United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2011 No. 136

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 14, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFF DENHAM 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.

WE NEED A REAL JOBS AGENDA, NOT ANOTHER ROUND OF NAFTA-STYLE DEALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, you want to know why we have a budget deficit?

We have a budget deficit because we have a jobs deficit, and we have a jobs deficit because our Nation has been outsourcing millions of jobs for over a quarter century. White House after White House and Congress after Congress have allowed our manufacturing and jobs base to be whittled away through a trade regimen that outsources U.S. production and American jobs, financed by the same big Wall Street banks that caused the financial meltdown.

Year after year the United States continues to rack up enormous trade deficits with nation after nation. The numbers don't lie. They tell us that over 2.7 million manufacturing jobs alone were lost just during the Bush administration. Washington must finally confront our so-called free trade failed policies if we are going to be serious about creating jobs in order to balance the budget.

Last year, the trade deficit was another astonishing half a trillion dollars. Imagine a half a trillion, plus a half a trillion, plus a half a trillion, plus a half a trillion year after year after year. That equaled, just for last year, 7 million American jobs that were not created here because of our job-killing trade policies.

Rather than stopping this enormous outsourcing of America, we're being offered up more of the same, more failed free trade agreements, this time with Korea, Panama, Colombia.

Has Washington learned nothing, or are the economic powers that outsource these jobs bearing down on Washington so greatly that the American people can't be heard? The public's interest is being suppressed.

These agreements are another expansion of the same policies and processes that were enacted with NAFTA. We were all told in 1993 that NAFTA would create millions of jobs. Instead, we have seen exactly the opposite, millions of jobs decimated.

Our trade deficit with Mexico last year was over $66 billion in the red. In 1993, proponents of NAFTA, like Gary Huffbauer and economist Jeffrey Schott, promised we would have, and I quote them, ''an annual current account surplus with Mexico of about $10 billion through the 1990s.'' That was an absolute falsehood. Obviously, they were all wrong, dead wrong. Instead, we saw over a third of all manufacturing jobs in the United States disappear since we signed that agreement and $1 trillion accumulated trade deficit with Mexico. Not a single year since NAFTA's is passage was the U.S. in the black.

We heard the exact same fairy tale regarding China's Permanent Most Favored Nation Status. We were told that that agreement in 1998 would create millions of jobs in America. Instead, the result has been a cumulative $2 trillion trade deficit with China alone.

When you think about the budget deficit, you'd better think about the trade deficit because they are absolutely interlinked. You're not going to balance the budget until the American people go back to work, and they can't go back to work when their jobs are being sent elsewhere.

If you always do what you have always done, you will always get what you always got.

The Economic Policy Institute's analysis predicts that the agreement that's proposed with South Korea will cost us an additional 159,000 jobs in our country. Since this January, we have already rung up, look at the numbers, over $7 billion trade deficit with South Korea. With passage of the proposed agreement, do you think it's going to make the job situation better?

If you want to see just how poorly negotiated the Korea deal is, take a quick look at the auto provisions. There's no reciprocity. Last year, Korea sold nearly half a million cars in our country; 500,000 cars. The United States, you know how much we sell to them? Six thousand. What kind of deal is that?

And we'll be lucky if, under this agreement, where there's a hope that we might sell perhaps, 75,000 cars to Korea, so, they get a half a million, we get a handful? How's that a credible plan to create jobs in our country?

Printed on recycled paper.

And then there are the other two proposed agreements with Panama and Colombia, the latest NAFTA expansion. What are the major commercial interests there?

The Government Accountability Office has identified Panama as a major haven for, guess what, tax avoidance. Panama is a popular destination for the very same multinational corporations that want to avoid paying their fair share of U.S. taxes by creating offshore subsidiaries.

And how about Colombia, which is the most dangerous country in the world if you care about labor rights, and no free country in the world does not have labor rights. Over 2,000 trade unionists, 2,000 have been assassinated there since 1990. What a pleasant place to do business. And there has been no justice for their victims and their families in the majority of those murder cases.

And what is the largest economic interest we have with Colombia? It has three letters. It isn't a place to export U.S.-made goods. Rather, it's more oil imports.

How can those that support these failed trade agreements want more?

We need to create jobs in this country again because, in order to balance the budget, you have to put the American people back to work, and you can't do that when you're outsourcing more of their jobs and importing more into our nation than we export.

PASS E-VERIFY TO CREATE AMERICAN JOBS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for 2 years, 14 million Americans have been out of work. Yet illegal workers hold 7 million jobs. It is inexcusable that American workers have to compete with illegal immigrants for scarce jobs.

Congress has the opportunity to open up millions of jobs for unemployed Americans by requiring all U.S. employers to use E-Verify. This program checks the Social Security numbers of new hires. E-Verify is free, quick and easy to use. Individuals eligible to work in the U.S. are confirmed 99.5 percent of the time.

The public also supports E-Verify. According to a recent Rasmussen poll, 82 percent of likely voters think businesses should be required to use E-Verify to determine if a new employee is in the country legally. This is one of the most important job creation bills Congress should pass and the President should sign.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON DEFICIT REDUCTION

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this week the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction began work on a roadmap to bring down our Nation's deficit and restore our fiscal health. They heard from Doug Elmendorf, Director of the Congressional Budget Office, who reiterated once again what we already know, our Nation's current fiscal position is not sustainable.

We also know that the problem we're facing stems, in part, from buying things without paying for them, including two wars, tax cuts for the wealthiest in America, and a prescription drug program. But what matters now is taking action.

□ 1010

Over the month of August, we heard very clearly from the American public that they want us to work together on the issues they are most concerned about: jobs and the deficit. Action on one issue will directly impact on the other.

Creating jobs and growing the economy is one of the most important things we can do to bring down the deficit. And getting a handle on our fiscal situation will give confidence to encourage economic growth and job creation. Both the Bowles-Simpson and Domenici-Rivlin fiscal commissions supported this tenet by calling for immediate action to boost the economy while laying out a plan to reduce the deficit over the long term. This is why the joint select committee must succeed.

We have a responsibility to show Americans and the international community that we can meet the challenges we face, that we can join together and make the tough decisions necessary to spur growth and to bring our debt under control.

I believe the committee must go beyond the $1.5 trillion target in the deficit reduction bill if we hope to strengthen our economy and seriously change our Nation's fiscal outlook.

Over 60 economists and former Members of Congress signed a letter encouraging the joint select committee to reach the biggest agreement possible, and I want to join with them in that request. In their letter, signed by co-chairs of both the Bowles-Simpson and Domenici-Rivlin fiscal commissions, among others, they state, ''We believe that a 'go big' approach that goes well beyond the $1.5 trillion deficit reduction goal that the committee has been charged with and includes major reforms of entitlement programs and the Tax Code is necessary to bring the debt down to a manageable and sustainable level, improve the long-term fiscal imbalance, reassure markets, and restore Americans' faith in the political system.''

I am in absolute agreement with that proposition. As the letter I just quoted indicates, the committee must also put all options on the table. That's a challenge on the Republican side; that's a challenge on the Democratic side. But it must be done because we cannot get to where we need to get without doing so.

The math is irrefutable. We cannot get to where we need to go if we ignore revenues or if we fail to ensure our safety net is sustainable for generations to come. A balanced approach that looks at defense spending, revenues, and entitlements is the only real way we're going to put America's fiscal house back in order.

A balanced approach is also key to making sure everyone pays their fair share. We cannot ask the middle class families and seniors to bear the entire burden of balancing the budget. The most well-off among us, which is most of us, by the way, in this body must also contribute to that objective.

But as we focus on ways to restore our budget balance, we cannot and must not forget the immediate jobs crisis that too many families face.

Any plan to bring down the deficit must start, as Bowles-Simpson and Domenici-Rivlin both observed, with getting people back to work. That is why I hope Republicans and Democrats will work together to bring the President's proposed American Jobs Act to the floor for a vote without delay. As the President said, we have 14 months to wait until the next election. People without jobs, people's whose homes are underwater, people who have lost their homes, they don't have 14 months to wait.

The jobs program suggested by the President mirrors many components included in the House Democrats' Make It In America agenda and will help create jobs in the short term.

All of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, must be invested in the committee's success. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be committed to the success of reaching agreement in this committee of 12. This is a time to put partisan politics aside and do the hard things, very hard things, the courageous things that we have to do for our country.

I believe we're equal to the task. And I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, if we are not equal to the task, then all of our citizens will rightfully be extraordinarily disappointed, as they are today, in their elected representatives on both sides of the aisle.

Success of this committee, success of this House and the Senate in reaching and meeting the challenge that confronts us is essential if the confidence level of our own citizens and the international community is to be raised and given the level necessary for future success.

AMERICAN LAND ACT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many, many years ago the second American Revolution took place when Washington, D.C., was invaded by the British in the War of 1812. Many forget that the Capitol, the White House, and Washington, D.C., were burned to the

ground by the British. And after the War of 1812 was over with, America found itself in a situation that's not unfamiliar with us today. America was out of money.

So what did people decide to do here in this body of Congress about how to get more money into the Federal Treasury? They thought of a unique approach that maybe we ought to think of and do today.

Right now we talk about raising taxes, cutting spending, and we need more revenue. Maybe we ought to think outside of the box when it comes to revenue instead of more government taking from the people and giving it to its special groups. Let's do what they did at the end of the War of 1812.

The Federal Government decided that it would sell some of the land to Americans—what a novel thought—and let Americans own America. They could produce that land, and then they could pay more taxes. And that's what they did at the end of the War of 1812.

We talk about the land in America. Who is the biggest landowner in this country? Uncle Sam. Uncle Sam owns 27 percent of the land mass in the United States. This poster here shows the land area in red, including Alaska, that is owned by the Federal Government, Uncle Sam. Twenty-seven percent of the land! Half of the land west of the Mississippi, or in the West, belongs to the Federal Government. Those folks in the West, half of it belongs to Uncle Sam. He's their neighbor in every western State. It's different in the East because much of that land was sold at the end of the War of 1812.

Now, 27 percent, what does that mean? That's really hard to understand how much that is. If you were to superimpose the 27 percent of the land mass in the United States into Europe, you would find that Uncle Sam would own almost all of Europe. Western Europe is about 27 percent of the land mass of the United States. And of course that includes the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Germany, Austria, Italy, Poland, and even Spain.

Now, we're talking about a lot of land. Does Uncle Sam really need all of that land? Much of it's unproductive, not paying any taxes, not paying any revenue to local and State governments.

So maybe we should do something that our forefathers, our ancestors did—sell some of that land to Americans and allow that revenue to come into the Federal Treasury so we can pay off all of our debts that we have accumulated over the years. Twenty-seven percent of the land mass is 623 million acres in this country.

Ronald Reagan tried to do that when he was President, but it did not go very far at all. You know, even President Obama mentioned about a month ago that there's 300 acres in Los Angeles County that's owned by the Federal Government. We could sell that for $2 billion.

So maybe we need to think outside of the box. I've introduced the American Land Act. We talk about the American Jobs Act. The American Land Act would require that the Federal Government sell a portion of that land over a period of years.

Now, I want to be careful to state we're not talking about the national parks. We're not talking about Yosemite. We're not talking about the marshes and environmentally sensitive areas in this country. We're talking about unused land by the Federal Government. And then we could raise some revenue.

I believe that this could be up to about $200 billion of revenue that would be brought into the United States. Sell it to Americans and that will bring revenue into our treasury. When Americans own America, they can also develop that land. Then they can be productive and then they can pay even more taxes.

□ 1020

When people own land, they pay property tax. That tax primarily goes to local and State governments, which pays for our school systems. So that undeveloped land, that unused land, some of that should be sold to Americans. Let Americans buy American. Real property in the hands of real Americans. What a novel thought that is.

Uncle Sam, the Federal Government, is all about power and control over everything. Loosen up a little, and let Americans buy part of America. Uncle Sam shouldn't prevent Americans from having a real stake or share in our country, the United States of America. It doesn't belong to Uncle Sam—at least it shouldn't. It should belong to Americans. The United States owns most of the grand estate in this country, and it's time to let more Americans own it because America should belong to Americans.

And that's just the way it is.

A REFLECTION ON THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING SYSTEM AND LABOR UNIONS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It is unfortunate there is an attempt to scapegoat America's unions for the economic problems that beset us.

After all, it was not America's grocery clerks, nurses, teachers, postal workers, and electricians who nearly caused the meltdown of the economy. It wasn't America's labor unions that were pushing for tax loopholes that made our revenue system a hopeless, inefficient mess. It wasn't unions that pushed for shortcuts for worker safety that produced the tragedy that we've seen in our mines. America's working men and women didn't engineer poor loans, systematically cheat consumers, and transform financial institutions into giant casinos.

No doubt there were some consumers who took unfair advantage as well as others who were not as vigilant as they should have been in the financial meltdown; but the truth is they were part of an unprecedented economic scheme that played on those weaknesses, the gullibility and some individual greed to make it into a vast industry.

Are there some areas where unions are too effective in securing benefits for their members? That probably depends on who you ask about the give and take of the collective bargaining process. The leadership of unions are, in fact, much more democratic than their corporate counterparts. Union officials are routinely challenged for reelection. There are insurgents even in the most powerful and entrenched unions, something one seldom sees on the boards of public corporations. How many business directors are defeated? It's not easy to even have opposing nominees through today's shareholder democracy. It's pretty sketchy compared with what happens with unions.

There is a very direct remedy for union power in the negotiation process. For 18 years, I was a local elected official, part of that time responsible for a collective bargaining program. I like to think that I bargained tough but that I bargained fair—but I bargained. I've supported collective bargaining rights for public employees since I was first in the Oregon legislature and still believe that honest, tough, principled negotiations will lead to the best results.

Having someone attempt to dictate working conditions unilaterally is not calculated to produce enhanced productivity. It matters how people are treated and how they feel. Employee-owned corporations illustrate this principle in spades, some of which are not only employee-owned but have unions in addition. One of the best performing of the world's economy is Germany, where they still manufacture and have a huge export market for high-value products. The Germans work hard to integrate labor and business with government in the decision-making process, something that is, sadly, too rare in the United States.

Unions are not the answer for every employee and every company, but every employee and every company ought to have that option. Even companies that are nonunion benefit. I've had executives from successful companies candidly tell me that they treat their employees right because they don't want them to unionize. Even these nonunion company employees benefit from higher wages, better benefits, and a system that respects worker rights because of the competition with the unions.

Instead of treating employees fairly by allowing them to organize, far too many corporations have chosen instead to attack the fundamentals of collective bargaining. It is today an art form in some companies to stall, delay, intimidate, even to flagrantly violate the

laws of collective bargaining in this country, weak as they are and as ineffectively as they are enforced.

Collective bargaining has been systematically under attack by my Republican friends in Congress as Republican administrations have fought to make a National Labor Relations Board that is toothless, passive and unable or unwilling to protect the rights of employees to organize. This is not calculated to produce a spirit of cooperation. It is not clear that people need to cheat in order to avoid any excesses of collective bargaining.

I would argue the opposite.

It's not just workers in companies, union and nonunion, who benefit from unions. American society benefits. It was organized labor that spearheaded the effort for a 40-hour workweek. It is not just rhetoric that unions brought you the weekend. Unions have played a key role in extending security to millions of Americans in the workplace, in consumer safety and in environmental protections.

Again I don't pretend unions are perfect and I've had some differences with them over the years. But make no mistake: Unions are amongst the few who stand up to some of the more egregious economic follies, for justice in the workplace, for protecting the unorganized, fighting for a minimum wage, even a living wage.

It's important to reflect about our collective bargaining system. I'm all for fine tuning, but I am adamantly opposed to gutting rights and protection of workers.

I think we all should start by acknowledging the debt we owe to unions and work to stop this wholesale assault on America's workers.

THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION, ''THE SINGLE BIGGEST IMPEDIMENT TO JOB GROWTH''

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. A legendary Georgia businessman recently called the Obama administration ''the single biggest impediment to job growth.''

That same man, Mr. Bernie Marcus, also says the business that he founded would have never succeeded if he were trying to start it today. Home Depot, his Georgia-based company, currently has more than 2,200 stores all across the United States. They support more than 300,000 American jobs, and they generated $68 billion in revenue just last year.

Now, imagine the impact on our country if companies that start out like Home Depot—which started as an individual store—or other small businesses weren't able to flourish. That is what the Obama administration is trying to do to the American Dream today. By creating a huge bill with ObamaCare and a failed stimulus bill and by piling thousands of new government regulations onto the backs of small businesses, it is no wonder that job creators are afraid to expand and hire new people.

And so, after 2½ years of growing the Federal Government and $4.5 trillion in spending later, the Obama administration has given us another proposal of the same old failed policies. Unfortunately, their latest solution to our 9 percent unemployment rate comes with a price tag of almost a half trillion dollars, money that we just simply do not have. So to pay for the American Jobs Act, as I like to call it ''stimulus part II,'' our Democrat leaders want to hike taxes on families and job creators.

We've been down this road before. The stimulus did not work 2 years ago, and it will not work today. Hiking taxes in the middle of a recession will make our economy worse, not better. When will this administration learn that more of the same just simply isn't good enough anymore? Jobs will come when government gets out of the way—by getting rid of ObamaCare, by stopping the reckless spending here in Washington and the threat of higher taxes, and by ending the uncertainty in the marketplace.

□ 1030

Congress needs to pass my jobs bill, which would immediately and permanently lower the corporate tax rate to zero, and it will permanently lower the capital gains tax to zero. This will stimulate our small businesses so that they can do what they do best, grow, expand and to thrive.

In the words of Mr. Marcus, the founder of Home Depot, ''It's time to stand up and fight.''

The free enterprise system has made this country what it is today, and we must have policy that makes it prosper.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS FOR PUERTO RICAN CIVILIANS

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask us to take action on a scathing Department of Justice investigation of a police department that ''regularly violates the constitutional rights of civilians through illegal searches, detentions, and arrests,'' that ''continues to demonstrate a deliberate indifference to the public's safety and the civil rights of individuals engaging in protected speech activities during protests,'' a police force where ''officers engage in a pattern and practice of unreasonable force and other misconduct to suppress the exercise of protected First Amendment rights.''

The report details the abuse against the people of Puerto Rico that they are facing by the Puerto Rico Police Department. Underscore, I said, ''I rise to bring the urgent attention of the U.S. House of Representatives to a human rights and civil rights crisis.'' I further stated, ''where the right of students to protest and speak their minds is being denied with clubs and mace and pepper spray.''

I spoke those words 7 months ago on this floor. The DOJ report states that the Governor of Puerto Rico has ''supreme authority'' over the police. Did he use that supreme authority to respond to Puerto Ricans who asked for help? Yes, he did.

The Governor's ruling party took immediate action after I detailed the abuse. The ruling party was outraged. It was outraged at me. Facing a civil rights crisis, the ruling party of Puerto Rico acted without hesitation, convening the legislature to urgently pass legislation to censure me for speaking out.

In part, the censure reads: ''Congressman LUIS GUTIERREZ made false allegations about a supposed human rights crisis in Puerto Rico; he expressed himself in a denigrating and malicious manner about the honorable body of the Puerto Rico police; all of which tends to hurt the good image and good name of Puerto Rico.''

Here's the problem: The ruling party of Puerto Rico has made clear time and time again they are not concerned about the abuse of their people, only that the world might notice that abuse. They don't seem to understand that if you love people, you stand up and you speak out, not pretend that everything is all right.

For standing up, the Government of Puerto Rico gave me a 600-word censure. But the government didn't give one word, not one word of censure, to what happened to Rachel Hiskes.

Here's what the DOJ describes happened to her:

''A student journalist, Rachel Hiskes, entered the Capitol with other individuals and attempted to access the senate chambers.

''Puerto Rico Police Department officers, who had been dispatched to the capitol earlier in the day, stopped Hiskes and hit her.

