardize our country.

Those burdensome regulations on Wall Street. Those burdensome regulations on BP. My God, how can we have those burdensome regulations on those big oil companies? Just free them up. They'll drill safely anywhere and everywhere, and there will never be a problem.

We had crappy regulation. Let's fix that. But we need regulations to avoid abuses. Don't pretend that we don't. Don't pretend that big business won't choose to abuse the privilege if we don't regulate them properly and smartly.

Do you want to have an aviation industry further deregulated? Let's deregulate safety. Let's get rid of those troublesome inspectors and all that stuff that goes on. No one would ever

fly a plane that isn't safe. They wouldn't ever engage in cutting corners. Whoops. That already happened a few times in history, didn't it, during the deregulatory binge in the Reagan years.

So if you want to focus on meaningless, bothersome, trivial regulations, things that impede real working people, small businesses, truckers, other people who use our transportation system, the general aviation pilots, you know, and the airlines, great. But if it's just another hortatory thing, which it seems to be, or another gift to your big business allies, forget about it.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 72 to review regulations and orders from agencies and their effect on jobs and the economy.

One example of an unnecessary proposed rule change is a change in the hours-of-service rule being considered by the Department of Transportation. It would have a detrimental impact on productivity and the economy.

Under the current rule, both the number and rate of fatal and injury-related accidents involving large trucks have declined by more than one-third. These accidents are now at the lowest levels in recorded history. We are successfully balancing safety with productivity, and this current rule works.

The proposed rule change would put additional trucks on the road to deliver the same quantity of goods. This puts more drivers at risk, increases congestion, pollution, and will result in higher final product costs, not to mention the burden this would place on the trucking industry, particularly the small business truckers, some of whom could be forced out of business. Furthermore, the proposed rules are so complex and restrictive, compliance and enforcement would become nearly impossible.

Why would we replace a rule that has served us well, particularly when the proposed change is hardly practical and would negatively impact productivity and our ability to compete?

In the least, this is a redundant and unnecessary process. At worst, it is designed to appease a narrow group of special interests.

On two prior occasions, the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration estimated that this change to the rules would cost the U.S. economy \$2.2 billion, and that number includes the safety benefits. Somehow and for some reason, the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration then changed its methodology for estimating both the costs and the benefits for this new proposed rule. This led to a statistically positive benefit-cost ratio. Strangely, however, the agency's own analysis still demonstrates the estimated benefits of retaining the current rule exceed the estimated benefits of the proposed change.

Changing this rule is both unnecessary and wasteful on the part of the Federal Government and of small businesses and large businesses everywhere.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a valued member of our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

Ms. HIRONO. I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is simple. It instructs the committees to do the job they already do—conduct oversight of the laws passed by Congress.

I believe clarity of purpose is an important component to successfully tackling the challenges we face as a Nation. So, while I have no objection to this resolution, I question why we need to spend 9½ hours debating what we should all unanimously agree on. Spending this much time on this resolution is like making sure we finish chewing our gum before we start walking—when just a few months ago we were doing both at the same time.

Take the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, for example. This legislation was passed as an unprecedented response to the most severe economic crisis our Nation has faced since the Great Depression. We knew that there was a lot of taxpayer money involved in this legislation. That's why we included reporting requirements for the recipients, and that's why we included diligent committee oversight. Because of these measures, I know that approximately \$1.5 billion was allocated to Hawaii. Since 2009, this money has helped to save or create 13,000 full-time equivalent jobs in Hawaii.

□ 1750

I also know that Hawaii received approximately \$156 million for highway and water infrastructure improvements. These funds are helping to build Hawaii's infrastructure for the future right now.

For example, when completed, the Waimea Wastewater Treatment Plant expansion project on the island of Kauai will double the capacity of the existing plant. It will allow the county to take advantage of photovoltaic systems that will minimize the facility's carbon footprint. The expanded capacity will also reduce the county's reliance on potable water for irrigation, water that they need for other purposes besides irrigation. Altogether, this investment will allow for expanded development in the area, which will lead to more new businesses and, importantly, more new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we need to learn how to walk and chew gum at the same time again. As the Recovery Act demonstrates, when we do, we can make a positive difference in the lives of our constituents, create jobs, and address the challenges we face together.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Washington State (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER).

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, let me clear up something really quickly. The reason I'm rising in support of this resolution and the reason it is so important that we debate the job-killing costs of regulation is because we are at an all-time high in my neck of the woods for unemployment. We're at double-digit unemployment in southwest Washington, and we've been doing it just in about every single county in my district for weeks.

The other side keeps saying, oh, my goodness, this is simple, this is kid's stuff. If this is kid's stuff, why are we dealing with it today at the beginning of this Congress? Why wasn't it dealt with last Congress? I'll tell you why, because we need to make changes. We need to tell these agencies back off small businesses, back off families, back off our cities. Operate within the law. Don't make your own laws.

Last year, the EPA promulgated 928 new rules last year alone, 928 new rules. You know, when I have my construction workers who are out of work right now come to me and say we've got these storm water regulations and they're requiring us to go back into pre-Lewis and Clark days, we don't even know what that looks like. We've got these regulations handed down to us from the Feds and we can't hire new workers. We can't build new businesses. We can't even redevelop without cutting our arms off, when it comes to costs.

It needs to change. I'm all for commonsense solution-oriented regulation. I want to protect our environment. I want to protect our way of life, but business and our economy are not mutually exclusive with our environment. We're simply saying, and we're taking the time today to say, that the EPA and other Federal agencies that have overstepped their bounds need to check themselves, or we're going to have this debate.

So I invite my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We want to create jobs. We want America to be working again. I have friends and family out of work in southwest Washington and they want to work; but then their small employer says, I'm sorry, I've got to put new money into this infrastructure piece to retrofit it to bring it up to speed with this new regulation, I can't hire you or I need to minimize your hours.

So there is work to be done.

Mr. RAHALL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the good gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. I thank the gentleman for the time, and, Mr. Speaker, I also want to briefly at the beginning comment on why we're here today. We're here today because the 111th Congress didn't do some of this work, and we have a resolution that is going to make the 112th Congress get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 72, and I'm speaking about

the egregious overregulation by the current administration. One specific instance I would like to bring up to the floor occurred with Spruce Number One surface mine in southern West Virginia.

I know that it is not uncommon for the EPA to veto mine permits, but this is the first time in the history that the EPA has vetoed a mining permit after it has been issued and placed into action. The portion of the Clean Water Act referenced was section 404, a requirement for commercial investment in several industries, including mining and transportation.

I'm the son of a coal miner who worked in an underground coal mine for 37 years, and now I'm representing southwestern Indiana, a district rich in coal reserves; and in State of Indiana, 95 percent of our electrical energy comes from coal. Every coal mine in Indiana, except for one, is in my district. I find it very troubling that the EPA would veto a mining permit after it had been issued by the Corps of Engineers and put into operation by the mining company. The mining company had invested \$250 million and was going to bring good jobs to southern West Virginia.

I am troubled by this overstepping by the EPA because I am fearful that all mining companies going through the permitting process in my district are going to be at risk, even if they're granted a permit. I'm also fearful for all the industries that require section 404 permits that could have theirs retroactively vetoed and would waste private capital investment and hurt job creation.

With our Nation's labor force participation rate at a 26-year low, we must end the overregulation and stop the atrocious overreaching by government agencies. We need jobs in America.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have my last speaker. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, we have a unique opportunity today to begin the long process of addressing the hidden tax of burdensome regulations. These are the regulations that choke small businesses, hinder U.S. manufacturers, and obstruct job creation.

Last year alone, the Federal Government created 43 major new rules that cost our economy approximately \$28 billion, and my friends on the other side of the aisle wonder why jobs are going overseas.

By directing committees to review and purge outdated and unproductive regulations from the books, this resolution provides much-needed oversight to a regulatory system that is spiraling out of control.

As the co-chair of the House Manufacturing Caucus, I hear almost every day from manufacturers and other small businesses that are being crushed by unnecessary regulations which constrict job growth and yet don't make

us any safer, any healthier, or any more secure.

Our country needs a sensible and economically competitive regulatory policy. We need to give the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration a stronger voice within the executive branch to stop or amend bad regulations before they become finalized. We also need to pass the REINS Act that will require Congress to have the final say on major regulations before they take effect to ensure that they are following congressional intent.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 72.

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to say I look forward to working with the gentleman from West Virginia and all in this House to make our America a better place to live, work, and raise a family.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. BACHUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1800

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and Speaker BOEHNER, Leader CANTOR and the House leadership for bringing this important resolution forward.

This resolution represents the opening battle in the fight against the continued expansion and overreach of the regulatory state, that state being the Federal Government.

We have just gone through 4 years of a very liberal Congress and 2 years of a very liberal administration, and working hand in hand, they have passed massive new laws that expanded government and weakened personal freedom. The 10th Amendment says that all powers not specifically granted to the Federal Government are left to the States and the people. But from health care to financial services to other sectors of the economy, Congress has ceded its constitutional responsibility to unelected and unaccountable Federal bureaucrats.

Two years ago, President Obama reminded us that elections matter when he said, "I won." Well, Mr. Speaker, in November, the American people won. In doing so, they made it clear to anyone listening that they strenuously objected to the direction that our country has taken. They object to the limitations imposed on our freedom, on our choices, and on our ability to create jobs. This is not new. In the past as well as in the current administration, liberal Presidents who could not achieve their goals by the consent of the people have resorted to regulatory fiat to give their most extreme supporters what they want.

Under these regulatory regimes, the power of Congress and the people has been reduced to notice and comment, a

notice and comment period in which they can only state their objections. However, as is becoming increasingly apparent to the American people, these comments are regularly ignored by the regulators. The expansion of the regulatory state continues to concentrate power in the executive branch and to marginalize representative government with congressionally enacted legislation being replaced by decrees from regulators who are insulated from the popular vote.

Fortunately, this Congress is committed to doing something about unnecessary and unreasonable regulatory burdens, and the resolution we are debating today is a great start.

Under this resolution, 10 House committees—including the Financial Services Committee—will review pending and existing regulations to determine their impact on our Nation's economy, on its ability to create jobs and, most importantly, our own personal freedoms.

This review comes not a moment too soon. Our job creators struggle under a seemingly endless and constant flurry of mandates pushed out by the administration and initiated under the former majority in Congress. Nothing better illustrates the rule of the unelected in the regulatory state than the Dodd-Frank Act. As a result of this one massive piece of legislation passed in the last Congress, there will be a tsunami of 300 new Washington rules and regulations. The burden of these regulations will almost certainly limit access to credit for small businesses and consumers. They will divert private sector resources that should go to expanding businesses and creating jobs. And they will also limit the owners and the consumers of those firms from making their own choices and decisions.

The Financial Services Committee has heard testimony from many witnesses about the harmful impact of the act. One of them, the Cargill Corporation alone, told us that the act's requirements on derivatives would cost the company \$1 billion, funds that otherwise would be deployed for the construction of a new plant in Kansas City, a plant that would create thousands of jobs and put Americans back to work.

That is only one example of the uncertainty our economy faces due to these new Washington regulations. It shows how the expanding regulatory state too often forces U.S. companies to divert resources and time away from job creation and investment and instead toward obeying the ever-growing demands of a bigger and more intrusive government.

In a hearing in my committee only this morning, there was bipartisan agreement and no opposition to a provision in our oversight plan offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) requiring a review of the mixed messages in which we hear Washington regulators calling for in-

creased lending by banks but examiners in the field micromanaging bank activities and stifling lending. These conflicting signals are creating uncertainty that prevents banks from lending to small businesses, and in extreme cases they have caused the failures of those very banks. This uncertainty, in turn, impedes economic growth and costs jobs.

Let me conclude by saying this Congress was elected to limit the scope of the Federal Government, not to expand it. Our forefathers who fashioned the 10th Amendment would be pleased with our debate and our efforts today.

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

Ms. WATERS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises, I am extremely concerned about the impact of the Republicans' continuing resolution on the ability of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the SEC, to police our capital markets, thereby preventing another financial crisis.

To be clear, the Republican continuing resolution, with its \$100 billion in proposed cuts, is an assault on job creation, vulnerable populations and our communities. However, it is also an assault on our financial markets. If the Securities and Exchange Commission is level-funded or funded at 2008 levels, we risk defunding the main agency with oversight over the risky financial products that started the 2008 financial crisis. The SEC is supposed to be our Wall Street cop. It is supposed to make sure that the brokerage firms are obeying the law. It is supposed to protect the investors. It is supposed to make sure that those people who work every day having their money invested by institutional investments like the pension funds are not losing their investments in their 401(k)s.

Let's talk about what happened in 2008. In 2008, our financial markets collapsed. In 2008, it was clear that the SEC didn't have the tools or the resources it needed to monitor or police those markets. So, frankly, I don't understand why Republicans would want to underfund the SEC with the same amount of funding it received in the year that it lacked the resources to monitor financial markets that were spinning out of control.

From 2005 to 2007, during the buildup to the crisis that imploded in 2008, the SEC lost 10 percent of its staff. In addition, from 2005 to 2009, the SEC's investments in information technology declined by 50 percent. During this time period, trading volume doubled, the number of investment advisers has increased by 50 percent, and the funds they manage have increased 55 percent to \$33 trillion.

Let's put these numbers into perspective. The SEC's 3,800 employees currently oversee 35,000 entities—including 11,450 investment advisers, 7,600

mutual funds, 5,000 broker dealers, and more than 10,000 public companies. Furthermore, these staff police companies that trade on average 8.5 billion shares in the listed equity markets alone every day.

The Dodd-Frank Act will prevent the next crisis by authorizing the SEC to regulate derivatives, provide oversight of investment advisers and broker dealers, and rein in credit rating agencies. In order to do this, the SEC needs additional funding. The Securities and Exchange Commission that is our Wall Street cop to protect us all needs additional funding. Unfortunately, House Republicans don't want the SEC to staff up or to even maintain their current staffing levels. Why? If funded at fiscal year 2008 levels, the SEC would have to lay off hundreds of staff and cut its IT budget down to \$86 million, its lowest level of IT spending since 2003.

□ 1810

At this level, the SEC would not be able to implement the new systems it needs to protect the Nation's securities markets.

We have all said to the public in so many ways, and certainly through Dodd-Frank, that we are going to change the way the SEC has been working; we are going to make sure we have some protections for consumers and investors. Yet we know it can't be done without the resources, without the money. You can tell where your priorities are based on where you put your funding. This attack on the SEC is more disturbing because the agency's funding will be deficit-neutral. Beginning in fiscal year 2012, fees collected by the SEC will match its congressional appropriation. The critical role that the SEC plays in our Nation's financial markets is precisely why Wall Street, the very entity that the SEC regulates, is asking for Congress to fully fund this agency.

According to a February 7 article in *The New York Times*, 41 prominent securities lawyers and professionals have already written to Congress to ask for full funding for the agency. Why do we have to beg for funding for the SEC if we are truly about the business of protecting our consumers?

Mr. Speaker, the SEC needs a sufficient level of funding. If Wall Street's cop on the beat is unavailable, we risk another financial crisis and loss of more jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding me the time. Thank you for your leadership on our committee as we work toward better solutions for a modernized financial regulatory structure.

Last year, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act was signed into law. Today we

are realizing the overarching effects such legislation will have on our economy, and this has only just begun. Onerous new regulations and the creation of an entirely new agency with vast influence over consumer choice will only impede our recovery. Instead of expanding the scope of government, we need efficient and effective regulatory oversight to support the private sector which will drive our economy's recovery.

I have deep concerns about what this new law will mean for employment, as do many of my constituents. Charles Maddy, who is the president of Summit Community Bank, testified before our committee. The bank is headquartered in my district, and he testified just this month about the effects of the new rules and regulations enacted under the Dodd-Frank financial reform legislation on small institutions. Even though small institutions are supposedly "carved out" of this law, Charlie expressed serious concerns about his institution's ability to compete in this new regulatory regime. Banks that didn't take excessive risks or use exotic financial products are going to see higher compliance costs, limited access to capital, and regulatory pressures on lending issues, all of which hurt our ability and his ability to serve the community.

While it is necessary to regulate those that acted irresponsibly, it is important that the regulations be targeted and effective, not broad and burdensome. At a time when we should be creating economic certainty in our markets, we are seeing the unintended consequences of this law. According to Mr. Maddy, "New standards are being applied without banks having a clear understanding of where they are." This will only discourage investment and innovation and hinder job creation.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I come after a couple of members of the Financial Services Committee with whom I like to work and I admire; but I've got to say, what's being proposed here today is that America forget what happened on Wall Street 2 years ago, 4 years ago, 6 years ago. It's a request to have collective amnesia and forget that giant Ponzi schemes were perpetrated on hundreds of thousands of people. Pension funds, firefighter funds, people all across this country.

Let's just start with one guy named Madoff. The reason you have regulations, the reason you want a regulatory body is to stop crooks like Bernie Madoff. And under the Republican watch, it was, Let's not regulate. Let's not enforce regulations. Let's allow the market to regulate and police itself. And then we have a guy like Bernie Madoff.

I heard Mr. BACHUS talk about a company that, because of regulations,

won't invest \$1 billion. Well, regulations and the lack of regulations under the Bush administration cost investors \$65 billion in the Madoff Ponzi scheme alone. Forget about Stanford and the other ones where these bandits were running rampant.

Our economy expects regulation. It requires regulation so people aren't defrauded and looted. And it's this kind of oversight where we make sure the regulators are doing their job to look out for crooks who are stealing people's money. That's their job.

The thing that threw this country into a tailspin was the Wall Street excesses and the rampage that these Ponzi scheme artists put on America, and my friends on the Republican side of the aisle want us to forget that. They want to say, Let's not have any regulation. We have too much regulation. Well, that lack of regulation almost killed this country's economy, millions of jobs lost. We don't hear anything from the Republicans about, Let's put people back to work; let's create jobs. It's about, wait a second; we've got to get rid of these regulations that they did not enforce when they were in power, causing this country to lose billions of dollars and millions of jobs.

So we all agree that there should be oversight of the executive branch. No ifs, ands, or buts about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WATERS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. The regulations are important, especially in an arena where huge amounts of money are being transferred. Billions of dollars were stolen from Americans. We have regulations in place. We need those regulations enforced. And if the Republican Party thinks that these things are in excess, they should go talk to some of the victims of those giant Ponzi schemes that occurred under their watch.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), the chairman of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, government burdens are the number one concern that employers in my district share with me every time I visit a small business or talk with local entrepreneurs. Among all the economic hurdles we face, Federal demands clearly play a leading role in driving the uncertainty that has frozen our job market. And it's no wonder.

Over the last few years, contrary to what the gentleman from Colorado just talked about, Congress has enacted sweeping new laws regulating finance, health, and more; and as a result, employers are facing thousands of new pages of Federal regulations, mandates, and paperwork nightmares. For example, the Dodd-Frank financial

overhaul will result in an estimated 330 new rulemakings that have the potential to raise the cost of credit, impede private investment, and curtail innovation in the financial sector.

As a result, the Small Business Administration estimates that America's most active job creators, small businesses, are the hardest hit by Federal regulations. Those with 20 or fewer employees pay an astounding \$10,585 per year per employee to comply with Federal regulations. It's time to go line by line through the Federal rule book. Let's examine what works, throw out what doesn't, and make sure we aren't imposing unfair and unnecessary burdens on job creators.

I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 72.

Ms. WATERS. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

□ 1820

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her leadership, and I join her and my other colleagues in speaking out in strong protest to the projected cuts that they are pushing through the Securities Exchange Commission, the watchdog agency that is looking to find corruption, abuse and to protect the investors and to protect our financial community.

Our Republican colleagues have proposed that the SEC's budget should be cut back to 2008 levels. But I can hardly imagine that they can be pleased at the level of oversight that was performed by the SEC in 2008, the year the economy cratered, the year that massive abuses such as the Madoff scandal came to light, and other abuses.

We should not be scaling back the staff and oversight capability of the SEC. We should be adding to it so that they can do a better job in protecting investors and the American taxpayer.

According to the SEC inspector general, the Republican proposal would force the agency to cut over 600 staff members—over 600.

Now, we know that the SEC has 60 studies that they have to come out with, hundreds of rules, and they are clamoring for more staff to meet the mandates of this Congress and of the regulatory reform bill that has been written to save taxpayers from having to bail out too big to fail and excesses and mismanagement in the financial industry.

Just as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are calling for more accountability, they would cripple one of the key agencies that holds people in a key sector accountable. The SEC's budget for all of 2010 is equal to just a small fraction of the bonus pool for just one major firm in the financial sector.

So let's look at the facts here. The total loss of household wealth as a result of the Great Recession has been estimated to be approximately \$14 trillion. \$14 trillion. It was a financial disaster that did not have to happen.

There was a movement on the Republican aisle to roll back regulation. There was a lack of adequate oversight, and the lack of oversight and regulation were major contributing factors to this financial disaster.

So the Republicans' new proposal to cut the badly needed oversight of our financial system brings to mind the old American saying, "They are being penny wise and pound foolish" with the economy of our great country.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the senior member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, in terms of a lack of regulation, I think it's interesting to note that it was the Republicans who attempted to regulate Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. It was the Republicans who were attempting to bring regulation against those government-sponsored enterprises because the Federal Reserve had approached us and told us that we faced a systemic economic consequence that might bring down, not only the housing sector, but the other sectors of the economy.

And who was it that pushed for those zero down payment loans? Who was it who pushed for the arbitrage over at Fannie and Freddie?

Now, here's the reality. The SEC has always had the ability to prosecute securities fraud. But what happened under Madoff for, what, 18 years, 20 years under President Clinton and under President Bush is that you had an inability on the part of the young lawyers at the SEC to find that fraud. And this is something I and others have pushed for.

One of the things we tried to do during the Dodd-Frank bill was to get a reform of the culture over at the SEC. Why? Because that over-lawyered institution was incapable of even understanding what Madoff and others had done with these Ponzi schemes. And when we tried to push those reforms through, what did we get out of it on the other side of the aisle? They agreed to a study, a study, of the SEC culture.

Now, in the meantime, we have 3,800 people over at the SEC. At a time when we're running a \$1.5 trillion deficit, we're going to have to have haircuts. We cannot ramp up everybody's salary around here. We can't give promotions to everybody all the time. Everybody's going to have to take a little bit of the cut in order for us to get this budget back into balance.

And I can share with you a couple of other thoughts, too, about the way in which we've approached this, because we've magnified too big to fail with what we've done with Dodd-Frank.

Ask any economist about some of the consequences of this legislation. We've reduced the cost of capital for the largest institutions at the expense of their community bank competitors or their credit union competitors. It is the large institutions that have a 100 basis point, a 1 percent interest point advan-

tage now in the market, because now we have made them too big to fail under this legislation.

If we don't reform this, if we don't change our system in a way in which we get some commonsense regulations out there, it's not as though we're not competing around the world. Think for a minute about what's happening in Germany. Think about what's happening in Britain and Brazil and Singapore. They are competing against us because of the antibusiness environment we have created, and not only in terms of regulations that don't make sense many times. But I appreciate the opportunity to point this out.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the SEC has 3,800 employees, and this is correct; it does have 3,800 employees. But it also has to be said that they oversee 35,000 entities. It must also be noted that they have to police 11,450 investment advisers. It also must be said that they have to monitor 7,600 mutual funds. They have 5,000 broker dealers that they have to keep an eye on. And they also have 10,000-plus companies that they have to monitor. Yes, 3,800 employees, but they are overworked already and they are overwhelmed with what they have to do.

I might note, also, that if we go back to the 2008 levels, we're talking about over \$200 million in cuts to the SEC. The SEC needs help, not hurt. This piece of legislation, if it is implemented to its fullest thought intent, will indeed hurt the SEC.

Let's talk for just a second about who the SEC employees actually are. These are the first responders to possible financial disasters. They are the ones who have to catch the Madoffs of the world, as has been indicated. And I must add, also, that it was under the 2008 levels that Madoff was able to make off with about \$80 billion with his Ponzi scheme.

We need to protect the SEC. Let's make sure that we don't cut jobs in an effort to save the economy—and these are jobs that are actually needed. So let's not just cut any jobs. Let's make sure that we protect the jobs that are going to help protect the financial security of the United States of America.

□ 1830

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, our subcommittee chairman of the international policy, Mr. MILLER.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. This side hasn't forgotten what went on. We haven't forgotten about Madoff. But the problem is that some people have forgotten that, in 1998, a whistleblower first went to the SEC on Madoff and they did nothing—nothing. Repeatedly, individuals went to the SEC on Madoff and they did nothing.

Now, we can pass all the new regulations through Dodd-Frank we want to

pass. Madoff went to jail because he was a criminal. He violated the law. And you don't need 20 laws in place to punish a person for one act. We did it. Dodd-Frank goes far beyond that. It is 243 new regulations in the pipeline; 243 is scary.

Now, the SEC has failed in many ways. I know many of my friends on this side of the aisle heard me talk about mark to market principles for 4 years with the SEC. Now, mark to market means when the lender makes a loan, they have to mark the value on their books of what the product is worth at current market value.

For example, if 5 years ago a piece of property is worth \$20 million, they lent \$15 million, today it's worth only \$12 million, well, the SEC says we should lend no more than \$8 million. Now the loan comes up for renewal and the loan is performing, meaning the individual who owns the property is current on his payments. What the lender is required to do based on SEC requirements, because Federal regulators have no control over that because SEC sets the requirements, they can either set a \$7 million set-aside because the loan is overvalued based on the books, or they can say to the individual, You owe us \$7 million to reinstate the loan. In this economy, most people don't have the \$7 million.

Had we modified mark to market standards and looked at loans on realistic fortune principles in the future, most of these lenders today would be in business and many people would not have lost their loans and their product that they had under that loan.

We have done nothing through the SEC. In fact, the first time I asked the SEC Chairwoman in the hearing, and the question was 4 minutes long regarding mark to market principles, she looked at me and she said, I'll get back to you on that, Congressman.

Nothing to date has happened.

So to look at the SEC and say they are saints, they are doing their job and they are protecting the citizenry and the individuals out there, I can't say that. I would like to see these individuals held accountable for what they did not do. In 1998, had they moved with Madoff and done what they should have done, or in 2000 or 2002, a lot of investors would have more money than they have today, but they did not.

Just as our Nation is trying to recover, it seems like the Obama administration is doing nothing but making it harder for American businesses.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to another member of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. MEL WATT.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I came in in the middle of this debate, and I have been trying to figure out if the American people who may be watching this, and even my colleagues here on the floor, may even understand what this debate is about.

The original resolution talks about inventorying and looking at and evaluating regulations. I think that's a substitute for trying to figure out how to cut back on various agencies and their authority and what they are doing, and we don't want to lose sight of that. I think that is an honorable objective.

The problem is that this debate has wandered off into a discussion about whether the SEC effectively did what it was supposed to do with respect to Bernie Madoff. And when I hear my colleague, Mr. MILLER, say, well, this is about holding the SEC accountable for what they did not do, I don't know how you hold the SEC accountable for what they did not do by decreasing their ability to regulate an industry and by decreasing their budget. Those two things don't compute with me. I just am having a big problem internalizing this.

You have an agency here that has a \$1 billion annual budget. It has responsibility for policing and monitoring all of the things that Mr. GREEN talked about in his debate. But on a gross level, 8.5 billion shares of stock are transferred every day, so \$1 billion a year. We are supposed to monitor and control 8.5 billion shares a day transferred and transacted, and here we are talking about, well, let's take authority from the SEC and let's take money away from the SEC to do what it's supposed to do.

Friends, that does not compute, and the American people know that it does not compute.

Now, the underlying resolution says that you are supposed to find ways to identify how these regulations impact and limit access to credit and capital. Well, imagine what is going to happen with investors in this country if the SEC isn't available to regulate the transactions, 8.5 billion transactions a day. And you are going to say, Okay, we want your capital, but we are not going to do anything to protect you as an investor. We are going to let Bernie Madoff do whatever he wants to do, because we are getting ready to limit the number of regulations the SEC can impose on Bernie Madoff, and we are getting ready to limit their budget to enforce the regulations that they have.

Friends, that does not compute. It does not compute with Members of this House, and, I will tell you, it will not compute with the American public.

This is a simple debate: Do you allow the private sector to do whatever they want to whenever they want to in whatever circumstances they want to so that we can be back in another economic chaos like we had for the last 2 or 3 years, or do we have some reasonable regulations and reasonably fund the ability of the regulators to enforce those regulations? That's what this debate is about.

I don't know what Mr. MILLER was talking about. I don't know how this relates to Fannie and Freddie. It doesn't. Everything in our committee seems to relate to Fannie and Freddie.

But this is about how we are going to regulate these stock transactions. And if you reduce their budget and reduce their ability to regulate, I guarantee you, we will be out of control. It does not compute.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished freshman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Our focus this Congress should be on supporting job creation. I would like to refocus this debate a little bit, because I support a pretty simple proposition when it comes to regulation, and that is the benefits of regulation should exceed the costs.

Last week, in Worthington, Ohio, I heard from over a hundred small business owners at a local chamber of commerce. They are worried about uncertainty. They are worried about limited transparency in this current regulatory environment, and it causes them to slow down on job creation and it stifles our economy.

Over the past couple of weeks, the House committees have had hearings on jobs, including the Financial Services Committee, that talked about job growth. We discussed the need to compare the benefits of the costs of regulation to those benefits even with the independent agencies. Experts suggested that we review overly burdensome and duplicative regulation, which hurts access to capital and job growth.

I believe the Office of Management and Budget should be required to analyze the tradeoffs between proposed regulations and what they have on affecting job creation, economic growth, innovation, and competitiveness.

We must ensure that our new Federal regulations don't interrupt consumers' ability to obtain credit, or prevent small businesses from adding jobs or hindering economic growth.

□ 1840

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), who also serves on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. MEEKS. I thank the gentlelady from California.

You know, I have been listening to the debate in my office, et cetera, and I agree with my colleague MEL WATT. Sometimes we get confused, I think. Maybe if we can just break this down to the common denominator.

I used to be a prosecutor, and I asked the following question: If a burglar breaks into your house and steals your life savings, do you then go to the police department and ask the police department to have the investigator or someone there so you can try to find out who did it or put in measures to prevent it from happening again, because you ask him to look to see how they broke into your house, what they did, how can you fix it? Or do you say, we don't need a police department. Forget having the police department,

so that other people's homes can be broken into also. That is really what we are talking about here.

So in the aftermath of the largest crisis of our lifetime, a crisis that not only wiped out trillions of dollars worth of investments and savings but led to the exposure of what we talked about, the Ponzi schemes and crimes perpetuated against the American people, it is imperative that we don't handcuff the people who can look and put in preventive measures and make sure that we don't have this catastrophe again.

The amount of money that the SEC and the CFTC are requesting, \$160 million, is less than we spend a day in petroleum marketplaces, in Baghdad or Kabul. We all agree, in this argument comes in, everybody knows that government needs to tighten its belt. But indiscriminate cutting across the board is not only absurd, it is dangerous. Reducing funding for the SEC and the CFTC is irresponsible and will lead to additional Madoffs in the future. I think that we owe the American people much more than that.

What we are simply talking about here is making sure that those individuals whose responsibility it is to make sure that we don't get in this predicament again, that people don't lose their life savings, have the resources that are necessary to do it. That is what we are talking about.

So I would urge that we not cut, but give the amount of money that is requested by the SEC and the CFTC, because I think that is what the American people would expect of us as being Members of the People's House, taking care of them and making sure that their life savings are protected.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished freshman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am a small business owner. I own and operate a business. I employ just under 100 people. For me, that is 100 families. One of the reasons that I am here today is I decided the government was making it harder and harder for me to put the key in the door and open up my business every day, and it should be quite the opposite.

We need regulation. I am going to agree with my colleagues on the other side. We need regulation, but it has to be smart regulation. H. Res. 72 finally gives the American public, employees, consumers, businesses, and families a bright light at the end of what is a very dark and long regulatory tunnel. And while we agree that many regulations are there to safeguard the American public, this resolution will simply require that House committees review these government regulations.

While doing so, each committee will identify each regulation's effects on jobs and economic growth, and, more specifically, ask certain sets of fundamental questions, including, will the proposed regulation impede private

sector job creation? That is the number one goal right now, to try to create jobs. Will the proposed regulation discourage innovation and the entrepreneurial spirit? Will the proposed regulation harm economic growth and investment? Will it harm America's global competitiveness? Will the proposed regulation limit access to credit and to capital? Will it create economic uncertainty?

Unfortunately, for years, many in the Congress and regulators have simply ignored these questions, with devastating results for job creation.

Mr. Speaker, in our global marketplace we must ask, analyze, and debate the questions contained in this resolution if we are serious about creating an environment where private sector jobs are created.

Unfortunately, in the past we had multiple massive bills with thousands of pages of legislative text written and jammed through the Congress without meaningful debate, without transparency, and without opportunity for most Members to actually read and to analyze the mountain of legislation, creating countless regulations, rules, studies, and commissions. How can we possibly expect businesses to invest scarce capital in new equipment, in new research, in development, in new product lines, in new marketing programs, maintaining existing jobs and new initiatives, when our regulations are paralyzing businesses and entrepreneurs with a tremendous amount of uncertainty?

I hear back in my district all the time from those that are trying to create jobs. A good example of the regulatory environment is a small business in the 10th District back in Illinois, Learning Resources, whose sole mission is to provide better resources for teachers and students to learn more easily.

Learning Resources has suffered along with its current employees, and I would argue potential employees and their families, because of undue burdensome regulations. Their regulatory compliance costs have increased ten times, 1,000 percent, in just the last 5 years, even though the company has not had any safety issues or any problems during that time or the years prior to. With unduly burdensome regulations, jobs have been lost, business expansion opportunities have been cut short, employee benefits have been shaved and consumer prices have been artificially inflated.

The Small Business Administration estimates that a total regulatory compliance cost imposed on American businesses amounts to over \$1.75 trillion each and every year. This is nearly twice as much as all individual income taxes collected each year. This takes away from productive investment and growth.

We live, Mr. Speaker, in a global marketplace where businesses and capital are mobile, where businesses and jobs gravitate to where they are most

welcome, where customers can easily choose to buy goods and services from businesses based anywhere in the world. We want those businesses and those jobs here in the United States. We want businesses to innovate. We want them to make sure they are welcome here in our borders. We have to create, however, an environment where they can grow and they can thrive.

H. Res. 72 is good for individuals, for families, for employees, for businesses. It is good for our government, and it is good for our Nation, and I would respectfully urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support its passage.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), who also serves on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, we have on this side spoken tonight at some length about a dangerous and poorly thought out effort on the part of the majority to underfund and gut the financial services regulatory apparatus that was established in the 1930s, which, yes, failed us in the last couple of years. And let's be clear: There is a legitimate tension between the amount of regulation which creates stability and confidence in a system and that which puts undue burden on the vigor of the private market. But this effort is wrong-headed.

Let's look at the SEC. The mission of the SEC is to protect investors. The notion that we should gut the funding of the SEC is anti-free market, it is anti-jobs and it is anti-growth, because we must protect those investors who take their savings and write a check and put it in the mail to a company in some town they have never visited, in a fund that they don't fully understand, because they know that there is a cop on the beat.

The families who write those checks, that is not just money. That money is a college education, it is a secure retirement, and they do it because they have faith. They have faith that there is a cop on the beat, that whoever takes that check is closely watched, that they are responsible and prudent. This is the fundamental aspect of our vigorous economy—that families and pension funds invest. We have efficient and vigorous capital markets because of faith.

Let's look at the lessons that have been learned in the last couple of years. It wasn't that the SEC was somehow complicit in what happened.

□ 1850

Yeah, they fell asleep at the switch. They didn't perform any better than a myriad of other organizations. But, if anything, the lesson is that the SEC was outgunned, underfunded, and needed help. And the effort of the majority now is to further underfund and gut that agency. It's particularly wrong-headed because the SEC pays for itself. In fiscal year 2012, the SEC will be budget-neutral. Why do this? Why risk the faith of the investors that are at the very heart of our system?

We hear a lot about uncertainty; there's so much uncertainty. Imagine the uncertainty for American families and pension funds and savers and small businesses if they need to send that check without knowing that there's a cop on the beat.

Mr. Speaker, we've seen this movie before. When the SEC was established in the 1930s, the Republicans at the time said this would be the end of capitalism. It would be the end of the free market. It would crush the U.S. economy. Instead, putting in place a well-balanced and vigorous regulatory apparatus led to 60 years of the most aggressive and intense economic growth human history has ever seen—because people had faith in the system.

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California has 5 minutes remaining.

Ms. HAYWORTH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 72.

The greatest challenge facing this new 112th Congress is our responsibility to support policies that foster an environment of economic certainty and that will provide businesses in Virginia's Fifth District and across this Nation with the confidence necessary to hire and expand once again.

It was refreshing to spend last week meeting with constituents and businesses in the Fifth District. People and businesses continue to struggle, and it is clear that job creation remains the top priority for the people that I represent. As I have talked to these same job creators and constituents over the past years, it is equally clear that access to capital is the lifeblood of Main Street business. It is also clear that the overregulation represented in Dodd-Frank will make it increasingly difficult for capital to be available so that our small businesses can succeed and hire new employees.

My constituents believe that we must rein in the size and scope of the Federal Government by removing unnecessary regulations for our job creators. House Resolution 72 will begin this process in a deliberative and thoughtful manner as it directs our committees to review Federal regulations and assess their negative impacts on our economy.

As a member of the Financial Services Committee, I look forward to working with the chairman and my colleagues as we conduct a close review of the regulations that are hindering job creation and economic growth for the people of the Fifth District and our Nation.

I urge a "yes" vote on House Resolution 72.

Ms. WATERS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 72, which would direct the Financial Services Committee to conduct an inventory reviewing existing, pending, and proposed regulations that impede job creation and economic growth. Once again, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are afraid of the answers that they will find when we shine the light of truth on what these regulations do.

As Members of Congress, we need to work with job creators to help create an atmosphere in our country that will foster job growth, particularly within the small business community. Simply put, the private sector, not the public sector, creates prosperity. We don't need more government or a bigger one. Last year alone, the executive branch issued more than 3,000 new rules and regulations which their own Small Business Administration reports will cost businesses over a trillion dollars.

Both sides of the aisle agree that small businesses are the backbone and the engine of the economy and provide more than two-thirds of all American jobs. As a small business owner, I know firsthand how Federal regulations can choke small businesses. The average small business with less than 20 employees faces an annual cost of \$10,585 to comply with a myriad of Federal regulations per worker they employ. For my small gravel company that employs two full-time workers, including a gentleman who's worked for my grandfather, my father, and myself, that equates to more than \$21,000 that I have to spend towards compliance—money that I could be using to invest in much-needed new equipment.

Last month, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that the national unemployment rate fell from 9.6 percent to 9.4 percent. This drop is due largely to people who have simply stopped looking for work. In some areas of my district, the Second District in Michigan, that number is nearly double the national average.

I believe there are some universal principles of successful businesses that Congress could work on to help grow our economy again. For government, that means creating an atmosphere for success through a reasonable tax and regulatory environment.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage my colleague, Mr. HIMES, in a colloquy for the balance of our time.

I appreciated the comments that you made just a few minutes ago, but you alluded to the length of time that we have organized the SEC and some protections and what happened, the kind of growth we had, but now things have changed somewhat and the oversight responsibility is a little bit more complicated and a little bit more difficult.

What did you mean by that?

Mr. HIMES. I thank the gentlelady from California for that question.

If you look at when these regulatory bodies were established in the 1930s and you look at the volatility and the growth that happened in the next 60 years, volatility was way down and growth was way up, and the American middle class took hold because they had confidence in the system. They knew that their investor dollars would be protected.

Then we began in the early nineties, policymakers from both sides of the aisle, to dismantle that regulation, to take the referee off the field. And so we find ourselves where we are today—uncertainty, a financial crisis meltdown—at the very moment when the technology, the flash trading, the complicated securities are bewildering in their complexity.

Now is exactly the wrong time to be gutting the SEC. We do that and people lose their confidence.

Ms. WATERS. I want to ask you, is it true that the average investor—I'm not just talking about the big institutional investors, but the average investor understands the complication of this? Do they expect that we understand it and we're going to regulate it, we're going to watch out for them? What does the average investor know about the system?

Mr. HIMES. The average investor, the mom and pop, the widows and orphans funds, they're not necessarily financially sophisticated. They need somebody looking over the shoulder of those that are selling them stock, selling them bonds.

The institutional investors that you're talking about, of course, in many instances, are exempt from regulations by the SEC. They're deemed to be sophisticated, so they can participate in private placements. They can use 144(a) or reg D to make investments.

But our individual investors who are so important to this economy need somebody looking over their shoulder and protecting them from snake oil salesmen and deception and poor disclosure.

Ms. WATERS. We heard on several occasions here today the tremendous oversight responsibility given all of the capital markets that have to be monitored, that have to be regulated. What do we need to do to make the SEC stronger? We've gone through this meltdown. We've have gone through this crisis. The American people expect something to happen. What do they need in order to be good overseers, good cops?

Mr. HIMES. In a more complicated and sophisticated financial world, the SEC must be faster. It must be more efficient. It must hire people who really understand the markets. It must be more robust, and it should be held accountable. One thing it should not be and cannot be is underfunded and weak, which is what the proposal of the majority would do to it.

Ms. WATERS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HAYWORTH).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from New York will control 1 additional minute.

There was no objection.

□ 1900

Ms. HAYWORTH. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in New York's 19th District, our employers and small businesses and community banks tell me costly regulations are crushing economic growth by discouraging investment and expansion, by creating uncertainty in the marketplace, and by delaying hiring. We can all agree that some commonsense regulations are good, but excessive government rules and regulations are bad.

On the Financial Services Committee, we know, from reporting requirements in Sarbanes-Oxley to countless excessive new regulations in Dodd-Frank, the Federal Government is sending a message to our financial institutions—an industry vital to my home State of New York. The message is: you aren't welcome here.

The United States is currently the financial capital of the world. Our capital markets must be vibrant, and we must foster an environment that promotes growth and attracts enterprise. If we fail to do that, we will see an exodus—and that threat is very real—to nations like Singapore and China, which appreciate the opportunity a healthy financial industry brings.

What a shame, because the American people want to go back to work. They want jobs. Burdensome, costly, and unnecessary regulations must be eliminated; and we must trust and empower our enterprises and our entrepreneurs and our small businesses and community banks and our employers. By supporting the resolution, we will start America on the path to creating jobs and prosperity for our citizens in New York 19 and our Nation. They deserve it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about is the size of the Federal Government and the size of our regulations.

In the last 4 years of our Democratic Congress, which took power in January of 2007—and I will remind everyone that that was prior to the financial crisis—our national debt doubled in that period of time. In other words, we have incurred more debt in the past 4 years under a Democrat Senate and a Democrat House and in the last 2 years under a Democrat President than we had in the 220 years before. We are talking about a record national debt of

\$14 trillion. We are talking about a growth in the size of the Federal Government which in 10 years will absorb every dollar and every dime and every penny generated by our economy.

Now think of such a thing—every dollar being spent by the Federal Government.

You have to ask yourself: With record deficits and record debt, don't we have too much Federal Government? Don't we have more government than we can afford? Don't we have more government than we need?

So I think it is entirely fitting for us to look at each government program and ask ourselves: Is there a benefit from this program? Is there a cost to this program? Does it eliminate jobs?

If you will go through a list of comments that people have made to these regulations, you will see comment after comment after comment: this regulation will cost my business this much money. This regulation will cost this much money. I won't be able to create a job.

So the government is spending record amounts of money. Yet it's adding to the cost, not only to the taxpayers, but to the cost for them to earn a living themselves.

Our Secretary of Defense, a member of the administration, has warned—he said that this country's dire fiscal situation and the threat it poses to American influence and credibility around the world will only get worse unless the U.S. Government gets its finances in order. He actually says that our financial situation is affecting our credibility, and that's absolutely true. Didn't we see Japan's sovereign debt downgraded recently? Standard & Poor's has said, if we don't act, our debt will be downgraded.

We talk about foreclosures. If our credit rating goes down, can you imagine the wave of foreclosures, the wave of job losses? We talk about foreclosures. What causes foreclosures? Most of it is job loss. We have testified here today—and we will tomorrow—that this regulation will cost jobs. You talk about foreclosures. Regulations that cost jobs cause foreclosures. It's that simple. We talk about the State and local governments not having tax revenue. When people lose their jobs, they don't pay the State; they don't pay the city; they don't pay the Federal Government. They can't. Yet we continue to add cost and job-killing regulations.

Admiral Mullen, our own chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said this: Our national debt is our biggest national security threat.

What does it take for us to finally realize that we are putting our country in jeopardy? We for 224 years have lived and enjoyed an independent democracy, a Republic, but we are threatening that by our inability to say "no," by our inability to say "no" to more Federal Government.

Ladies and gentlemen, the answer is not growing government. It's turning the private sector loose.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, gasoline prices are rising, and we have near double-digit unemployment. The Obama administration should be doing everything within its power to spur economic growth and to create new jobs. Unfortunately, they have not.

This administration has chosen to impose regulation after regulation and policy after policy on American businesses that impede their potential growth and thus impede our economic recovery. Many of these regulations delay or flat out prevent Americans from responsibly developing our own natural resources. They block access to American energy; they block access to American minerals; they block access to American water supplies; and they block access to American forest products.

By their actions, this administration is jeopardizing our economic competitiveness. This jeopardy is making America more reliant on foreign countries to meet our everyday needs.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe Americans are content with locking up our valuable resources.

□ 1910

I don't believe Americans are content with sending American jobs overseas, but that's exactly what these regulations and policies are doing.

President Obama says that he wants to eliminate regulations that are strangling businesses. That's noble, but this appears to be one more example of his rhetoric not matching his actions. The rules and regulations imposed by the Obama administration have allowed the Federal Government to insert itself in places that it's never been and, frankly, doesn't belong. Let me give you several examples.

First, burdensome regulations are being used to restrict access to American energy production on public lands, both onshore and offshore. Last year, new rules were imposed for onshore lease sales that have significantly decreased energy production throughout the intermountain West. Offshore, the administration continues to impose a de facto moratorium on drilling in the gulf and has yet to issue a single deep-well permit since last April. President Obama's de facto moratorium has put thousands of Americans out of work.

These regulations are not only impeding oil and natural gas production but also renewable energy such as wind and solar. Why? Because these regulations will restrict renewable energy development to only a tiny, tiny fraction of our public lands.

Second, the Obama administration is aggressively pursuing sweeping new changes to mining regulations. These regulations—Mr. Speaker, let me repeat this—these regulations, by their own admission, will cost thousands of American jobs and decrease American energy production in 22 States.

Third, the Obama administration has reversed a long-standing legal agreement and moved to establish a new "wild lands" policy that will further restrict public access to multipurpose public lands. This backdoor approach will prohibit many popular forms of recreation and severely restrict job-creating, energy-producing activities. By creating de facto wilderness, the administration is circumventing Congress' sole authority to establish wilderness areas.

Fourth, the President has signed an Executive order establishing a new National Ocean Policy and Council that could severely restrict recreational and commercial use of our oceans. This policy establishes mandatory marine spatial planning, otherwise known as ocean zoning. The reach of this policy may stretch far inland, extending to potentially all rivers, tributaries, and lands that drain into the ocean.

Fifth, the Environmental Protection Agency has allowed questionable science to be used to impose regulations that could end the use of vital farm crop and tree protection products. This will cost jobs and adversely impact trade of our agricultural products.

And last, Mr. Speaker, but certainly not least, the Obama administration has supported withholding valuable water from communities in California's San Joaquin Valley, prioritizing the needs of a 3-inch fish over thousands of workers and their families. This Government and manmade drought caused hundreds of thousands of acres of fertile farm land to dry up, and that has resulted, Mr. Speaker, in an unemployment rate that exceeds 40 percent in that area.