''She was not resisting or combative. Hiskes then sat in the hallway with other visitors in protest. A capitol employee then sprayed Hiskes and others with chemical irritants.

''As Hiskes tried to get up, an officer hit her across the back with a baton, causing her to fall. An officer continued to push and strike her with his baton, driving her toward the doorway.

''When she reached the door and had her back to the officer, the officer shoved her out onto the concrete stairs using his baton and hitting her in the neck.

''Hiskes was never arrested or charged with any crime.''

Instead of protecting people like Rachel, the government derided the people.

This Governor's chief of staff, a man he has absurdly tasked with responding to the Department of Justice report, said protesting workers would be treated as ''terrorists'' and boasted he would

personally kick protesting students off campus.

This government cannot fix a problem they helped to create and expand.

The students, bloodied with batons, deserve more. The workers beaten and the journalists pepper-sprayed deserve more.

And, to be clear, the many honorable and brave Puerto Rican police officers, men and women who are incorruptible, who do their jobs right and risk their lives every day, they deserve more too.

When crimes like these are brought to light, we expect criminal indictments.

I want to see a special prosecutor appointed, the grand jury seated, the trials begun and see those responsible, not just the police officers following orders but those who directed the police to systematically suppress free speech, sent to jail.

The goal must be to reestablish the rule of law and to reestablish a police department in Puerto Rico that protects and serves the people. The goal must be a police department fighting crime, not committing crime. The goal must be that no government can act with impunity against its own people.

And I have one last recommendation. The Governor of Puerto Rico should apologize to his people. Puerto Ricans have called out for help. In response, the Governor and the ruling party have led an effort to demonize them for standing up for their civil rights.

Governor, the Department of Justice of the United States of America has just made clear that your people were right and you were wrong, and it is time for you to say you're sorry.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL THEODORE MALLORY III

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, there are men who watch life go by as a spectator, and then there are the Ted Mallorys of the world. In one of life's greatest mysteries, Ted Mallory's time on Earth came to an end June 26 after a late diagnosis of stomach cancer.

Major General Theodore ''Ted'' Mallory III had embraced his many gifts and lived one of the fullest lives I have ever been privileged enough to encounter. The Bible says: As iron sharpens iron, so one man sharpens another. Ted made it his personal mission to sharpen the lives of those men and women around him, and he pushed people to their highest potential.

After attending Auburn University, Ted entered into the U.S. Air Force Officer Training School in 1965 and graduated with the U.S. Air Force Outstanding Graduate Officer Award, among many other awards that he obtained while in training. These were the first of many commendations Ted would receive throughout his 36-year military career. A recipient of the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal, National Defense Service Medal with one bronze service star, Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Cross with Palm, and Global War on Terrorism Service Medal. Ted truly embodied the ideal airman. He was also awarded the Daughters of the American Revolution Medal of Honor. I would need an hour on this floor, Mr. Speaker, of time just to list all the rest of Ted's accomplishments.

His education did not stop at Auburn University. In addition to the military professional education programs offered through the Air Force, Ted is also an alumnus of the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

After he left active duty service, Ted entered into the Air National Guard, where he served for 30 years and held the roles of group commander, wing commander, and chief of staff. He was promoted to major general in 1997 and retired in 2001 as commander of the Air National Guard/Air Education and Training Command.

While serving in the Air National Guard, he remained active in his community, serving on the Fayette County school board for 10 years as chairman, and on the Georgia School Board Association as president in 1986. Ted served on several additional boards, including my academy nomination board, and was president of the Joseph Sams School board of directors, a school serving the needs of children with mental and physical disabilities, and Ted took me on a tour of that facility about 2 months before he passed away.

His accomplishments reach far beyond military service, though. Ted was also a very successful businessman in the aviation industry. His focus was always on safety and flying, where he was training new pilots, or as a senior vice president of Flight Operations and chief safety and security officer for ASTAR Air Cargo.

□ 1040

General Mallory is now flying sorties far above us all, watching down on his loved ones left behind. My wife, Joan, and I will continue to pray for Alice, his wife of 44 years, his soul mate; his children, Teddi and T.J. and their families; his grandchildren, Mallory and Thomas; and his sister and brother-in-law, Molly and Tom. May all those who have been touched by Ted's life find comfort knowing that his legacy will live on in both our lives and our memories.

So Ted, until we meet again one day, I want to thank you for everything you did to better our lives and our country. I miss you, Teddy. We all miss you.

A COST-EFFECTIVE CIVILIAN SURGE FOR AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the U.S. embassy and NATO headquarters in Kabul were attacked. The Taliban, which we know has exerted its influence in many of the remote regions of the country, is now flexing its muscle in the supposedly secure capital. It's just the latest piece of evidence that the military occupation of Afghanistan is having exactly the opposite of its intended effect. Nearly a decade after we allegedly defeated the Taliban and drove them from power, they remain as fearless and undaunted as ever.

The longer we have boots on the ground, the more we prop up the very enemy we are supposed to be fighting. And for this, the American people have the privilege of shelling out $10 billion a month.

I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, the ones who are lecturing us every day about cutting spending, isn't there something better we can do with the taxpayers' money?

Well, it turns out there is, and it would do more to promote security and counterterrorism than waging a bloody and violent war.

For years now, I've been promoting a platform I call ''SMART Security.'' SMART Security represents a wholesale change in the way we protect our country and promote our values abroad. It puts us in a position of partner, not invader. It's smart because it treats warfare as a very last resort. It's smart because it uses different tools to engage other nations and resolve global conflicts. It's smart because it emphasizes diplomacy, pursues multilateralism, promotes democracy, and respects human rights. And it's smart because it would dramatically increase our investment in international development projects that will lift people up instead of tearing their country down.

What we need in Afghanistan and poor countries around the world is a civilian surge, one that will rebuild infrastructure, power lines, schools, hospitals, economic opportunity, and much more, whatever that nation would find useful that we could help with.

You think it sounds expensive? It's a drop in the bucket. I'm talking about pennies on the dollar compared to a 10-year military occupation. In fact, The Washington Post noted last week that civilian efforts in Afghanistan have cost the United States about $1.7 billion over the last 2 years. Let's compare $1.7 billion over 2 years to $10 billion a month in Afghanistan. And even that level of funding is now facing tough scrutiny here on the Hill. Are you kidding me? Let's put this into perspective—$1.7 billion, we spend that much on the war in Afghanistan in less than a week, and that's what we invest in 2 years of civilian efforts.

If we ended this war, we could reinvest the money in the bigger, bolder surge that we really need and still have plenty left over to create jobs right

here at home and meet other important obligations. But right now, Mr. Speaker, our priorities are completely distorted. We are sacrificing the lives of our troops in a morally reprehensible war that is fiscally reckless and strategically an epic, historic failure. After 10 years, it's time to bring our troops home, make the change we so desperately need.

Embrace and adopt the principles of SMART Security.

TEXAS LEGISLATURE CALLS ON CONGRESS TO PASS BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks as I traveled across my district, the 24th District of Texas, it became very obvious to me that the number one issue on the minds of my constituents is out-of-control Federal spending.

In the last legislative session in Texas, my former colleagues in the Texas legislature passed a resolution addressing this out-of-control Federal spending. The resolution requested that the Congress pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution and send it to the States for ratification.

This is the resolution I have in my hand that was sent to me by the State representatives and the senators in my district that I represent. By overwhelming votes in both houses, the house and the senate, the Texas legislature passed this resolution that I'm holding right here in my hand. The Texas House of Representatives approved this bill by a vote of 115–17 on April 13, and the Senate adopted the bill on May 19 by a vote of 28–3.

This resolution calls on Congress to enact the best measure to stop runaway Federal spending. We can best ensure our future prosperity by passing a balanced budget amendment. I would like to personally thank the members of the Texas legislature that represent parts of my district, the 24th District of Texas. I applaud them for sending this resolution urging us to take action. My sincere thanks go to State Senator Jane Nelson, State Senator Chris Harris and State Senator John Carona, and to State representatives Vicki Truitt, Burt Solomons, Linda Harper-Brown, and Todd Smith. These brave men and women have taken a courageous stand on this issue, and I feel it's my obligation to follow through with their request.

The Federal Government must end sustained deficit spending. In fiscal year 2010, the Federal Government accumulated a deficit in excess of $1.3 trillion, an annual deficit that exceeds the entire gross State product of Texas. In order to finance our current deficit, we borrow 40 cents of every dollar we spend—40 cents on the dollar—money that could easily go to pay our national debt down.

The longer we wait only results in more debt, debt that we will pass along to our children and to our grandchildren. Our national debt currently stands at $14.7 trillion, which equals a debt per taxpayer of $131,288. This is a problem we can no longer ignore.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Texas legislature's request for prompt passage of a balanced budget amendment.

THE STATE OF TEXAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 18

Whereas, the gravity of federal debt and federal obligations was established early in American history, with deficit occurring only in relation to extraordinary circumstances, such as war; yet for much of the 20th century and into the 21st, the United States has operated on a budget deficit, including the 2010 budget year, which surpassed an astounding $1.3 trillion, an annual deficit that exceeded the entire gross state product of Texas; and

Whereas, the federal debt is greater than $14 trillion, a sum that if shared equally by each person in America would be a burden of over $45,000 per person, and yet the federal government continues to accrue debt; and

Whereas, the higher the deficit, the more the government must spend on paying interest on the debt; compounding the problem is the use of deficit spending, which becomes a responsibility for future generations of Americans to assume without their consent; and

Whereas, Congress has attempted to set budgetary restraints for itself in the form of a balanced budget amendment; the proposal won wide support in 1995, failing by only one vote in the senate; and

Whereas, many states have previously requested that Congress propose a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget, but Congress has proven to be unresponsive; and

Whereas, this growing burden of public debt is a threat to the nation's economic health, and action must be taken to restore fiscal responsibility; a balanced budget amendment would require the government not to spend more than it receives in revenues and compel lawmakers to carefully consider choices about spending and taxes; by encouraging spending control and discouraging deficit spending, a balanced budget amendment will help put the nation on the path to lasting prosperity; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 82nd Legislature of the State of Texas hereby respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to propose and submit to the states for ratification an amendment to the United States Constitution providing that except during a war declared by the Congress of the United States pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 11, United States Constitution, or other national emergency, the total of all federal appropriations for a fiscal year may not exceed the total of all estimated federal revenue for that fiscal year and providing for a spending limitation; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Texas Secretary of State forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the speaker of the house of representatives and the president of the senate of the United States Congress, and to all the members of the Texas delegation to the congress with the request that this resolution be officially entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

UNDERAGE DRINKING AND FTC WE DON'T SERVE TEENS INITIATIVE

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the topic of underage drinking. It is an issue that challenges every generation of public officials, parents, educators, law enforcement, industry members, and concerned citizens. But through bipartisan leadership and almost three decades of public and private effort, our Nation has made some substantial progress. I mention ''bipartisan'' because it was President Reagan who teamed up with Democrats in Congress to enact the National Minimum Drinking Age Act of 1984.

□ 1050

At the signing ceremony, the President's remarks are a great lesson in federalism and national leadership that remains very important today. He said that underage drinking is a problem that is ''bigger than the individual States.'' He called underage drinking a ''grave national problem'' that ''touches all our lives.'' President Reagan concluded, ''With the problem so clearcut and the proven solution at hand, we have no misgiving about this judicious use of Federal power.''

I said that this was a bipartisan effort. Our colleague from the other body, Senator LAUTENBERG from New Jersey, was instrumental in guiding the measure through Congress, and he continues to be a forceful advocate for young people today.

According to the National Highway Safety Administration, the number of fatalities in teen drunk driving crashes has declined 74 percent since the early 1980s. Studies from the Department of Transportation and Government Accountability Office indicate that the 21-year-old drinking age has saved tens of thousands of lives. Most government measures of underage drinking have also declined.

Parents, educators, and other adults who have influence on young people need to recognize that older teens are still capable of making youthful mistakes, and some of these mistakes can be fatal. We should not do anything that allows our young people to obtain alcohol before they reach the legal drinking age. We need to remain involved in their lives and do everything we can to encourage and insist that they make responsible decisions.

Back in 2006, our colleague LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD led the effort to enact the Sober Truth on Preventing Underage Drinking Act, better known as the STOP Act. The law established a framework for cooperation among Federal agencies with responsibility to address underage drinking. In mid-July, we received a report from the Federal Interagency Coordinating Committee that was formally established by the STOP Act. It documents Federal Government prevention initiatives across

17 agencies, including the Federal Trade Commission, which created the We Don't Serve Teens program as a public education and outreach initiative.

The 2011 launch of We Don't Serve Teens occurred last week in Chicago and throughout the Nation. One purpose of the We Don't Serve Teens initiative is to inform parents and all adults that teen drinking is not inevitable. Crown Imports and MillerCoors, the number two and number three American beer suppliers, are both headquartered in the district I represent in Chicago. Both companies have supported the We Don't Serve Teens program since it began in 2006.

I am pleased that these two companies have joined the FTC, Members of Congress, Chicago officials, and thousands of concerned citizens to support We Don't Serve Teens. We need everyone at the table. Industry members have a unique ability to reach out directly to local stores, bars, restaurants, and other places where alcohol is served.

The We Don't Serve Teens message is reinforced. I commend these efforts. I especially commend the distributors of these alcoholic beverages in their effort to make sure that teens handle alcohol responsibly. The best way is to not drink at all.

POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the founding member and a cochair of the Congressional Out of Poverty Caucus. The 42 members of the caucus work every day to ensure that we meet our economic and, yes, our moral obligation to the most vulnerable across this Nation—those people facing or living in poverty.

Yesterday, the United States Census Bureau released data showing that 2.6 million more Americans fell into poverty, making it 46.2 million people living in poverty in America. This is the highest number since the Census Bureau started keeping these records in 1959. Fifteen percent of Americans lived in poverty last year. The poverty rate among African Americans in 2010 was 27.4 percent; for nonwhite Hispanics it was 26.6 percent; for Asian Pacific Islanders it was 12.1 percent; and for non-Hispanic whites it was 9.9 percent.

Digging deeper into the disparities, the data reveals that the real median income declined for white and black households between 2009 and 2010. Real median income for each race and Hispanic-origin groups have not recovered to the pre-2001 recession all-time highs.

According to the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, the Census data reveals that both the number and percentages of people living in deep poverty hit record highs, meaning that some 20.5 million Americans had cash incomes below $11,000 for a family of four. In addition, the Census reports that the median household income fell 2.3 percent, or $1,100, in 2010.

Those at the bottom of the income scale have lost far more ground than those at the top. Income inequality continues to grow at alarming rates. We know that this crisis is even worse in communities of color.

The national average of children living in poverty in America is 20 percent. That's outrageous. For African American children, it's 36 percent; for Latino children, it's 31 percent. That's hard to believe. The median net worth of white families in 2009 was 20 times greater than that of the average black family, and 18 times greater than the average Hispanic family.

These are not just statistics. These are real human beings who deserve an opportunity to live the American Dream, which to our dismay, unfortunately, has turned into a nightmare for millions. So the Out of Poverty Caucus cochairs, Congressmen BACA, BUTTERFIELD, CONYERS, HONDA, and myself, sent a letter to the President asking him to address our Nation's job crisis, which is a national emergency, through a bold package of direct investment which is aimed at our Nation's most vulnerable—those facing or living in poverty. We asked that he consider including programs like the TANF Emergency Contingency Fund, which gets money out of the door across the country efficiently and effectively, and it puts people to work. We asked for job training at communities affected by the Great Recession, which of course is the depression for these communities, and we asked for programs that will help train and put our Nation's young people to work.

We are pleased and thankful that in the President's jobs bill he did embrace some of our suggestions, including building on programs like the TANF Emergency Contingency Fund and on the job training, youth employment, extension initiatives, and extending unemployment compensation, but we also still believe that unemployment compensation must be extended to those who have exhausted their benefits after 99 weeks until we create these jobs, because there are four individuals looking for one job. After 99 weeks, these individuals are no longer eligible for unemployment compensation. So we're asking that H.R. 589 be considered, which is a bill by Congressman BOBBY SCOTT and myself, to extend this unemployment compensation by 14 weeks. That's the least we can do.

Make no mistake about it, people are suffering. Children don't have enough to eat. People want and need jobs, as we saw during the Congressional Black Caucus' very important and successful jobs tour and the Congressional Progressive Caucus' Speak Out for Jobs Now tour. People want our economy to grow, but they know that they need a job to do this.

Our country needs full employment for people to turn the economy around. More and more people are falling into poverty than ever before—from all walks of life and educational backgrounds.

The Out of Poverty Caucus will continue to sound the alarm about the growing crisis of people living in or facing poverty. I want to remind everyone that many middle-income people are on the verge of falling into poverty. As we say, many are one paycheck away from poverty. It is critical that America returns to the land of opportunity for all.

□ 1100

STOP MILITARY RAPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as I have done virtually every week, to tell a story of a man or a woman in the military who has been raped. Nineteen thousand are raped every year in the military. Only 13 percent report the rapes because there has been such an ineffective addressing of this issue. So today, I rise again to tell another story.

I hear from victims who have been sharing their stories with me by emailing me at stopmilitaryrape@mail.house.gov. It is time for us to act. We have known of this problem for over 16 years. We have had 18 hearings and reports on this issue, and yet nothing changes.

So today I'm going to tell you about Darchelle Mitchell, an airman. And she writes: ''I never thought that I would be a victim of such a horrible and traumatic event, nor did I believe that it would occur under the blanket of freedom I swore to fight for. I decided to serve my country as an example for my two boys and to do my share to better my Nation.

''In my first year, I began to accept the unwanted comments of my shape, size and looks as though it was part of something to deal with when working and living with men on a ship. It escalated to the uncomfortable motions by a superior trying to pull me into a two-manned rack that was in the office. I reported the incident to my immediate supervisors requesting that they speak with him, and the responses were always that the superior meant no harm and that he was just being playful. This led to my superior grabbing me by the top of my head and pushing it into his genital area, stating, ''I bet I can make you say 'oh, God.' ''

''After the reporting of this incident, I suffered the backlash of being blackballed. My job assignments became very difficult, and I bounced around from command to command until someone was willing to take the chance to allow me to perform as an airman trying to advance.

''I worked very hard to remove the negative light that was cast upon me. I went on to advance to a dual-qualified

second class petty officer in less than 3 years. Despite my efforts of advancing and volunteer services, the stigma remained with me.

''I decided to take orders to Italy and move my family to another country in an attempt to step away from the negative light. Within the first 3 months of my tour in Italy, I was raped by another servicemember. I did everything in accordance to the training provided by the military. I reported the incident to NCIS and suffered through a rape kit. My children were present and had to experience something that no parent could ever dream of allowing their children to go through.

''With his DNA found in my rape kit, his fingerprints found throughout my room, and ripped clothing, the servicemember was found not guilty. The explanation given to me was, 'It is no question that his genitals touched your genitals, but it is reasonable to believe that he thought he had your consent.' From that, I was expected to return to work as if tomorrow was just another day. My superiors continued to treat me as if I brought shame to their command. The trauma was so overwhelming that I attempted to take my life on two occasions.

''Despite the constant reminder that the military is a man military, I graduated with my master's in business administration, volunteered at numerous organizations, and regained some confidence in my safety around people. This was not supposed to be the intended meaning of the sacrifices that veterans go through to serve their country.

''I pray that my experiences are not completely in vain and that one day no one will ever have to suffer what my family and I are still suffering.''

For Darchelle and every other servicemember, we must take steps to prevent this crime from happening and punish the perpetrators when it does. We should not be a country in which it is more likely to be taken into someone's room to be violated, to have violence committed against you by another member of the service, more likely than by the enemy.

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 11 o'clock and 4 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

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless the Members of this assembly as they set upon the work of these hours, of these days. Help them to make wise decisions in a good manner and to carry their responsibilities steadily with high hopes for a better future for our great Nation.