So this is just one example of how the implementation of the Endangered Species Act, which I might add hasn't been reviewed for almost 20 years, is being used to block or delay job-creating projects. Mr. Speaker, the goal of the ESA was to conserve key domestic species, but today, unfortunately, it's being used by special interest groups to file lawsuits and drain resources away from the real recovery efforts of those species.

The National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, and other environmental regulations are going far beyond their original intent, and they, too, are being used to place unnecessary and costly burdens on economic development projects throughout the country. NEPA has become a tool for litigation, sometimes resulting in decades worth of delays before a project can move forward.

The list of burdensome regulations and policies go on and on, and what I have described just scratches the surface. American businesses are struggling to keep their doors open. Rural communities who depend on these resources are feeling their livelihoods threatened. And American families, many of whom are already finding it difficult to make ends meet, are paying more for everything from gasoline to fruits and vegetables.

A clean, healthy environment is a priority for all Americans. But an equal priority is a Federal Government that sets sensible rules that provide clarity, certainty, and allow job-creating initiatives to move forward in a timely, efficient manner.

The Obama administration needs to exercise common sense. Spending more money and imposing new rules will not lead to economic recovery. Businesses and communities need relief from these top-down policies that are costing American jobs.

The Natural Resources Committee and all of its subcommittees will be conducting thorough oversight of the Obama administration policies, taking a close look at how and why decisions are made. So, Mr. Speaker, I fully support this resolution, and Republicans on the Natural Resources Committee are committed to promoting policies that will reduce spending, strengthen the economy, and create American jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself 5 minutes.

This is a very important debate because it goes right to the very heart of what is needed in order to ensure that we provide the proper protections for families across our country, from the despoliation of the environment and all the public health and safety and environmental catastrophes that then can affect American families.

I have here a picture of the Deepwater Horizon in flames as it's about to go to the bottom of the ocean. This is what happened because of deregulation. This is what happened when regulations are not applied and enforced in a way that ensures that the public health and safety is protected, the greatest environmental disaster in the history of the United States, devastating the lives of 11 men and the livelihoods of millions of people in the Gulf of Mexico. This is the legacy of what happened during the Bush administration, a ticking timebomb that exploded across our country, leading to this environmental catastrophe.

The same thing, by the way, is true in our financial marketplace where, in the Bush years, they turned a blind eye to obvious problems with derivatives, obvious problems with chicanery inside of the financial marketplace, a ticking timebomb that exploded, that has wreaked havoc on millions of Americans, losing their home, their jobs.

When George Bush left office, the Dow Jones industrial average at 6,400, 6,400, after 8 years in office. That's what George Bush left in office, by turning a blind eye to the kinds of regulations that it needed there to protect the lives of families. Today, with Barack Obama on the job, with a Securities and Exchange Commission doing its job, the Dow is now over 12,000, almost doubled, because people have confidence in the regulations. They can trust their money in the stock market once again. That's what happens when

regulations are there to protect ordinary people.

Now, what is their proposal? Their proposal is to take the Environmental Protection Agency and to turn the Environmental Protection Agency into every polluter's ally. They're going to bring a bill out here onto the House floor that says they're going to repeal the ability of the EPA to improve the fuel economy standards of the vehicles which we drive, to ensure that regulations are on the books that we have renewable fuels that we develop here in the United States, not imported from OPEC.

The result of that bill that they're going to bring out here on the House floor in the next 2 weeks? Some 5 million barrels of oil per day that otherwise would be backed out, that we would not import from the Middle East, will now have to be imported. At \$100 a barrel with 365 days in a year, we're talking about \$162 billion a year that the American consumer will have to send to the Middle East because they do not want to regulate.

□ 1920

They do not want to ensure that the efficiency of the cars which people drive, the amount of pollution that comes out of those cars, they say, is too high a price to pay. While here as we watch Egypt explode, Tunisia explode, other countries in the Middle East on the verge of having the same kind of explosions, this kind of environmental, this kind of safety protection that we put on the books enforces the need for us to ensure that we do not allow for the repeal of these environmental and safety protections. That's what this debate is all about.

This is the same kind of war on the environment that we saw during the 8 years of the Bush administration. This is the result of that, ladies and gentlemen. And that's where they're going to take us if we have this wholesale destruction of this environmental and safety regime which has been put on the books in order to protect the American public.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that all time on the resolution be yielded back and that H. Res. 72 be adopted so that we can move on to consider legislation to create jobs in our country, which is really what we should be debating out here on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the majority manager, the gentleman from Washington, yield for the purpose of that unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield for the purpose of that request.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Indian and Alaska Native Affairs Subcommittee,

the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman.

I have a prepared statement here and I'll probably use some of it. I can't help but answer the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has never supported at any time, has never supported in any way, any energy development in this country. He was against nuclear power many years ago. He is still against it. He was against solar power and then since it is wind power in his State. And he's against, very frankly, any fossil fuel development. And depending on his so-called make-believe wind power, make-believe solar power, in the meantime, we're buying oil from overseas. And you know that.

The EPA, very frankly, is part of the problem. I am the chairman now of the American Indian and Alaska Natives and their lands can't be developed because of EPA. The Navajo Nation had a coal plant. They had the coal. They had the financing. And the Obama administration says, no, you can't do that through the EPA, through the Fish and Wildlife, et cetera, and they lost the financing for a coal project because they don't believe in coal. We have a trust relationship to the American Indians. And to have other agencies within the government say, "No, you can't do it, you stay right where you are" is wrong. They have the highest potential of energy of any land mass in this Nation and they're precluded from development because of regulations.

EPA just came out—I mentioned this earlier today—with a new concept of a regulation for dairies. This is your government, the Obama administration. And, by the way, thank God for George Bush. They're still blaming him for everything. But if I remember correctly, Horizon was done under the Obama administration. If I remember correctly, it was his Minerals and Management agency that wasn't doing their job. There were enough regulations in place. They weren't doing their job. If I remember, that's correct. George Bush was out of office.

But EPA now comes out with a new regulation under the oil spill liability where we develop oil that the moneys will be put aside for a cleanup, of which I support, but there are new regulations because they want to regulate the dairies of our Nation today. Mr. and Mrs. America, keep in mind, they want to regulate the dairies today because there's fat in the milk. Fat in the milk. And they want to have each cow be charged \$600 per lifetime of that dairy, put aside in a fund to clean up spilt milk. That's your EPA and regulations. Remember, the term "don't cry over spilled milk" is going to cost you money now. That's the government regulations. I can go on and on what they've done to American Indians. They don't allow them to develop

their resources. There's a paternalistic type of society they have today. And I'm saying here as chairman, we are going to develop those resources in the nations that they are. That's our responsibility as a Congress. And to preclude that because of actions of regulatory agencies is dead wrong.

I am asking my colleagues to remember this. Every committee should be looking at every regulation. You want to balance this budget?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. By the way, 1,600,000 laws on the books today were never voted on by anybody. Not ever voted on. It costs \$1.01 trillion a year to implement those regulations. You want to balance the budget? Eliminate those regulations and you can balance it in 13 years. We could have industry again.

I'm just saying this is a good idea. Let's pass it.

Federal policies and regulations stand in the way of economic progress and free enterprise for all Americans, but the problem is especially bad in Indian Country.

Indian reservations have the highest rates of unemployment and poverty of any comparable areas in America.

These statistics are astounding when you consider that tribes own an estimated ten percent of the Nation's energy potential.

But so many tribal lands lie vacant and unused.

The problem is that development of Indian land is based on outdated, paternalistic Federal laws and policies.

Let me describe a few examples of these laws and policies.

We have the Long-Term Leasing Act . . . a 56-year-old statute that restricts most Indians from leasing their property for more than 25 year terms. In some cases this has prevented tribes from constructing new homes.

There is the National Environmental Policy Act, a law routinely used to delay and stop the use of lands reserved exclusively for tribes under solemn treaties with the United States.

The Endangered Species Act has become the weapon choice by special interests seeking to harm tribal development.

And then we have the Environmental Protection Agency, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. One of the first acts of the Obama Administration was to have these agencies stop the Navajo Nation from building and operating a 1,500 megawatt power plant on its reservation.

The project would have created thousands of good jobs on a reservation with 50 percent unemployment, generating \$1.5 billion over 30 years for the tribe's treasury.

Thanks to our government, the tribe is not allowed to create jobs for its citizens or produce power for millions of consumers.

This is wrong.

Tribes are caught in a Catch-22. They have over 50 million acres of land pursuant to treaties and Acts of Congress, but the catch is they can't use them without permission of Washington, DC.

Tribes are suffering from 19th-century Indian policies, and the result is a continuing Great Depression across many reservations.

Fortunately, a number of tribes have taken control of their resources from Washington, DC. They have proven to be outstanding stewards of their lands while providing huge energy resources needed by the country.

The Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs is going to study the accomplishments of these tribes. We will consider changing outdated laws and policies that stand in the way of tribal economic development.

I look forward to the Subcommittee making progress—on a bipartisan basis—to create more tribal opportunity, and more tribal freedom from outdated Federal laws.

These sort of harmful regulations are not unique to Indian Country. For example, my Alaska fishermen are faced with similar crippling stupidity.

EPA now requires fish processing vessels operating in the Bering Sea to take water samples which are then tested at such a high resolution level that the tests cannot be performed by any labs in Alaska. The samples have to be sent out of Alaska at great expense.

To make matters worse, the test are required to be so precise and to such an unrealistic resolution level that if a technician has mercury amalgam fillings, his breath could alter the result.

In another instance, EPA is requiring complex seafood processing permits and gear for Alaska's small freezer troll fleet.

These folks only catch about 1,000 pounds of fish a day. They have 45-foot fishing boats and one or two deck hands—they fish with hook and line and clean their fish immediately. They toss fresh fish heads right back into the waters they came from—one at a time, and EPA wants them treated like a big factory ship. This is preposterous!

Again, this Committee will examine these issues and take steps to remove these foolish regulations that are stopping the production of new wealth.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Thank you, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. Speaker, I'm listening to the debate, and I can relate to a lot of what is being said.

I am going to speak to the issue of water and the role it plays in our local economies. We've been working steadfastly with my colleagues on the other side, although sometimes I don't think they buy into some of the issues that we're trying to push forward, the water recycling, water conservation, water efficiencies that create, not paper water, that is paper on ledgers, but real water that create jobs because of what it does in the local communities.

When we refer to the ESA, I sat through many a hearing with Mr. Pombo on the Endangered Species Act and I can tell you that protecting domestic species is one of the ideals that we have in this great country of ours. Species. Fish. Species. Man. When is our turn? That's one of the things that we look towards to protect the Amer-

ican public, the ability for us to ensure that whatever is delivered to them, whether it is food, transportation, water, anything, that it is going to be safe not only for people but for other species.

The Bureau of Reclamation's WaterSMART grants and title XVI projects, which is water recycling, are locally initiated and fully supported and are an important part of our water supply solution. These projects create in our areas and have in the past many jobs which allow communities to sustain their economic growth while producing potable water, or water for agriculture, through real efficiencies, conservation and water recycling.

The Bureau of Reclamation created 62,000 jobs and supported through funding in 2009 through all their programming, including title XVI, and it has already awarded over \$93.2 million in Federal funding for 235 WaterSMART grant projects in 16 western States from 2004 to 2010. These projects will conserve approximately 705,000 acre-feet of water per year when fully constructed at an approximate cost of \$132 per acre-foot. Currently it runs anywhere from \$300 to \$1,500 in Arizona in some areas. Title XVI projects have produced an estimated 260,000 acre-feet of real, pure water in 2010.

Please, ladies and gentlemen, speak to your local water agencies; ask how critical projects in your communities, their funding, create jobs, local jobs, and create water so badly needed especially during times of drought, and Mother Nature does have drought cycles upon us in the United States. Real water and jobs are created through conservation, not by talk or conversation about regulation. We must support projects to conserve water, to conserve our communities and thereby create jobs.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the chairman of the National Parks, Forests and Public Lands Subcommittee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, last year the Senate and House Western Caucus produced a document that was entitled the War on Western Jobs, in which we discovered 10 areas in which regulations from this administration and past administrations have created specific problems and specific loss of jobs to the West.

□ 1930

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has said that the West has the highest regional unemployment for the past year; that, indeed, six of the top 12 States that had the largest decline in employment-to-population ratio since the recession began were found in the West. Three of the top five States showing the most stress were found in the West, and Washington's misguided policies were making the matter worse. Whether it was in the areas of energy

use, takeover of water, domestic energy mandates, prioritization of species, multiple use on national forests, overregulating, seizing Western lands, bureaucratic overreach, all 10 of those areas illustrate the problems that we face in the West.

In Western public lands, it is essential to have a resource management plan. It is an effort where professionals on the ground were able to come up—in the case of Utah after 6 to 10 years of planning—following the law, including the public process to come up with a policy and procedures for our plans, all of which have been turned upside down by arbitrary regulations coming out of the Interior Department here in Washington.

Let me give you simply two examples: an arbitrary decision that made a restrictive new regulatory framework for U.S. oil shale. The U.S. Geological Survey said in a 16,000-square-mile area of Utah, Wyoming, and parts of Colorado, they estimate at least 2 trillion barrels of oil shale—that is equal to what Canada is enriching themselves through their tar sands proposal—were available and experimental programs were moving forward until a regulation stopped it. The estimate: a potential loss of 100,000 jobs and \$1.9 trillion to the GDP of this country was lost in that particular project.

The day after the last day of our lame duck session, the Secretary of the Interior, using questionable authorities, created a new or announced a new wild land policy which, once again, stopped those management plans in their tracks.

The result of that, let me simply give you one example: one company in two counties of my State, having 300 high-paying jobs, that had been working for 3 years with leasing and environmental review process with the BLM, within hours of that wild lands announcement, special interest groups recommended the area they were working being managed as wild lands; and their leasing process was delayed indefinitely for a potential wild lands inventory, despite the fact that this entire area consists of 800 drill holes with cement casings, roads, man-made Earth berms, and every other sign of man that would be prohibited if it was a wilderness designation.

Local governments desperately need those management plans because they provide the consistency for business to understand that.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman 15 seconds.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Once again, in the West, thousands of jobs have been lost. Millions of dollars that should be going to schools on trust lands have been lost. Billions in capital investment have been lost because of this war on the West through regulation. It's time to end the war. It's time to help the people out. I look forward to this process.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, let me thank our ranking member, Mr. MARKEY, for the opportunity.

This resolution is, quite frankly, an unfortunate use of our time. Rather than discussing jobs proposals, we are discussing a resolution that is telling ourselves to do something we are already doing, which is the regulatory review. The majority is intent on talking about what they perceive the unemployment problem to be while spending no time at all attempting to work on some real solutions.

In the New West—and the chairman of our subcommittee, Mr. BISHOP, mentioned that—there is high unemployment. I would suggest that we need to look deeper than the regulatory issues that he pointed out. The West leads the country in foreclosures. Those were the manipulations of banks and mortgage companies and shenanigans that Mr. MARKEY called. And as a consequence of that, we lead the Nation in unemployed construction workers. We lead the Nation in unemployed labor. And that is a deregulated industry. So I would suggest that if we are going to use unemployment as an example, we look at the root problem of where our unemployment is in the West.

The Republican majority on the Natural Resources Committee seems to think that American people have to choose between healthy, vibrant national parks, forests, and public lands or jobs. If you ask them for their ideas regarding job creation, what you hear is that we have got to roll back existing environmental protections and open up the ever-expanding areas of public lands to unregulated, destructive resource extraction. This is a horribly false choice created by those who care more about increasing the profits for oil, timber, and mining companies than really about creating jobs. This is a false choice because with a little bit of forward thinking, we can create jobs that will not only provide people with paychecks but will actually improve our environment and the economy and at the same time take care of our public lands.

We have heard many examples from Members on this side of the aisle, and we will continue to hear that today, and I am proud to try to do my part as well. Yesterday I reintroduced, with the senior member of our committee, Mr. MARKEY, the Public Lands Service Corps legislation, H.R. 587. This legislation passed the House last Congress, and I am pleased to reintroduce it.

At the same time that we are facing high unemployment, we also face huge backlogs of labor-intensive work needed on national park lands, forests, wildlife areas, historic sites, and Indian lands. Years of inadequate funding have put land management agencies far behind on the vital maintenance work while infrastructure continues to crumble.

Our legislation would provide opportunity through three Departments: Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce; provide service learning opportunities on public lands; help restore our natural, cultural, and historic resources; train a whole new generation of public land managers; and promote the value of public lands. This legislation will modernize the scope of the corps projects to reflect the new challenges, such as climate change and adding incentives to attract new participants, especially from underrepresented populations.

By providing job training, by providing opportunity, we are providing people with a chance to succeed. I would suggest that as we talk about legislation and we talk about jobs, that we talk about job creation and not merely talk about the need for jobs but talk about the specificity, what are going to be the mechanisms and the techniques to put people back to work.

To use the misery of unemployment in this community as a reason to give away our natural resources is cynical at best. It doesn't create jobs; it doesn't protect Americans; and it doesn't empower our communities or protect our very valuable and cherished public lands.

And to do so, this bill begs the question. It does not talk. It does not specify what we need to do. It merely reiterates an ideology that says, no regulation. We've seen that history. We have seen its consequences, and I urge a "no" vote on this.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the subcommittee chairman of the Energy and Minerals Subcommittee.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, under normal circumstances, the programs under the jurisdiction of the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee bring in the second-highest revenue to the Federal Treasury, provide opportunities for American job creation, and contribute to our Nation's economic and national security. However, the Obama administration is crippling American energy and mineral production through restrictive new policies, rules, and regulations.

President Obama's de facto moratorium on offshore drilling in the Gulf of Mexico has left many thousands of people out of work. Since last spring, the administration has issued only a handful of new shallow water permits, and they have issued no new permits for deepwater leases. Why are no new permits being issued? The reason is simple: it's regulatory confusion. The administration is attempting to create new rules for oil and gas permitting and has repeatedly changed the rules and moved the goal posts on companies operating on both Federal lands and waters. Instead of thoughtful, reasoned

rulemaking that seeks public comments and engagement, the administration unilaterally directed the change of over 14,000 engineering requirements.

□ 1940

The Louisiana Secretary of Natural Resources has said the changes would not enhance safety but, instead, “create a regulation with increased safety risks, mandates that cannot be met, and too many ambiguous and unenforceable requirements to count.”

This same regulatory uncertainty is happening all over the country. Take the Western United States. While the administration has announced that solar energy is one of its highest priorities, it has once again created tremendous regulatory confusion.

The new solar energy zones proposal, while potentially helping some solar development, has left dozens of major energy projects and many jobs with no regulatory path forward.

The regulatory confusion on Federal lands is even worse for onshore oil and gas production. Rule changes and regulations have cost billions in lost investments in the West. In my home State of Colorado, there’s been nearly a 90 percent drop, a 90 percent drop in new leases on Federal land.

A recent study by the respected Western Energy Alliance has documented \$3.9 billion in investment that was diverted from the West in 2010 because of red tape and overregulation by the Department of the Interior. The Western Energy Alliance estimates this lost investment could have helped create upwards of 16,000 jobs in the West. And these are high-paying jobs.

The administration is now examining how to impose Federal regulations for the first time on hydraulic fracturing on Federal lands. This proposal would duplicate State permitting and create an unnecessary obstacle for American energy development.

Finally, no discussion of burdensome regulations would be complete without addressing the administration’s war on coal. Nowhere is this effort more evident than their effort to rewrite current surface mining rules. The current rule was the result of years of environmental review, public comment and hearings, and responsible rulemaking. The administration is now purposefully limiting public comment opportunities and rushing forward with a rule that, by its own admission, will cost thousands of jobs.

Even worse, the Obama administration recently pulled a permit 3 years after it was approved for a coal mine that was already hiring people. What sort of confidence can anyone have in an administration and its regulatory environment when issued permits can be stripped away at whim?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, to conclude, this resolution asks us to focus on the impacts of restrictive regulations just like these, and that is what we plan to do. We will focus on how we can clear away these regulatory hurdles to create a path for energy security, lower energy prices, help for balancing our budget, and, most of all, more high-paying energy jobs for Americans.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. As I listen to this debate this evening, Mr. Speaker, I find myself wanting to focus on jobs, but what I just heard makes my blood boil.

I was the Deputy Secretary at the Department of the Interior while the rapers and pillagers of the public land wanted all regulations to disappear. They wanted to have open hunting for minerals, for oil, for gas and coal on all public lands.

And you talked a moment ago about the pulling of that permit for that coal mine. They would, in that permit, level the hills of Appalachia, flatten them, ruin the streams, destroy, destroy, destroy.

The regulations are there for a reason. They are there to protect the precious environment of America. And if it is your intent to do away with those regulations, then know this: You will have a fight on your hands.

You will have a fight on your hands when you try to do away with the regulations that protect the men and women on those drilling rigs from the extraordinary accidents that happen in deepwater drilling.

But, my purpose here tonight is different. My purpose here tonight is to ask why it is that the Republican majority has spent 5 weeks, 5 weeks leading this Congress, and not created one bill that creates one job, not one. Five weeks, zero jobs. You ran on jobs. Where are your job bills?

Your regulations are hiding—this whole debate is hiding something, because, as we speak, here you are in the process of figuring out how to cut \$100 billion out of the Federal budget for the next 7 months.

What does that mean? It means that national parks will close. It means that the clean water people that came to my office today will have no money, no money to build the sanitation systems and provide clean water for their citizens in the rural communities that you were just talking about.

What is this about? This is about hiding the ball. This is about wasting our time. When we ought to be talking about jobs, instead, you are hiding a \$100 billion cut that will displace hundreds of thousands of workers in the next 7 months. That’s what this is about.

We’re talking about hiding the ball when it comes to the men and women that maintain those very places you talk about out there in the great western lands.

You’re hiding the bill about the cuts you are going to make to education, for the teachers that will lose their jobs, for the janitors, for the bus drivers, for those people that are now employed that will lose their jobs as you attempt to put those cuts in place.

This is about jobs. The Democrats are talking about jobs. We’re talking about making it in America. We’re talking about those solar projects. Yes, we’re talking about who’s going to win the next energy, the next energy systems for this world. It’s not coal. It’s not oil. It’s the green renewable energy and nuclear. That’s what we’re talking about on our side. We’re talking about how we can do that.

And you’re talking about wasting 9 hours of precious time on this floor doing what you’ve already done. You’ve already issued the edicts of what you are going to do in this committee. I received it 2 weeks ago. You’re going to explore this; you’re going to review that. Two weeks ago you told me, a new member of this committee, what you intend to do, and now you’re wasting our time on this floor when we ought to be talking about jobs.

We ought to be talking about China getting ahead of us on tomorrow’s energy, wind, solar, solar thermal, all of those things. But no, no, we’re going to talk about what you’ve already done. You did it 2 weeks ago.

Why are you wasting our time when Americans want jobs, when Americans want solid legislation like Make It In America, using our tax money to buy solar and wind equipment that is manufactured in America? Why don’t we talk about that?

Why don’t we talk about using our money, our tax money that we pay every day at the gasoline pump, about American-made buses and trains?

But no, we’re going to talk about regulations. You already have told us what you’re going to do.

Let’s talk about creating jobs. That’s what we ought to be doing here. We ought not be wasting our time doing what you’ve already done. You’ve told us what you’re going to do.

And, by the way, if you think for a moment you can do away with those regulations that are protecting America’s precious resources and lives, know this: You’ve got a fight. You’ve got a fight that you lost in the 1990s. You lost it in the 2000–2008 period, and you will lose that fight because we are about creating good, healthy jobs in America that do not destroy the American environment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, after hearing the last gentleman, I yearn for these open rules we’re going to have.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1950

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING), the subcommittee chairman of the Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs Subcommittee.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to bypass the hysterics that have been going on tonight from some of our speakers and let's talk about the things that are important to Americans.

I have the great honor of representing the people of the Fourth District of Louisiana. I have a deep and abiding appreciation for the coastal wetlands and the thousands of jobs that are dependent on the health of the Gulf of Mexico. We in Louisiana understand that the offshore oil and gas industry is critical to our long-term economic survival.