Deepen their faith, widen their sympathies, heighten their aspirations, and give them the strength to do what ought to be done for this country. Give them the wisdom and perseverance to work together constructively to address the pressing issues facing our Nation.

May Your blessing, O God, be with them and with us all this day and every day to come, and may all we do be done for Your greater honor and glory.

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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. TSONGAS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches from each side of the aisle.

FREE STUFF

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Ron and Cynthia Barrs from Texas sent me this email:

''The folks who are getting the free stuff don't like the folks who are paying for the free stuff because the folks who are paying for the free stuff can no longer afford to pay both for the free stuff and their own stuff. And the folks who are getting the free stuff want even more free stuff on top of the free stuff that they're already getting. So now the ones who are forcing the people to pay for the free stuff have told the people who are receiving that free stuff that the people who are paying for the free stuff are mean and greedy. So the people who are getting the free stuff have been convinced they need to despise the people who are paying for the free stuff. And they are promised more free stuff if they vote for the ones who force others to pay for the free stuff.''

Mr. Speaker, there's just not enough stuff for free.

And that's just the way it is.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, last week President Obama laid out a plan of action to create new jobs and strengthen our economy. Now the American Jobs Act has been sent to Congress, and it is up to us to catch the ball and run it into the end zone.

The American people are suffering. They are in pain. They are hurting. They need and deserve our help now, not tomorrow. They don't need more excuses.

The American Jobs Act contains tax incentives, Federal incentives that will give our economy an immediate boost. Ninety-eight percent of businesses will have payroll tax cut in half. The new tax credit will encourage businesses to hire returning veterans, and 280,000 teachers will be saved from being laid off. New investments will help build our roads, our bridges, our airports and rail systems, and not the bridges to nowhere.

Let's invest in the American people and work together to build our economy. This is not about allowing President Obama a win. This is about the American people, people who need jobs now, and building our economy.

Let's work together. Let's help the American people who are suffering.

A JOBS PLAN THAT WORKS

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

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, instead of President Obama's no-jobs plan, which is just more of the same, I'd like to give my 2 cents worth on what it takes to create jobs right here in America. Why? Because I know what it's like to take a risk and open a business, to hire someone and make a payroll.

Putting a moratorium on all new regulations would be a good start. Repealing the job-killing ObamaCare and Dodd-Frank financial reform laws—which are actually no reform at all and are already decimating our economy—and putting forth a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. If President Obama adopted these approaches, immediately capital would start flowing, which would then create jobs.

What we can no longer afford are the current, Big Government, socialist policies that will only put us further into debt and hurt job creation.

I have created hundreds of jobs in my district in Louisiana. How many jobs has the President created in his 2½

years? I would say net negative on that.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, on January 21, 1990, over 300,000 Ukrainians joined hands to create a 300-mile human chain from Kiev to Lviv in a show of unity and support for Ukrainian independence. One year later, on August 24, 1991, Ukraine rose from under its Soviet yoke and declared its independence.

I stand here today to commemorate the 20th anniversary of Ukraine's independence and to commend them on their many democratic achievements over the last two decades. Yet as we celebrate Ukraine's severing of its Soviet chains, we must be aware of new restraints, for new shackles in the form of press crackdowns and opposition intimidation threaten to re-enchain Ukrainians and reverse their many hard-fought freedoms.

I have faith in the spirit of the Ukrainian people and hope they will join hands again, as they did 20 years ago, and continue to stand strong for freedom and democracy, knowing America will always be standing beside them.

As they say in Ukraine: Together we are many. We cannot be defeated.

HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER DAVID R. CARTER

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor a soldier who made the ultimate sacrifice and laid down his life for our freedom: U.S. Army Warrant Officer 4 David R. Carter.

Chief Warrant Officer Carter dedicated himself to over 24 years of military service. As a member of the Colorado Army National Guard, he deployed to Afghanistan this summer. On August 6, 2011, he was piloting a CH–47 helicopter on a mission to reinforce a unit under attack in Wardak province. On that tragic day, he was one of 30 Americans who lost their lives when their helicopter was brought down by enemy fire.

David Carter was regarded as one of the most highly trained aviators in Colorado, with multiple combat deployments and over 4,000 flight hours. He is also remembered for the tremendous impact he had on his family, friends, and community. Friends recall that he was never too busy to help out with a problem.

Chief Warrant Officer David Carter personified the honor and selflessness of service as a citizen soldier. His bravery and dedication to duty will not be forgotten.

As a Marine Corps combat veteran, my deepest sympathies go out to his family, fellow soldiers, and all who knew him.

□ 1210

WORK TOGETHER TO PASS AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, the American people have waited too long for this Congress to put the focus where it belongs—on creating jobs and getting the Nation back to work. Now we must boldly make up for lost time. We need a plan as serious as the challenges we face. The American Jobs Act is that plan.

We will harness the industry and energy of the American people. We will give small businesses, the backbone of our economy, the incentives and assistance that they need to hire and to grow. We will put people to work building a transportation infrastructure worthy of the 21st century. We will stop teachers from being laid off and help end the outrage of our crumbling schools.

The American Jobs Act is good news for veterans, construction workers, teachers, firefighters, the long-term unemployed, and good news for all Americans who can look forward to a stronger economy and a more competitive Nation. Let's work together to pass this bill and get the American people the help they need and the support they deserve.

TIME TO GET AMERICA WORKING AGAIN

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Madam Speaker, there are 14 million Americans out of work. We have a record 30 straight months of unemployment at 8 percent or above—the longest stretch since the Great Depression. That's simply unacceptable. The President and the Congress must work together to grow the economy and create jobs. As a businessman for over 30 years, I have seen firsthand that the government does not create jobs. The private sector does. Small business does.

My jobs plan would expand overseas markets for U.S. goods and services, lower taxes on business, eliminate frivolous lawsuits, and abolish unnecessary regulation. We need to get our financial house back in order and move towards a constitutional balanced budget amendment. It's time we work together to get America back to work.

INVESTING IN CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Speaker, we need to put people back to work, and it is past time that this issue is finally getting the national attention necessary to get something done. As we work to finally enact a jobs plan, we should be investing not only in our workforce, but also in our future competitiveness, which is why we should invest in the next revolution—clean energy technologies. We export billions of dollars each year to import the energy that powers our country. If we can harness the power of clean, renewable energy, we will not only create high-paying jobs but we can begin to address the real threat of climate change as well.

By investing in clean energy technologies, such as wind and solar, we can begin to replace many of the manufacturing, construction, and high-tech jobs lost during the recession. We should take advantage of this unique opportunity to immediately create good jobs here in America while safeguarding the future of our children and grandchildren at the same time.

PRESIDENT'S SCORECARD ON JOBS

(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. Madam Speaker, the Nation's unemployment rate is a gruesome 9.1 percent. This marks the largest period of high unemployment since the Great Depression. More than 14 million Americans are unemployed. More than 25 million Americans who want a full-time job don't have one. In today's Politico, Josh Boak reported that ''Long-Term Jobless at 50-year Record.'' The State's front page revealed the Nation's poor have swelled to a sad record of 46.2 million people. The Democrat chairwoman says the President ''owns'' the economy.

The President's policies are sadly failing. He's on the wrong track, as evidenced in New York. He needs to change course with a bipartisan tax cut in the tradition of Presidents Kennedy and Reagan. The President's proposal for a second half-trillion dollar stimulus is a repeat of failure. Out-of-control borrowing and spending and the failed stimulus have aggravated unemployment. Tax increases destroy jobs. House Republicans will continue to lead bipartisan efforts of creating an environment for job creation that promotes small businesses.

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

PASS THE AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, despite the fact that we face persistent unemployment and slow economic growth, Republicans would rather waste time with debt ceiling disapproval resolutions and risk default again than come up with real answers to our most pressing problems. Democrats want to pass the American Jobs Act right now to get people back to work. We want to offer payroll tax breaks to small businesses that create jobs, not continue corporate welfare to major oil companies. We want to create infrastructure banks to repair and rebuild our communities, not delay these highway projects to score political points.

Monday, in Politico, a senior Republican aide was quoted as saying he ''didn't want to hand Obama a win'' on jobs legislation. It's clear that Republicans care more about beating the President than beating unemployment. The jobless of this country cannot wait another 14 months. Pass the American Jobs Act today.

COMMONSENSE SOLUTIONS FOR JOBS

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

Mr. FLORES. Madam Speaker, our country is facing record deficits, high unemployment, and stagnant economic growth. Yet President Obama is doubling down on the triple threat of taxation, regulation, and spending that is crushing job growth. This week, the President has been touting his so-called ''jobs plan.'' But his detrimental policies have forced a power generation company in Texas to close five facilities and sacrifice 500 middle class jobs. The impact of this EPA shutdown will reduce generating capacity in Texas by 1,300 megawatts, a move which the Electric Reliability Council of Texas says could spur future power outages.

These regulations hurt middle class jobs and harm electric reliability in Texas with no scientific evidence that power generation in Texas is causing nonattainment of clear air standards in other States. Not only are this administration's disastrous policies preventing future job creation; they're destroying existing jobs. Instead of proposing the same failed idea that Washington can create jobs, we need to get Washington out of the way and rely on commonsense Main Street solutions that put Americans back to work.

NASA ANNOUNCEMENT ON SLS

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Madam Speaker, this morning, NASA announced the design of a new space launch system which will be the basis for future exploration beyond low Earth orbit. It is a critical step, but one among many we need to take. Although I am pleased this decision was made, it is long overdue since it was mandated by the NASA authorization bill passed in the last Congress. This announcement combines existing technologies while enabling new ones, all the while attempting to maintain the most skilled and dedicated workforce in existence in human space flight. NASA's plan still lacks the destination focus I would like to see, and we must be diligent in keeping costs manageable, especially in these difficult economic times. But the investment in our Nation's space program enables men and women like those at the Stennis Space Center to do what they do best—test rocket engines for space flight.

America is the leader in human space flight. Today's decision helps continue that leadership role.

□ 1220

DISASTER RELIEF SUPPLEMENTAL

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

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ago, Hurricane Irene ravaged the east coast, including the State of New Jersey. Earlier this year, tornados leveled parts of the Midwest, and now Texas is experiencing one of the worst wildfires in its history. Furthermore, on the heels of Hurricane Irene, Tropical Storm Lee hit New Jersey, causing more damage and forcing more people from their homes. Homes have been destroyed, businesses are suffering, and many areas are still covered in water.

While many major disaster declarations have been made, the availability of Federal assistance remains uncertain. Today, I rise to ask my colleagues to work in a bipartisan manner to immediately pass emergency disaster relief legislation to support recovery efforts. Communities across the country have witnessed unthinkable destruction and endured great loss, and it is the Federal Government's responsibility to replenish the Disaster Relief Fund to ensure that these communities receive help in their time of need.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting supplemental disaster relief. We must come together now to provide disaster assistance to these devastated areas.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S JOBS BILL

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Madam Speaker, I rise today with great disappointment in the President's most recent proposed bill to create jobs. I was hopeful that the President would offer a commonsense, pro-growth agenda. Unfortunately, the House continues to stand ready without a proposal that is acceptable.

But this administration continues to offer the same tired, Big Government proposals. One example is the section that creates, in 17 pages, a wholly government-owned corporation—that's right, government-owned corporation—complete with a chief financial officer, chief risk officer, chief compliance officer, chief operations officer, chief lending officer, general counsel, board of directors, and billions of dollars in new taxpayer money.

It appears once again that this administration is more focused on growing government than it is on growing jobs.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker and Members, jobs are the issue, and the American Jobs Act is the solution that this House should consider on the floor immediately. This bill will help reverse the flow of jobs overseas and will help rebuild the manufacturing base in America, providing good jobs for hardworking Americans.

Make It In America creates jobs in America. This bill builds America. The long-term FAA reauthorization will create 150,000 jobs, and reauthorizing the surface transportation bill will support 134,000 projects around the country, 5,000 mass transit projects, and nearly 1 million jobs over the next year. The national infrastructure bank proposal would combine public and private resources to build, rebuild, and repair the country's key infrastructure.

This bill also helps create jobs through the Tax Code. The proposal cuts the payroll tax in half for 98 percent of businesses on their first $5 million in payroll; it offers a $4,000 tax credit to employers for hiring long-term unemployed workers—get them on the tax rolls and not on the unemployment rolls—and it starts a ''Returning Heroes'' hiring tax credit, between $5,600 and $9,600 for firms that hire unemployed veterans.

We have the responsibility to help our country climb out of this tough economy, and this bill is a proposal that deserves bipartisan support to help accomplish that.

REGULATIONS DON'T CREATE JOBS

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

Mr. YODER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join the chorus of Americans asking Washington to stop damaging the economy with job-killing regulations. Small businesses don't thrive when they're hit with additional burdens from the Federal Government.

As unbelievable as it sounds, some in this body actually believe that new regulations create jobs because they force businesses to hire people to comply with the new mandates. Madam

Speaker, this defies common sense. And that's why I am introducing two bills: one which would pause all new regulations for a year so that businesses would know the rules they are to live under, and another that would require Federal regulators to analyze the impact of their new rules on jobs and to find the least costly alternative for each new business mandate.

Madam Speaker, let's come together and agree that regulations don't create jobs. And let's pass commonsense legislation to get America working again.

THE URGENT NEED FOR JOB CREATION IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the urgent need to create jobs in America.

Millions of Americans have lost their jobs through no fault of their own, and finding a job now is as hard as it has been in generations. Our country needs decisive action, and we need it now.

Earlier this week, the President submitted the American Jobs Act to Congress, and I ask my colleagues in both parties to put partisanship aside and work together to create jobs our country desperately needs. Many of the proposals included in the American Jobs Act enjoy bipartisan support, and I call on Speaker BOEHNER and Leader CANTOR to work together in good faith to bring forward good jobs proposals from both parties to Congress.

We won't have an economic recovery without putting people back to work.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, too many people in America are out of work, and as the President said in his speech last week, too many people are living day to day, paycheck to paycheck, struggling to find work. That is why we need to pass the American Jobs Act now.

A consequence of such high unemployment is poverty. Yesterday, the Census Bureau reported that our country's poverty rate last year was an astonishing 15.1 percent, the highest it has been in almost two decades. With 22 percent of our children living in poverty, this report makes clear who has borne the brunt of our country's economic woes.

I believe that all of my colleagues share a strong love of this Nation and its children, but in order for them to succeed, we must ensure that they have access to health care, housing, modern classrooms, and qualified teachers. We must also put their parents on a path back to work.

Madam Speaker, it is a travesty to have even one child living in poverty in this country, let alone one in five of our children. It is also unconscionable to allow our actions, or inactions, to affect their future prosperity. Let's work together in a bipartisan way now to pass the American Jobs Act today.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 352

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, 53 years ago, China declared ownership of the islands in the Eastern Sea, which include the Spratly and the Paracel Islands.

On September 14, 1958, then-Prime Minister Pham Van Dong of North Vietnam issued a diplomatic note affirming the declaration from China regarding the Chinese ownership of those islands. When this decision became known, Vietnamese students and bloggers organized unprecedented protests in Hanoi and in Saigon against China's violations of Vietnam's sovereignty in the Eastern Sea. The Vietnamese security police were ordered to end the public demonstrations regarding the issue of the Spratly and Paracel Islands and detained over 40 activists who were involved in this protest.

Since early August of this year, at least 13 young patriots have been arrested by police and the Ministry of Public Security in Vietnam, and several of these activists are prominent bloggers, such as the Vinh Diocese of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, for this same issue.

As a cosponsor of House Resolution 352, I call for a framework in accordance with the United States Convention on the Law of the Sea for a peaceful resolution to this conflict.

Furthermore, I urge the Vietnamese Government to unconditionally release all advocates who were exercising their rights as citizens to call for social justice and protesting the sovereignty of Vietnamese territories from China.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, as I traveled throughout my district these last few weeks, one issue dominated all conversations—jobs.

As my colleagues on the other side created the default crisis this summer, the American people threw up their hands in disgust and dismay, and I don't blame them. Our constituents know the number one issue facing this country is jobs, and they know this Congress must take concrete actions to grow our economy, and it must take them now.

The good news is we have a plan. The American Jobs Act is a commonsense, bipartisan plan to put Americans back to work and strengthen our economy. It keeps teachers in the classrooms and cops and firefighters on our streets. It rebuilds our crumbling roads and bridges, modernizes our schools, and rehabilitates our neighborhoods. It cuts taxes for small businesses, workers and their families.

The time for political games—which are costing jobs and creating economic uncertainty—has passed. I urge the House leadership, help us pass the American Jobs Act, and let's pass it now.

□ 1230

AMERICANS LIVING IN POVERTY

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, today we learned that 46 million Americans are living in poverty. More people are suffering economically than at any time since the Great Depression. But we learned from an excellent article by Scott Lilly of the Center for American Progress that history may be repeating itself.

In 1937, conservative Republicans succeeded in virtually eliminating the Federal jobs programs of the New Deal, so as to eliminate the Federal deficit. But the results were catastrophic to America's economy and society. Half of the 8 million jobs that had been created by the New Deal were lost, and unemployment went over 19 percent.

Economists generally classified the economic reversal in 1937 and 1938 as a second depression. Not until military spending began to revive activity in 1940 did unemployment again drop to less than 15 percent.

That was a long and painful experience. It would be tragic if we permitted the new conservative crowd in Washington to repeat it by killing President Obama's jobs act and sending us back into a double-dip recession.

Those who don't learn from the past are doomed to repeat it.

JOBS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the all-important issue of jobs in America.

As I travel around my district, I frequently hear discussions about jobs. But more importantly, I hear discussions about jobs that have gone unfilled. In my district alone, that is 2,600 jobs. In America it is 3.2 million jobs that are ready to be filled today.

We must come together, as Members of Congress, to provide assistance that helps us train people, relocate them, or do whatever is necessary to bring people to jobs; 3.2 million people back to work, that's significant. I hope that my colleagues in Congress will work with me to put 3.2 million Americans back to work.

This is not a situation where there are not jobs. This is a situation where there are unfilled jobs.

INVEST IN DETROIT

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I offer this Congress and this country a simple, yet powerful, way to create new, good-paying manufacturing jobs in the United States, and that's by investing in Detroit, by allowing the tax dollars that Detroiters pay to be invested back in Detroit; invested to help make the streets of Detroit safer, to help improve Detroit schools, to help train Detroiters for jobs, to help rebuild our city.

You see, this type of investment will definitely create jobs in Detroit. But more importantly, Detroit's manufacturing know-how, our trained workforce, investing in Detroit will help put Americans back to work. So by helping put Detroiters back to work, you're going to help put this country back to work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken tomorrow.

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM REFORM AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2011

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2867) to reauthorize the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2867

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT AND COMPOSITION.

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—Section 201(b)(1)(B) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431(b)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''Nine'' and inserting ''five'';

(2) in clause (i), by striking ''Three members'' and inserting ''One member'';

(3) in clause (ii)—

(A) by striking ''Three members'' and inserting ''Two members'';

(B) by striking ''two of the members'' and inserting ''one member''; and

(C) by striking ''one of the members'' and inserting ''the other member''; and

(4) in clause (iii)—

(A) by striking ''Three members'' and inserting ''Two members'';

(B) by striking ''two of the members'' and inserting ''one member''; and

(C) by striking ''one of the members'' and inserting ''the other member''.

(b) TERMS.—Section 201(c) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: ''An individual is not eligible to serve more than two consecutive terms as a member of the Commission. Each member serving on the Commission on the date of enactment of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2011 may be reappointed to not more than one additional consecutive term.'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''May 15, 2003, through May 14, 2005'' and inserting ''May 15, 2012, through May 14, 2014'';

(B) in subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

''(B) PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS.—The member of the Commission appointed by the President under subsection (b)(1)(B)(i) shall be appointed to a 1-year term.'';

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking ''three members'' and inserting ''two members'';

(ii) by striking ''the other two appointments'' and inserting ''the other appointment''; and

(iii) by striking ''2-year terms'' and inserting ''to a 2-year term'';

(D) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by striking ''three members'' and inserting ''two members'';

(ii) by striking ''the other two appointments'' and inserting ''the other appointment''; and

(iii) by striking ''2-year terms'' and inserting ''to a 2-year term''; and

(E) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''May 15, 2003, and shall end on May 14, 2004'' and inserting ''May 15, 2012, and shall end on May 14, 2013''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) INELIGIBILITY FOR REAPPOINTMENT.—If a member of the Commission attends, by being physically present or by conference call, less than 75 percent of the meetings of the Commission during one of that member's terms on the Commission, the member shall not be eligible for reappointment to the Commission.''.

(c) ELECTION OF CHAIR.—Section 201(d) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431(d)) is amended by inserting at the end the following: ''No member of the Commission is eligible to be elected as Chair of the Commission for a second, consecutive term.''.

(d) QUORUM.—Section 201(e) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431(e)) is amended by striking ''Six'' and inserting ''Four''.

(e) APPLICABILITY.—A member of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom who is serving on the Commission on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue to serve on the Commission until the expiration of the current term of the member under the terms and conditions for membership on the Commission as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF ANTIDISCRIMINATION LAWS.

Section 204 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6432b) is amended by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

''(g) APPLICATION OF ANTIDISCRIMINATION LAWS.—For purposes of providing remedies and procedures to address alleged violations of rights and protections that pertain to employment discrimination, family and medical leave, fair labor standards, employee polygraph protection, worker adjustment and retraining, veterans' employment and reemployment, intimidation or reprisal, protections under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, occupational safety and health, labor-management relations, and rights and protections that apply to employees whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, all employees of the Commission shall be treated as employees whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives and the Commission shall be treated as an employing office of the Senate or the House of Representatives.''.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 207(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6435(a)) is amended by striking ''for the fiscal year 2003'' and inserting ''for each of the fiscal years 2012 and 2013''.

SEC. 5. STANDARDS OF CONDUCT AND DISCLOSURE.

Section 208 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6435a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''$100,000'' and inserting ''$250,000''; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking ''International Relations'' and inserting ''Foreign Affairs''.

SEC. 6. TERMINATION.

Section 209 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6436) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2011'' and inserting ''September 30, 2013''.

SEC. 7. REPORT ON EFFECTIVENESS OF PROGRAMS TO PROMOTE RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the implementation of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Comptroller General shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees and nongovernmental organizations for purposes of preparing the report.

(c) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report shall include the following:

(1) A review of the effectiveness of all United States Government programs to promote international religious freedom, including their goals and objectives.

(2) An assessment of the roles and functions of the Office on International Religious Freedom established in section 101(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6411(a)) and the relationship of the Office to other offices in the Department of State.

(3) A review of the role of the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom appointed under section 101(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6411(b)) and the placement of such position within the Department of State.

(4) A review and assessment of the goals and objectives of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom established under section 201(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431(a)).

(5) A comparative analysis of the structure of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom as an independent non-partisan entity in relation to other United States advisory commissions, whether or not such commissions are under the direct authority of Congress.

(6) A review of the relationship between the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom and the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and possible reforms that would improve the ability of both to reach their goals and objectives.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6402).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, first of all, let me thank ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, the chairwoman of our committee, and HOWARD BERMAN for their fine work in helping to bring this very important legislation to the floor today.

I want to thank especially Congressman FRANK WOLF, the author of this legislation, who is also the author of the original International Religious Freedom Act that was passed back in 1998, against considerable odds, opposition from the Clinton administration, for example, opposition from a number of people on both sides of the aisle. But at the end of the day, that legislation, historic, was signed into law and was signed by President Clinton. So he came around and actually put his signature on that historic legislation.

So I again want to thank Mr. WOLF for his famous leadership. He has been a leader on human rights and on religious freedom in particular for more than 30 years. And that culminated, at least on the religious freedom side, with the enactment of the International Religious Freedom Act.

Madam Speaker, religious freedom, the right to worship and practice one's faith according to the dictates of one's own conscience, is a foundational human right. Not only is it an essential element in our Constitution; it is intrinsic to the human dignity of every man and woman on this Earth and was enshrined in the universal declaration of human rights.

But it is a right denied or curtailed for millions, really billions, according to some estimates, even a majority of the people living in the world. For Copts in Egypt, for Christians, Buddhists, and Uighurs in China, Montagnards, Evangelical Christians in Central Vietnam, Jews in Baha'i in Iran, many Buddhist monks in Burma and, of course, this rising pernicious tide of anti-Semitism, not just in the Middle East but in many parts of Europe, and even in the United States, the ability to live their faith without threat of persecution is a distant and unrealized promise.

I was pleased to work with Mr. WOLF years ago, as I mentioned, on this legislation. And I actually chaired the hearings on the legislation. And again, there was considerable opposition that was turned around, and at the end of the day this legislation did become law.

The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom was an important part of this effort. It was created as an independent body of experts to review the facts and make policy recommendations from a vantage point outside of our diplomatic corps, where bilateral and other concerns had sometimes resulted in the soft-pedaling of severe ongoing violations of religious freedom around the world.

Even today, when the quality of State Department reporting on religious issues, while it's improved, the commission continues to serve as a critical role and a sounding board and a catalyst. One indicator is the fact that the commission's list of recommended, what is called ''countries of particular concern'' for severe violations of religious freedom, remains larger than the number actually designated by the State Department. They ought to be the same, but they are not.

Just yesterday, Secretary Clinton rightfully designated the People's Republic of China, Burma, Eritrea, Iran, North Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sudan and Uzbekistan as countries of particular concern. But the State Department's list does not add any new countries from last year, and one of the most glaring omissions of all is Vietnam, whose policies have more than earned that badge of shame.

Secretary Clinton did not designate Egypt either, or Iraq, Nigeria, Turkmenistan and Pakistan, as recommended by the commission. So, unfortunately, their recommendations went unheeded. But it does provide an important backdrop and framework to review and to look at what it is that the State Department is doing.

We need, Madam Speaker, this commission more than ever. Already in the Congress, we have had three comprehensive hearings on religious freedom: one in the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission in January regarding the religious freedom of minorities in the Middle East; one in the committee that I chair, the Africa Global Health global Human Rights Committee, regarding the prioritization of religious freedom in U.S. foreign policy; and one just last month in the Helsinki Commission on the particular plight of Coptic Christians in Egypt. That hearing brought to light an egregious policy that is acted out in Egypt each and every day, where young Coptic Christians girls, some as young as 14 and 15, are kidnapped. They are forced into Islam, and then they are, at age 18 or thereafter, given in marriage forcibly to an Islamic man.

□ 1240

That is an outrage against women's rights, human rights, and religious freedom as well.

The Commission has been an invaluable resource to Congress as we monitor the protection and promotion of religious freedom around the world and the response of the administration on this very important issue. They have also a resource to governments seeking to remedy religious freedom abuses within their own borders. For instance, in Indonesia, the Commission worked with members of the Indonesian House of Representatives and civil society groups and introduced measures to strengthen provisions in the criminal code regarding attacks on religious gatherings and amend the law governing the building of religious venues.

The Commission also continues to help network human rights and legal advocates in Indonesia and elsewhere around the world working to defend individuals accused of blasphemy and religious minorities facing intimidation and violence from extremist groups. The Commission's work in Indonesia will have practical impact on the exercise of human rights and the preservation of peace in that country.

Other governments have looked to the Commission as a model for their own religious freedom commissions.

The bill before us today includes a number of bipartisan reforms to the Commission authorities and operations to make their work even more effective.

Again, I want to thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, the chairwoman, and thank HOWARD BERMAN for their leadership in ensuring the bill came to the floor today and for their support for the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2867, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2011.

I would like to thank the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who has been a leader on this issue for, as my colleague Mr. SMITH pointed out, well over a decade on the question of international religious freedom.

We're fortunate to live in a country that was founded by religious refugees on principles of tolerance. We strive to adhere to article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that ''everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion. This right includes freedom to

manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance.''

But elsewhere around the globe, religious freedom and human rights are routinely violated. Countless men, women, and children face violence, persecution, and discrimination because of their faith. Violent extremist attacks have taken place in the Middle East and South Asia. The regimes in North Korea and Iran actively repress religious freedom. Apostasy and blasphemy laws have fueled discrimination against religious minorities in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia.

Other religious minorities like Tibetan Buddhists, Uighur Muslims, Ahmadis, Baha'is, Assyrian Christians in Iraq, Copts in Egypt face violence and government restrictions. And anti-Semitism is still prevalent around the world.

Just yesterday, Secretary Clinton designated Burma, China, Eritrea, Iran, North Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, and Uzbekistan as countries of particular concern that have ''engaged in or tolerated particularly severe violations of religious freedom.''

While these may be the worst offenders, we have serious concerns about religious freedom in many other countries around the world. More than ever, we need the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom to continue its important work.

The bipartisan bill before us today reauthorizes the Commission, also known as USCIRF, which is set to expire at the end of the month. The bill also contains some sensible reforms that will strengthen USCIRF's efforts to monitor and report on the status of freedom of religion abroad. These reforms include the process of selecting the chair, terms of service for members of the Commission, and a GAO study on improving the effectiveness and coordination of all U.S. Government bodies that focus on international religious freedom.

In particular, I would like to thank Mr. WOLF for agreeing to include a provision that clarifies that USCIRF is subject to the same workplace restrictions and civil rights laws as the rest of the Federal Government.

Congress has long provided that the Federal Government, including the executive and legislative branches, is subject to laws intended to keep the American workplace safe and free from discrimination, including the Family and Medical Leave Act, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, OSHA, and workplace protections for veterans.

However, under current law, it is unclear whether USCIRF's employees could resolve disputes over workplace protections through the procedures designed for executive branch workers or under the procedures that apply to legislative branch employees through the Congressional Accountability Act. This legislation will ensure that all claims will now be resolved under the procedures created by the Congressional Accountability Act. USCIRF supports this clarifying position.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, it is a distinct privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, the author of the original International Religious Freedom Act, an historic piece of legislation and today's reauthorization, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, before I begin, I want to thank Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN; ranking member, Mr. BERMAN; the Human Rights Committee chairman, Mr. SMITH, who's been a champion on all of these issues from the very first day he got in here; and their staffs. The staffs have made all the difference in the world.

I want to particularly thank the chairman's staff, Yleem Poblete and Doug Anderson, for their help, and also the leadership on both sides and my side, and the leadership staff who have really tried to work this and get this thing through. I'm going to say some things that hopefully are not too controversial, but I do want to thank them for getting this thing out and getting it moving because, if it didn't move today, it may very well come to an end.

I rise in support of this critical legislation to reauthorize and reform the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom. The sad truth, though, Madam Speaker, this bill has been held hostage by the other body—and keep the word ''hostage'' out there as we think in terms of what this bill would do and what's taking place around the world. And if we do not pass this bill in this form today, the likelihood of this Commission shutting down is very, very high.

I wish I could name—I know the House rule—and I would name the members over there if anyone asks me, but it's being held hostage. Some in the other body are now saying that even these are not the changes that they would like to see to the Commission. And, quite frankly, I believe that some over there and this very administration would not mind seeing this Commission shut its doors.

This was a bipartisan issue for years. Scoop Jackson, the leader, Jackson-Vanik, President Reagan. To my side, Reagan said the words in the Constitution were a covenant to the entire world, not just to the people in Philadelphia in 1787 but to the entire world. And yet religious freedom, often referred to as the first freedom, is central to our American values and should be featured prominently in foreign policy.

But, sadly, the constituency for human rights and religious freedom issues is growing smaller and smaller in Washington and in this Congress. These issues have become second-class citizens in this Congress and in this town. There are no big law firms downtown. They're representing the Saudis. They're representing the Chinese. They're representing filth and garbage in certain cases, but no one represents human rights and religious freedom.

So there are all the Members who have agonized and pushed and pulled and want to kill this. I'm concerned because as we stand here today and debate, and you've got to know this, Iraqi Christians are being killed. People who speak the same language as Jesus, the Aramaic language, and more biblical activity took place in Iraq than almost any other country other than Israel, they're being killed; and Iraqi women are being forced to do terrible things in order to keep their families.

And there are some who don't want this bill to pass. They never talk about the Iraqi Christians. Yet many of them supported the Iraqi war and yet they say nothing.

The Baha'is in Iran and Egypt are being marginalized, and I never hear a word said.

Chinese Bishops. I can remember Congressman SMITH took Holy Communion from Bishop Su. Bishop Su was arrested and has never been seen since, maybe once being forced into a public security police car and taken away.

□ 1250

Protestant pastors are being arrested today as we speak in China, and yet this doesn't really seem to bother this place. It's almost like, Well, you know, what are we going do? You know, man does not live by bread alone. These are important issues. Go back to Scoop Jackson. Go back to Ronald Reagan. Go back to the Constitution. Go back to the Declaration of Independence.

Shabaz Bhatti, the Christian minister in the government, was gunned down because of his faith, because he was a Christian. The Ahmadiyya Muslims in Pakistan are being persecuted. They're going through a very, very difficult time. There are the Coptic Christians. I was in Egypt in July, and the Coptic Christians—8.5 million—are going through a very difficult time.

As Mr. SMITH just said, anti-Semitism is running rampant. Anti-Semitism is running rampant in this world, and yet there are some who are trying to kill this Commission, for some reason, over in the other body. We're having such a hard time.

The Buddhists in Tibet, they can't even have a picture of the Dalai Lama. Hu Jintao, who is the current President of China, was the one who cracked down on Tibet and raided all those monasteries, and yet, with this bill, some are just saying, Well, you know, I don't know, and I don't know, and I don't know.

Though this bill is not what we originally planned, the Commission has said they can live with these provisions so that the Commission may remain a reliable voice for the world's persecuted

people. As Mr. SMITH said, there probably is not a time that you do need this Commission more than now. Since the passage of this legislation, religious freedom has been elevated at times in U.S. foreign policy, but it still does not enjoy the preeminence it deserves.

Sadly, a strong U.S. voice on these critical issues has arguably never been more needed. The Commission faces extinction at the end of the month. Members of Congress know, if you knock this bill down, if you want to kill this Commission and if they vote ''no,'' it will go out of business by the end of this month if the Congress fails to pass it.

Just yesterday, as Mr. SMITH said, the State Department released its annual International Religious Freedom Report. In the report, several challenges to religious freedom were pinpointed. People around the world continue to face violent extremist attacks, apostasy and blasphemy laws, repression, and anti-Semitism. According to a Pew Research Study released in 2009, one-third of all nations, containing 70 percent of the world's population, severely restrict religious freedom.

I want to thank again Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. BERMAN and my good friend Mr. SMITH and their staffs.

I don't know what we would say to the Christian community around the world and to the Baha'is and to those concerned about anti-Semitism and the Buddhist community in Tibet and the Uyghurs in China if this thing fails to pass. They would say, What's taking place in Washington? Why is this no longer an issue that this Congress and this administration care about? So I would hope we should pass it. I think we should have a roll call vote. Every Member should stand up and explain what they're going to do.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN, Ranking Member BERMAN, Human Rights Subcommittee Chairman SMITH, and their staffs for working tirelessly in a bipartisan manner to continue to fight for those who are persecuted for their religious beliefs. I would like to particularly thank the chairman's staffers, Yleem Poblete and Doug Anderson, for their help. Thank you also to our leadership for bringing this bill to the floor.

I rise in support of this critical legislation to reauthorize and reform the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF). The sad truth is that this bill has been held hostage in the other body, and if we do not pass this bill in the form it is in today, the commission will shut down.

Some in the other body are now saying that even these are not the changes they would like to see to the commission, and quite frankly, I believe that some over there and this very administration would not mind if the commission were to shut its doors.

Religious freedom, often referred to as the first freedom, is central to our American values and should be featured prominently in U.S. foreign policy. Sadly, the constituency for human rights and religious freedom issues is growing smaller and smaller in Washington and in Congress. These issues have become second class citizens in this Congress.

I am deeply concerned because, as we stand here and debate this bill, Iraqi Christians are being killed, Baha'is are being marginalized in Iran, Chinese bishops and Protestants pastors sit in jail, Christian and Ahmadis continue to be repressed in Pakistan, Coptic Christians are having a difficult time in Egypt, and anti-Semitism is growing around the world.

Though this bill is not what we originally planned, the commission has said they can live with these provisions so that the commission may remain a reliable voice for the world's persecuted people.

Recognizing that this critical issue and other human rights related issues are often relegated to the sidelines within the State Department, I authored legislation more than 10 years ago, in 1998, to establish the International Religious Freedom Office at the State Department, headed by an ambassador at-large, and to create the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF)—an independent, bipartisan Federal Government commission, charged with monitoring the status of freedom of religion or belief abroad and providing policy recommendations to the President, Secretary of State, and Congress.

Since the passage of this legislation religious freedom has been elevated within U.S. foreign policy. But it still does not enjoy the preeminence it deserves. And sadly, a strong U.S. voice on this critical issue has arguably never been more needed. USCIRF faces extinction at the end of this month if Congress fails to pass the bill before us today and it is not signed into law.

Just yesterday, the State Department released its annual International Religious Freedom Report. In the report, several challenges to religious freedom were pinpointed. People around the world continue to face violent extremist attacks, apostasy and blasphemy laws, repression, and anti-Semitism. According to a Pew Research Study released in December 2009, one-third of all nations, containing 70 percent of the world's population, severely restrict religious freedom.

This legislation will reauthorize the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom until September 30, 2013. USCIRF, unlike the State Department, is unencumbered by the impulse to maintain good bilateral relations above all else . . . an impulse which sadly can result in critical issues of religious freedom being sidelined in the pursuit of broader foreign policy goals.

USCIRF regularly holds briefings and hearings on and off the Hill and is frequently called upon to provide expert witness testimony to Congress.

Just in the last year the commission has taken a leadership role on a series of key issues. It was quick to recognize the strategic importance and courageous voice of the late Shabaz Bhatti, Pakistan's federal minister of Minorities Affairs, an outspoken critic of his nation's draconian blasphemy laws.

During a critical time for the people of Sudan, the USCIRF issued special recommendations on the implementation of the historic Comprehensive Peace Agreement.

It made a series of policy recommendations aimed at preserving and protecting Iraq's besieged religious minorities.

It has actively worked with dozens of Hill offices on combating the ''defamation of religions'' resolution before the United Nations.

In short, ensuring that the commission is reauthorized is of paramount importance. In a Constitution Day speech, President Ronald Reagan famously described the United States constitution as ''a covenant we have made not only with ourselves, but with all of mankind.''

Passage of this legislation will go a long way in helping us keep that covenant. I urge my colleagues' support. We must let the world know that the U.S. Congress continues to believe in the importance of protecting the first freedom for every person in this world.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to again thank Congressman FRANK WOLF, Chairman WOLF, for his eloquence and for his passion for those men and women and children of faith who suffer terrible, terrible injustices around the world, including persecution.

There were two books that got me involved, in all candor, in religious freedom issues—there were two incidents in my first year in Congress in 1981—''Tortured for Christ,'' by Richard Wurmbrand, who was a great evangelical pastor who spent years being tortured by the Securitate in Romania because of his faith. He made an appeal, and he said, Do not sit idly by while men and women of any faith are being tortured and persecuted because of that faith, because it's not just the individual who suffers; the entire family suffers; and very often they're incarcerated and tortured as well.

The other was the trip to the Soviet Union with the National Conference on Soviet Jewry in 1982, January. It was 10 days in Moscow and Leningrad, meeting Soviet Jewish refusniks who were persecuted, who were put into psychiatric prisons simply because of their faith.

A couple of years later, Mr. WOLF and I went to Perm Camp 35 in the Ural Mountains. It took years to negotiate our way in. This was in 1987. We met with persecuted Jewish refusniks and Christians and political prisoners who were there simply because of their faith. It was where Natan Sharansky had spent a number of his years incarcerated by the cruel dictatorship of the Soviet Union.