Despite the tragedy of the Deepwater Horizon accident, the citizens of Louisiana support environmentally safe offshore energy development, and they are growing increasingly frustrated, if not angry, at the Obama administration's de facto moratorium that occurs today in the gulf, time delays that recently resulted in a Louisiana Federal judge finding the Department of the Interior in contempt of court. This moratorium has caused the loss of thousands of jobs; it has increased our growing dependence on imported oil, and it has contributed to the accelerated increase in the price of gasoline.

We have also heard an ongoing drumbeat of misinformation about hydraulic fracturing, which is a longstanding practice that has been effectively regulated by the States for over 60 years. In my own congressional district, hydraulic fracturing is necessary for the development of the Haynesville Shale play.

As a result of this energy activity, our local and State tax revenues have increased by at least \$900 million in 2009 alone, and more than 57,600 new jobs in Louisiana have been created. Let there be no mistake; if you add unnecessary and strangling bureaucratic red tape to hydraulic fracturing, the net result is less jobs and less energy for this country.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs, I will be conducting comprehensive oversight reviews, hearings on several job-destroying regulations and policies that are being promoted by the Obama administration.

The most far-reaching and least understood of these policies are those being proposed by President Obama's National Ocean Council, which will add additional layers of bureaucracy as well as a new zoning process for the coastal and marine environments. Yes, actual zoning out in the ocean. The council is in the process of creating a new layer of oversight over both recreational and commercial activities.

This effort will either override or replace a number of existing State-initiated cooperative efforts with a federally led planning process based on new Federal guidelines. In addition, the administration has undertaken a process to zone the Nation's oceans and coastal areas. This process could reach far inland and could override local planning and zoning processes.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman 15 seconds.

Mr. FLEMING. Clearly, this will have an effect on the jobs and economic livelihood on coastal and fishery-dependent communities and could have a devastating economic impact on a range of ocean users. So, for that reason, I stand in support and urge my colleagues to support this resolution as well.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the independent bipartisan commission on the BP oil spill issued its final report last month. And what did it conclude? Well, that the Deepwater Horizon that went to the bottom of the Gulf of Mexico, creating the worst environmental disaster in our country's history, was not an isolated incident; that the problems were systemic across the entire oil and gas industry.

That report was a blistering, scalding indictment of the deregulatory environment which was created at the Department of the Interior that led inexorably, inevitably to this catastrophe, this environmental catastrophe.

But are we here tonight debating legislation to implement the reforms that the commission presented to the Congress in order to prevent another catastrophe like this? No, we are not. We are instead debating whether or not we should have fewer regulations, whether or not regulations that actually protect against incidents like this hurt job creation.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, what we learned from the Deepwater Horizon catastrophe was that lax regulation doesn't save money; lax regulation costs money. Lax regulation does not create jobs; lax regulation destroys jobs. And in this case, lax regulation led to the loss of 11 lives and 155 other individuals who were seriously injured. Lax regulation, ladies and gentlemen, leads to catastrophe.

Boosterism breeds overconfidence, and overconfidence breeds disaster. That's what happens in our financial markets. That's what happens in environmental and health regulation when you just trust the private sector to always do the right thing. Ladies and gentlemen, this is what happens when the government doesn't move in to protect the little guy, to protect ordinary citizens.

The reason that we were able to move from the average age of death at 48 years of age in the year 1900, after 5,000 years from the Garden of Eden

until 1900, to 79 years of age just 100 years later is we started to regulate for public health and safety for ordinary people. Methuselah always lived to 900 years. The wealthy always did well. But only when regulation started to be put on the books to protect the meek—the water, the air, and the environment in which people live—did ordinary families start to benefit as well. That's what they want to take off the books. That's the agenda of large companies across our country.

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

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

How do you create jobs? We haven't heard that yet. We haven't heard that yet. Well, they say drilling. Well, last year there were 4,700 new leases that were granted by the Bureau of Land Management, but the oil industry only began drilling on 1,400 of them, only one-third.

Now, we don't really have to worry going forward in the future, because at \$100 a barrel plus, ladies and gentlemen, the \$40 billion in tax breaks that the Republicans want to give to the oil industry over the next 5 years, we don't have to worry that they are going to go drill, because they are going and drilling.

But why are we giving them \$40 billion? Why aren't the Republicans out here as free market devotees saying let's take that \$40 billion of taxpayers' money away from the oil industry? Why aren't they doing that? Why are they going to allow the taxpayers to be shaken upside down at the gas pump and have money come out of their pockets for the rest of this year as the price of a gallon of gasoline goes to \$3.30, \$3.40, all the way up to \$4 a gallon again?

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

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Because the real agenda here is to create as many red herrings as they can about the real agenda. As a matter of fact, we can put an aquarium out here there are so many red herrings. As a matter of fact, so many red herrings are being created by the Republicans in this debate that they wouldn't be an endangered species there are so many things that are taking us off the real agenda that they are taking about. And the real agenda is to make sure that we do not invest in wind, that we do not invest in solar.

And, by the way, in the Waxman-Markey bill that was passed that year, \$60 billion was put in to the Waxman-Markey bill for clean coal technology; \$75 billion was put into that bill for nuclear technology that they could apply for low-interest loans to build new nuclear power plants in our country, plus wind, plus solar, plus geothermal, plus all the other things that we could do domestically in our country.

What we are talking about here, though, is a different agenda altogether. It's an agenda that will just allow the oil industry to go back to business as usual without the regulations to protect the public health and safety.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the subcommittee chairman of the Water and Power Subcommittee, Mr. McCLINTOCK, from California.

□ 2000

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I know I speak for all of my Republican colleagues on the Water and Power Subcommittee when I say that we are excited and eager to undertake the mission outlined in House Resolution 72 to identify the Federal regulations in this field that are impeding job creation and that are slowing the economy. The only problem we have got is deciding where to start.

A generation ago, the principal objective of our water and power policy was to create an abundance of both. It was an era when vast reservoirs and hydroelectric facilities produced a cornucopia of clean and plentiful water and electricity, on a scale so vast that many communities didn't even bother to measure the stuff. But that objective of abundance has been abandoned in favor of the rationing of shortages that have been caused by government. The result is increasingly scarce and expensive water and power that now undermines our prosperity as a Nation. Nowhere is that more evident than in the Central Valley of California.

This last Congress sat idly by as this administration deliberately diverted 200 billion gallons of water away from the most abundant agricultural region of our Nation, all to satisfy the environmental left and its pet cause, a 3-inch minnow called the delta smelt. This willful diversion cost over 20,000 farm workers their jobs. It inflicted up to 40 percent unemployment rates in the region. It destroyed more than a quarter-million acres of the most fertile farmland in America. And it forced up the price of groceries for us all.

Or we could start with the Klamath, where this administration is pushing to tear down four perfectly good hydroelectric dams that generate 155 megawatts of the cleanest and cheapest electricity on the planet, enough to power over 150,000 homes, because we are told of catastrophic declines of salmon.

When I suggested building a salmon hatchery instead, I was informed there already is one. It produces 5 million salmon molt a year, 17,000 of which re-

turn to that river as fully grown adults to spawn. But they are deliberately ignored in the population counts. To add insult to insanity, as they tear down these dams in the name of saving the salmon, they are also tearing down the fish hatchery that actually is saving the salmon.

Or we could begin in Colorado, where they have sacrificed over 1,000 megawatts from the Glen Canyon Dam for the humpback chub—at the expense of a long-neglected species called homo sapiens.

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan was right: In this crisis, government is not the solution to our problems, government is the problem. The good news is that it's entirely within our power to correct, and it was clearly the mandate of the American people last fall, and we will act on that mandate beginning with a series of hearings and actions directly related to this much-needed resolution.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. I do so just to say that Democrats see high unemployment and we look forward. We recognize that American ingenuity, innovation, and hard work can dig us out of this hole by creating high-paying, long-term domestic jobs in new vibrant industries.

The Republican majority, they see high unemployment and they look backwards. They seek to increase the already massive profits for huge international corporations and hope that on their way to the bank they hire a few people here and there.

Ladies and gentlemen, the great challenge of our time is to not allow China and Germany to replace OPEC as the place from which we have to import our energy technologies. If there is no plan which is forthcoming from the Republican majority, which so far has not presented itself, because they have yet to have one bill that actually creates one job come here onto the House floor in the first 5 weeks that they have controlled the majority, then I am afraid that the next generation of young Americans will wonder why all the solar and wind technology is being manufactured in China, and they here in America are unemployed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the valuable new member of our committee, Mr. GOSAR from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, rural Arizona is under attack from overregulation, out-of-control spending, and government redtape. The small businesses that power my district can no longer compete. I just wrapped up a weeklong tour of my district, and one thing was clear: The Federal Government is in the way and inhibiting my district from creating jobs. Government agencies have over-regulated our businesses out of existence.

Take for example the Schultz Pass Fire in Coconino County. Last year, a 12-year-old girl, Shaelyn Wilson, lost her life because of the government's in-

ability to use our forest resources in a commonsense fashion. As a further insult, this manmade, bureaucrat-dictated disaster resulted in a fire that could have been prevented, and now we, the American taxpayer, will be forced to pay for it for the next 50 to 100 years.

Enough is enough. A bureaucrat in Washington, D.C., should not dictate decisions that are best left to local communities that have to suffer the tragic consequences of government's actions.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, we only have one speaker remaining on our side, so until the majority is down to one speaker, we would like to reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to another new valuable member of the Resources Committee, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 72. For too long, the EPA, the Department of the Interior, and other permitting agencies have held vitally important energy projects hostage to their unreasonable job-killing demands.

In eastern and southeastern Ohio, our unemployment rates are among the highest in the State, and we are falling behind the rest of the Nation. But we are blessed with an abundance of natural resources that we could tap into to create thousands of high-paying jobs and economic opportunity, if the government would simply get out of the way.

Over the last week, I met with my constituents at three town hall meetings, and there was one message that came through loud and clear: Get the government out of the way so we can get back on the right economic track.

Right now, there is a company that wants to invest \$6 billion in eastern Ohio for a clean energy project that would turn coal to liquid while capturing 85 percent of all carbon dioxide produced. This project would create at least 2,500 direct jobs that would help revitalize the local economy. But at each and every turn, Federal regulators have moved the goalposts, making it more and more difficult for this project to get off the ground.

Mr. Speaker, eastern and southeastern Ohio cannot afford to lose the jobs this project would create. We can't afford for the company to call it quits due to what can only be described as Federal harassment.

It is time that the Federal Government gets out of the way so we can unleash our natural resources, both onshore and offshore, to create high-paying jobs and put us on the road to energy independence. We have got to get serious, Mr. Speaker, about our energy future.

I encourage my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am the last remaining speaker on our side. I reserve my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very, very pleased to yield 2 minutes to another new member of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, one of the top concerns I am hearing from my constituents is the state of our economy and jobs, and that is why I rise today in support of this resolution directing the committees of the House to examine and exercise oversight of Federal agency regulations and their impact on the economy.

The U.S. Department of Energy recently announced that we currently have the highest gas prices in this country that we have ever had during the month of February, and it makes no sense for the Department of Interior to continue to resist access to our own sources of American energy. This is critical, because our country's economic health is tied to having a robust energy sector.

Obama administration officials estimated it would cost roughly 23,000 jobs if they enacted the deepwater drilling moratorium, but it went ahead anyway. And to add further insult to Americans, it also included a shallow water regulatory permit slowdown. Recently a judge held the Department in contempt for administration's drilling moratorium.

□ 2010

Congress and this administration can and should encourage private sector job growth, not hinder it with unreasonable regulations. We risk losing more scarce jobs and more investment capital every single day due to the ever-increasing weight of our Federal bureaucracy. Many of these regulations place significant burdens on manufacturers and small businesses at a time when our economy can least sustain them. According to the Small Business Administration, Federal regulations cost American businesses between \$8,000 and \$10,000 per year per employee and between \$15,000 and \$37,000 per American household each year.

One of the worst offenders of this regulatory epidemic under the Obama administration is the Environmental Protection Agency. Unfortunately, the expansion of their power is not without cost. To name a few of EPA's pending egregious actions and estimated consequences:

One, a ban on the pesticide Atrazine, which will result in a potential loss of 45,000 ag-related jobs;

Two, a mandate requiring the use of expensive and/or economically unsound renewable energy sources, causing a \$5.2 trillion cut in our GDP, a \$2,400 cut in household incomes per year, and the loss of more than 1 million American jobs;

Number three, new unsubstantiated ozone standards costing \$1 trillion in compliance costs and 7.3 million jobs lost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HERGER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. FLORES. And to add insult to injury, when asked if their regulations had a cost benefit analysis, they said that they didn't need them, that their rules were the most cost-effective in government. I strongly beg to differ. I think that the arrogant nature of the EPA and the administration is not doing American business any favor or American jobs any favors. Something has to be done to stop this epidemic.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I say to the gentleman from Washington State that just 2 weeks ago we passed by unanimous consent the oversight plan which the majority has for the Department of the Interior, and the minority signed off on that oversight plan over all of the regulations and all of the various agencies that come under the jurisdiction of our committee. We did not fight that.

This debate tonight is something that doesn't really even have to take place. The committee—our committee, the Natural Resources Committee—is already fully empowered to do all of the oversight that they believe is necessary, and we will be there joining with them where it is necessary to conduct that oversight.

Coming back, though, to the central point, that's something that we all agree upon. What the American people want is to see what the agenda is for creation of jobs in our country. That's what has been lacking on the House floor since the Republicans have taken over the House of Representatives. And that's the most important agenda for our country. And I don't believe that we can accomplish that goal if the Republicans continue with their objective of \$100 million in profits going to oil companies at the same time that they want to give \$40 billion worth of tax breaks to them.

That is not really a good policy for our country. That's not going to create any new jobs. It would be better if we took that \$40 billion, moved it over to wind and solar and all-electric vehicles; that we moved it over to take care of the low-income people whose oil prices are just skyrocketing across this country, so that people don't freeze in their own homes. That would be a better use of that \$40 billion instead of handing it over to the oil and gas industry. We would create more jobs, we would protect people and keep them safe in their own homes, and we would have a better balance for where this country should be going. Instead, we're here debating oversight of these agencies, and we agree with the need to do so.

We probably disagree over the extent to which we should deregulate them. In fact, if we deregulate too much, if we take too many regulations off the books, we're just going to see a repeti-

tion of the same kind of environmental disasters that have ravaged our country over the years, the same kind of economic collapse that was a result of turning a blind eye to the shenanigans that went on in the financial marketplace with the big Wall Street firms that were not given the proper oversight, and on and on down the line.

So I want to just say again to the majority that we want to work with you on our committee. We want to work with you on the oversight that is necessary. That's why we signed off on the plan to do the oversight. I just think that we have wasted an hour here on an issue that we already agree upon; that we should be partnering to make sure that wherever there is chicanery, wherever there is wrongdoing that we should partner together to root it out.

But I'm afraid that this is part of a larger agenda that really seeks to destroy the wind and solar industries in our country, to cut dramatically the low-income heating assistance that we give to the poorest people in our country, to keep the \$40 billion in tax breaks on the books for the largest oil and gas companies in our country even as they are going to enjoy \$100 billion worth of profits this year given to them by tax breaks that are a hundred years old, with the price of a barrel of oil now at \$100 a barrel.

That is absolutely absurd, ladies and gentlemen. It is a squandering of the limited resources that we have in our country that should be spent on creating new jobs in the renewable energy sector and creating jobs by the millions that young people in our country want to create. They want to be able to tell OPEC, We don't need your oil any more than we need your sand.

And as Mubarak is teetering, the one message that we can send to the Middle East is the same message that President Kennedy sent to Krushchev in 1961. We are going to use our technological might in order to fend off this threat that is posed to our country economically, militarily, diplomatically, environmentally. We are going to use this as an opportunity.

That is not what this debate is about. That's where we should move over the next weeks and months. My hope is that we can do it together.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The gentleman from Washington has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I appreciate my friend from Massachusetts' willingness to work with us on this very important issue.

But I want to make it very, very clear because there are some on the other side that were suggesting that we want to do something that we're not even debating here, and that is to wipe

every regulation off the book. No, what we are trying to do here is to look at the regulations and see where perhaps they are not being carried out as Congress intended them. And I think specifically what we want to do, since this President took office, even though we should have done that with past Presidencies on both sides of the aisle, but since this President took office, the scope and reach of the executive branch has greatly expanded as has been documented by just about every speaker and even acknowledged by speakers on the other side. And the question, Mr. Speaker, is: Why? And what is the cost to our economy and American jobs?

Congress has an obligation to look into this and to hold the administration accountable—and any administration, for that matter, in the future. So, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here tonight and what this resolution on the floor that we are debating by virtually all committees in the House is simply starting that process. And I look forward to working with my friends across the aisle because we appear to have common ground.

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

□ 2020

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 72. It instructs the Committee on Ways and Means, as well as nine other committees, to review existing, pending, and proposed regulations and orders from Federal Government agencies and to focus on their impact on the Nation's economy.

In listening to the stories I hear tonight from both sides, one thing that I would like to say for the record is that oftentimes our discussion about regulations gets caught up in unnecessary emotion and ideology.

One point that I would like to make is that so much of what we address are process issues. When we increase complexity—and I'm speaking as an engineer, not as a Member of Congress—we can reduce effectiveness. I am not opposed to regulation, but I am a strong supporter of sensible regulation, of honestly looking at the secondary and tertiary effects of regulations that either come from poor legislation that was too broadly written or from compromises so great, so elastic that the bills were thrown over the wall to agencies that may or may not act within the intent of Congress and are not working closely with those who are regulated.

I think it is of constitutional importance for our body to make sure that we work together with those who are regulated and with those who are the executive agencies that we oversee to ensure that there is a high-quality outcome and that our communities are not unreasonably burdened with the objective that is defined. Much of that context has gotten lost from the origi-

nal intent of many of the agencies that have come into being over time.

I will tell you that the motivation for me, after my professional career prior to Congress, that the motivation for me in addressing this issue of regulations doesn't come from feeling that standards are wrong, but that so many regulations impede or prevent actual job growth and innovation.

The question that I'd asked time and again over the period of the last Congress, particularly last year, was: Where are the jobs?

With this growth of a regulatory state, what we do not understand are those impacts on business owners, who need predictability in order to hire people. We can have fine sounding language about the intent of legislation, which might sound okay here in the Chamber, but as we know from the health care bill and others, many Members didn't read the bill, didn't understand the secondary effects that would come from implementing policy, and left regulators with a near impossible task. And many of the rules that have begun to come out on this are nearly impossible to implement effectively and in a cost-effective manner.

I would say that any reforms in government should be bipartisan. This should be one of those—first for the institution and second for the people we represent to create jobs. We can remove a great deal of that unpredictability and give certainty rather than create an adversarial relationship between the executive branch and the people who create the jobs and who pay the taxes, and I am speaking specifically to our small business owners.

This resolution is necessary because the ever-expanding regulatory code is far too complex and burdensome. Regulations are the off-budget hidden cost of government impeding Americans' ability to create jobs. The Small Business Administration estimates the annual cost of Federal regulations in the United States exceeded \$1.75 trillion in 2008, almost double the amount of all individual income taxes collected last year.

Both sides agree all the time on the ability to refine regulations. I would say that the Government Reform Act was only used one time in its existence since 1995 to stop a regulation that was going to be considered unnecessary or too costly.

There is a program through the Small Business Administration to address regulations and their costs over time. In coming out with their top 10 regulations for review in that time, the only thing that has been done out of thousands and thousands of regulations that have been reviewed or pushed for reform was to simply remove a withholding of payment to architects and construction companies doing government contracts. That's not affecting the core of this, which is our tax-paying base—the ability to create the jobs that generate the taxpayers that fund the government.

At a time when our economy is struggling to recover, we can't afford to have anything other than a sensible and competitive regulatory code. It must be the mission of this Congress and our government to improve the competitiveness of the United States and the global economy and thus create jobs.

The resolution we consider tonight represents an important first step in the process by learning to develop eyes to see the roots of the problem and the impositions on businesses. Again, this is not anti-regulation. It is asking the question: Why are we accepting a regulation? What are the impacts of it going to be? It is allowing those who are being regulated to be part of this discussion, and more than comments from the Federal Register that are very rarely heeded by the agency community.

It is important for us to reform the code and to reform the process of how we view that code so that there is transparency and accountability and a check and balance that the American people have, not only on us but on the executive branch as well.

We've just entered our 21st straight month of at least 9 percent unemployment or more. As Americans across the country continue to look for work, Members of Congress have a responsibility to ask ourselves: Are we adequately addressing job creation by removing the barriers to growth and creating conditions that encourage businesses to hire? In industrial engineering language, we would call that asking the questions: Is this a non-value-adding regulation? Does it add value to safety in a true and tangible form?

For example, half of all the regulations in OSHA have nothing do with actual safety. They have to do with paperwork compliance standards that could shut a business down. This is not a statement against the importance of industrial safety. It's simply asking the question so as to remove excesses and remove extraneous overhead. The agencies will be more efficient, and we will be much more effective in creating jobs in the private sector.

For the past 2 years, the answer to one question is simply that we have not been adequately addressing job creation by removing these barriers to growth and encouraging businesses to hire. From the failed stimulus package to the misguided attempt at health care reform to financial regulatory reform, American businesses have been hit with an explosion of new taxes and regulations. They increase the cost of doing business, and therefore make it more difficult for businesses to hire.

For small businesses that have less than 20 employees, the regulatory burden amounts to an average of \$10,585 per employee per year. These small firms have been responsible for 64 percent of the net new hires over the last 15 years and could play a role in lowering our unemployment rate if the

regulatory burden on them were reduced and brought into a scale of context for their size versus a very large business. Excessive regulations can also have a direct impact on American families, many of whom are already struggling to make ends meet, by increasing the cost of food, medicine, doctor visits, and utility bills for basic services such as electricity, water, and sewer rates.

I am encouraged that President Obama has recognized the potential negative economic effects of regulations and rules in both his State of the Union address and in a recent op-ed in *The Wall Street Journal* that followed an editorial about a bill that I introduced last year called the REINS Act.

This is not a partisan issue. Both Republican and Democratic administrations have contributed to the massive growth of government and to expanding the volume and complexity of the regulatory state. However, I am concerned that the President's recent rhetoric on regulation may be just that—rhetoric. Despite these comments, the administration has used the regulatory process, not the Congress, to advance elements of its agenda that cannot be passed in the Congress.

After Speaker PELOSI forced the job-killing cap-and-trade bill through the House of Representatives, the legislation was stopped in a democratically controlled Senate. In December of 2009, however, the Environmental Protection Agency took matters into its own hands, without the express approval of the Congress, to begin moving to regulate greenhouse gas emissions.

This raises serious questions of our ability to control and provide oversight of the executive branch on behalf of the constituents we represent. These regulations would have disastrous consequences for a weak economy. They would result in higher energy costs, which, in turn, will result in increased utility rates for struggling families and for the small businesses and manufacturers that employ millions of Americans.

Any time a regulation or rule enacted by an executive branch agency can have this kind of impact and broad-reaching implications on our economy, it should be subject to the review of the Congress to be accountable to our citizens and not a faceless bureaucrat in an agency.

This was the idea behind H.R. 10, the REINS Act, legislation that I introduced to provide greater accountability and transparency in the rule-making process. On all rules that have a direct economic impact of over \$100 million, the REINS Act would require an up-or-down, stand-alone vote by both the House and the Senate and require that they be signed by the President before they can be enforced on the American public.

While the REINS Act reforms the process of how these regulations are approved going forward, the resolution we are debating tonight addresses

those rules already on the books or those that have been proposed. President Obama has also ordered his agencies to review rules and proposals that may be hindering job creation or economic growth. However, H. Res. 72 is superior to the President's review in several important ways.

First, the resolution before us would ask the House committees to review regulations rather than the agencies that created them and enforce them. The fox should not guard the henhouse. Before even beginning the review required by the President's Executive order, the EPA announced that it was confident that the review process would not result in the repeal or alteration of a single current or pending rule.

That is not internal oversight, and it goes against the clear, express will of the American people and their elected Representatives and Senators. In fact, when House Oversight Committee Chairman DARRELL ISSA called on business and trade associations to identify regulations that burden their businesses, EPA rules were cited more than any other Federal agency.