In China today, the believer Christians, Uyghurs, Tibetans, and Buddhists are tortured beyond anyone's imagination. It's real. It's happening today. In Vietnam, there has been a backlash against people of faith ever since they got trading benefits and the bilateral trade agreement and MFN were extended to them, or PNTR. They have done a backlash to men and women of faith that is unprecedented, and ought to be on the CPC list of the International Religious Freedom Commission. I hope people will go to the Web site. Check out this wonderful Commission, which if it is not renewed by the end of this month, goes out of business.

I would call out our Members on the other side of this Capitol, the other

body, to pass this legislation immediately. We ought to be strengthening and significantly expanding it, not doing less than status quo, which is what we're doing today because of some budget concerns that people have. This is the quintessential watchdog agency in this town. It doesn't get the big press, as Mr. WOLF said. It doesn't have the big bucks—no K Street lobbyists—but it is a wonderful and a very important and effective Commission that keeps track of religious persecution globally, that keeps us in line in the House and the Senate and also the State Department. I read their reports. I read them from cover to cover. Please, I would ask the Members of this body to support this legislation and call on our friends in the Senate to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2867, "United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2011." This legislation mandates the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom (Commission) compliance with federal anti-discrimination laws, restricts the Commissioner to two consecutive terms, and requires the Commissioner to attend 75 percent of Commission meetings. H.R. 2867, extends the Commission's sunset date by two years, and appropriates $4.29 million for FY12 and FY13. In addition, H.R. 2867 requires study to determine the Commission's effectiveness to ensure that the act is being implemented properly.

As a senior Member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I understand the importance of protecting the religious rights of men, women, and children throughout the world. By advocating for religious stability, we in turn decrease the likelihood of religious extremism and advance the growth of healthy nations. The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom serves as an essential fact finder and impartial advisor on these matters.

The 18th District of Texas is home to many different faiths and religious backgrounds and welcomes a variety of views on religion. This reflects the principles of freedom of religion upon which our nation was founded. The founding fathers understood the importance of freedom of religion and the perils of religious persecution. Respect for the religious practices of others is woven into the very fabric of the United States.

The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom is an independent, bipartisan commission. The Commissioners are appointed by the President and Congress. The Commission's core mission is to review international violations of religion freedom and make policy recommendations to the President, the Secretary of State and Congress. These recommendations impact the lives of millions of people of faith around the world. I believe in the importance of protecting those who are being persecuted based upon their religious beliefs.

According to a Pew Research Study released in December 2009, 198 countries, containing 70 percent of the world's population, severely restrict religious freedom. The study found that 101 governments used force against religious groups or individuals. Christians and Muslims, who make up more than half of the world's population, were harassed in more countries than other religions, although the study does not reflect the intensity of the persecution. This study was conducted prior to the Arab Spring. Many of the nations with increasing religious restrictions are the very nations that have seen popular uprisings and subsequent crackdowns—among them Egypt, Yemen, Syria and Libya, a clear indication that we need this Commission more than ever.

I firmly believe that the Commission has a positive impact on the lives of millions of people of faith throughout the world, especially at a time when many governments continue to repress religious freedom and persecute persons on the basis of their religion. Such repression only stands to marginalize vulnerable populations, emboldens extremists, fuels sectarian tensions, and robs societies of the moral and charitable contributions of faith communities.

Repression of religious freedom runs contrary to shared universal values and undermines genuine stability. In the words of Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton "Religious freedom provides a cornerstone for every healthy society. It empowers faith-based service. It fosters tolerance and respect among different communities. And it allows nations that uphold it to become more stable, secure, and prosperous.

The Commission monitors religious freedom through the lens of international human rights standards, such as those found in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Forty-five years ago the nations of the world signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which codified in international law the right to religious freedom. The ICCPR affirmed under Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that "everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief and freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching."

The Commission is not a tool to advance religious beliefs or any specific values. It is focused on addressing the religious climate in each country based upon the ICCPR. By relying on international human rights standards as specified in ICCPR, The Commission guards against any attempts to impose American values on other nations, but rather examines the actions of foreign governments against these universal standards and by their freely undertaken international commitments. This Commission is a vital resource in learning to address conflicts between religious groups, especially in the wake of the Arab Spring.

As the Commission serves to address the violations of religious freedom abroad, Congress is charged with ensuring the Commission itself is in compliance with laws that protect the rights of workers and those they serve. H.R. 2867 reflects the principle that discrimination has no place within our government and will ensure that the commission itself complies with all federal anti-discrimination laws. This is an essential distinction from the current law, which lacks these robust discrimination protections. This legislation further underscores the importance of this Commission by expending the sunset date of the Commission by 2 years to September 30, 2013. Lastly, the amount of appropriations allotted for the Commission would be amended by striking $3,000,000 for the fiscal year 2003, to $4,291,000 for fiscal years 2012 and 2013.

I firmly believe that H.R. 2867 will allow the Commission to continue to address international religious persecution, provide much needed discrimination protections, and will garner the appropriate amount of oversight to ensure that the Commission operates as effectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2867, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam 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.

DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION RELATING TO DEBT LIMIT INCREASE

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 392 and as the designee of the majority leader, I have a motion at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Reed moves that the House proceed to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 77) relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as submitted under section 3101A of title 31, United States Code, on August 2, 2011.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3101A(c)(3) of title 31, United States Code, the motion is not debatable.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 77

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as exercised pursuant to the certification under section 3101A(a) of title 31, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3101A(c)(4) of title 31, United States Code, the joint resolution is considered as read, and the previous question is considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage

without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) as the proponent and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) as the opponent.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

□ 1300

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. I am pleased to offer this resolution of disapproval of the request from the President of the United States to borrow an additional one-half trillion dollars. Dealing with this national debt is one of the primary reasons why I ran for Congress. It is to stop the endless borrowing of Washington, D.C. on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. I am also pleased to offer it in the House as the demonstration of a commitment to ending the decades-old borrow-and-spend practices and mentality that runs rampant here in Washington.

Our national debt has reached its breaking point. The need to make serious decisions to get our spending under control has never been more urgent. We have all heard the words of Admiral Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. When asked what is the most direct threat to our Nation, his immediate and clear response was that our national debt is the greatest threat to our national security. The recent downgrade of our national credit rating by S&P further demonstrates the necessity of making significant structural changes to the way we spend money in Washington, D.C.

My focus here today, because we know the Senate has acted and this resolution did not pass the Senate—and is likely not to result in the borrowing of the President getting the additional half a trillion dollars of borrowing—but it's to send a message to the Nation that we need to act proactively in this Chamber and in both Chambers of this House. We need to recognize the national debt. And rather than deal with it in a crisis situation, we should be mindful of it in a proactive, strategic, open and honest manner so that we have good, sound policy responses to the issue that we face and finally tame this beast known as the national debt.

We have spent over $15 trillion of money we did not have. That national debt is growing at the rate of $58,000 per second. That's $55,000 owed by every man, child and woman in America. That level of borrowing, that level of spending is just not acceptable because it jeopardizes our Nation and, more importantly, jeopardizes our Nation for the generations yet to come.

The American people have made it clear. They spoke loudly in November 2010, and we are listening. More borrowing won't solve the problem. In fact, it will dig the hole even deeper. Borrowing even more before we can enact significant spending cuts to begin dealing with the root problem is a foolish errand. We have a responsibility to future generations to take immediate action.

I will continue along the path of working on both sides of this Chamber to try to identify common ground to solve this crisis on the national debt. The continuing resolution last spring and the Budget Control Act, which requires this vote, are only the beginning.

This war on our national debt is going to go on for many years to come; but we need to take those first steps because with every journey it takes the first step to get us on the path too success. I know the battles ahead will not be popular, and there will be tremendous political pressure on all of us to continue to borrow and spend as usual, but we must stand up to that political pressure. We must honor our oath to do our duty and do our job in this Chamber, and that means standing up and changing the path of Washington, D.C. Making difficult decisions now is the only way we can win this war on what is a common enemy we all face, our national debt.

It is my hope this resolution continues to show the President how serious we are about this issue and at the same time that we are dealing with this issue we will focus on jobs, we will focus on the economy. We, in the United States Congress, have to be able to walk and chew gum at the same time. We are competent men and women in this Chamber who love our great Nation.

We must come together on all fronts at all times, not only on the national debt but on our economy, on getting Americans back to work. And I think, with that bipartisan attitude, it will be amazing what we can accomplish in order to achieve all those goals, the national debt being one of the critical ones that we must face head on today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, we should not even be considering this resolution. I repeat, we should not even be considering this resolution. We should be moving forward, not backwards. This resolution is a dangerous distraction from the unprecedented challenge before us.

Fourteen million Americans are looking for work. The Census Bureau reported just yesterday that the poverty rate is higher than it's been in 17 years, and median income in this country is at 1996 levels.

The President has proposed a jobs bill that one knowledgeable observer, Mark Zandi, estimates would create 1.9 million new jobs and add 2 percentage points to GDP growth next year. We need action to spur economic growth and job creation. That's what we should be considering today.

Instead, through this resolution, Republicans want to prolong the agony of the debt limit debate and take us back to the brink of default, which would be where we would be if you succeeded.

This bill can pass the House only if Members who voted ''yes'' in August on this issue decide in essence to vote ''no'' in September. ''Yes'' in August, ''no'' in September.

This Nation wants us to be guided by the needs of the Nation, not the internal politics of a caucus or a conference. We have seen the consequences of that kind of Republican brinkmanship. Standard & Poor's said, in downgrading our credit rating: ''It involved a level of brinkmanship greater than what we had expected earlier in the year.''

In August, consumer confidence dropped by the largest amount since the peak of the financial crisis in 2008, and the conference board noted a direct link between the fall and the debate over default. I think we need only to check 401(k) statements from August to remember the precipitous drop in the stock market.

Were this resolution to become law, all those who speak or vote for it have to understand that the U.S. would default on its obligations for the first time in our history. This would throw our economy back into deep recession, trigger $400 billion in immediate job-destroying cuts, and call into question our ability to pay earned Social Security and Medicare benefits.

Madam Speaker, we should not be considering this resolution today. We should be moving forward on the President's plan to jump-start our economy and create jobs for American workers.

□ 1310

The American Jobs Act will put more money in workers' pockets through a temporary tax cut, saving the average family $1,500. It would also keep over 6 million workers from losing their unemployment benefits while they continue searching for work and provide new employer incentives to help get them hired.

If we don't act on these issues, over a million people will lose their unemployment benefits in January and over 2 million in February. So we need to act. We need to look ahead, not just try to go backwards.

So I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this resolution so we don't waste one more minute on a renewal of Republican brinksmanship. Fourteen million Americans who are looking for a job and 43 million Americans who are living in poverty cannot afford to wait 1 minute longer.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MACK).

Mr. MACK. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution of disapproval because Washington will continue to have a deficit spending problem until we say enough is enough and we put a stop to it. The gentleman across the aisle would like to say this is going backwards. Every time I hear someone on the left speak, it ends up costing us more money. We need to stop the insanity here in Washington. We need to stop this overspending. It seems like the only proposals that are coming our way are more spending and more taxes, so I strongly support this resolution.

I opposed the debt deal because we can no longer wait to make deep spending cuts and balance our Federal budget. We need to act now. Today we have an opportunity to prevent some of the debt deal from going into effect and disallow the government from borrowing another $500 billion—borrowing another half trillion dollars.

Recently, we heard the President keep saying on his new proposal: Pass this bill now. Pass this bill now. Pass this bill today. I'm saying and the American people are saying: Stop the spending now. Stop the spending today. Stop putting this burden on our children and grandchildren. Yet the President wants to continue to go out there and sell a jobs plan that is more of the same, and he wants to pay for it mysteriously, shockingly, by raising taxes that will do nothing but kill jobs. So his own proposal that he wants the Congress to take up, in effect, will destroy jobs.

Somehow we have to convince the people here in Washington and the President that it's not the government that creates jobs. It's the individual. It's the entrepreneurs, the people willing to take risks. But they are not willing to take risks in an economy where the President continues to try to push more regulation and more laws and more taxes. It just doesn't make sense, and the American people are fed up. They've had it. Enough is enough. We've spent way too much money.

During the August district work period, over 500 people showed up to my town hall meeting in Fort Myers, Florida. And do you know what I heard over and over again? ''Hold the line on government spending.'' ''Stay strong.'' ''Reduce government.''

And this one I love: ''It's not your money; it's my money.'' See, only in Washington do the people in this room look at it as their money. They look at your money as their money. It's not. It's the people's who have earned it.

Now a comment was made by a constituent of mine, Edward Benet, which I think speaks directly to this issue. He said: ''We have to reduce the size and scope of government. I'm unemployed, but just because I don't have a job doesn't mean my neighbor should have to pay for me.'' And then he continued on: ''The best way for government to help is to step aside, get out of the way, and let individuals and businesses do what they do best.''

He and his family are willing to sacrifice to preserve the economic freedom for Americans. We must cut spending now. That's why I introduced the 1 Percent Spending Reduction Act, commonly known as the Mack Penny Plan. With this plan, we can balance the budget in 8 years by capping spending at 18 percent of GDP in the 7th year and cutting 1 penny out of every Federal dollar for 6 years. One penny. Everybody at home, every business, every individual has had to take more than 1 penny out of their home budget or 1 penny out of their business budget over the last 4 to 6 years. And for the Federal Government to instead be talking about spending more money every year, we need to cut spending. We need to balance our budget. My plan will balance the budget in 8 years.

And for those people who might want to say we're not for just across-the-board cuts, great. What we've said is Congress decides where the 1 percent comes from. But if the Congress fails, then we're going to require an across-the-board cut. So we can either work together, or one way or another we'll get the 1 percent across the board.

The deficit spending has to stop. Like I said before, enough is enough. I support this resolution, and I would encourage all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say to the gentleman, working together won't work if you undo the work that we did together.

I now yield 5 minutes to the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I'm a great fan of the tradition of comedy in America, and I want to salute my Republican colleagues for this tribute to one of our great comedians who died tragically early, Gilda Radner, who in the early days of ''Saturday Night Live'' invented the character of Roseanne Roseannadanna, who would get on the news segment and say something outlandish. And then when she was corrected, her response was, ''Never mind.''

This is the ''never mind'' resolution that the Republicans have brought forward. People should understand what this says. It says that the bill that we passed that kept the government from shutting down—and I didn't like the bill, but I liked the part of it that kept the government from shutting down. I was ready to vote just for an increase in the debt limit. Singling out the increase in the debt limit and canceling it, that's what this does. What this says is—and here's the problem. We have a majority that has a problem with reality. They have a problem with reality in the field of science. They have a problem with reality in the field of the economy.

One of the manifestations of that is their objection to raising the debt limit that was in large part necessary because of debt they incurred. You know, when the debt limit came up, it struck me: It wasn't my debt limit; I didn't vote for the war in Iraq at a cost of a trillion dollars; I didn't vote to give millionaires a tax cut that they didn't need and that had no beneficial effect on the economy. But I did, out of a sense of responsibility, vote to raise the debt limit. Now, I voted against one of them, but I voted for several others.

What this bill says is this: Yes, we had to, because we were getting a lot of pressure, vote to raise the debt limit, but now that that is safely behind us, we're going to pretend that we were really against it. So this is the ''never mind'' resolution. People should understand this. What this resolution would do would be to undo what just happened.

So we have Members on the majority side who have trouble explaining to their primary voters why they had a temporary embrace of reality. Now they're not comfortable with that. Their primary voters aren't comfortable with that. So having done what they had to do, they now want to pretend that they're going to undo it.

The Senate has already killed this. They don't want it to pass because, understand what it would do, it would put us right back in the debt limit situation crisis.

And, by the way, these are people who are putting this resolution forward who purport to believe that a major concern with the economy today is the uncertainty that faces investors. So what do they do? They bring up a resolution today that would re-create—if anyone took it seriously, and I will give them the credit of saying that they don't. But if anyone took it seriously, it would re-create the greatest source of uncertainty we've seen in a long time, whether or not the Federal Government was going to shut down. So that's the phoniness of this.

□ 1320

Now let's talk about the substance. My colleagues claim to be against spending. Apparently, in their world, the nearly $700 billion that is spent annually by the Pentagon isn't spending. I don't know what it is. We have a situation in which this year in the budget the Republicans brought forward a bill to increase military spending by $17 billion while funds for local police and funds for local street repair were cut. So that's the problem.

Yes, I am for reducing spending. I am for reducing a swollen Pentagon budget. We had the President reduce by 10,000 the troops in Afghanistan. Many on the Republican side, including their leadership, criticized him for that. Do they think 10,000 troops in Afghanistan are paid for with ''funny'' money?

The fact is that while on the one hand we hear these complaints about spending, we have people who are pushing for more and more spending. And I

have to say here that I would include my administration in this. And I think if the President expects us to go along with certain restraints elsewhere, adding billions of dollars to what we have already wasted in Iraq by keeping thousands of troops in Iraq beyond this—and, by the way, why are we keeping troops in Iraq? One of the leading advocates for keeping troops in Iraq, a leading Republican Senator, Senator GRAHAM, said we must keep our troops in Iraq because we have to police the border between the Arabs and the Kurds, that at a time when we are denying funds to our cities to police their own areas.

So, let's be clear. First of all, this sham says, You know what? We had to vote to raise the debt limit. We're now going to engage in this mock exercise of taking back what we did. If anybody takes it seriously, it will send waves of uncertainty back into the economy. But, secondly, going forward, yes, join us. And that includes some on the Republican side—unfortunately, a small minority. Don't give more and more and more for the military not to defend America, not to fight terrorism. Those things are not in controversy, but to subsidize the wealthy European nations.

Madam Speaker, the NATO nations outside the United States spend an average of 1.7 percent of their gross domestic product on the military. We spend 5.4 percent—more than three times as much. And my Republican colleagues have resisted reducing that. What they want to do is subsidize the social safety nets and the spending of Western Europe at the expense of spending here. And how do we do that? By allowing them to hold down the military.

So people who want to keep troops in Iraq; people who objected when the President began a withdrawal that was too timid, in my judgment, from Afghanistan; people who want to continue to spend unnecessarily and unwisely not to defend America but to keep America the worldwide policemen have no credibility in complaining about spending.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Tennessee (Mr. DESJARLAIS).

Mr. DESJARLAIS. I thank the gentleman.

For too long, the Federal Government has been allowed to engage in an irresponsible spending spree that has resulted in the accumulation of over $14 trillion of debt, and $3 trillion of that debt occurred in just the last 3 years under President Obama.

Does anyone really believe that the American people have received a good return on their investment? I know that many of my constituents in Tennessee's Fourth District don't. Unemployment is still above 9 percent, and our economy is still not creating jobs. And now this President claims to need a $2.4 trillion blank check to continue with his failed policies. That means our national debt would be close to $17 trillion by the end of next year. Enough is enough.

The latest assessment of our debt indicates it will reach 109 percent of GDP in the next decade. That will only further degrade employers' confidence in our economy and hinder their ability to create jobs. We cannot allow that to happen. I was elected by the people of Tennessee's Fourth Congressional District to come to Washington to finally make the Federal Government learn to live within its means. No more borrowing 40 cents out of every dollar, no more trillion-dollar deficits, no more stimulus spending, and, most importantly, no more expecting our children and grandchildren to pay for all of this.

The debt limit debate provided us with a real opportunity to put our Nation back on a fiscally sustainable path by finally forcing the Federal Government to make difficult, but badly needed, spending decisions—decisions that I am more than willing to make. I believe that we missed an opportunity to open up the books and do something that should have been done years ago—prioritize our spending.

It is hard to believe that with all the waste, fraud, and abuse that occurs within the Federal Government that we would have any problem cutting enough spending so that raising the debt limit would be unnecessary. When families in my district have spent more than their budget allows, they look to how they can cut back, not how they can borrow more money. Maybe they don't take a vacation that summer. Maybe they go out to eat less often or hold off on purchasing a new car. The point is they know that the answer to getting back on the right fiscal track is spending less, not borrowing more. The same should hold true for the Federal Government.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this joint resolution of disapproval.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to another member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Seattle, Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution because it is in favor of the United States defaulting on its debts. The Republican Party is calling for the United States to default, to tell the whole world: we don't pay our debts. That's what this is about, and it doesn't do one single thing to help American workers or businesses with jobs.

Now, make no mistake: The House of Representatives is being used by the Tea Party as an attack machine on the President. They will delay action on anything that helps the economy. The President came up here on Thursday with a plan. Where's the schedule for bringing it out on the floor to create jobs? No, we have to come up here with this resolution. For the majority, delaying economic recovery is a small price to pay if they can win an election. They don't care about ordinary folks, working people. They only care about people on the top. Instead of doing something to help create jobs, they have brought up this bill to gin up their extreme base that thinks the only thing Americans should build together are roads and a Defense Department. That is what the U.S. Government is all about. Nothing else makes any difference. We don't need to invest in health or science. What do we need science for? It will work out. Don't worry.

In this resolution the Republicans are voting for the United States not to pay its bills. That's what we're spending time on. Today is just another day in the Alice in Wonderland of the Republican House. Pure politics and nothing to help the American people get jobs. This whole Republican Congress is about the Presidential election. It has been from the beginning back in January. Not helping the middle class. What have they done for foreclosures in this country? What have they done for youngsters trying to go to school? What have they done for anything except try and get the President? They are trying it by stopping the economy from moving forward.

I urge my colleagues not to just vote ''no'' on this but for the majority to withdraw it and bring up the American Jobs Act. The President brought it up here. It deserves to be brought up to the floor and debated and amended and passed.

I sometimes wonder when I listen to the discussion about this doing stuff to pay someplace down the road, some long-term investment, if a Republican has ever bought a house. I remember when I bought my first house in Seattle. I was 25 years old. I was a medical resident. I paid $16,400 for it. And I wondered if I would ever be able to pay for it, because I wasn't making that much money in those days.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Lo and behold, I bought the house. And you know what? Thirty years later I paid off that house. That's what investment is about. What the President is saying is that we have to invest in this country if we're going to bring it out of the problems it's in. And that means infrastructure on the ground and it means in human beings in education.

□ 1330

If we don't invest, as the Greatest Generation did after the Second World War—here came Eisenhower and said, hey, we've got to build roads. Nobody said, well, you know, we can't go in debt for all that. Nobody said we can't invest in human beings.

We did the GI Bill of Rights, and that's what made us the strongest country in the world. We took every veteran who came back from the war and said here's a college education; get

it and take it out and make this country work. That was investment. But not today's Republican Party. Oh, no, we can't, we mustn't.

Don't you understand investment?

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, it's been said that leadership is willing to make hard choices, fact-based choices to come up with solutions to solve problems and deliver results.

Now, we gathered here last Thursday in this Chamber to hear the President, with a much-touted plan beforehand that he was going to bring forth to the American people that was going to help solve the high unemployment in this country and get our economy back on a competitive basis. I can tell you, Madam Speaker, I sat there and I listened very intently, and I left this Chamber with great disappointment because it's not enough.

Furthermore, he is proposing taxes, new taxes, taxes on energy production, American energy production. Now, let's look at the facts of what happened.

Yes, we had an oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, and it was dealt with. It was a tragic situation, but it has been dealt with. The fact of the matter is we need American energy production to move this country forward. And now what we're seeing with the lifting of the moratorium is this continued de facto moratorium because of slow-walking of exploration plans and permits.

Now, what does this mean? If we brought back the permitting process to the same timeframe we had before—without sacrificing safety—bring it back into a reasonable amount of time, let's say 30 days to take care of these permits, in 1 year, the year 2012, 230,000 jobs would be created, new jobs, good, high-paying jobs. And not only that, a third of those jobs would be beyond the Gulf Coast States around this country, in California and Florida and in the central part of the country. This would add $34 billion to our GDP. And that's just getting things back to where they were. That's not even talking about expanding exploration in these shale formations or looking at the east and west coast where we can do more or Alaska. These energy jobs are good-paying jobs. And not only that, it would bring in, in 1 year, $12 billion more into the Treasury and reduce our bill on foreign oil by $15 billion. And that's just getting us back to where we were.

Now, I stood here and listened to the President. Instead, he offers taxes, $45 billion more in new taxes on independent oil and gas companies. That's going to hurt American energy production, it's going to kill American jobs, and it's going to do nothing to help solve our economy.

Furthermore, he chided us about the trade agreements. We have three trade agreements sitting there. They've been there for 3 years. They've been negotiated. They're ready to go. And he said Congress needs to pass them. Well, Mr. President, the answer is: Send them to Congress and we'll pass them. That's the process.

And beyond that, what is our trade policy? This country is losing credibility globally and it's losing its leverage because we have no trade strategy, a strategy that's going to promote American-manufactured goods, American farmers and their commodities so that we can sell these around the world to open markets. That will get our economy going.

If we want to solve our debt problem, yes, we've got to balance our budgets, yes, we've got to deal with the debt problem—we've taken some steps—but I saw nothing that the President offered. That's why I'm here supporting this resolution, to push this President to consider the steps that need to be taken to promote American competitiveness, private sector job growth. That's what we need in this economy.

Now, the President had the answer. He was standing here at this podium and he had the answer right up there on the wall of the House behind him. There is a plaque up there, and it's a quote from Daniel Webster. And that first sentence of the quote says, ''Let us develop the resources of our land.'' What's wrong with that, Mr. President?

For God's sake, we need American energy production, and it's simple. With the stroke of a pen, he could solve this permitting problem and at least get us back to where we were, create 230,000 jobs next year and add to our GDP growth. And this would be a start, a down payment to a comprehensive energy strategy for this country. This is a no-brainer.

We need natural gas as part of our transition strategy. His policy is going to lock out natural gas production in this country. Ninety-seven percent of it is done by small domestic companies here in the U.S., and these taxes will put many of these companies out of business.

Mr. President, read the plaque. Let's develop our natural resources. Let's do what we have to do. Let's promote a very aggressive, export-oriented trade policy.

And we need a willing partner to move forward with tax reform. We're getting half-hearted signals. This country needs fundamental tax reform. We want to do it on the House Ways and Means Committee. We're ready. We stand ready as willing partners, but yet we're getting signals—mixed signals. This administration has not shown a serious intent to move forward with fundamental tax reform that will unleash American ingenuity and entrepreneurship in this country.

And that's what I heard all through August when I was back home in my district when I talked to folks. They want to see an energy strategy. They want to see comprehensive tax reform that simplifies our Code and lowers rates and clears up some of the loopholes. They want to make sense out of this Tax Code. And they want to see us selling goods overseas, letting our ports expand.

He didn't even mention maritime infrastructure. We've got bills right now that would improve our maritime infrastructure without costing one penny more in deficit spending. Why aren't we acting on these things?

We're tired of rhetoric. We're tired of political talking points. And what we need is action. The American people have had enough. And I say let's get to work. Let's get this House moving on fundamental changes that will improve this economy and create private sector jobs.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to say to the gentleman from Louisiana, I listened intently, and I don't understand how he could have voted ''yes'' to raise the debt ceiling in August and now, in essence, he's going to vote ''no'' and bring this country back to the brink of chaos.

I now yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, a very active member of our committee, Mr. NEAL.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I'm fascinated by this argument, for the people that are viewing it, largely because this is not an argument about new spending; this is an argument about paying for past spending. So when Bill Clinton said ado, said goodbye to the American people on January 19, 2001—this is fact, not opinion—America was staring at a $5.6 trillion surplus. On January 20, George Bush took the oath of office, and when he left 8 years later, we were looking at a $10.6 trillion deficit.

Let's recount those years: Two wars, $2.3 trillion worth of tax cuts, and a prescription D benefit that was unfunded. And all of the money they applied to those arguments—and I am very pleased by the fact I voted against those tax cuts, spoke against them, and voted against the war in Iraq. But all of the money that I've just referenced was borrowed money by the Republican Party. They borrowed all of the money for it—fact, not opinion. And now the bill has come due, and they're on the floor talking about fiscal rectitude.

Now, here's what I think is important: The gentleman from Florida opened this debate, my friend, Mr. MACK, by talking about our money and how that money is utilized. Well, guess what? The veterans hospitals, 35,000 men and women wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, is he saying that that's not our money that ought to pay for those hospitals?

□ 1340

Joe Stiglitz has estimated that the cost of disability for the war in Iraq will be between $500 billion and $900 billion.

I hope people pay attention to what I'm about to say. Almost one out of two people who have served us honorably in Iraq and Afghanistan, they're coming back with a long-term disability. Those VA hospitals are going to be stretched for years to come.

Now, whether you were for Iraq or against it, our responsibility is to pay for those men and women who served us honorably: 20 years old, life expectancy of 80, they're in our care for the next 60 years.

I would note with some humor that the Republican leadership did not send out, today, people that were here for the tax cut vote or for the vote on the war in Iraq. Remember weapons of mass destruction and how that vote was to take place?

Friends, this is about paying our bills. This is not about new spending. And I hope there's no confusion in the hinterlands. Today, because of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, every American citizen has a bill of $17,000.

They helped bring us to this path of fiscal irresponsibility during their years of borrowing and borrowing and borrowing, and they ask the American people to embrace amnesia. They set the fire, and now they're calling the fire department.

This is a very simple vote. It's about paying our bills.

Mr. REED. I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Madam Speaker, I'd like to thank the gentleman from New York for yielding on such an important subject that we're talking about today.

I would like to make a couple of points in reference to what the gentleman from Massachusetts just made regarding the Republican Party. And I would say that the Republican Party did make mistakes at the beginning of this decade. I would say the Democrat Party has made some mistakes in the last several years. I think there's plenty of blame to go around for both parties in Washington.

But there's a new crew in town. There's 87 new Republicans that were elected last November from all across this country who have joined those in our party who are saying stop the spending. Stop the madness. We're working against ourselves, folks.

Madam Speaker, I would say that we wouldn't have to continue having this discussion if we would stop spending, stop borrowing, and then we would focus on the economy. It's going to take both sides to come together to fix the problem within our economy.

We're going to have to control our spending. We're going to have to help those Americans who are out there and those who are actually establishing jobs, those who are creating jobs. It's not the U.S. Government that is going to create the jobs for those who are unemployed.

I believe that we have a great opportunity right now to again say, let's stop this sort of spending binge in Washington, D.C. We're passing on debt to our kids and our grandkids. This is an opportunity for us to come together, both parties, and say, let's forget about the sins of the past. Let's pay those bills. But let's not continue to spend the way that we're spending today.

From a debt of $79 million when the Revolutionary War ended, the United States has racked up a debt of nearly $14.6 trillion. It would take nearly everything that Americans produced in all of last year to pay off the existing national debt.

Right now I see two competing visions in Washington and across this country, Madam Speaker. The first vision is the ''business as usual'' vision. And we see a lot of that right here in Washington. It says we need to blindly increase our debt; and if people complain, call it investment instead of debt.

In May, President Obama called for a no-cuts-attached increase to the debt ceiling. He didn't give up his call for a blank check until his request had failed here in this House by an overwhelming and bipartisan vote of 97–318.

The second vision that I hear a lot about back in Indiana is the same vision and the same work that families do every year. You figure out how to live within your means. You have real cuts, not budgetary gimmicks. You don't fool yourself when you're sitting around the kitchen table trying to figure out the mess that you find yourself in. It's based on the truth.

Families sit down at the kitchen table and have the heart-to-heart talks about the situation that they're in. Two conclusions that they usually come to are, we have to cut spending, and we're going to have to figure out how to bring more dollars in. It accepts the challenge, Americans accept the challenge, knowing that these things are not easy.

We know that the ''business as usual'' vision, it's broken, and it will inevitably lead us to ruin and more ruin. This vote is a vote against that vision.

I come to the floor to support the second vision, the vision that Americans across this country support, a vision that is shared by the men and women of northeast Indiana. It is a vision of prudence, honest conversations, and optimism.

When we get pulled into these discussions because of the continual discussion about more spending, we cannot focus on the important part of getting people back to work and growing our economy. Government doesn't create jobs. Governors don't create jobs. Americans create jobs. I believe in the American people, and that hope is still a part of our vocabulary.

I believe that we're also changing the discussion here in Washington. Career politicians have had their day in Washington, and it's time to talk about cuts. And since we've talked about cuts, the sky has not fallen. Optimism is a part of what the American fabric is built upon. I believe that this Joint Deficit Committee needs to find common ground for actual cuts and that the Senate will pick up the job growth bill that we passed right here on the floor of the House of Representatives this Congress.

We all knew that this debt ceiling debate was never going to be our final battle in a struggle for balanced budgets and fiscal responsibility. It gives us the chance to continue to talk about it. And if we want to continue to raise the debt, if we want to continue to increase spending, we'll continue to talk about why we need to restrain Washington politicians.

I'm going to continue the dialogue. I believe it's crucial. It's an important part of saving this country's economic future for my kids, for our children and for our grandchildren across this country.

Government has, for too long, continued this business as usual and the status quo vision that I talked about earlier. Americans are going to have to pay back all of this debt. This may not be a tax increase, but inevitably and indirectly it is.

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

Mr. REED. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. STUTZMAN. So, Madam Speaker, I come to the floor in support of this resolution because I believe that we need to all agree, Republicans and Democrats, that we're going to limit spending, we're going to stop borrowing.

We can pay our bills back. But at the same time we're going to focus on job creation, getting people back to work, as the gentleman from Louisiana mentioned, the energy jobs that were talked about. That was one of the things the President didn't discuss in his address the other night is he didn't talk about energy.

We are the leaders in the world on production. I come from a district of a lot of manufacturing; and I believe that if we would focus on energy, cut spending, we need to reform government. That's what's going to get people back to work. The economy's going to grow. We will still be number one in the world.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 30 seconds.

This resolution isn't about a new vision. It's really about blind rage. There may be a new crew in town; but if this were to pass, it would be a wrecking crew because, essentially, we would be back on the edge, once again, of default.

I now yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, America was united in its disgust at the spectacle in Washington during the debt ceiling fiasco. The Republican threat of default ranks among the most reckless and destructive political stunts in modern American history. It undermined the fragile, but recovering, economy and reduced faith in

the United States of America. It has also undermined the American people's trust in its government.

There's no reason to have a debt ceiling at all. It doesn't restrain spending since the spending has already been committed. It just threatens our credit, and it weakens our country.

That's why I, Representative NADLER, and Representative MORAN introduced this morning the Full Faith and Credit Act, a bill to do away with the debt ceiling once and for all.

□ 1350

But if we are going to have a debt ceiling, the threat by Members of Congress to refuse to raise it is an outrage. We've already made these commitments; yet some would have us default. Some would undermine the full faith and credit of the United States. Some would do irreparable damage to our economy and our standing in the world. It's a disgrace. It's a total disgrace.

And the American people see it for what it is: part of a concerted effort to undermine this economy in order to undermine the President and fulfill the congressional Republicans' Inauguration Day vow to do everything within their power to ensure that President Obama would be a one-term President.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I appreciate the gentleman from New York yielding to me.

I do support this resolution.

Here in this Chamber—actually, here in America—we often talk about achievements in terms of metrics: the larger, the better. For a private company, it's impressive when it has a large budget, a large workforce, and a large profit and a large presence.

The Federal Government, as an institution, should not talk this way, even though similar assertions would all be true. Washington spends too much, employs too many people, and is too intrusive in the lives of all Americans.

The major difference is that private business makes investments that deliver returns, and failure to do so is the demise of the business. The Federal Government's spending, though, often fails to deliver real results. But the Federal Government does not meet its demise; rather, the all-too-often negative consequences fall on taxpayers and usually result in a new government program or one or dozens more.

But if we were thinking like a businessperson, we would consider the results that have come from past investments before making another.

Two-and-a-half years ago, the previous Congress and this current President implemented a stimulus that ultimately will cost Americans more than $1 trillion. This mega-investment was supposed to create 3.5 million jobs. This investment was supposed to bring an unemployment rate of 6.4 percent last month. But what has actually happened? The President is more than 6 million jobs short and unemployment stood at 9.1 percent last month. That's not even counting the millions of Americans who are underemployed.

The Budget Control Act, which the President signed, was supposed to be about putting an end to Washington's business as usual: spend and borrow, spend and borrow some more. Yet when the President came before us here in this very room a week ago tomorrow, all we heard was a recycled idea: another stimulus, another $450 billion exercise in excessive spending that will underperform and underdeliver.

Spend, spend, spend, raise taxes and borrow more to pay for that spending. Raise those taxes from the very individuals and businesses that can actually create jobs that will get the economy out of this rut and put millions of Americans to work. And along the way, let's demonize job creators. That's what happened in this Chamber.

I believe the Federal Government should function as efficiently and as effectively as a private business; but it, by no means, should be able to brag about a large budget that fails to deliver and which only adds to the red ink each year.

Before adding to the $15 trillion in debt this country already has or sustaining more years of trillion dollar annual deficits, we have no choice, and the American people expect no less, cut current spending and cap future spending obligations and pass a balanced budget amendment.

I support this resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my privilege to yield 3 minutes to another active member of our committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

I think it's clear that this resolution is just not my cup of tea, but I can tell you if we followed the path that was just recommended, Republicans could drive us deeper into recession or even depression.

It's as if the Republicans who are here today wanted to start Halloween early because they keep trying to bring back to life, as if it were some zombie, the specter of debt default that has already caused us so many problems.

Building on their earlier success in sowing panic and reaping fear in our global financial markets that contributed to the first-ever downgrade of our Nation's credit rating, these professional obstructionists are determined to keep trying to wreak havoc.

As families are demanding action on the economy, a response to jobs, the Republicans instead are focusing on pandering to a small group of people for whom reality doesn't seem to make much difference. The problem is reality has a Democratic bias when it comes to this question of the economy and job creation.

I think if the Republicans really want to help us close the debt gap, the best way to do that is to get this economy moving. An increase in economic growth will do more than any of the things that he just mentioned—some amendment that might be approved years from now—will do more to help us get the debt under control than most anything else.

Of course, how did we end up with the debt that we have today? Much of it is directly related to the policies of the Bush-Cheney years when Republicans were totally ignoring the issue of debt: unpaid wars, tax cuts based on the mythology that they would pay for themselves when they just dug us deeper into debt. And now we face the need to try to get our economy moving again. Their solution? Do less. Jeopardize the full faith and credit of the United States.

I think one of the problems that we have here, and it afflicts the Democratic Party to some extent as well as the Republicans, but especially with our Republican colleagues, is that we've just got too many certified smart people here in Washington. They're so smart they know what they know; they just don't know what the American people are experiencing. You don't have very many people advising about this economic recovery.

Whoever had to drive a truck for a living? You don't have people who even had to worry about whether they could make their next truck payment. And you sure don't have people advising who've had their house foreclosed and had to move their family into a truck. But that's the plight that too many Americans face today, and we need to be responding to their legitimate concern that what we need to do is focus on the demand side of the equation and help improve demand and get this economy going again.

I like the idea of focusing on our roadways, our trucks, our crumbling bridges and the like, building the infrastructure that will help American business as well as the people who would do that construction work.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. I believe that focusing on our infrastructure, our roads, bridges, our schools, focusing on what is happening inside our schools with so many teachers threatened with dismissal around the country with the cutback in State and local budgets, that's the kind of focus that can help get America moving and address the debt issues at the same time.

I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on today's empty political resolution so we can focus on what really makes a difference to working families across this country.

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

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New York, CHARLES RANGEL.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise against this resolution.

I had thought that the Congress had already passed this very, very embarrassing experience.

When you read the papers today and see the pain that exists throughout these United States, it is not Republican or Democratic pain. It's pain that they're feeling as a result of the lack of economic growth in our great country.