□ 2030

By passing this resolution, we will begin a regulatory review that is both objective and analyzes costs and benefits in real numbers.

Before being elected to Congress, I ran a small manufacturing consulting business. What we did for a living was process improvement and flow management. In other words, we took inventory of a manufacturing facility's processes. We understood the flow. We sought to decrease complexity, remove processes that didn't add value, and increase the overall throughput and efficiency of the facility, thus protecting the existing jobs and creating more jobs in return. That's exactly what H. Res. 72 asks the House committees to do with the Federal regulatory process.

Removing and altering outdated, costly or ineffective rules will streamline our regulatory code and make our economy more competitive and inviting to investment and job creation. Even saving a small percentage of the \$1.75 trillion that is currently spent on regulatory compliance each year by job creators would free up capital which can be reinvested into our economy to create jobs.

Please join me in supporting this resolution so that we can begin the process of reforming the Federal code and get our economy moving and hiring again.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself as much time as I shall consume.

This is about oversight, and what the majority is doing is losing sight of the needs of tens of thousands of workers in this country. What they are doing is overlooking the needs of the workers of this country.

Our committee has jurisdiction over trade adjustment, and what's happened

this week regarding trade adjustment assistance is really incomprehensible and, I think, disgraceful. This Congress is going to leave town tomorrow. On Saturday, the extension of TAA expires, the 2009 extension. And what's going to happen? Tens of thousands of people, who will be laid off because of trade, will no longer be able to be certified—tens of thousands. They will be out of luck when they hit bad luck through no fault of their own.

We've received all kinds of communications from people in my State, and I'm sure there are people like this in every single State. We heard from a machinist laid off, qualified for TAA, and is now pursuing a career as a technician. He's in a program that goes on for a few years. Before TAA was overhauled in 2009, States could not have approved training of that length nor have approved the prerequisite training.

We heard of another worker, a service worker in the State of Michigan, laid off, qualified for TAA, and is now pursuing an associate's degree. She's planning to complete her program in June of 2012. Before the TAA reforms of 2009, service workers were not even eligible for TAA.

We also know of another person who was laid off, a die helper, who's qualified for TAA to continue training on a part-time basis. Only because of the extensions of 2009, the changes, the improvements, could this person have been in that training.

And then another worker in Michigan—and you know, workers throughout the country are like this—who learned that she would be laid off, petitioned for TAA and began pursuing an M.A. degree before she actually lost her job.

There are thousands of people who are going to be in this position, and because the majority in this House have failed to act, there are going to be tens of thousands of people who will have no place to turn in terms of training.

Since the 2009 improvements, about 177,000 people have been able to receive training—170,000—and now, beginning Monday, tens of thousands will not be able to be certified for help.

Now, this isn't only in the State of Michigan. It's not only in the State of Ohio. It's not only in the State of Indiana. It's not only in Pennsylvania. This is true throughout the country—true throughout the country—and essentially, the majority here is leaving, turning their backs on the people of this country.

So what happened this week was the following: that a few groups outside of this institution decided they did not want to support the 2009 expansion of benefits; and a group within this House, the Republican Study Committee, issued a document urging Republicans not to support the extension. There are many, or some, Republicans in this House who were ready to support it, but they pulled back the bill,

and the document from the study committee has this as one of the reasons why we should not step up to the plate.

They said, under TAA programs, the government picks winners and losers because TAA favorably discriminates towards workers who lost their job due to trade. Well, picking winners and losers, what TAA does is to fill in gaps that were not filled in previously and often gaps that were increased because of the inaction of the now-majority of this House.

And talking about winners and losers, the losers are going to be the unemployed people of this country, unemployed through no fault of their own, unemployed, looking for work, who will not be able to be certified for TAA. This is a disgrace. And there are some people who will continue to be eligible for TAA who are going to have to now pay more for their health care if they can afford it.

When we put this together a few years ago, this is what Senator GRASSLEY said about the reforms, and I quote, Today's achievement is the result of the dedication, hard work, and commitment of many individuals. It is the culmination of years of effort, and I am confident that the result will serve to benefit American workers in Iowa and across the United States for years to come, end of quote.

The failure of the Republicans to bring this bill to the floor this week means that what Senator GRASSLEY said will serve to benefit American workers in Iowa and across the United States for years to come, that's going to end on Monday, because Saturday is a weekend. People who are laid off because of trade are going to hit a wall, a wall.

So we are in favor of oversight. We made that clear earlier. We are also sure we should not be shortsighted about the needs of productive people who want to work and cannot find a job.

The person speaking on behalf of the Republicans, my distinguished colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, talked about those who are out of work through no fault of their own. You mentioned 9 million. There's a record number of people in this country who have been unemployed for a longer period of time than has been true in the past, and now all they ask for, unemployment comp in many cases—they're looking for work—and a chance to be retrained. On Monday, for thousands that chance will be gone.

□ 2040

That should not have happened.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) manage the balance of the time on the Democratic side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished fellow member of the Ways and Means committee, the gentleman from California, Chairman HERGER.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his leadership in working to bring more congressional oversight to the regulatory process. The heavy hand of overbearing environmental regulations has struck my northern California rural congressional district in full force. The Endangered Species Act, in addition to regulations under the Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act and other environmental laws continue to be enforced by Federal agencies and activists to curtail irrigation water for family farms and ranches, force communities and developers to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on environmental "analysis" and even threaten public health and safety by delaying forest management to reduce catastrophic wildfire and much needed infrastructure such as flood preventing levees and transportation improvements. Another set of job-crushing regulations surrounds the 3 percent withholding tax that is set to go into effect next year. This tax will cost far more in unfunded mandates on small businesses and State and local governments than it will ever raise in revenue for the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will be reintroducing bipartisan legislation to repeal the unfair 3 percent withholding tax. I would like to enter into the record a letter from the Government Withholding Relief Coalition highlighting this provision's regulatory burden and urging its repeal. I strongly support this resolution and look forward to stopping the regulatory assault on my constituents and our Nation's economy.

GOVERNMENT WITHHOLDING
RELIEF COALITION,
January 28, 2011.

Re: regulations and their impact on the economy and jobs.

Hon. DARRELL E. ISSA,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ISSA: The Government Withholding Relief Coalition and its 116 member associations appreciate your interest in regulations that negatively impact the economy and jobs. We welcome the opportunity to highlight one specific issue that was the genesis for the creation of this coalition: the 3% tax withholding mandate. This requirement is set to go into effect on January 1, 2012 if it is not repealed. It will cost jobs and waste significant amounts of time and money for companies as well as governments to implement.

The 3% withholding law, which was enacted in Section 511 of the Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-222) as section 3402(t) of the Internal Revenue Code, mandates that federal, state, and local governments withhold 3% of nearly all of their contract payments, Medicare payments, farm payments, and certain grants. Compliance with this law will impose significant, unnecessary financial burdens on both the public and private sectors, with a disproportionate impact on small businesses.

The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) issued a proposed rule in December 2008 and is scheduled to issue a final rule to implement this counterproductive law in the near future. However, this is just the beginning of the regulations that need to be altered and issued. The Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) will need to be changed, and regulations for Medicare payment, farm payments, and grants will also need to be modified. These are merely the federal regulations that will need to be changed, but since this requirement flows down to state and local governments (as an unfunded mandate), every state and many city, county, and municipal governments will need to change their regulations and companies will have to learn to comply with these numerous and likely divergent implementing regulations.

The provision is already proving costly and will increase exponentially as the implementation deadline moves closer. If this tax is not repealed, it will cost companies and governments at all levels substantial amounts of money. These exorbitant expenditures will be at the expense of hiring new employees, expanding businesses, and providing government services at a time that neither the public nor private sector can absorb such unnecessary costs.

The Department of Defense in April 2008 estimated that it would cost more than \$17 billion in the first five years to comply with the 3% withholding requirement, which far exceeds any estimated revenue gains due to tax compliance. While this estimate may be reduced depending on how the law is implemented, needless to say, the costs will be huge across all levels of government.

The Coalition believes this law and its corresponding regulations are a prime example of wasteful requirements that have a negative impact on the economy and job-creation. As you develop your agenda, we strongly urge you to consider the damaging effects of the 3% withholding tax and include its repeal among your priorities for this year.

Sincerely,

GOVERNMENT WITHHOLDING RELIEF
COALITION.

Aeronautical Repair Station Association, Aerospace Industries Association, Air Conditioning Contractors of America, Air Transport Association, America's Health Insurance Plans, American Bankers Association, American Clinical Laboratory Association, American Concrete Pressure Pipe Association, American Congress on Surveying and Mapping, American Council of Education, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Health Care Association, American Institute of Architects, American Logistics Association, American Moving and Storage Association, American Nursery and Landscape Association, and American Road & Transportation Builders Association.

American Society of Civil Engineers, American Subcontractors Association, American Supply Association, American Traffic Safety Services Association, American Trucking Associations, Armed Forces Marketing Council, Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated Equipment Distributors, Association of National Account Executives, Association of School Business Officials International, Business and Institutional Furniture Manufacturers Association, California Association of Public Purchasing Officers, Coalition for Government Procurement, Colorado Motor Carriers Association, Computing Technology Industry Association, Construction Contractors Association, and Construction Employers' Association of California.

Construction Industry Round Table, Construction Management Association of America, Design Professionals Coalition, Edison

Electric Institute, Electronic Security Association, Engineering & Utility Contractors Association, Federation of American Hospitals, Financial Executives International's Committee on Government Business, Financial Executives International's Committee on Taxation, Finishing Contractors Association, Gold Coast Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Government Finance Officers Association, Independent Electrical Contractors, Inc., International City/County Management Association, and International Council of Employers of Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers.

International Foodservice Distributors Association, International Municipal Lawyers Association, Management Association for Private Photogrammetric Surveyors, Mason Contractors Association of America, Mechanical Contractors Association of America, Medical Group Management Association, Messenger Courier Association of the Americas, Miami Dade County, Modular Building Institute, Munitions Industrial Base Task Force, National Asphalt Pavement Association, National Association for Self-Employed, National Association of College & University Business Officers, National Association of Counties, National Association of Credit Management, and National Association of Educational Procurement.

National Association of Government Contractors, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Minority Contractors, National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers and Treasurers, National Association of State Chief Information Officers, National Association of State Procurement Officials, National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, National Beer Wholesalers Association, National Corn Growers Association, National Council for Public Procurement and Contracting, National Defense Industrial Association, National Electrical Contractors Association, and National Electrical Manufacturers Association.

National Emergency Equipment Dealers Association, National Federation of Independent Business, National Institute of Governmental Purchasing, National Italian-American Business Association, National League of Cities, National Precast Concrete Association, National Office Products Alliance, National Roofing Contractors Association, National Small Business Association, National Society of Professional Engineers, and National Society of Professional Surveyors.

National Utility Contractors Association, National Wooden Pallet and Container Association, North-American Association of Uniform Manufacturers & Distributors, North Coast Builders Exchange, Office Furniture Dealers Alliance, Oregon Trucking Association, Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors—National Association, Printing Industries of America, Professional Services Council, Regional Legislative Alliance of Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties, Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce, Security Industry Association, Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Council, and Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors National Association, Inc.

Shipbuilders Council of America, Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council, Small Business Legislative Council, TechAmerica, Textile Rental Services Association of America, The Associated General Contractors of America, The Association of Union Constructors, The Distilled Spirits Council of the U.S., The Financial Services Roundtable, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, United States Telecom Association, Veterans Entrepreneurship Task Force, and Women Impacting Public Policy.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we come out to discuss this resolution, H. Res. 72, I couldn't but think of a story from the middle part of the United States of America. There was a Methodist minister who fell ill, very, very seriously ill, and the head of the board of deacons called the board together to have a discussion about what they should do about the problems of the ailing minister. They had a long discussion. It took, not as long as this debate will take, but it took 2 hours. And at the end, by a vote of 4-3, with 17 abstentions, they wrote a letter to the minister urging him to get well.

Now this resolution has about as much effect as that letter to that minister in central Illinois. Two years ago—and what a difference a day makes—January 28, 2009, this Congress passed the American Recovery Act. Seven hundred billion dollars that stopped the economic collapse in this country, that got us started on recovery from the problems created by the previous administration. We did that in less than a hundred days.

We've been here a hundred days. There used to be a TV program I liked when I was a kid called *This Is The Week That Was*. Now let's review this week that was. I arrived back from Seattle and on the calendar were two bills. One was a bill to deal with, as the gentleman from Michigan has suggested, the problems of workers who have been displaced by trade, the so-called Trade Adjustment Act, TAA. That was one bill. The other bill was a bill to extend the Patriot Act. I don't know what the leadership on the other side was thinking. Maybe they can't count. But the bill to extend the Patriot Act went down in flames. They then pulled the bill on extending TAA. That was Tuesday.

Then we came to Wednesday. That was the day they brought the bill in, a meaningless bill, messing with the United Nations funding, that didn't save one single dollar but simply said we weren't going to pay our dues to this, then that section of the United Nations that somebody didn't like, and so they decided they'd come out here and make a big show about the United Nations. That bill went down in flames.

Now the week has not been a total loss. We did change the name of a courthouse; we did it on Wednesday, and I think we got something to go home and talk to our people about in our districts.

And now we're to Thursday. Here we are spending 9 hours out here on a meaningless piece of legislation. It is truly a sad day for the House that we are spending another day not helping the people of America. Not helping the private sector create jobs. Not doing what the people sent us here to do. Early this morning, congressional representatives and staff came to work on Capitol Hill to work for the American people. It is the job every day for Members and staff to oversee the agencies of the Federal Government, to oversee

the regulations so that the common good is served. It doesn't require House Resolution 72. We are here to track how money is being spent and that it is being done responsibly. That is the Congress' constitutional responsibility and has been for 224 years.

You would have thought that maybe the people on the other side would have figured this out, Mr. Speaker. We stood out here and read the Constitution. I guess for some of them it was the first time they had ever read it but they weren't paying attention or something because this resolution is simply restating what has always been our responsibility.

Now it's been 100 days, as I said, for the Republicans in control of the House, and they have done not one single thing to create a job. Nada. Nil. Zilch. Nothing. Not a single thing to create a job in 100 days. We have 14.9 million unemployed in this country. We have an intense economic competition with the rest of the world that we are in danger of losing if we don't get moving. We have a home foreclosure crisis in this country. We've got two wars. We've got huge energy and environmental issues to deal with and an economic system that's falling further and further behind the rest of the world. We do not lead the world in college graduates per capita. We are about sixth or seventh or eighth, somewhere down there. Other countries are passing us because of our inaction.

And what do we do? The Republicans say, let's go out and waste the 10th of February. Now, instead, the Republicans are having us working for two whole days to tell the House of Representatives to do its job. For heaven's sakes, what a silly piece of legislation. This bill is an insult to the American people. It's an insult to the people who work here, and they don't even seem to understand they're insulting themselves, as though they didn't know what their job was. It's like Nero fiddling while Rome burned. The House is sitting here while millions of Americans are unemployed. They're selling their belongings. They're emptying their 401(k)s. They're doing everything possible to stay afloat.

□ 2050

Now, this isn't 1930. In 1930, what people did was, they took what few belongings they had, went out, put it on the top of the car, drove to California, and found a job. That's what people did. But every day, millions of Americans can't move to take a new job because they can't sell their house because their homes are under water, according to the banks. In Seattle today, one-third of the homes are under water. Now, if you don't think some foreclosures are coming out of that, you don't understand how it works. There is a whole new underclass of unemployed, undertrained Americans who are not being helped to compete in the world economy.

And while Americans across the country suffer, the Republicans come

out here with H. Res. 72. They are going to do nothing. The Republicans, the party of “saying one thing and doing another,” promised big action on jobs during the election: If you elect us, we will get this country rolling again. So they have taken control of the House, and what do the American people get? Instead of helping the private sector with a smart science, technology, and energy investment policy, we are considering Republican legislation on pornography. That certainly makes a lot of sense if you don’t have a job.

Instead of compassionately and energetically helping the unemployed, the Republicans want to redefine the rape of women to keep some women who have been raped from getting abortions. You will see that one next week. That’s going to be the great bill.

Where’s the job bill? Where are the job bills? I have no idea. There are more 99ers every week. Now in case you don’t know what a 99er is on the other side, let me educate you. We have an unemployment system that provides for unemployment insurance for 99 weeks; and when it runs out, you are done. And there are four or five people for every job that comes up in America. So if you go out looking for a job, you have a one in four chance of having any chance at getting it. And yet these 99-weekers are piling up all over the country because they’ve run out of their unemployment insurance, and the Republicans do nothing about creating jobs.

Instead of intelligently debating administration plans in Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran, Republicans want to vote on meaningless bills like the one I talked about with the United Nations that save no money and don’t advance the U.S. interest in anything.

The Republicans ran on a slogan, Mr. Speaker: Government spending kills jobs. They are the extreme party of “everyone for themselves,” no action for the common good. And now that the Republicans have responsibility, all they have is their message machine. That’s what these 9 hours are about. Just in case you haven’t broken the code, they are all in their offices now, Mr. Speaker, cranking out press releases: I’m going to take on this regulation. I’m going to take on that regulation. And somehow they think that those messages will get them reelected in November of 2012. They are creating a paper blizzard. Like we have had some snow around here, well, this is a real blizzard.

Now when you try to govern without ideas, it doesn’t go over very well with the American public, and slowly the Republican leadership is hearing the feedback. What is the new Republican response? They say the need to “retool their messaging.”

Since we have to waste the people’s time on the floor today on this meaningless resolution, I thought I should try and be helpful to the Republican effort. It’s my civic duty. As a member of

the minority, I should help the majority rule. Now, the problem the Republicans are having is that what they ran on, that “Big Government is the problem,” isn’t true. Big Government is not the problem. No one wants Big Government. What do we want that for? We’ve all been through TSA. We don’t want that stuff.

But the government is not the problem. The government is made up of Americans, good Americans who are writing rules and regulations to do things that Americans want. Americans want clean water. They want to be able to drink the water. They want some water to irrigate their crops. They want water for a lot of things. And it takes regulation because if you let anybody take as much water as they want, some people and some very important things are not going to get done.

They want clean air. Americans want clean air. They know there is an epidemic of asthma among children living in cities, and they’re worried about it. And they want regulations. They want regulations in construction so that you don’t create an epidemic of youngsters with asthma who fill the emergency rooms every night in hospitals in this country.

Now, the American people want fairness. They want the rule of law. They want laws fixed that don’t work. Sometimes you pass a law; and 10 years ago, it seemed like a good idea at the time. Things change. Things need to be changed. Sure, we ought to be doing that. But you don’t need House Resolution 72 to tell you to do it. Common sense would tell you to do it. And the American people need the collective help that we can give them. The American people want effective government that deals with people’s problems.

Now the Republican “fear and blame machine” is an old, tired, failed philosophy that from time to time can be used to scare the American people in an election. They did it in 2004. Remember the orange alerts and the Oh, God, yellow alerts. Oh, God, we’ve got to have 4 more years of the same stuff. And we got 4 more years of it. In 2010, here they are again.

We were over in the Ways and Means Committee today doing oversight with a wrecking ball. Let’s wreck the bill that we passed last year on health care. Now Bill Frist—you are not going to call him a wild-eyed liberal. He used to be the majority leader in the Senate. Bill Frist said to the Republicans, Mr. Speaker, don’t repeal it. Fix it. But what we’re doing today is getting ready to blow the bill out of the way so that we can have the Paul Ryan road to the end of Medicare and to a voucher system. Paul Ryan vouchers for every senior citizen in this country is the goal. And that oversight is really set to blow apart any chance of developing better law than we got through here last year.

It would work better if both sides worked together, there’s no question

about it. But if you’re going to use a wrecking ball and try to put in a voucher system and say to all the old people in this country, Hey, here’s your voucher. This is an \$8,000 voucher. Go out and find yourself an insurance company that wants to give you insurance. Mr. Speaker, consider that idea. I mean, I don’t know how old the Members’ mothers and fathers are; but when you get to be 75 or 80, and you go out with an \$8,000 voucher and try to build health insurance, you can’t do it, except by taking another \$5,000 or \$6,000 out of your pocket.

The seniors in this country spend already one-third of their income on health care. They have got plenty of skin in the game. They don’t need any more. But the Ways and Means Committee today is doing that rather than trying to figure out what it is that we can do to make the law better. There wasn’t a single question about how can you make the law better. All it was was an attack on the man who ran CMS. The first question was, Do you still believe that the national health system of Great Britain is the best thing since sliced bread? The question wasn’t, Doctor, how can we help you make this law work more effectively for the American people?

There is an extreme agenda here, and it won’t be helped by retooling the message. Now, the other thing that is kind of ridiculous about this whole thing is, we have an Oversight Committee on the Ways and Means Committee. We have a very distinguished Member from Louisiana, Dr. BOUSTANY is a very smart Member of Congress. He is the ranking member on the Oversight Committee. He does not need H. Res. 72 to tell him to do oversight. He is a very thorough man. He is a cardiac surgeon. I mean, come on. This guy is smart and able and can see what the problems are, and he doesn’t need these 10 hours out here flogging this resolution so that we can then have our press releases.

□ 2100

The American people deserve better than this. They deserve us to put positive proposals forward that will create jobs, that will deal with the foreclosures, that will deal with the health care problems they have, that will deal with the energy problems, will deal with what’s happening in the world and what’s going on overseas.

And we are about to see in the budget that comes out what the priorities of the Republican Party are. The budget is a moral document. It is when you say what you really care about. And when you look at that document, you will see what they really care about.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, returning to the subject of regulations and its impact on the creation of jobs and the need to create jobs to create taxpayers, I yield 2 minutes to the

gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), a distinguished new member of the Ways and Means committee.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of today's resolution directing committees to review existing, pending, and proposed executive agency regulations. Congress is charged not only with legislating but with also overseeing the implementation of legislation.

Agencies continue to promulgate blanket rules which ignore Congressional intent. Forty-three major regulations were published by executive agencies in 2010, and another 191 are currently in the works. These regulations marginalize small businesses and communities which have less ability to absorb the cost of compliance. Small towns in Nebraska, for instance, are spending millions of dollars installing water treatment facilities and electric generation units to comply with EPA standards which continue to be arbitrarily changed, regardless of the science. These people are, in good faith, purchasing lower emission units. They want to comply with the law, Mr. Speaker. But cities and residents can no longer afford higher prices because of these arbitrary and inconsistent regulations. It's not fair, and it's not good government.

I would also like to touch on some Medicare regulation, which has the potential to disproportionately hurt rural hospitals. Medicare outpatient physician supervision requirements have a serious impact in my district and I'm sure many others. For the last 2 years, Medicare rules for outpatient hospital procedures have included a provision to require a medical doctor be on site for even the simplest of procedures, for example, a phlebotomist taking a blood sample. Certainly, I don't think that was congressional intent.

Without the current temporary suspension of this rule for small rural hospitals, many critical access hospitals in my district would not have the manpower to perform outpatient procedures on a regular basis, the result for patients being lengthy travel to larger cities for care, be it routine care or otherwise.

This regulation is also having a negative impact in more urban areas. Yesterday I was speaking to a group of physicians from Nebraska, and one shared with me his ability to remotely order a CT scan at the hospital when he knows such a procedure is necessary.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. However, the hospital cannot begin the scan until after he arrives at the hospital to oversee the scan, although not even necessarily perform the scan.

As a cosponsor of the REINS Act, I also applaud this effort to begin curbing unchecked agency regulation hampering families, job creators, and the growth of America's economy.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to yield 2 minutes now to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to rise also in support of this resolution which directs committees to review Federal agency rules and regulations which indeed may unfairly harm the ability to create jobs and grow our economy.

I continue to hear on a pretty regular basis from my small businesses in my community in Minnesota about new rules and new proposed regulations that absolutely could hamper their operations and opportunity for growth. I'm just going to give a couple of examples real quickly.

I've heard from financial service companies in my district about a rule that the Department of Labor is proposing now that fundamentally changes a 35-year-old definition of "fiduciary" under ERISA. Now, if implemented, this new rule would cause a major disruption to the marketplace and directly result in higher costs and severely limited access to much-needed products and services to consumers.