And when you see the number of years and decades that this Congress has approved the President's authority to increase the debt ceiling for the purpose of maintaining the fiscal integrity of our country and, therefore, the democracy-loving countries that depend on the credibility of our fiscal condition, I would have hoped that we would think of this issue not in terms of the political implications, but how does the world perceive us to be.

Quite frankly, without being political, in watching the debate the other night, it wasn't that it annoyed me, but I was just so embarrassed that the world might think that that represented the principles of my country, people laughing about execution and laughing about people dying.

I'm certain nobody in this body takes pride in that type of thing. But to go against the President's ability to maintain the integrity of the United States of America, I think it is just so wrong.

There are good reasons that we can't challenge as to why our polling as a body is so low.

□ 1400

I don't think anyone can walk away feeling proud—liberal, conservative—about what's going on. The reason is because people don't go to sleep at night worried about what we're doing and debating on the question of revoking, of giving the power to the President to protect the integrity of our great Nation. No. They're going to bed at night having hope that maybe tomorrow they'll get a job, that maybe they'll be able to guarantee their health insurance, that maybe their kids will have a better life, that maybe we'll stop fooling around, playing politics with the future of this great country, that just maybe, one day, we'll be more concerned about the lack of default and the credit of our country than our own reelections.

I know it seems absurd that we can wish that; but if you think about it, they're not talking about Democrats' polls being low, and they're not just talking about Republicans' polls being low. They're talking about all of us.

The greatest thing about America, far beyond our military and economic wealth, is the trust that people used to have in government. Once they lose that, whether they're poor or whether they belong to that small number of people who hold the Nation's wealth, then the country is in desperate trouble.

So I hope that people who witness this debate recognize that the opposition is not speaking for the country or the Congress, but probably for the Republican National Committee.

Mr. REED. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to another member of our committee, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. This pointless exercise that the House has embarked upon here today illustrates the challenge that we have to try and deal meaningfully with the very real problems that America expects us to make progress on. This resolution has already been laid to rest in the Senate. It has been defeated. Ain't going to happen. So, no matter what the result of the hours of debate that we have here today, it will make absolutely no difference.

It is an extension of what happened with the totally manufactured crisis surrounding the debt ceiling earlier this year. The debt ceiling increase was to deal with bills that we had already incurred, for which Congress over the years had already approved the spending, and we'd borrowed the money for it. It made no difference about future debt. It made no difference about the spending commitments that had already been made. Yet we watched tremors go through international markets, not because America couldn't pay its bills, but because some politicians, for their own purposes, were willing to risk that America didn't pay its bills.

Unprecedented.

We've raised the debt ceiling over 100 times. There was no doubt that we would, in fact, honor our commitments; but there were people talking crazy enough that cast doubt. That, I think, at least in part, is why we have seen the markets in the United States be on a roller coaster and people watch their 401(k)s maybe become 301(k)s one afternoon before they go up a little again and then go back down.

It doesn't have to be this hard if, instead of a pointless exercise, we would spend some time on areas where actually Congress could come together and cooperate on dealing with the infrastructure crisis in this country, where there is broad support from the business community, organized labor, contractors, local government, environmentalists to move forward to rebuild and renew this country, putting not tens of thousands but millions of Americans to work in strengthening our country and our economy. We could be dealing with something like this, but we're not.

We could deal with reforms in agriculture that would put more money in the hands of America's farmers and ranchers, less in mega-agribusiness. We'd save money, and we'd improve the state of agriculture. While we're at it, we could probably improve the health of our children in school with their nutrition, but we're not dealing with that.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Most tellingly, we should be accelerating the reforms that the last Congress enacted. When they started, most of them were bipartisan ideas that have been implemented, in some cases, by Republican Governors. The difference between what America spends on health care this year and what the second most expensive country, Switzerland, spends is $3,000 a person, $3 trillion over 10 years. If we could just spend as much as the second most expensive country in the world.

We ought to be working on things like this that will make a difference for America, put them back to work, have fiscal stability—and maybe regain a little confidence in the political process instead of pointless exercises like this. I hope—I hope—that we will get this out of our system, get down and get to work. America deserves our best, not our worst, which is on exhibit here today.

Mr. REED. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my good friend from Michigan for yielding.

Let me take this opportunity to thank the 174 Republican Members of this House who voted with us in a bipartisan fashion just last month to avert the first Federal default in the Nation's history. It may not have been an easy vote for some, but it was the right thing to do to prevent a catastrophe that would have certainly shaken further our fragile economic recovery. Today's vote is no different.

I urge my colleagues to not give in to the political gamesmanship that Standard & Poor's cited as the very reason for its bleak downgrading of the United States' credit rating. We must reaffirm our commitment that America will meet its obligations, and we don't want to find ourselves politically explaining how we voted for it before we voted against it.

Make no mistake that voting in favor of this resolution will, in fact, lead to the very default we voted to avoid with the Budget Control Act. You cannot now be for default after having just voted against it. We must reject this resolution and move on to the real challenge of working with a bipartisan supercommittee to restore fiscal responsibility, revive our economy and, most importantly, re-instill confidence in the American citizen and the American business community.

Mr. REED. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Does the gentleman from New York have any more speakers?

Mr. REED. I have one additional speaker, and then I am prepared to close after that, I believe.

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. I know of the intentions of my colleagues across the aisle. You want to try to make America a better place.

We had the prior speaker indicate that tremors were sent through the financial markets because some politicians, for their own purposes, put the financial integrity at risk. The Democratic speaker before that indicated that we should not go against the President's ability to protect the integrity of the United States. The Democratic speaker before that said that no one was apparently advising Republicans who had missed a truck payment. Things like that.

Guess what. I know that was not intended to be misleading. I know the intent was not that, but the fact is some of us go home as we did in August.

□ 1410

Some of us get out into the far reaches, the most rural areas of America, our districts. We talk to those people. They're struggling with gas prices. They are having all kinds of trouble making ends meet, and they cannot understand how the people that are sent to Washington as representatives don't get it, how we could come up here and we can't control our spending.

So I wanted to help illuminate those friends who are mystified as to what our own purposes were in opposing a debt ceiling bill that jacked up the debt ceiling and then says, you know, we are going to cut 1, maybe 2, 2.5 trillion over 10 years when everyone in this body either knows or needs a good education to know that there is not a court, there is no way in the world you can bind a future Congress into making cuts that they have not agreed to. You can't do that. It's not enforceable. So the trick here in Washington is to back load all of the massive cuts, have a little trickle of cuts now.

So our own purposes boil down to this: I didn't deserve to be born in America. None of us that were born here did. We weren't born here because in the womb we did something deserving of being born in America. We are the most blessed nation in the history of the world, and it's not because of what anybody living today has done. We were blessed. We were born here. So many have been able to immigrate here and be blessed because of what prior generations have done: the responsibility, putting their lives on the line in war, struggling through depression to be accountable, struggling through the earliest days when they pledged their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor. Those people are the reason we have been blessed.

So to make clear about what our own purposes were in opposing that debt ceiling, that didn't really do any kind of significant cuts in the next year, 2 years, back loaded them for 10 years, because that's irresponsible. And if future generations have any hope at all of being blessed as we have been, it's up to us. We can't repay the people that paid the ultimate price and that scraped and saved and were responsible in Congresses for 200—well, not 200, but 150 years or so that lived within their means. We can't repay them, but we can repay them by being responsible for the future.

So to come in and to have a debt ceiling increase time after time after time is not a real debt ceiling. And it is not an adequate defense to say, well, Bush did it; well, Clinton did it; well, Bush did it before him or Reagan did it, and just go on down, Carter did it. At some point we have to be responsible for our own actions and quit playing the pointing game and say, look, our time is now. We are elected to be responsible now. Our own purposes are to be responsible for the debt that we are incurring now. The $4.5 trillion more than has been brought in is pretty irresponsible. That's no way to go.

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

Mr. REED. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GOHMERT. But if you want the numbers, if we are only able to save a trillion dollars over 10 years, which is quite possible under the debt ceiling deal that passed, then it will take 150 years before the budget balances if we continue to cut 1 trillion every year, and it will only add about $120 trillion to the 14 trillion we have now. If we could save 2 trillion every 10 years, then we are looking at 80 years before we balance the budget and only adding 72 trillion to the debt that we have.

That's irresponsible. This country won't be around in this form, this Congress, and therefore that is our special purpose for doing this. That is why we say it's time to stop the debt ceiling bill from where it was, get responsible, and propose real cuts so this Congress does what the people who are missing payments are trying to do—live within their means.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to say to the gentleman from Texas I disagree with his position, but I respect it. I can understand that those who voted ''no'' will now vote ''yes.'' What is not understandable is that those on the Republican side who voted ''yes'' are now voting ''no.''

I yield 4 minutes to our distinguished whip, the gentleman from the proud State of Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The previous speaker voted to go deeply into debt. Frankly, I voted for some of those programs myself, two of which were to support the efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq. We didn't pay for them.

As has been said, I didn't vote for it initially, but I think it's a good program. We have made it better for the prescription drug program, and the gentleman wasn't here when we passed that, but we didn't pay for it. He is correct: It doesn't matter which side didn't pay for it; we haven't paid for it.

This bill is about whether or not we are going to stand up and say, yes, we voted to pay for it but, guess what, we had our fingers crossed; we are not going to do it. We said we were going to do this. We took some tough action. Both sides joined together, both leaderships joined together and said we are going to do this.

Now, this bill is a phony. This is posturing. This is politics. This is pure politics because the United States Senate has already rejected this bill and only one House needed to reject it. We are going to have an extension of the debt.

The extension of the debt will simply mean that those items that we all voted on will be paid for, that we won't welsh on our debts, that America will pay its debts.

Now, this bill is about, oh, no, let's not pay our debts. Let's pretend that they don't occur, that we really don't have to pay them. America's welshing on its debts really won't have much consequence; although the overwhelming majority of people believe that if we welsh on our debts it will have extraordinary consequences. In fact, it's having extraordinary consequences on our economy right now, as we speak. It's undermined the confidence in America that we had this confrontation about whether America was going to pay its bills.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to urge my colleagues to vote down this resolution of disapproval which is transparently political and which will do nothing to secure our Nation's fiscal future. In fact, this resolution is premised on the assumption that the American people are ignorant—I don't believe that—ignorant about the nature of our debt ceiling and the sources of America's fiscal challenges.

As often as some in this House attempt to falsely persuade the American people that raising the debt ceiling means taking on more debt, we will be here to repeat the truth. This is about nothing more than paying the bills we have already incurred. The American people understand that fact, as evidenced by their disgust with the partisan brinksmanship that almost brought America to the brink of default.

What Americans want to see is us coming together to take real action on two issues they are deeply concerned about: jobs and our mounting deficit.

One of the most important things we can do to reduce the deficit is to create jobs, grow our economy, get people back to work.

The President has put forward the American Jobs Act, which incorporates many elements of House Democrats' Make It in America agenda to create jobs. I hope my Republican colleagues bring it to the House floor for a vote as soon as possible.

Over the long term, though, we must lay out a path to restore fiscal sustainability. And the only path that is feasible fiscally, politically, and morally is one that is balanced and asks everyone to pay their fair share, not let some of the special interests and favored few be left out of the obligations to bring fiscal responsibility to this Nation. All of us need to be included. A balanced solution is favored by an overwhelming majority of Americans and even three-quarters of Republicans.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. The Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction must put aside partisan politics and put some hard choices on the table, choices that encompass both spending and revenue, and we must support their efforts to reach agreement.

□ 1420

That's what the American people deserve. That's the difference between posturing on our fiscal future, as this vote today does, and leading on our fiscal future. I urge my colleagues, let's vote down this empty resolution which is a pretense, a pretend, a statement that we don't like debt. Nobody likes the debt we've incurred, and everybody ought to join together in paying it down.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is an issue of responsibility. It's not easy. It's not always politically popular. We've incurred a debt. It is our responsibility collectively, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans to come together and pay down this debt and not pretend that simply by defeating a resolution, or passing a resolution of so-called disapproval—which is already a dead letter, and everybody on your side of the aisle knows it's a dead letter because the Senate has already voted.

This is just a statement that I don't like debt. None of us like debt. Let's join together and reduce it as we did in the nineties.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. I just wanted to make sure the record was clear.

My dear friend from Maryland said there were those on this side who wanted to welsh on our debt, and that's not the case. The thing that we want to do is stop incurring debt. We are all about being good for the debt we incur. We don't want to welsh on any agreements. I didn't ask my friend for time, so my time is very limited. I just wanted to correct the record. We're not out to welsh on anything. We're here to say, let's quit incurring debt. That's the whole point.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think we have already set the parameters for this discussion. We can see by the throngs that are on the floor of the House how keenly important this is to the American people. The reason why I say that is because important discussions draw Members even away from their duties elsewhere. But we know that the reason why we are speaking to empty seats is, one, because the other body has resoundingly denounced and voted this particular provision down because we have reached a compromise, a respectable compromise that we realize we have to pay our bills.

But of course those who believe that they are not in the people's House, they can put this resolution on the floor because if they look to what the people want, 46 percent of the American people believe that jobs are more important than reducing the deficit. More than 65 percent believe we should be doing a jobs bill. We have the greatest poverty among children of all sectors in all areas of the country right now as I speak. And the new population of the impoverished are those recent college graduates. All of the stars in the eyes and excited parents who've paid large amounts of dollars to ensure that their young ones have an opportunity for a college education, there are no jobs.

Now, I don't concede to the fact that the only initiative that should come about should be from the government, but we are the umbrella on a rainy day. This is a small measure that the President has offered, a small, constructive measure, his jobs bill. It is balanced across the board. It provides relief for small businesses. It provides the jobs that they will create. It gives incentives to hire someone. It works with our larger companies as well. And, of course, it puts back to work what has been a devastating phenomenon in our communities, taking away firefighters, police and teachers. You're going to feel the pinch when your young children are in classes that are 50 and 60 persons. So this is realistic.

It also addresses the question of the 46.2 million Americans who are living in poverty. As I indicated, a disproportionate share of those are children.

So what we are doing today goes smack against what the people want, and this is the people's House. I am concerned that we are not only being redundant, but we're saying to the world: smack us as irresponsible. We have the money to pay our bills, but we want the word to go out: we are irresponsible. We're not paying any bills. We're not Greece, we're not Spain, we're not Italy. We are Americans, and we have the know-it-all and the commitment to be the greatest country.

I've never taken seriously the pundits about America's decline; but it is a decline if we get on the floor of the House and ignore the needs of our brothers and sisters, ignore the needs in the Northeast where there's been a devastating hurricane, ignore those in the Southwest where 1,400 homes have been burned to the ground in Texas. Who is going to help those folks besides their private insurance? They need the Federal Government, the rainy day umbrella on a rainy day or when a fire is there, the hose for the fire.

So I ask my colleagues to consider being realistic and rational. Vote this down. Put a jobs bill on the floor and do what the people want, create jobs now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 77, a Resolution of Disapproval intended to prevent President Obama from raising the debt ceiling by $500 billion as he is authorized to do by the debt ceiling agreement reached last month. This resolution will obstruct the federal government from meeting their financial obligations; measures like this one have already failed in the Senate. This is a colossal waste of valuable legislative time. The message has been heard loud and clear, we must address the debt limit; however another message is being muffled—the need to focus on jobs. Here we are once again with another proposal before the House that appears to throw caution to the wind. This joint resolution is gambling on our financial future, if this amendment passes then we will fail to raise our nation's debt limit and will allow our nation to default.

We should have learned a valuable lesson from what happened the last time my colleagues on the other side of the aisle tried to suggest that we should allow our nation to default. The stock market reacted immediately and a well known credit company lowered our nation's credit rating. We need to maintain our creditworthiness to meet the needs of the very people we have been sent here to serve. I am disappointed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are more interested in playing political games than creating jobs or improving the economy.

Attempting to prevent the President from raising the debt ceiling to pay for the needs of the country and functions of the government will only lead us to the brink of another crisis. This is a continued effort by my Republican friends to ransom the American economy in order to extort the American public.

Instead of working toward a bipartisan job creation bill, congressional Republicans are attempting to constrain the ability of Congress to deal effectively with America's economic, fiscal, and job creation troubles.

There has been a consistent theme this Congress of failing to bring forward measures that will create jobs. My Republicans colleagues have set the agenda. They seem focused on cutting programs that benefit the public and those in need, while making no concrete attempt to focus on job creation and economic recovery. This bill is wasting a tremendous amount of time when we should be focused on paying our nation's bills and resolving our differences.

In my district, the Texas 186, more than 190,000 people live below the poverty line. We must not, we cannot, at a time when the Census Bureau places the number of American living in poverty at the highest rate in over 50 years, cut vital social services. Not in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis and persistent unemployment, when so many rely on federal benefits to survive, like the Supplemental Nutrition Access Program, SNAP, that fed 3.9 million residents of Texas in April

2011, or the Women, Infant, and Children, WIC, Program that provides nutritious food to more than 990,000 mothers and children in my home state.

In 2010, there were 46.2 million Americans living in poverty nationwide. According to the 2010 Federal poverty threshold, determined by the US Census, a family of four is considered impoverished if they are living on less than $22,314 per year.

Children represent a disproportionate amount of the United States poor population. In 2008, there were 15.45 million impoverished children in the nation, 20.7% of America's youth. The Kaiser Family Foundation estimates that there are currently 5.6 million Texans living in poverty, 2.2 million of them children, and that 17.4% of households in the state struggle with food insecurity.

Attempts to prevent President Obama from raising the debt ceiling threaten our ability to keep paying for programs that benefit the least among us, and I for one, will not turn my back on the Americans who are the most in need of compassionate leadership and responsible governing.

Threatening an increase in the debt ceiling threatens our ability to pay for Medicare, which guarantees a healthy and secure retirement for Americans who have paid into it for their entire working lives. Protecting Medicare represents the basic values of fairness and respect for our seniors, including the 2.9 million Texans who received Medicare in 2010.

Yes, we must take steps to balance the budget and reduce the national debt, but not at the expense of vital social programs. It is unconscionable that in our nation of vast resources, my Republican colleagues would pass a budget that cuts funding for essential social programs. Poverty impacts far too many Americans and social safety nets provide these individuals with vital assistance.

Perhaps my friends on the other side of the aisle are content to conclude that life simply is not fair, equality is not accessible to everyone, and the less advantaged among us are condemned to remain as they are, but I do not accept that. That kind of complacency is not fitting for America.

Prior to the existence of the debt ceiling, Congress had to approve borrowing each time the federal government wished to borrow money in order to carry out its functions. With the onset of World War I, more flexibility was needed to expand the government's capability to borrow money expeditiously in order to meet the rapidly changing requirements of funding a major war in the modern era.

To address this need, the first debt ceiling was established in 1917, allowing the federal government to borrow money to meet its obligations without prior congressional approval, so long as in the aggregate, the amount borrowed did not eclipse a specified limit.

Since the debt limit was first put in place, Congress has increased it over 100 times; in fact, it was raised 10 times within the past decade, and last month, we were able to negotiate another compromise, and keep the country from default. I urge my colleagues not to undermine the agreement that was reached by attempting to block the President's ability to raise the debt ceiling.

Once again, the American economy hangs in the balance as the act of the President raising the debt ceiling becomes an irrelevant spending debate that is as unnecessary as it is perilous, as increasing the debt ceiling does not obligate the undertaking of any new spending by the federal government. Rather, raising the debt limit simply allows the government to pay existing legal obligations promised to debt holders that were already agreed to by Presidents and Congresses, both past and present.

This resolution is a petulant attempt to undermine President Obama. The bill itself says it is a joint resolution ''relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit''. Exercise of authority. It does not say unlawful exercise of authority, or unconstitutional exercise of authority. The language of the bill itself makes it clear the President has the authority to raise the debt ceiling as indicated in the agreement reached on August 2.