I've also heard from some of my medical device companies in my district that are leading the world in developing these new lifesaving technologies. And there's a new rule now that's been proposed by the Department of Transportation which would require finished medical devices and other products that contain lithium batteries to now be shipped as hazardous cargo. Now, this is going to have a devastating impact on the production of pacemakers, defibrillators, and neurostimulators.

This is a new requirement that would severely disrupt the medical industry's just-in-time delivery system. It's going to lead to bottlenecks in the supply chain, and it's going to delay access to care for patients all over the country, even though these devices pose no demonstrable safety risk.

And it isn't just medical devices, Mr. Speaker. The regulation is also going to have a significant impact on shipping of everyday technologies. All in all, it's estimated that this new regulation alone is going to cost about \$1 billion annually to the economy and these businesses.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the examples, and we've heard others tonight of some of the burdensome regulations that are out there and being proposed, and it clearly outlines the need for some oversight and reform.

I ask for support of the resolution.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I'm just sitting here thinking about this whole business about regulation. Since I've been in Congress, when I arrived here we were in the midst of the savings and loan crisis which cost this country some-

thing like \$50 billion or something to bail ourselves out of. It wasn't the fact that we didn't have the right rules and regulations; we just weren't enforcing them.

Then we had Enron went on down in Texas, and we had the Exxon Valdez, and you look at all these issues.

We need regulation and enforcement to make sure that the people are protected. It is our job, in part, to protect the American people from the capitalist system. The capitalist system is not bad. It simply doesn't have any morals. It is designed to make money. That's all it's about.

And the regulations that are put in are, in large measure, to protect the American people from the excesses of the economic system. And if we don't do that, we don't do our constituents what they sent us here to do, which is to represent them and protect them. We think about protections in terms of, you know, things overseas and missiles flying in from somewhere and all that kind of stuff, but there is more damage done to American people by what happens here in this country by our own companies to the water and the air and the land and the air we breathe. So it is very important that we do this. We should be doing continuous oversight. And in some instances, we should be tightening the regulations.

The banking system that collapsed collapsed because we allowed Wall Street to have a heyday with derivatives and said, you know, do whatever you guys think is right. What they thought was right was to gamble with our pensions and our people's savings, and the whole system collapsed. And we're digging our way out of it.

And to come out here and say what we need is to remove regulations is simply not—doesn't make sense, and it shouldn't make sense to anybody who thinks about it for 1 minute. And I urge my colleagues to vote against this. It's useless. It's stupid. Every committee already has an oversight subcommittee and they will do it, and I think that there is no reason to pass this.

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

□ 2110

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I find some degree of irony in the gentleman's comments that anybody saying that we need to do away with regulation was stupid, because the President of the United States stood in this Chamber last month and was citing specific regulations that were redundant or were inappropriate.

The resolution that we have been debating tonight is a critical step toward restoring our economy and getting Americans back to work. I would like to point some context out on this.

I think we have 100 percent agreement in the Chamber tonight that we want clean water and we want clean

air. I'm the father of an asthmatic child, two asthmatic children, I might add, who has been up all night and made the trips to the ER and understands this. But there's a significant difference between the context of application there and dealing with some of the changes and the moving standards in the regulatory community that have huge economic impact on our communities.

I would like to cite three brief examples of different contexts of regulations that need to be modernized or changed, or have lost their context.

Again, we are not talking about an anti-regulation issue here. The fact is that regulations have never been aggressively attacked. What happens is we layer another regulation on top of an existing regulation. We increase the complexity of that. We create new organizations that do the same thing, costing more money, creating uncertainty. And I think we have common ground on the need for that reform. But let me give you the first example.

Clean air is a great concern to me. I grew up around the steel and the mining industries as a small boy on the other side of the tracks and got to see the bad things that were done. When the EPA came into being, there were some good starts. Ironically, the real efforts of true environmental remediation began in the States. Operation Scarlet in Pennsylvania began changing the way the land was treated. Much of that was copied by the Federal Government and changed our community demonstrably. But those days are long gone, those good old days, and the complexity and the intrusiveness of the bureaucracy is even different to a greater degree.

The Marathon oil refinery that's in Catlettsburg, Kentucky, spent tens of millions of dollars in full compliance with existing regulations. Long-term capital investments were made to deal with sulfur, nitrous oxide, and mercury, other chemicals that were in potential emissions, both in water and in the air. And then, after these huge, multiyear capital investments, the ball was moved again. It has crippled the ability of that specific facility to grow and to create jobs.

That is what I'm talking about, context and predictability. Having overseen long-term capital investment plans in the manufacturing industry, when you have to take 10 years, you cannot afford to have that lack of predictability. This is what we are talking about.

At a closer level to home, we talk about veterans a lot here, we talk about prescription drug problems, drug addiction issues. That's something I care very much about. Growing up in a dysfunctional household and seeing the worst of substance abuse or substance addiction in family members, I can say, as somebody who has volunteered for over 30 years to help people escape from these kinds of things, that regulation in fact is helping to create a worse problem.

We work very closely with the Veterans Administration. As a former Army Ranger myself, I care very much about our veterans coming home. And the one thing I would say here, Mr. Speaker, is that we do have a prescription drug diversion problem with older veterans in certain parts of the country.

I was approached by a group of doctors from the Veterans Administration who shared with me that they had been banned by the Veterans Administration general counsel from using the drug registries that are in the State of Indiana and the State of Kentucky, as well as all other States in the Union that have these registries, from simply checking to make sure that the patients weren't seeing a civilian doctor in another State or a civilian doctor in Kentucky and going to the VA to get a double or triple dosage of the same pain medications like Oxycodone and selling it on the street or abusing it themselves to a degree. The doctor said to me, "I'm not interested in criminal prosecution. I don't want to kill my patients. I want to make sure they receive the best health care."

With a stroke of a pen, the general counsel of the VA has added to the complexity of this problem. I spoke to the head of National Drug Control Policy at the White House personally about this, and he said his hands are tied and, "We are looking into that." All of this impacts jobs ultimately.

Finally, I will give a context of the small business owner who gets trapped in this before fully closing. We have lots of great innovative small business owners who go out and they see an opportunity, and they take the risk, usually with their life savings, which may not be much. We only had a few thousand dollars when we started our business that became successful and supported a number of families for many years before I came to Congress.

My friend, Nick Bell, who started Braxton's Cleaners, was an entrepreneur that wanted to take a chance and build a dream with that. His customer service is outstanding, and people flock to him for the responsiveness, the creativity, the initiative, the kindness of his people. He implemented home delivery and suddenly wanted to set up satellites. So many people were coming to him for business, he realized he needed to put another dry cleaning machine in place. One would think that, to support more customers, we could do that.

He suddenly found out, as he bumped up against the Division of Water and the Environmental Protection Agency for the first time, that he had to do a soil sampling under the pad, the concrete pad of his building, before putting that second machine in. What he didn't know along the way was that an arbitrary decision was made in another Federal agency that dry cleaning fluid was put on a list of carcinogens. As one oncologist told me, you would probably have to drink about 80 gallons of this

product daily to create the chemical pH in your body to cause cancer in the first place. But that's beside the point. Here is the context of why we have to forcibly address regulations, and I will point this out.

Mr. Bell suddenly found out that one teaspoon of water under 14 bore holes under the pad was discovered. In that teaspoon of water were several parts per million of dry cleaning fluid. Guess what. They said, "Well, you're going to have to remediate this." Mr. Bell said, "I can't afford to do that." The response from the compassionate Federal agency that cares about jobs was, "If you don't remediate it, you are going to shut it down." That made him an activist. He was going to have that business shut down, every family working there, over one teaspoon of water, and he had to spend effectively his life savings of \$60,000 to clean up one teaspoon of water, and it took him years to recover.

Those are the stories. I appreciate all the comments about caring about workers. I care about those. My grandfather was a mine inspector after he retired. I care about those issues. And I think that it's incorrect to try to create this demonization of those of us who just ask the question, why is that there? We have regulations that not only impede jobs, but regulations that make it so complex.

And I will speak with authority as an engineer on this. The more complicated you make something, the more likely you will have errors. Thus, many of the things that have been cited tonight as reasons we need more regulations are because we have got so many that it can become arbitrary overnight.

I agree with the gentleman that we need to address these issues, but we need to do them in a manner that is devoid of emotion and with a technical focus on what the numbers actually say. And, regarding regulations, let's measure the right things, because we don't do that. What worked in 1960 is not necessarily applicable with the technology and the tools today.

Reviewing all current and proposed rules is the first step. We should do it, because successful businesses, successful schools, any successful institution, even, I guarantee you, the champion Green Bay Packers, review their playbook on a regular basis throughout the season to make sure that they were adaptive and agile for that great game we saw last week.

Reviewing it is a necessary step for us, and it's one that by reviewing this will not hinder economic growth; it will help it. It will free people to achieve, to fulfill the spirit of regulations and help enhance prosperity for all Americans. On behalf of the Ways and Means Committee, we are eager to do our part in this task.

The next step will be to change the way that major rules take effect in the first place. We need more accountability up here. That is nonpartisan.

And the last administration, I am sure that the gentleman and I could find plenty of opportunity to point out regulations that were against the will of Congress that were being implemented regardless of who was in the majority here. For the sake of our Constitution and the people who sent us here, we should embrace that.

To provide greater transparency and accountability to this process, I look forward to the House moving forward with the REINS Act, which will be a complement to H. Res. 72. I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution as the critical first step of opening the eyes of the Congress, opening the eyes of the American people to the impact of these regulations honestly, and to alleviate job creators from not the burdens of legitimate safety standards, of legitimate standards to benefit our communities, but those non-value-adding overheads that are imposed upon us that prevent the hiring and create unpredictability.

Let's move forward. Let's take the burden off our families from these excessive and unnecessary regulations, and create jobs and put America back to work.

Mr. CANSECO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the H. Res. 72, the great engine of America for the last 235 years has been innovation. American ingenuity is a tremendous source of pride in our nation's history. Sadly, this aspect of American life is reeling today from a wave of new regulations that have been added on top of an already complex regulatory system that costs money, jobs, and growth across every sector in our economy. We've been told that more regulation is somehow "good for us," that a select few know better than our citizens how to make the day to day decisions in our small businesses. But every time a teenager in our country is prohibited from entering the work force because his would-be employer has to comply with a new health law and can't afford his labor, we lose the chance for that teenager to learn valuable skills and perhaps create something special later in his life. Every time a small bank in West Texas is forced to comply with a law that came as a result of the irresponsibility of others, we lose the chance for that bank to extend a loan to an entrepreneur that is capable of creating hundreds of jobs in a small community. Mr. Speaker, Pecos County State Bank in Fort Stockton, Texas takes in 50 percent of the deposits of that town's residents. The cost to run their annual audit is now almost four times as much as it was before the onslaught of regulations we've seen passed in the last two years. We cannot keep placing these burdens on our small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Congress to begin the work of placing the responsibility and trust in our society back where it belongs—in the hands of the people. We must begin it now before it's too late.

Mr. FALCOMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Ranking Member of the Committee on Natural Resources, Mr. ED MARKEY, for the opportunity to speak on this important issue. I also like to thank Chairman DOC HASTINGS for his leadership.

Every year, thousands of federal rules or regulations governing almost every aspect of

society are conceived through the federal rule-making process. Consequently, federal agencies perform quasi-legislative functions and, in many ways, serve as an extension of Congress. This notion of an unelected entity having such tremendous impact on society rests uneasily with democratic theory. For this reason, a critical feature in our democracy is to control excessive bureaucratic discretion and to ensure that rules and regulations promulgated by federal agencies are consistent with the intent of Congress as expressed in the law.

The Administrative Procedure Act (APA) of 1946, exists for this purpose—to constrain excessive bureaucratic discretion through procedural requirements for agency decision making, including setting goals and standards for regulations, and ensuring public participation through notice and comment. Other statutory rulemaking requirements applicable to a wide range of agencies include the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, and the Information Quality Act. These statutory requirements established a clear process for agency rulemaking and standard by which the quality of regulations should be measured.

I appreciate the concerns of my Republican friends that there are problems with many federal regulations. Over the years, we have seen evidence of excessive bureaucratic discretion that result in federal regulations being too burdensome, costly, counterproductive and even prohibitive. Critics argue that mundane requirements have led to the ossification of the rulemaking process, which at times could mean years before the final regulations are put in place.

Meanwhile, federal regulations are derived from the laws that are enacted by Congress. These laws are put in place to safeguard public interest. Without federal regulations though, we could have situations such as the recent Deepwater Oil Spill in the Gulf of Mexico. The lack of regulatory oversight contributed to one of the biggest oil spills in the country, in which, the deepwater well released about 200 million gallons or 4.9 million barrels of crude oil into the Gulf of Mexico, over a period of 84 days. To prevent such environmental disaster in the future, we need stronger federal regulations to ensure that appropriate standards are in place.

Mr. Speaker, I support a more common sense approach to federal regulations. Federal agencies should strive to protect the public interest and to ensure that proposed regulations do not stifle economic growth and job creation. For this reason, I am pleased that President Obama has ordered a government wide review of federal regulations to root out those regulations that stifle job creation and make our economy less competitive.

As the lawmaking institution in our system of government, we also have a responsibility to ensure that federal agencies are given the resources and better guidance to formulate regulations that are consistent with the intent of the law.

Mr. CRITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind this body of what the American people asked of us in November. They did not ask us to continue the parliamentary back and forth this institution has become known for; nor did they ask us to stand around while small businesses are hurting on Main Street. What the constituents of the 12th district of Pennsyl-

vania asked of me, and what the American people demanded from this Congress, is for us to help build an environment where business can create jobs.

Yet today, we are here considering a resolution that would give lip-service to creating jobs, but have no actionable results. H. Res. 72 simply instructs House Committees to review existing, pending, and proposed regulations by federal agencies. These Committees are to then create an inventory of these regulations to report this information. Mister Speaker, this is what our committees are already doing. These are the actions we are already taking to ease the burden on the small businesses in this country. What productive action are we taking by debating and voting on our Committees to fulfill a role in Congress that has already been defined for them?

This resolution is the epitome of the redundancy. I can say with certainty that H. Res 72 does nothing to reduce real regulatory burden on small businesses. Yet we are on the cusp of adopting a rule that will have my colleagues charged in a debate for an extended amount of time. This is what Americans see as the problem in Washington. As they are struggling, we are engaging in debate on a symbolic measure that does nothing more than reiterate what we have already been charged to do as Members of Congress. What are we doing for our small businesses today?

Small businesses create two-thirds of net new jobs each year in this country. It is our duty to make sure that we help generate the best environment to allow these job creators to thrive. Some of the reasons we were all elected to the 112th Congress was to help these small businesses and help our economy. What we are considering today, will produce no actionable result for either of these two goals.

There is no question that the small businesses of America face a large burden when it comes to federal regulations. Federal regulations now cost Americans \$1.75 trillion each year; that's up 50% from their annual costs in 2005. Federal agencies continue to add thousands of pages of new regulations which add to the already challenging task of creating a small business. It's estimated that these federal rules cost \$10,585 per worker for businesses with less than 20 workers. This cannot be the environment in which we expect our unemployment rate to turn around. It will take a bipartisan effort to reduce this burden and guarantee that our economy continues to thrive.

As a member of the Small Business Committee, I am determined and ready to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to review these challenges and barriers faced by job creators in this country. But I am sure this can be accomplished with the rules already set in place for this body. What will hinder this process and do nothing for small business is a debate on the House floor for nine and a half hours, as this rule sets in place, on instructing members to do what has already been asked of them. After that time, how can Congress say that it helped foster the environment for small businesses to create jobs? How many jobs can we say have been created as a result?

What our small businesses need is action. What the American worker needs is action. What our economy needs is action, and today, with this resolution, we have no action. I urge

my colleagues to vote no on this rule, which will result in no jobs for the small businesses of America.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 72, a resolution directing certain standing committees to inventory and review existing, pending, and proposed regulations and orders from agencies of the Federal Government, particularly with respect to their effect on jobs and economic growth.

While it is clear that across government there are tremendous amounts of red tape that we must cut in order to more effectively and efficiently spur job creation, I would like to focus on four specific issues under the jurisdiction of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

FMCSA HOURS OF SERVICE

Proposed changes by the U.S. Department of Transportation to hours of service rules for truck drivers would have a substantially negative impact on productivity and the U.S. economy.

The rules currently in place are working well and do not need to be changed. Since the current rules were implemented seven years ago, the trucking industry's safety performance has improved at an unprecedented rate. Both the number and rate of fatal and injury accidents involving large trucks have declined by more than one-third and are now at their lowest levels in recorded history. The remarkable reduction in the number of truck-involved fatal and injury crashes occurred even as truck mileage increased by almost 10 billion miles between 2003 and 2008, the latest year for which data is available.

If the proposed changes are implemented, trucking companies will need to put additional trucks and drivers on the road to deliver the same amount of freight, adding to final product costs and increasing congestion on the nation's already clogged highways. Small business truckers would be especially hard hit.

On two prior occasions, the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) estimated that similar changes would cost the U.S. economy \$2.2 billion, inclusive of safety benefits. However, in the new proposed rule FMCSA has changed its methodology for estimating both the benefits and costs of changes to the hours of service rule, effectively decreasing estimated annual costs by \$1.5 billion and increasing estimated annual benefits by \$1.1 billion in order to produce a positive benefit-cost ratio. Further, the agency's own analysis shows that the net benefits of retaining the current daily driving time limit exceed the net benefits of reducing allowable driving time by one hour, the option favored by FMCSA. Frankly, it is very difficult to understand how FMCSA rationalizes its proposal on this fact alone.

In addition to encumbering the industry and a struggling economy, the proposed changes would significantly challenge law enforcement. Because the proposed rules are complex and restrictive, motor carriers could have difficulty understanding them and enforcement officers could have difficulty accurately identifying violations. For instance, in order to determine if a driver can legally claim to have met the conditions of a weekly rest provision, enforcement officials would have to ensure that at least 168 hours had elapsed since the beginning of the most recent weekly rest period, and that the break included two consecutive nighttime peri-

ods between midnight and 6 a.m. Such complexity will only serve to hamper both industry compliance and motor carrier enforcement.

Now is not the time to impose costly new regulations that would impede the nation's economic recovery and increase the cost of almost every product Americans produce and buy.

Along with my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. GRAVES, I am circulating a letter on this issue to be sent to the Secretary of Transportation, Ray LaHood. I encourage all of my colleagues to join in signing on to this important letter.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RAILROADS, PIPELINES, AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS ISSUES

As the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous materials, there are three issues under my jurisdiction that I want to draw attention to—two related to railroads and another related to hazardous materials.

Put simply, the United States has the greatest freight rail network in the world. Our system is the most efficient and cost-effective in existence, and relies on virtually no subsidies from the federal government. Over a century ago, America's railroads opened the door for economic expansion, literally ushering in the great advancements in industry that sparked America's emergence as an economic power on the world stage. By linking our coasts, rail opened markets for goods and services in parts of our nation before rendered inaccessible. America's railroads revolutionized transportation, gave promise to freedom of movement and made business more efficient. That heritage continues to this day.

Today, we find ourselves in the midst of a new era of a freight rail renaissance. With 140,000 miles of track carrying almost two trillion ton-miles annually, freight rail is an immense jobs generator and a major driver of the nation's economy. In fact, the industry supports directly or indirectly over 1 million jobs, and 43 percent of all freight carried each year in the U.S. is moved by train—with demand projected to grow. In order to meet this demand, it is essential that there is continued growth in rail capacity.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Yet given their successes and self-reliance, the railroad industry appears to be in the crosshairs of the Surface Transportation Board (STB). The question is this: will America's railroads continue to be given the freedom necessary to grow their industry without direct interference by the federal government or will the STB attempt to move to re-regulate the industry?

Re-regulation would be a potentially catastrophic public policy that could erase 30 years of positive growth in rail, and threaten to reduce the railroads to the ruinous decreases in services and disinvestment not seen since the 1970's. I firmly believe that if the Surface Transportation Board attempts to re-regulate this vital industry, it will be only a matter of years before our once self-reliant railroads will be forced to rely on taxpayer dollars to invest in infrastructure, safety and efficiency as federal mandates mount.

The Surface Transportation Board has recently announced two hearings. One will review rail traffic exemptions while the other will assess the competitive marketplace in which the railroads operate. In connection with those hearings, we would like to express our collec-

tive view about the importance of the freight rail industry as a critical component of our nation's transportation system, and impress upon you the importance of maintaining the existing regulatory balance between the railroads and shippers.

The passage of the Staggers Act in 1980 created a balanced regulatory system that has allowed the rail industry to build the world's best freight rail system, while protecting shippers in areas where there is no effective competition. Since its passage, average inflation-adjusted rail rates measured by revenue per ton-mile are down over 50 percent and freight railroads have re-invested more than \$480 billion back into their operating networks. That could not have been done—and will not be done in the future—unless the STB maintains the current regulatory balance as contemplated by the Staggers Act.

Recently I joined with my senior colleagues on the Transportation Committee, what we call the "Big 4"—the Chairman of the full Committee, Mr. MICA, the Ranking Member of the Full Committee, Mr. RAHALL, the Ranking Member of the Railroads Subcommittee, Ms. BROWN, and myself, the Chairman of the Railroads Subcommittee—in sending a letter to the Chairman of the Surface Transportation Board regarding maintaining the existing regulatory balance between the railroads and shippers.

In our letter, we made it clear that any policy change made by the STB which restricts the railroads' abilities to invest, grow their networks and meet the nation's freight transportation demands will be opposed by the Transportation Committee.

POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL

Notably, these debates are occurring at a time when the rail industry is at a crossroads dealing with massive new mandates and proposals that threaten to undermine our rail renaissance. Recent unfunded mandates on the freight rail industry to retrofit equipment with Positive Train Control (PTC) equipment are expected to cost in excess of \$10 billion, with limited, if any, operational benefit. This mandate will divert scarce capital from critical investments in one of the most capital-intensive businesses in the world.

The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) issued a Final Rule in January 2010 to implement the statutory requirement in the Railroad Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to implement Positive Train Control (PTC) systems by December 31, 2015 on mainline rail tracks that carry passenger trains or hazardous materials that are toxic by inhalation.

Positive Train Control is a technology (or combination of technologies) that is designed to automatically stop or slow a train before accidents caused by human error can occur. The accidents PTC is intended to prevent include:

- Train-to-train collisions;
- derailments caused by excessive speed;
- unauthorized incursions by trains onto sections of track where maintenance is taking place;

- trains moving through track switches left in the wrong position.

A fully functional PTC system must be able to precisely determine the location and speed of trains, warn train operators of potential problems, and take action if the operator does not respond to a warning. The type of accidents that PTC systems are designed to prevent are very rare. Of all train accidents on rail

mainlines over the past seven years, only around 4 percent would have been prevented if PTC systems had been in place.

According to the FRA, freight railroads will have to spend up to \$13.2 billion to install and maintain PTC systems over the next 20 years, but PTC will yield just \$608 million in benefits over the same period—a cost-benefit ratio of 20 to 1.

An April 2010 study by the consulting firm Oliver Wyman found that the so-called “business benefits” of PTC—reducing train delays and being able to move more trains through congested sections of track—are actually very low or nonexistent. In fact, systems very similar to PTC that are currently being implemented in Europe do not support that claim that PTC will yield significant business benefits for U.S. railroads.

The manner in which FRA determined which track will be required to have PTC installed has caused a great deal of concern in the railroad industry. Many provisions of the Final Rule go well beyond the statutory requirements of the Railroad Safety Improvement Act. These provisions add hundreds of millions of dollars to costs, but will not improve safety in any meaningful way.

In the final rule, the FRA orders railroads to install PTC on rail lines that carried toxic-by-inhalation hazardous materials in 2008. Nothing in the law refers to using 2008 as the base year for determining where PTC must be installed.

As it currently stands, the Final Rule will require that approximately 70,000–80,000 miles of rail miles have PTC systems installed, about half of the total Class I railroad 160,000-mile national freight network.

The decision to use 2008 as a base year for determining which tracks require PTC implementation makes no sense, because hazardous materials routing in 2015 will be vastly different than in 2008, for the following reasons:

Significant hazardous materials rail routing changes were recently implemented in response to a Department of Transportation/Department of Homeland Security joint regulation requiring railroads to ensure that toxic-by-inhalation chemicals are transported on routes posing the least overall safety and security risk.

Additionally, marketplace dynamics are changing the transportation of hazardous materials. For example, many chemical companies are phasing out production of chlorine, or moving their production sites to where the chemical will be used, thereby dramatically changing the amounts and routes over which these toxic-by-inhalation materials are moved.

Finally, the rule does not provide for a “de minimis” exception, where a rail line carrying very little of these materials could be exempted from the PTC requirement. Such an exception would significantly reduce costs without compromising safety in a meaningful way.

The PTC mandate applies to all passenger railroads on the general railway system, including Amtrak and 26 different commuter railroads.

Amtrak’s capital needs and operations are fully subsidized by annual appropriations. Commuter railroads also receive capital funds from the Federal Transit Administration for repair and modernization of their systems, but these federal funds represents only about 40 percent of total funds spent on their systems,

which are primarily supported by local governments.

The cost of installing PTC is a significant burden for these commuter railroads. The American Public Transportation Associations estimates that installation of PTC on commuter railroads will cost more than \$2 billion—these agencies are already cutting service levels or raising fares because of the recession’s impact on local government budgets.

Additionally, most commuter railroads operate over freight rail-owned track. These agencies must ensure that the PTC technology they install on their commuter systems is interoperable with the systems that their host railroads put in place.

Because of issues like interoperability, there is real doubt that PTC can be successfully implemented by December 31, 2015.

There is also a severe shortage of available broadband spectrum for the wireless communications networks that are central to PTC implementation. The Federal Trade Commission has authority over allocating spectrum, and the FTC decision process is slow and cumbersome.

Instead of penalizing the rail industry for its success, Washington should be promoting new investment and expansions in service to keep America’s railroads in the driver’s seat of the global economy. That’s why I support tax credits for the expansion and rehabilitation of the nation’s rail infrastructure.

Tax credits are a proven and effective policy tool to encourage businesses to invest in worthwhile projects. Because the railroads still pay for their projects under tax credit plans, tax credits ensure that the railroads will only pursue projects that will grow their businesses, and ultimately expanding the economy. Direct grants, on the other hand, could be seen as “free money” that would not be subject to the same rigorous business decisions. There are two tax credit bills that I support, including a 25 percent tax credit for rail projects that expand the rail network and ease congestion, and a short line tax credit that expired at the end of last year.

America’s railroads are at a crossroad. The direction the Administration pushes the rail industry will have a lasting impact on American competitiveness and economic growth. Washington must resist the urge to over-regulate an industry that has proven it to be largely self-sufficient and capable to weather economic stress and improve upon its business model. We cannot go back to the days of stifling over regulation and I will do my part as a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to make sure it does not happen.

LITHIUM BATTERIES

Finally, I want to touch on the transportation of lithium batteries.

In January 2010, the Department of Transportation issues a Notice of Proposed Rule-making to regulate the air transport of lithium batteries.

The proposed rule:

Regulates and treats as a hazardous material all lithium batteries and most devices shipped with or containing such batteries, such as laptop computers, cell phones, and medical devices.

Applies to air shipments within the U.S. and to shipments carried on U.S. registered aircraft traveling anywhere in the world.

Proposes to limit stowage of lithium batteries on cargo aircraft to crew-accessible po-

sitions or in yet-to-be-approved Federal Aviation Administration fireproof containers.

Billions of lithium batteries have been safely transported as air cargo in the last twenty years. This is not one of NTBS’s “Most Wanted” safety recommendations. In fact, there are no confirmed fatalities associated with the lithium batteries transportation that I am aware of.

The proposed rule grossly underestimates the cost of the regulation to American businesses. The Department of Transportation analysis estimates approximately \$9 million per year in cost to the U.S. economy. But actual costs to hundreds of businesses—battery manufacturers, consumer goods manufacturers, freight handlers, and air transportation companies—could easily top \$1 billion a year.

I believe the Department of Transportation analysis did not take into account:

Additional annual payroll and internal handling costs,

Administrative costs associated with negotiating and executing hazardous materials contracts for customers shipping these newly-regulated goods,

Adverse impacts on retail shipping outlets,

Potential layoffs associated with the burdensome requirements, and

Commercial consequences from potential lithium battery shipment consolidation.

The United Parcel Service alone estimates this new regulation would cost the company \$264 million in the first year, and more than \$185 million in each following year.

This proposed rule threatens to stifle job creation and industrial advancement, and affects a wide segment of the economy, including U.S. manufacturing, transportation, and retail sectors. It will also give foreign cargo carriers a competitive advantage over U.S. companies.

Transportation regulations for lithium batteries have been extensively considered by international bodies such as the United Nations, International Civil Aviation Organization and International Air Transport Association. In order to protect the competitiveness of the U.S. in the international marketplace, standards for the transport of lithium batteries should be fully harmonized with international rules and regulations. This is the only reasonable focus of any regulatory action on air transportation of lithium batteries. I strongly support efforts to make the transport of lithium batteries as safe as possible, but we must do so in a reasonable, responsible manner.

I applaud our House leadership for bringing this important resolution to the floor and thank them for the opportunity to discuss these important issues.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans—to support small business and small business trucking.

As we debate H. Res. 72, the most critical issue facing America is how to increase jobs so that families can rise up against economic hardships.

Small businesses are essential to our nation’s economy.

They account for half of our gross domestic product, more than half our jobs, and three-fourths of new jobs created each year.

We must support new and small businesses through open access to loans, credit and capital.

We can reduce onerous paperwork, and give small companies the tools they need to

take care of their employees and build their companies.

By passing legislation focused on protecting the economic vitality of small businesses in the trucking industry and all other sectors, we will facilitate economic growth for all Americans.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of this resolution is postponed.

□ 2120

HONORING COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to honor the 141st anniversary of the founding of Colorado State University, located in Fort Collins, Colorado.

On February 11, 1870, Colorado Territorial Governor Edward McCook signed the Morrill Act establishing the State Agricultural College in Fort Collins. In its 141 years, Colorado State University has grown to over 26,000 students, 1,400 faculty members, and has become one of the Nation's leading research universities. On average, CSU's research expenditures top \$138 million annually.

To this day, Colorado State University still maintains the commitment of a State agricultural college. It provides countless support for promoting economic development throughout the rural communities in Colorado. CSU has over 90,000-plus alumni that live in the State, accounting for nearly \$4.1 billion annually in household income for Colorado. The CSU alumni list includes State Governors, business leaders, Olympic gold medalists, teachers, researchers, artists, and even a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I am proud to call myself a Colorado State alumnus. It is my honor to recognize CSU on the House floor for its 141 years of excellence in education and research.

JOBS, THE DEFICIT AND FEDERAL SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOWDY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 18 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, congratulations. You look good up in the Chair there.

We are going to have a chance to talk for just a few minutes about an interesting topic. It is something on the minds of Americans everywhere, and that is about jobs, about the deficit and about Federal spending and what we have to do in those areas.

I think sometimes it is helpful, you hear so much detail that you need to

step back at the 30,000-foot view and say what is the big picture of what is going on. So I have here one of those traditional pie-type charts, and it has an overview of the total spending of the Federal Government in the year 2010. So what I want to do is just take a look at that and then talk about what that means relative to the problems we have in overspending in the Federal Government.

Also, this connects to unemployment in this sense, that when the Federal Government spends too much money and is too intrusive and takes too much in taxes, all of those things destroy the jobs created by small businesses.

So let's just be completely clear. We have heard stories about unemployment and these "heartless Republicans." The problem is that if you destroy businesses, you don't have any businesses, you don't have any jobs. And that is what we have been doing. How is it we destroy businesses? One, we overtax them; two, we overregulate them with red tape; three, we make it hard from a liquidity point of view to get loans from banks, because the Federal officers are looking over the bankers' shoulders second-guessing the loans; fourth, we create an era of uncertainty because we don't know what the silly government is going to do next; and, last of all, we spend money like mad, which then makes the economy that much harder for our businesses to compete in a world competitive environment.

But let's take a look at this pie chart here, and there is something here that when you start to think about it is really a little bit on the frightening side. Let's take a look at some of the big chunks of money.

The bottom one down here is defense. The Constitution of the United States says that the Congress will provide for the national defense. It is the one main thing that Congress is supposed to do. States can't do it; locales can't do it. It is something that has to be done by the Federal Government. That is why our U.S. Constitution says even in the preamble to provide for the national defense. That is \$692 billion here in the 2010 budget. So there is defense.

This over here is the non-defense, what is called discretionary. These are the funds that Congress spends every year, and that is \$666 billion. This includes things like the Education Department, the Energy Department, the Department of Commerce. It would be jails and prisons, things like that. All of those, the Park Service, would all be in this non-defense discretionary area. So these two, kind of similar size, running in there about a little bit under \$1.5 trillion in total.

Now, the other one that I want to call to your attention, though, is all the rest of these. This is Social Security, this is Medicare, this is Medicaid. And so what these things are, a lot of times people call them mandatory spending. What does that mean?

Well, what it means is that sometime a long time ago a Congress came along, passed these laws, and the law works like a little machine and the machine spits out dollar bills whenever anybody meets certain criteria. So we call it an entitlement. These little machines are spitting out, printing out, dollars; and the Congress doesn't have to do anything at all and the Federal Government is spending lots of money. How much money? Well, Social Security, there is \$700 billion, there is another \$519 billion in Medicare, and Medicaid, \$273 billion.

Another thing that works a little bit like an entitlement is the debt. So if we sell a Treasury bill, we have to pay the interest on it; and when we do that, we get this interest. And then there is these other mandatory things which are really other kinds of entitlements. So it is not just Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. You have got SCHIP, you have got food stamps and things like that that are additional entitlements.

So these things here, when you put all of these together, this is kind of a spooky number. These things come out not too far away from a little over \$2 trillion, maybe \$2.3 trillion. And what does that mean, \$2.3 trillion? What that is, that also is the amount of revenue in a given year for the Federal Government.

So what has happened is all these entitlements now plus the interests on the debt have gotten to the point that they are chewing up all the money that the Federal Government takes in in taxes in a given year. So then the question is, well, how about defense? How about non-defense discretionary? How about these things? Do we have any money? No.

The point of the matter is you can zero this out, zero these out, and these together are using all of the money that the Federal Government is taking in in revenue in a given year. Now, that is kind of scary. What that says is that we are starting to run deficits of over \$1 trillion.

In fact, the Obama deficits for the last 2 years have been about \$1.5 trillion. That is a lot of money. That is three times a bigger deficit than President Bush's worst budget deficit. So you take his worst budget deficit, which is about \$450 billion, and we are talking the last 2 years we are running at a \$1.5 trillion deficit. So this is what is going on.

So let's take a look. If you are like an awful lot of Americans, you want to solve a problem. We have got a problem here. We are apparently spending too much money. So you say, well, what are our alternatives? How do we approach this?

I am thankful this evening also that we have got one of our very bright young freshmen Congressmen from the State of Colorado. SCOTT is here to join us, SCOTT TIPTON. SCOTT, I just want to make sure you knew, any time you want to jump in here, we could talk a little bit about this.

What is your reaction here? You are a little bit newer here to D.C. But you take a look the size of this entitlement that is the same size as what we take in for a whole year, isn't that a little bit of a spooky thing to be walking down here and run into this as a problem?

Mr. TIPTON. You know, it really is. We just finished a tour of the Third Congressional District of Colorado. Our district is about the size of the State of Florida, the fifth largest congressional district in the United States which is not an entire State, a massive land area, a lot of diversity in terms of the economies.

Incredibly interesting to me as we traveled throughout that Third Congressional District over this past week, we put on probably a little better than 1,500 miles.

□ 2130

Better than 30-plus meetings throughout that district. The frustration level of the American people, the people in my district, their understanding of the challenges that we face as a nation is truly remarkable. The American people get it. And what they want to see out of Washington is that Washington truly gets it.

As we're looking at your chart right now and we go to the revenues that are coming in, the spending which is going out, we're looking at a \$1.5 trillion deficit that we are facing. That's going to be going on top of a debt in this country of \$14.3 trillion, an unsustainable glide path that is going to take us to economic ruin.

As I traveled through my district, we found people that understood that it's important to be able to build for the future. We challenged them, and they rose to that challenge when we brought it down to taking a picture out of their own wallet and looking at their child or their grandchild. Many of us, myself and perhaps you as well, were raised with that concept of the American Dream. We always believed that we would have it better than our parents and our grandparents before them. The challenge which lies before us is to deliver that American Dream to our children and to our grandchildren.

I was in a conversation with a man from Craig, Colorado, born in 1924. In this conversation he recounted his life. He talked about living through the Great Depression; obviously, World War II. And we were talking about the economic circumstances of our time. And he said, SCOTT, this is the challenge of your generation. The question yet to be answered is: Will we rise to meet that challenge?

We've seen the government—and I think none of us can question the intent has always been good. And I would challenge anyone who will demonize others for their intent, because I think no matter whatever program, there was a thought behind it. But the problem is, as Americans, when we pull that checkbook out of our hip pocket,

we know there's only so much money. And if we exceed that amount, there are going to be consequences that have to be paid. That's the reality that the American people expect us to truly deal with here in Washington. And they know that there are going to be some sacrifices. But those sacrifices are going to be from the standpoint that we have overspent. We're going to have to cut back. We have to be looking to the future. We have to be standing for our children, for our grandchildren, to deliver that dream that we have always believed as the American promise.

Mr. AKIN. SCOTT, when I heard you talking, it just kind of reminded me, a few years back I spent a fair amount of time with the Boy Scouts because I had four kids that went through the Boy Scouts program. They got to be Eagle Scouts and all. One of the things we always used to say, and to me, at least, it paints kind of a picture. You move in with the Boy Scouts to a camping area, and some of them a little wet behind the ears, but they somehow get the tents all assembled and they'd have a little bit of fun spraying some hairspray into the fire and things that little kids do; yet when it came time to clean up, we had this one rule, and that is you're going to leave the campsite better than you found it.

Our forefathers, my immediate parents, dad fought in World War II, and he had the attitude that we've got a job to get done and we're going to go over and get the job done. And they came back with the attitude that they wanted to give you and me a better life and better opportunities than what they had. And we've always wanted to pass that down.

Now I've got some kids of my own and I want to pass to them a better America, and yet what we're doing is we're passing them this tremendous debt. And we're the first generation that's really passing a worse America off to our kids than what we had before. And I think that's why your constituents elected you to come down here and get this thing straightened out.

Mr. TIPTON. It truly is. I believe that I grew up with—and perhaps you did, too. My parents raised me with phrases like “Yankee ingenuity,” “American know-how.” And I think that when we look at the entire mesh of what's been coming out of Washington, frankly, over the course of the last 10 years, we have seen an over-reach of government, which has stifled American creativity.

I'm a small business man, not a career politician. I've actually gotten my hands dirty. I've created a business from the ground up. I have risked. We've had to work hard. But one thing I've learned being a small business man is you have to be nimble. You have to be creative in terms of addressing the problems.

One of the real challenges that we face is there seems to be a mentality in

Washington, D.C., that once a program starts, it never ends. We will build on it. We will expand it. We will create redundancies, and we will build out that bureaucracy.

In the private sector, we do things a little bit differently. Periodically, we audit. We take a look to see what we are doing and is it achieving the goals that we are trying to achieve. If not, we eliminate it. We start to approach it from a different fashion to be able to make it work. I think it's that sort of creativity, that sort of nimbleness, which Washington lacks, and it's what the American people are truly crying for. They want to see us be innovative. If it isn't working, don't do it.

Ronald Reagan made the comment, he said the nearest thing to eternal life on Earth is a government program. Nothing has ever been said that is probably more true here on Earth.

Mr. AKIN. Let's take a look at this problem because you've got all these entitlements. And this represents all the money that comes in in a year. Then things here are beyond. And yet we're thinking that you've got to do defense and you've got to have the park open or you've got to have a prison open. So how are you going to deal with this problem?

Let's take a look at the next chart. This is an optimistic way of saying it. This is Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, and it shows over time—this is 1965—and over time, these things are getting bigger because some of us baby boomers are coming along and putting more demand on the system. But this is an optimistic chart because the problem with it is you don't have the other entitlements in here or the debt service.

So what the problem is, if you put those other things in, what we're saying with this first pie chart is that, as you take a look at our revenue from taxes, it's averaging about 18 percent. So here comes the revenue along at an average of 18 percent, and here we are at 2011, somewhere in here, and you put these other things in and it comes all the way up to here. We can zero defense. We can take every soldier off the field, every ship out at sea, every plane out of here. We can zero defense to zero and all the other discretionary spending and, boom, here we are. Our entitlements have eaten up everything that the government takes.

One of the things that I find amusing and I've had to struggle with a little bit, too, is the idea of how you lose weight. You get older. I used to eat the double pecan pie ala mode, no problem, up to my mid-forties. But as you get a little older, you've got to watch that carrot cake or cheesecake or whatever. There's all of these ways of packaging weight loss programs, but the hard facts are there's just two variables: one is how much exercise you get, and how much food you eat. And, unfortunately, all of these supposedly complicated budget things come down to two things: how much money you're going

to spend and how much revenue you've got coming in.

And the problem is here, this 18 percent. I'd like to talk to this in a couple of minutes. I don't think we can increase the amount of Federal revenue that much. Maybe we can do some things to get that to improve. But you can raise taxes, but the trouble is you raise taxes, you do just what you're saying: You crash the economy; the businesses close; there aren't jobs; you aren't picking up tax revenue.

So you can raise taxes, but it doesn't actually get you more money. And yet we've got all this spending going on, which says it's a little bit like if you can't do any more exercise, you're going to have to stop eating. We're going to have to stop spending on all these things.

Jump in, SCOTT.

Mr. TIPTON. I think that, first of all, just to set the plate, and I know that you will join with me on this, we have an obligation to our senior citizens that are receiving Social Security, to those who are about to receive it. And we also have another obligation, again, to our children and our grandchildren. And we need to be able to have that conversation in terms of how are we going to make sure that their opportunities are going to be the equivalent or even better than what our current senior citizens are receiving.

You show a pattern right now in terms of average revenues in relation to expenditures, particularly as baby boomers come on line. That is going to be something that we are going to have to deal with as a Congress, and I think it's something certainly that they're expecting leadership out of Washington. We are compassionate people. We will stand up for our senior citizens. It's a pledge that I made that I will keep for our senior citizens that are receiving Social Security. But I'm also making a pledge to our children and our grandchildren. We are going to be looking at ways to be able to address this so that their future can be as bright and they're going to be looking at a better America as well.

Mr. AKIN. Right. I think a lot of ways that you hear people talking about how do you get into this kind of problem, some people who are already very senior and dependent on some of these things, you're probably not going to touch their things at all. But it may be that the people who were not—maybe people in their thirties or forties, you put a different kind of program together and may give them some alternatives: Choose this, this, or this.

□ 2140

Those are the kinds of ideas we've got to look at, but we have to be honest with ourselves. I wasn't really aware of how bad these numbers were, even though I've been here for a while, until a few months ago. These entitlements are totally absorbing, even now, all of our revenues here. So really this

is a little bit like the guy who's overweight. He's got a choice. You know, you're either going to have to reduce the spending here or you're going to have to somehow get in more revenue. The interesting fact on this is that there is evidence to suggest that, when you drop taxes, you actually get more revenue.

As a business guy, you probably understand that to some degree, SCOTT.

So here is an example of this top marginal tax rate. Back here in 1960, it was up at 90 percent for the guys making the most money. As this thing was brought down—Ronald Reagan brought it down a lot—what happened, as you see, is that the total Federal tax receipts actually increased. A lot of times, it seems like: How in the world can you drop taxes and get more revenue from the government?

SCOTT, say you were sort of king for a day and you had to put a tax on a loaf of bread, not for a day but for a year, and that you've got to get the maximum revenue for your little kingdom by taxing bread. You think, Huh, I'll put a penny tax on it. Then you think, No, \$10. Then you think, Well, if I do \$10, not enough people will buy the bread. So you come up, and at a certain point, you've got an optimum tax. If you raise it, you lose revenue. If you reduce it, you don't. So there is an optimum point.

What this thing called a Laffer curve shows us is that, as we drop taxes, we actually get more revenue into the Federal Government. So, to a degree, we can use growth of the revenue to deal with some of the problem. The trouble is that it's not anywhere near going to deal with all of it, which means, no matter what you do, you're going to have to cut spending, particularly that entitlement spending. So we have to do that sensitively and carefully. It's going to be politically controversial, but we've got to do something.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. AKIN. I thank you, Mr. Speaker. You've done an admirable job.

Thank you very much, SCOTT TIPTON, from Colorado—a great new Congressman—and the very top of the evening to the rest of my colleagues.

OUR NATION'S ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 18 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me. I am coming down to the floor tonight to speak on behalf of the Progressive Caucus to talk about the real situation when it comes to our Nation's economy.

First of all, the Republican Caucus essentially created this massive budget deficit themselves through two wars and a massive tax cut for the very

wealthiest Americans—the people who didn't need a big tax cut, who didn't ask for a big tax cut but who got one anyway, and who demanded, in exchange for poor people who were unemployed, getting unemployment extensions, that the richest of the rich get a bunch of tax breaks or get them extended so that, even when they die, they can just pass on massive amounts of money to their heirs and never have to do anything to help the society that helped them make all that money in the first place. I'm not talking about taking it all. I'm talking about something called the estate tax, which is something that every society has, and it just makes sense.

You have heard, Mr. Speaker, a lot of things that just ain't so—aren't true—and are just invented.

We see our Republican colleagues saying very piously, Oh, we've got to make sure we don't pass on this deficit to our children and grandchildren. Well, they created the deficit. They created the deficit through massive tax cuts for the wealthiest people and an Iraq war, which never, ever, ever should have been fought. So now what they say is the richest of the rich don't have to chime in; they don't have to help out; they don't have to give up anything. They just want to take it out of the poorest of the poor. Now they want to say, Oh, we have to have an adult conversation with our seniors.

What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? That's insulting to me.

To say to a 65-year-old person who has worked his whole life, who maybe has pain in his back because of the hard work he has done and tell him, We have to have an adult conversation, I hope every senior in this country turns to the Republican Caucus and says, Sonny, young lady, don't you tell me about having an adult conversation. I'm the adult around here.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that an adult conversation means you're going to try to cut benefits for people who have worked hard and have paid into Social Security. That's not fair. That doesn't make any sense. By the way, Social Security doesn't contribute to the budget deficit. We actually borrow money from Social Security. Social Security is something that is the crown jewel of American politics and the crown jewel of our Nation. It is one of the finest programs that our country has ever seen, and it is something that says that our seniors will not live their golden years in abject poverty. It's an income source. It's how we honor our people who have been able to stick around and carve a path for the rest of us. Now some folks in our Republican Caucus want to have an adult conversation with them. That is an absurdity, and I think we ought to call it what it is.

In a few days, we're going to be dealing with the budget. In a few days, we're going to deal with the CR. The CR is the continuing resolution. The CR really represents a Republican pink slip for America.

The Republican Caucus had their way. They were against regulation. They deregulated everything. We said, You know what? Those things, those derivatives, they don't need to be regulated at all. They promoted this philosophy of no regulation of big business. What it resulted in is the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression—the worst one. A financial crisis and housing crisis all over the place were caused because the people who were supposed to mind the store refused to. They figured that, you know, all the folks who work in our Nation's economy—the businesspeople, the industry folks—would just always do the right thing. The market would solve every question.

Well, the market didn't solve every question.

Markets are important things, as people know, and they can be extremely helpful, but they need folks to regulate them because there are social activities that human beings conduct and engage in. Everybody knows, when human beings get together and do something, some of them will do the right thing, and some of them will not. That's why we have police. The police officer is not for the honest person. He's for the person who needs to be watched after. In every market, most people do the right thing, and some people do not; but we said no regulation, so the cop on the beat was gone, and even the good actors in the housing market were getting out-competed because the bad ones were willing to do anything, so it was a race to the bottom.