Passing this resolution will not decrease spending; it will merely compromise our ability to pay for spending already authorized. This bill does nothing to reduce the deficit, or address the budget, it only risks our economic standing and ability to pay our nation's bills, while simultaneously hurtling the nation toward another debt ceiling crisis.

Instead of spending time on resolutions designed to cast the President in a negative light, it is time for this Congress to come together, and pass meaningful legislation that will benefit the American people. In his address to a joint session of Congress last Thursday, President Obama gave this body a great opportunity to achieve bipartisan, job creating legislation that will invest in small business, help families that have been struggling with chronic unemployment, assist veterans in finding jobs, and invest in our infrastructure.

It is time for a new sense of bipartisanship. It is time for Congress to work together to aggressively take on job creation. It is time to end these divisive tactics and compromise to encourage the rapid job growth the American people deserve. I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to stand up and vote no on this partisan resolution; we can, and we must take this opportunity to declare our intent to do what is right, face what is hard, and achieve what is great.

Instead of attempting to embarrass the President, I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to come together, and focus on passing legislation that will help the American people by improving the economy and creating jobs. Now is not the time for partisan malice, now is not the time for H.J. Res 77; now is the time for this Congress to do all it can to usher in a new age of American ingenuity and prosperity. H.J. Res. 77 is simply a way to engage in past battles, and I am voting against it in order to focus on the future.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the great State of New York, Representative REED, for recognizing me, but most of all for bringing this resolution. I support it, and I urge everyone here to support it.

As you may remember, it was a two-step process when the debt ceiling was increased: an initial $400 billion immediately to avert the possibility of a default. That has been done. But an additional $500 billion will not go out if this resolution passes. I think we need to slow down and take a look at our spending before we commit another trillion dollars of debt.

We did reduce next year's budget by, I believe, $31 billion over last year. That's a good step. That's a step in the right direction, but it's only a small step when you realize that this year's deficit is $1.3 trillion. So $31 billion is only a small step in the right direction. So this would give us more time and seriousness of purpose to look at additional savings.

So with that prospect in mind, I would urge my colleagues to support this resolution. Let's slow down the adoption of an additional half trillion of debt. I urge support.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Very briefly, in one sense this is a meaningless resolution. My guess is that opinion makers in this country and I think abroad will consider it not meaningful, that it's going through the motions.

But there is a real danger here, and that is what it says about the dynamics on the majority side. That's the worrisome thing. It isn't that we would slow things down. If this were to pass and become law, indeed, the ceiling would fall. We would go into default very soon.

And I guess what this resolution being allowed to be brought up says is that there's a feeling within majority ranks that we have to let some bring this up, and perhaps a lot who voted ''yes'' now in essence vote ''no'' in order to bring some kind of peaceful equilibrium within the ranks of the majority.

The problem is that we need to be able to reach across the aisle. Having set up a select committee, it says we need to worry less about the dynamics within our caucus or conference and more about reaching common ground.

□ 1430

That's why this exercise isn't meaningless. The danger is that it will become very meaningful and that we will become—this Congress—essentially handicapped, if not imprisoned, by the inability of the majority on this side to step up to the plate and realize that in order to solve our problems there needs to be a balanced instead of imbalanced approach; that we have to look at revenues as well as spending cuts. That's the significance of this being brought up here.

I think all of us need to take another look before we essentially change our votes. And, essentially, it would mean ''signaling.'' It will be still more difficult than the present perilous path to make meaningful our effort to move ahead in this country to address the job needs in this country, and yes, to address the deficit, but mainly or essentially to get our economy growing again. If we don't send that right signal here today, and send the wrong signal, I'm afraid this vote will become too meaningful.

I strongly urge that people vote ''no.'' I strongly urge on the Republican side that those who stepped up to the plate last time, step up to the plate this time and not duck for what is essentially an internal political dynamic. The dynamics of this country in terms of jobs and job growth, those dynamics are too essential for partisan internal politics to reign supreme on this floor at this time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I truly appreciate the sentiments of my colleague from Michigan, and I truly appreciate the debate that we've had today on this resolution.

It is time that we come together. As a member of the freshman class that's come to Washington, DC, I can tell you it is not a group of radical extremists, but men and women who have left their families, who have left their businesses, and have come down here to Washington, DC to accomplish what needs to be accomplished, that is, to get the fiscal house of Washington in order; it is to have the ability and skill to deal with the economy and put people back to work.

We have the energy, we have the desire to reignite this country so that generations of our children and grandchildren will be able to enjoy the benefits that we have all benefited from. We come here sincerely to reach across the aisle to have an open and honest dialogue with each and every one of the Members of this House, and that is why this debate is such a positive thing, in my mind. Because we are now starting down the path of recognizing that the debt has to be dealt with once and for all, but at the same time we must work together to heal our country, to reignite our country's economy so that people can afford the American Dream that they so deserve and as each and every one of us has always benefited from.

So I come here this afternoon and offer this resolution to send a message to the President, to the world, to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we cannot take our eye off the ball. We have to do all things. Because we are in a historic time when the issues we face can no longer be pushed down the road. It is now time to lead. It is now time to come together and act for this great Nation, the United States of America.

In this vote, I urge all my colleagues to support the passage of this resolution to send that message that we will deal with the debt, we will deal with the economy, we will deal with the jobs, and we will create an environment upon which the private sector will blossom again and people will benefit for generations to come.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 77, a resolution disapproving of President Obama's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit. The recent decision by the President to raise the debt ceiling was not one made in haste or taken lightly, but rather it is one that absolutely must be made. The consequences of not acting are so grave that we could not let it be an option as it would do great irreparable damage to our economy. We played with fire last month, and although we ultimately approved an increase, we spooked world markets and caused an unprecedented downgrading of our country's heretofore sterling credit rating. In brief, we must raise the debt ceiling to prevent a default on our Nation's obligations, avert an international economic crisis, and prevent further harm from being visited upon middle class families.

My colleagues have failed to recognize the damage their political posturing is doing to our economy. We have wasted plenty of floor time on theater, and in the meantime have let our Nation dangle on the precipice of default. Instead of rehashing old arguments and playing the same political blame games, we should come together and focus on the main problem facing Americans today: jobs. When I was back home in Michigan during the August recess, I heard firsthand from my constituents about the urgent need to create jobs, regenerate our economy, and get America going again. People across our Nation are hurting and are sick of the inaction in Washington.

President Obama should be commended for taking the initiative on this important issue by unveiling the American Jobs Act. While we may disagree on the specifics of his proposal, it should be considered on merit alone and Congress should come together to reach consensus on what can be done to improve the economy. Resolutions such as this one are nothing but a distraction from this important mission, which is why I am voting against it today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the statute, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 186, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 706]

AYES—232

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—186

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)

Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Ribble
Walsh (IL)

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann
Barletta
Capuano
Deutch
Giffords
Grimm
Lewis (GA)
Marino
Nadler
Towns
Yarmuth

□ 1502

Mr. DREIER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. ROGERS of Alabama, GOODLATTE, WHITFIELD, ALEXANDER, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 706, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2881

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for Representative HASTINGS of Washington to be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2881 and be replaced with Representative HASTINGS of Florida.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING CUMBERLAND AMERICAN LITTLE LEAGUE TEAM

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Cumberland American Little League team from my home State of Rhode Island. Cumberland American reached its first Little League World Series after winning the New England Regional Championship. It was one of 16 teams out of 6,800 Little League All-Star teams that made it to the World Series in Williamsport, Pennsylvania.

Congratulations to Cumberland American for working so hard and for showing such great sportsmanship in the World Series. In my record book, Cumberland American is a champion, not because it drove in the most runs or caught the most fly balls, but because of the dedication and respect and sportsmanship they showed while playing this great game.

Little League baseball is more than a game. It's an enrichment activity that fosters community spirit and helps young people develop critical skills. The coaches, sponsors, Little League officials, and parents who cheered from the stands all played valuable roles in making Cumberland American a success and providing a safe and nurturing environment for these young people to grow.

Thank you to all who made this possible. Again, my congratulations to each of our Cumberland American Little League Baseball players.

CUMBERLAND, RHODE ISLAND AMERICAN LITTLE LEAGUE TEAM ROSTER

Players: Jacob Glod; Austin Cabral; Stephen Dugas; Max Hanuschak; Cam Rosa; Connor Lavallee; Chris Wright; Connor Mastin; James Belisle; Thomas Faltus; Matt Murphy; Colin Cannata; Ryan McCormick.

Coaches: Dave Belisle; Chris Gold; Matt Wright.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that all of us, all 435 of us, went back to our districts during the August recess. Now, I would suspect that most every Member of this House heard what I heard. I suspect that all of us who were listening heard the same message: When can I go back to work? When will there be a job for me? I'm going to lose my house because I lost my job. I can't afford to put my kids through school. You guys have got to get the job engine working once again. You've got to get Americans back to work.

Well, we are back here at work, and we're probably at the 257th day of this Congress, and yet the Republican majority has yet to put one jobs-creating bill on the floor. Now, they put a lot of bills on the floor, all of which would actually reduce employment. You cut the budgets, you're cutting somebody's job.

Fortunately, last week, the President of the United States came before this Congress, stood there where the Speaker is now standing, and presented to the American people an answer to the question that all of us heard during the recess. And he said: We can and we will put Americans back to work when Congress acts on this jobs act.

The American Jobs Act is now before the United States Congress and the United States Senate, and it's time for us to act so that Americans can go back to work.

Some say we could delay until after the next election. It will be 17 months—just short of a year and a half—before the next Congress will be in session and we will be able to pass legislation. There is not an unemployed American in this Nation that can or wants to wait 17 months to get a job. We have the opportunity today to put Americans back to work with the American Jobs Act.

The American Jobs Act works. It works. Americans can immediately go back to work as soon as that legislation is passed by this House and the Senate and put on the President's desk.

This afternoon, we're going to take maybe an hour with my colleagues to talk about various parts of the American Jobs Act, and we're going to start right now with the Representative from Illinois.

JAN, if you would join us, you talked earlier about this very eloquently on the steps of the Capitol. Please share with us.

□ 1510

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Let me add a personal twist to all of this about jobs.

When I grew up in Chicago—I was the daughter of a furniture salesman and a Chicago public schoolteacher—the American Dream was alive and well. On my dad's modest income, we could afford a little house in a quiet, middle class neighborhood.

Back then, a man could work in the steel mills on Chicago's South Side—one good union job with family health care benefits and a decent pension—and really live a middle class life. The family could own a home and buy a car and even send the kids to college. That was the 1950s, and anything seemed possible if you were willing to work hard. Incomes were going up for everyone. Income inequality was shrinking, and Americans were experiencing the greatest growth in living standards in history. For most working families, that American Dream was in reach, and that was the normal.

But today, after decades of attacks on organized labor, the passage of tax policies that favor wealthy individuals and corporations, the growing disparity of income, the squandering of a

budget surplus, and the turning of a blind eye to Wall Street greed and recklessness, that dream is drowning in a sea of joblessness. I feel like the Republicans are pushing this as the new normal: that the rich get richer and the rest of the country gets poorer. Fortunately, our President, President Barack Obama, has made it perfectly clear that we are not helpless in the face of our daunting but man-made economic challenges, and he has proposed a jobs bill that will immediately improve people's lives and jump-start the economy.

The answer to this jobs crisis is surprisingly simple. If you want to create jobs, then create jobs, good jobs—jobs that can provide people with a middle class life, that can rebuild our middle class, jobs like the 35,000 schools that under the President's bill will be repaired.

There are children all over this country right now who are sitting in classrooms where the ceilings are crumbling, that have dangerous asbestos in them, that are leaking energy, that don't have the wiring for the new technologies that our children need to succeed in this world and to get those 21st century jobs. We don't have the kind of schools and classrooms in which our children are going to be able to compete in this 21st century world. At the same time, we have hundreds and thousands of construction workers and electricians and boilermakers and maintenance workers who are jobless right now, who are sitting home, unemployed, who are more than willing to roll up their sleeves and give our schoolchildren the kind of classrooms that they deserve.

So here we have a tremendous need, and we have the people who can answer that need. Not only will they be back to work, but it will jump-start our economy and be good for everyone. It is not rocket science. We can do this, and we need to do it now. As the President said, the election isn't until 14 months from now. The Republicans seem to want to adjudicate this issue at that time, but this isn't about politics. This is about all those families who simply want a job. They don't want to be receiving unemployment benefits. As a matter of fact, they want to pay taxes.

If we want to reduce the deficit, jobs are the answer once again. Jobs equal deficit reduction. That's why we can't wait to pass this American Jobs Act. We need to enlist the help of all Americans to call their Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats—I'm talking about the people out there regardless of party—to say, ''We need to pass this right now.'' This is the way that we can get back to what the normal was when I was growing up, when there was opportunity. People lived a middle class life. Instead, we're watching that middle class disappear and that American Dream slip through our fingers. The economy needs to be revived. The President has the answer. We need to do it now.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentlelady from Illinois who speaks so eloquently on this.

As you were talking about the schools, 44 percent of the principals across this Nation say clearly that their schools are not up to the standard that they want to have their own children in. In the classrooms, paint on the walls is falling off and bathrooms are inadequate, playgrounds and the like. There are 35,000 schools across this country that can be repaired, that can be rebuilt—new classrooms, science classrooms, upgrading the Internet systems in these schools, and the playgrounds. All of that is possible.

How correct you are when you say there are men and women out there who are ready to do that work. These are a lot of jobs. This isn't heavy equipment work. This is heavy ''person power'' work. Let's put these people to work.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. May I say one more thing about it?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Please.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. These are jobs that can be created right away. I'm from the Midwest, so we actually have a construction season; but for fixing schools, you can do that around the year, around the calendar. We can put these people to work within a few months. They can be on the job, earning money. This is such a sensible program.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Actually, in discussing this with the administration, the day the bill is signed, the schools can begin the work because the administrative process is very straightforward. This is a very, very important one. We're talking 35,000 schools, perhaps several hundred thousand or a couple hundred thousand men and women going to work immediately to repair our schools. Wouldn't that give us community pride? My school is getting repaired. It's getting a paint job. The toilets are getting fixed and the classroom, the science classroom.

This is community pride. This is American pride in our most basic of investments—the investment in our children.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. The sign you have there says that poor conditions of their schools interfere with students' learning. So we are also depriving our children of that sense of pride that will motivate them to be good students, to learn, to be ready to take over in this 21st century job market.

Mr. GARAMENDI. One of my favorite subjects is Making It In America. The way the legislation is written, when that gallon of paint, when that heating/air-conditioning system or the playground equipment is brought to the school, it's going to be made in America. It's going to be made in America because the legislation that the President brought to us says that the money will be used to buy equipment made in America.

I notice that our colleague from Maryland, DONNA EDWARDS, has joined us.

I know we were talking earlier about some of your favorite subjects. I believe it was infrastructure. So please, if you will, DONNA, join us in this conversation.

Ms. EDWARDS. I want to thank the gentleman because I think that we've received some rather sobering news about the state of America and the state of American workers—the state of Americans.

It is that here we are at a time when we've reached the highest poverty rates in 52 years in this country, where median incomes are down lower than they've been in a generation—7 percent less, in fact, than what median incomes were even in 1999—where nearly a third of African American families in this country live in poverty, where millions upon millions of children in this country go to bed hungry because they live in poverty, because their families—their parents—don't have a chance for a job and an opportunity.

I think that that should be sobering news for us, not as Democrats and Republicans; it should be sobering news for us as Americans. That's why, when I heard President Obama in this House speaking to the American people about the need to create jobs right now, I know what I heard was a message that said: I suppose with the politics we could politic this out for 14 months, that we could fight amongst ourselves as Democrats and Republicans for 14 months, that we could in the political arena just raise millions and millions of dollars to run campaign ads and make annoying phone calls to people across this country for 14 months—or we could take a different path.

□ 1520

We could take a path that's really about creating jobs and opportunities for people who are living in poverty, for Americans who want to work right now.

I had a really interesting experience for me over the break that the Congress had. I visited the new Martin Luther King, Jr., memorial with my mother—my mother, who was born at the beginning of the Depression, my mother, who lived in a community in North Carolina where she would visit the local town and had segregated water fountains, where people really struggled. They were farmers who struggled greatly to put food on the table.

On the way to the Martin Luther King, Jr., memorial, we passed the memorial to FDR. I saw there the statues representing people who were standing in employment lines and in food lines, and I saw the words of that wonderful President who recognized that he had to get beyond the politics to a point where we were creating jobs, not just meaningless jobs, but jobs that were about rebuilding the Nation's infrastructure, that were about putting people to work so that they could put food on their tables so that they could make a contribution to this country.

So as I walked, as we walked from the FDR memorial over to the Martin Luther King, Jr., memorial, I said to myself that the United States right now, in this time of great need, with 14 million people unemployed, that we need an FDR moment, that the American people need an FDR moment and that that moment has to be about creating jobs for people right here in America, for rebuilding our manufacturing sector, for investing in research and development and innovation and creativity, for taking those 150,000 bridges across this country that are falling apart.

And I know when I drive over a bridge, I don't say, Is this a Republican bridge or is this a Democratic bridge? What I say is, Is this a bridge that I can get my car over that waterway safely? And when I look at that bridge and I see the steel beams, I know that those are steel beams manufactured by people right here in the United States.

When I look at the asphalt and the cement that covers that bridge, I see work that took place right here in the United States. When I look at those bridges and these 150,000 bridges all across the country that need to be rebuilt by hardworking Americans, what I see are the light posts up by the bridge with the electricity running through them or the solar panels on them that are put there and built there by American workers.

So when the President says to pass the American Jobs Act right away, the reason he is saying that is because those are jobs right now for hardworking Americans who actually want to work hard, building things in this country, rebuilding all of our infrastructure, our bridges, our roadways, our water and sewer systems that are falling apart. They want to do this.

I think it's really incumbent on us to do it, and I think that the American people ought to hold each and every one of us to account for failing to do it.

I note, as Mr. GARAMENDI is showing here and that we will see, that nearly 2 million construction workers across this country are unemployed. When our colleague, JAN SCHAKOWSKY from Illinois, talks about the 35,000 schools that need to be reconstructed for the 21st century so that our young people can learn in a 21st-century learning environment, it is not just because it feels good but because it will make a difference to our own competitiveness for the 21st century. What I know is that those are those 2 million construction workers who are unemployed across this country who can do that work in our schools, in their communities.

So I think that this is a real imperative, and I would just urge our colleagues to look beyond the D and an R and look to a job for the American people who are asking us to do this for them, but also to do this for us. I don't know how it is that we survive in a global economy when we are not producing anything, when we are not putting our people back to work, when we are not engaged in rebuilding all of our infrastructure that was decades in the making from FDR and beyond and is now falling apart.

I owe that to my mother and my grandmother and my grandfather for the generation that did all of that for us. We owe it to them not to allow it to fall apart.

So I say, yes, let's pass the American Jobs Act now.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Representative EDWARDS, thank you so very much for your compassion and passion for these issues. Bringing FDR, the monument, and Martin Luther King together around this set of issues is really important.

This is the worst economy since the Great Depression, and I remember on one of those plaques at the FDR memorial—and I may get this wrong a little bit—but he said, we measure our progress not by those who have much could have more, but by those who have little have enough. He had the compassion.

Last week, the President brought to us an answer to the compelling question that we hear—what are you going to do about jobs?—the American Jobs Act.

You spoke so eloquently about the infrastructure—the streets, the bridges, the schools—and that 2 million construction workers are out of jobs. The President has proposed a $50 billion immediate infusion of money into America's infrastructure—into our roads, our bridges, our water systems, our airports. There is $50 billion available this year to put Americans back to work.

It's not just the construction workers that will have those jobs, because these people will be able to keep their homes. They will be able to buy their food; they will be able to bring that money back into their economy with what is called the multiplier effect. And so that $50 billion may run through the economy three times, two and a half times, so that instead of 2 million, maybe it will be 3 million that will get their jobs.