Then after the Republicans pushed their philosophy of laissez-faire economics, it failed us. That's why under President Bush there needed to be a massive bailout of Wall Street, because that philosophy failed us.

Now, all of a sudden, these guys act like, well, it's the Democrats' fault that the budget deficit is here. President Obama literally helped to lead saving this economy. We saved the American auto industry. You would think they'd say thank you. We saved Goldman Sachs. We saved all these big banks. Now you would think, by the bonuses they're handing out to each other, that they would have more appreciation than they've shown so far. Literally—literally—President Obama helped save this economy and put it back in shape.

Private job growth is going up. When the Republicans had the Presidency and both Houses of Congress, in President Bush's last month in Congress, we saw 741,000 jobs lost. We were losing millions of jobs under Bush. Then as soon as the Democrats get in, we begin to add jobs back on, but we didn't add them on fast enough. Part of the reason is we couldn't get any cooperation from the Republican Caucus.

The fact is now they have gone out there, and they have told the American people it's not health care; it's death panels. Oh, it's not financial reform;

it's the Democrats' bailing out people. Wait a minute. The bailout happened in the Bush regime. The Bush White House was in operation during that, and they just sort of bamboozled a lot of folks.

□ 2150

The fact is that once they get in, first thing they do is they read the Constitution. Now, there's nothing wrong with that. I love our Constitution. I'm a lawyer, studied constitutional law, taught it in fact; but I can read the Constitution on my own time. I don't need to take up floor time for that.

Okay. So then you'd think they're going to get to getting America back to work and doing some jobs after that. Well, guess again. What they do next after that is they want to repeal health care. They want to repeal seniors' ability to get that donut hole closed up. They want to repeal seniors' ability to get free preventative care. They want to repeal seniors' ability to be able to get some real help when it comes to meeting their basic needs in the health care system. They want to get rid of the system to squeeze out waste, fraud, and abuse out of Medicare so we can make it a program more solvent and to last longer.

They want to repeal all that. They want to repeal health care; but you know what, the Senate was never going to go for it and the President is not going to go for it. And they knew it and they knew it and they knew it, but that didn't stop them, Mr. Speaker. The Republican caucus went on ahead with health care repeal anyway, wasting hours on the floor when we could have been talking about jobs.

So, first of all, we take up floor time to read the Constitution, which you should do your own anyway, and then they take up time with this repeal effort, which they knew was never going anywhere. We haven't dealt with jobs yet. It's February 10 and we haven't seen the Republican caucus take up a single measure that would put anyone back to work. And you know what, I hope the American people are watching and paying attention very closely because they promised a lot, and so far they've given absolutely nothing.

The other day they brought in a measure to try to take money from the United Nations. The problem facing the American people is not the United Nations. It's no jobs. But our friends in the majority caucus, they went out and told the American people some stuff. They took advantage of people's pain, and they got themselves elected and then the first thing they do is abandon any effort to get the American people back to work.

So this week we've had nothing on jobs. This week we've had nothing on jobs at all, and next week they're not just going to do nothing on jobs, they're going to start putting in policies that are going to get rid of jobs.

So let's talk about it. The Republican pink slip for America will further

devastate the economy. The best way to get the economy moving is to create jobs. You hear Republicans in the caucus say, well, the government doesn't create jobs. Well, tell that to a police officer, tell that to a teacher, tell that to a firefighter, tell that to a construction worker, tell that to somebody who makes sure that our streets and our lights on our streets are in good working order. Of course, the government creates jobs. But not only does that, the government helps create rules that actually help the private sector make jobs. This is just a fact.

You want to balance the budget and deal with the deficit, which I certainly do, start putting America back to work, but that's not what the Republicans are doing.

What they're doing is they are going after public employees, and they are going after programs that provide important and vital services to the American people provided by public employees. Republicans are giving a pink slip to America as they try to go after the public employees, as they try to stop and even end up cutting people who provide important public services to our country. The American people voted for jobs, and all they got was a pink slip.

The Republican budget cuts, which we are beginning to already hear serious rumbles about, mean cuts if you're a nurse, mean cuts if you're a teacher, mean cuts if you're a firefighter or a police officer or construction worker; but not only that, not only that, we're talking about, folks, more than that. Here's a list in front of my face. I have a list of 70 spending cuts to be included in the continuing resolution coming up next week if they can ever get around to it. They've been having problems with that recently.

Flood control and coastal emergencies, \$30 million, they want to cut that. Wait a minute. These are people who make sure that when there are floods and when there are coastal emergencies, there is someone who will help people who are in peril and in trouble. This is not some nameless, faceless program. This is hardworking professionals who work on our Nation's coasts to make sure that things are not dangerous. Oh, that's \$30 million. How many jobs does that cut? I don't know how many jobs it cuts, but it cuts \$30 million from the budget.

Energy efficiency and renewable energy: \$899 million. \$899 million cut out of energy efficiency and renewable energy in a time when we need to be going toward green jobs. We need to be doing more with efficiency. We need to do something. We need to weatherize those old, windy homes so we don't need so much energy to heat them up or cool them down. In a time when we are driving toward the future, when nations around the world are greening themselves, our Republican caucus says cut \$899 million, that \$899 million which employs the American public and, of course, some private workers to help provide important services.

They want to cut the Office of Science by \$1.1 billion. Science and innovation. Where do the members of the Republican caucus think the jobs are going to be? And if you cannot get people to work, then you can't get them to pay taxes; and if you can't get them to pay taxes, then we're not going to lower the deficit. But still, they want to cut the Office of Science \$1.1 billion.

The Internal Revenue Service. They want to cut the Internal Revenue Service. Aren't those the guys who actually go get the money to deal with the budget deficit, Mr. Speaker? They want to cut the Internal Revenue Service \$593 million. They want to cut the people who actually go get the money to help fill the budgetary holes. That is absolutely not logical. They want to deal with the folks who go get—who don't pay, who don't pay their taxes. They want to get rid of the people who go get that revenue.

International Trade Administration. Now, our country could do much more in the area of exports. International Trade Administration helps to produce and promote exports. That's us selling things to foreigners which makes money for our country which helps us push down the deficit. They say cut it. They don't have a vision for growing our economy. They have a vision, a dark vision of just cutting it, reducing it, lowering it. They have a defensive view of America and not a bold courageous view of America.

The COPS program. The COPS program, community-oriented policing. They want to cut it \$600 million. How many of our Nation's brave members of law enforcement wearing those blue uniforms, protecting our streets all over this country are employed through a COPS grant? Quite a few. The Republican caucus says get rid of them.

What about NASA? Space exploration? So many important things come from space exploration, from satellites, all kinds of important things that we have learned here and get from NASA, \$379 million. Get rid of it.

The EPA, you would think we can keep the program that keeps us breathing clean air. Nope, got to get rid of those; and, you know, I can go right on down the line.

What about WIC: women, infants and children? WIC. A poor mom and her kids better figure out what they're going to do because the Republican caucus wants to cut \$758 million out of that program. That's just cold-hearted and mean right there.

And let's keep on marching down the list. HUD community development block grants which have helped cities all over this country apply funds to problems that are facing them and doing it on a flexible basis because it's not just for this program or for that you give the city block grant money. They decide how they apply those funds. Cut that \$530 million.

LIHEAP contingency fund. This is so people who live in cold northern States

can have some heat. Now you want to cut that program, so people can be in the cold? Literally in the cold and figuratively, too.

What about the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund? I actually am a big fan of clean drinking water, Mr. Speaker, and the Republican caucus wants to get rid of that one to the tune of \$250 million.

It goes on and it goes on and it goes on and on and on. Important programs that are literally powered by men and women who work for the Federal Government, tossed away and will result in the pain and injury to this very fragile economy.

You know, people listening to this broadcast tonight, Mr. Speaker, should know that if I am a public employee and somebody else works for a private employer and we both go to the local grocery store and buy groceries, the dollars spend the same way. You cut all these people out, you're going to cut consumer demand and you're going to send this economy back into recession.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PLATTS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending a funeral.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 188. An act to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 98 West First Street, Yuma, Arizona, as the "John M. Roll United States Courthouse".

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 11, 2011, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

336. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluazinam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0032; FRL-8859-3] received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

337. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the Navy Fisher House annual report for Fiscal Year 2010; to the Committee on Armed Services.

338. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting an accreditation report conducted by the Commission

on Accreditation of Rehabilitation (CARF) and the Continuing Care Accreditation Commission (CCAC), pursuant to 24 U.S.C. 418; to the Committee on Armed Services.

339. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] [Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1160] received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

340. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting report on transactions involving U.S. exports to the Republic of Azerbaijan pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

341. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report on the activities of the National 911 Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

342. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — List of Non-conforming Vehicles Decided To Be Eligible for Importation [Docket No.: NHTSA-2010-0125] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

343. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan and Operating Permits Program; State of Missouri [EPA-R07-OAR-2010-0176; FRL-9248-6] received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

344. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determinations of Attainment by the Applicable Attainment Date for the Hayden, Nogales, Paul Spur/Douglas PM10 Nonattainment Areas, Arizona [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0718; FRL-9250-1] received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

345. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Minnesota; Gopher Resource, LLC [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0675; FRL-9250-8] received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

346. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Mississippi: Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Nitrogen Oxides as a Precursor to Ozone; Correction [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0041-201058(c); FRL-9250-4] received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

347. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Adoption of 8-hour Ozone Standard and Related Reference Conditions, and Update of Appendices [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0881; FRL-9251-9] received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

348. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Amendments to Existing Regulation Provisions Concerning Case-by-Case Reasonably

Available Control Technology [EPA-R03-OAR-2008-0780; FRL-9251-8] received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

349. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for Fossil-Fuel-Fired, Electric Utility, Industrial-Commercial-Institutional, and Small Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0031; FRL-92551-1] (RIN: 2060-AQ46) received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

350. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Waste Confidence Decision Update [NRC-2008-0482] received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

351. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor that was declared in Executive Order 13348 of July 22, 2004, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

352. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 28-10 informing of an intent to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

353. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting annual certification concerning the continued effectiveness of the Australia Group; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

354. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

355. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Lebanon that was declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

356. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the semi-annual report on the activities of the Inspector General for the period April 1, 2010 through September 30, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

357. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting notification of the new mileage reimbursement rates for Federal employees who use privately owned vehicles (POVs), including privately owned automobiles, motorcycles, and airplanes, while on official travel, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5707(b)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

358. A letter from the Deputy Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — New Agency

Logos [NARA-10-0006] (RIN: 3095-AB70) received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

359. A letter from the Associate Special Counsel for Legal Counsel and Policy, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

360. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting account balance in the Defense Cooperation Account as of December 31, 2010, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2608; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

361. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting transmitting an order that would cancel construction debt assessed against Indian-owned Lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

362. A letter from the Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 0908191244-91427-02] (RIN: 0648-XA070) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

363. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; USS Fort Worth Launch, Marinette, Wisconsin [Docket No.: USCG-2010-1044] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

364. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Traffic Separation Schemes: In the Strait of Juan de Fuca and its Approaches; in Puget Sound and its Approaches; and in Haro Strait, Boundary Pass, and the Strait of Georgia [Docket No.: USCG-2002-12702] (RIN: 1625-AA48) received January 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

365. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 777-200, -300, and -300ER Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2007-27042; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-225-AD; Amendment 39-16531; AD 2010-24-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

366. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30758 Amdt. No. 3404] received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

367. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Using Agency for Restricted Areas R-5301; R5302A, B, and C; and R-5313A, B, C, and D; NC [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1071; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-28] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

368. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a statement of action with respect to the GAO report GAO-11-107; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

369. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Corrections: Matters Subject to Protest and Various Protest Time Limits [CBP Dec. 11-02] received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

370. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2011-7] received January 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

371. A letter from the Secretary Attorney General, Department of Health and Human Services Department of Justice, transmitting the thirteenth Annual Report on the Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control (HCFAC) Program for Fiscal Year 2010; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

372. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, transmitting the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (SIGIR) January 2011 Quarterly Report; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

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. CONNOLLY of Virginia (for himself, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 11. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Build America Bonds program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Ms. SUTTON):

H.R. 601. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal fossil fuel subsidies for large oil companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 602. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to make improvements to the individualized education program under that Act and facilitate the transition of children with disabilities to adulthood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 603. A bill to amend the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 to provide assistance to States for development and implementation of an individual transition plan for each individual with a developmental disability in the State who is making the transition from the secondary school system into adulthood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 604. A bill to amend the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to authorize grants for the transition of youths with significant disabilities to adulthood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COLE, Mr. DENT, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 605. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 606. A bill to establish a Commission to provide for the abolishment of Federal programs for which a public need does not exist, to periodically review the efficiency and public need for Federal programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. LONG, and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 607. A bill to enhance public safety by making more spectrum available to public safety agencies, to facilitate the development of a wireless public safety broadband network, to provide standards for the spectrum needs of public safety agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 608. A bill to expand the Alpine Lakes Wilderness in the State of Washington, to designate the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River and Pratt River as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COLE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SEN-SENBRENNER, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 609. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the corporate income tax rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KLINE, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. DOLD):

H.R. 610. A bill to authorize the issuance of United States bonds to fund Alzheimer's research; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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. RUSH:

H.R. 611. A bill to foster transparency about the commercial use of personal information, provide consumers with meaningful choice about the collection, use, and disclosure of such information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. STARK, Mr. FARR, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. WU, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HONDA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 612. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to permanently prohibit the conduct of offshore drilling on the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of California, Oregon, and Washington; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 613. A bill to strengthen Buy America requirements applicable to airports, highways, high-speed rail, trains, and transit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. FALCOMA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. STARK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 614. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the age of eligibility of dependent children for receipt of transferred educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 615. A bill to amend the Arms Export Control Act to provide that certain firearms listed as curios or relics may be imported into the United States by a licensed importer without obtaining authorization from the Department of State or the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STARK, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 616. A bill to provide that 4 of the 12 weeks of parental leave made available to a Federal employee shall be paid leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. MATHESON (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 617. A bill to prohibit the importation of certain low-level radioactive waste into the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 618. A bill to develop a rare earth materials program, to amend the National Materials and Minerals Policy, Research and Development Act of 1980, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 619. A bill to rescind amounts for certain surface transportation programs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. YODER, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. WEST, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HECK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DOLD, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 620. A bill to rescind unobligated stimulus funds and require that such funds be used for Federal budget deficit reduction; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado:

H.R. 621. A bill to deauthorize the Military Selective Service Act, including the registration requirement and the activities of civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and similar local agencies of the Selective Service System, except during a national emergency declared by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 622. A bill to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. BACA (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 623. A bill to establish the National Commission on State Workers' Compensation Laws; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 624. A bill to establish the First State National Historical Park in the State of Delaware, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 625. A bill to ensure that the victims and victims' families of the November 5, 2009, attack at Fort Hood, Texas, receive the same treatment, benefits, and honors as those Americans who have been killed or wounded in a combat zone overseas and their families; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. CLEAVER:

H.R. 626. A bill to require the Secretary of Education to establish a pilot program to award grants to State and local educational agencies to develop financial literacy programs in elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 627. A bill to require energy audits to be conducted for any single-family and multifamily housing purchased using federally related housing loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 628. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to temporarily reinstate, with certain adjustments, the Emergency Contingency Fund for State Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 629. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the private activity bond rules to except certain uses of intellectual property from the definition of private business use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRITZ:

H.R. 630. A bill to waive the annuity buyback requirement under the Federal Employees Retirement Service with respect to certain law enforcement officers involuntarily called or retained on active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 631. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a base minimum wage for tipped employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 632. A bill to permit a State to elect to receive the State's contributions to the Highway Trust Fund in lieu of its Federal-aid Highway program apportionment for the next fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 633. A bill to rescind unused earmarks; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 634. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate that up to 10 percent of their income tax liability be used to reduce the national debt, and to require spending reductions equal to the amounts so designated; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. FORBES:

H.R. 635. A bill to require that all Federal agencies, contractors, and government-sponsored enterprises use the words "mother" and "father" when describing parents in all official documents and forms; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 636. A bill to repeal PPACA and the health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a refundable credit against income tax for the purchase of private health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, House Administration, Appropriations, Natural Resources, the Judiciary, and Rules, 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. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs.

MYRICK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 637. A bill to amend the procedures regarding military recruiter access to secondary school student recruiting information; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed 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 Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H.R. 638. A bill to impose a moratorium on the use of appropriated funds for official travel outside of the United States by Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives until the Comptroller General issues a report on the costs of such travel and makes recommendations regarding appropriate restrictions and reporting requirements on such travel; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETRI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. STARK, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WOLF, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 639. A bill to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to clarify that countervailing duties may be imposed to address subsidies relating to a fundamentally undervalued currency of any foreign country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 640. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Acquired Bone Marrow Failure Disease Registry, to authorize research on acquired bone marrow failure diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 641. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to establish the Of-

fice of the District Attorney for the District of Columbia, headed by a locally elected and independent District Attorney, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PENCE (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MACK, Mr. TURNER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. JONES, Mr. AMASH, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DREIER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HARPER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. WEST, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. FOXF, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BONNER, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. LANDRY, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. KLINE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 642. A bill to prevent the Federal Communications Commission from repromulgating the fairness doctrine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 643. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain land located in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 644. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the roles and responsibilities of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROSS of Arkansas (for himself and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 645. A bill to restore Second Amendment rights in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 646. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to be used to recruit, hire, and train 100,000 new classroom paraprofessionals in order to improve educational achievement

for children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 647. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit an exchange of land between the city of Ketchum and the Blaine County School District, Idaho; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 648. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to authorize members of the Armed Forces not in uniform and veterans to render a military salute during the recitation of the pledge of allegiance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 649. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require consolidation of the defense exchange stores system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 650. A bill to amend title XII of the Social Security Act to extend the provision waiving certain interest payments on advances made to States from the Federal unemployment account in the Unemployment Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JONES, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 651. A bill to require the President to seek to negotiate and enter into a bilateral status of forces agreement with the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. CARTER):

H.R. 652. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to limit the increase of premiums, deductibles, copayments, or other charges for health care provided under the TRICARE program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MACK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LONG, and Mr. POSEY):

H. Res. 82. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to establish the Committee on the Elimination of Nonessential Federal Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H. Res. 83. A resolution recognizing National Nurses Week on May 6 through May 12, 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MORAN:

H. Res. 84. A resolution commemorating 100 years of natural resource conservation achievements made possible through the vision and leadership of Representative John W. Weeks and the enactment of the Weeks Act in 1911; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Agriculture, 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. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms.

BASS of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. WATT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H. Res. 85. A resolution supporting the democratic aspirations of the Ivoirian people and calling on the United States to apply intense diplomatic pressure and provide humanitarian support in response to the political crisis in Cote d'Ivoire; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

3. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Indiana, relative to House Resolution No. 5 supporting the participation of Taiwan in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4. Also, a memorial of the Congress of the Federated States Of Micronesia, relative to Congressional Resolution No. 16-154 expressing condolences to those affected by the violence in Arizona; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 11.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation regarding income taxes. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that "Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . ." (Section 8, Clause 1). Further clarifying Congressional power to enact an income tax, voters amended the Constitution by popular vote to provide that "Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived . . ." (Sixteenth Amendment).

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 602.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 603.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 604.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 605.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 606.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8, Section 9 and Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 607.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 608.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 609.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 610.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to borrow money on the credit of the United States; To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; and to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 2 & 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 611.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

[The Congress shall have Power] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes. U.S. Const., Art. I, §8, Cl. 3. More specifically, the Interstate Commerce

Clause—the second of the three enumerated commerce clause powers that the Constitution confers upon Congress—serves as the constitutional basis for this legislation. Further, per the landmark U.S. Supreme Court case, *Griswold v. Connecticut* (1965), the Court held that the Constitution protects an individual's right to privacy, which is contained in the "penumbras" and "emanations" of other constitutional protections. Three of the concurrences to the majority *Griswold* opinion based the right to privacy on both the Ninth Amendment and the due process clause found in the Fourteenth Amendment. Finding such support in the Fourteenth Amendment is notable, in part, as at least ten (10) states (AL, AZ, CA, FL, HI, IL, LA, MO, SC, WA) expressly recognize a person's right to privacy in their own state constitutions. Elected federal public officials, federal and state policy makers, industry, consumer and privacy advocacy groups all agree that personal privacy of consumer information must be protected in order for e-commerce business models and businesses (in particular), which make use of Internet- and intranet-based platforms and networks to be successful and sustainable.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 612.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1—The Legislative Branch, Section 8—Powers of Congress: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession

of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 613.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1—The Legislative Branch, Section 8—Powers of Congress: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 614.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 615.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 616.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 617.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and 18.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 618.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 619.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 620.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ."

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado:

H.R. 621.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 622.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 623.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution; Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution; and Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution Clause 14, which grants Congress the power to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CRITZ:

H.R. 630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. EDWARDS:

H.R. 631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is authorized to enact this legislation under the Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." Additionally, Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to the Preamble of the Constitution, "to promote the general welfare."

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8, which include the power to "lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises, to pay the debts . . ."

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8, which include the power to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States . . ."

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8, which include the power to "lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises, to pay the debts . . ."

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 and Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 636.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for the Fairness for Military Recruiters Act is Article I, Section 8, Clause I. Also, Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12, 13, 14 and 16.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H.R. 638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties and to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 641.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PENCE:

H.R. 642.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill protects against infringement upon the essential liberty of freedom of speech, in accordance with Amendment I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 643.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 644.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution which states that the "Congress shall have the Power To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution which states that the "Congress shall have the Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. ROSS of Arkansas:

H.R. 645.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 646.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes," Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which gives Congress the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States," and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers."

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 647.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 648.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 649.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; the Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 650.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; the Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 652.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 5: Mr. COLE, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 21: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 24: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 68: Mr. PITTS and Mr. BARTON of Texas.
 H.R. 69: Mr. PITTS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H.R. 86: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H.R. 91: Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. NUGENT.
 H.R. 96: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BACHUS, and Ms. JENKINS.
 H.R. 97: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 100: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 110: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. BOSWELL.
 H.R. 114: Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 118: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 121: Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 140: Mr. ADAMS, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 143: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 152: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 153: Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 155: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 177: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 198: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 205: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. LUJÁN.
 H.R. 218: Mr. FARR, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 280: Mr. FORBES and Mr. ADERHOLT.
 H.R. 290: Ms. FOXX and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 297: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
 H.R. 302: Mr. LABRADOR.
 H.R. 303: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BARROW, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 304: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 305: Mr. FLORES.
 H.R. 308: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 327: Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 330: Mr. CRITZ.
 H.R. 335: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 337: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 340: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 349: Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 358: Mr. STEARNS.
 H.R. 361: Mr. LATTI, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LONG, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. CRITZ.
 H.R. 365: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 372: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 397: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 399: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
 H.R. 402: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 412: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 421: Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. STUTZMAN.
 H.R. 431: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 432: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 435: Mr. PETRI.
 H.R. 436: Mr. POSEY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. ROYCE.
 H.R. 440: Mr. FORBES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. PENCE.
 H.R. 457: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. JONES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LATTI, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
 H.R. 458: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 469: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 497: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 498: Mr. REED, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
 H.R. 509: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 535: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 547: Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 548: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HALL, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. HARPER, Mr. JONES, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. LONG, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 559: Mr. ALEXANDER.
 H.R. 567: Mr. GOWDY and Mr. PETRI.
 H.R. 584: Mr. POLIS.
 H.J. Res. 1: Mr. CAMP, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr.

NUNNELEE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.J. Res. 2: Mr. QUAYLE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. YODER, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. WOMACK.
 H.J. Res. 15: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. GERLACH.
 H.J. Res. 23: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H. Con. Res. 3: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H. Res. 15: Mr. FORBES.
 H. Res. 25: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FARR, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H. Res. 35: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H. Res. 44: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H. Res. 55: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H. Res. 69: Ms. NORTON, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HOLT, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. WU, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H. Res. 81: Mr. MARKEY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF MICHIGAN

The provisions in H.R. 514 that warranted a referral to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII:

2. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 624 requesting that the United States Senate and House of Representatives pass bills S. 1619 and H.R. 4690; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Financial Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce.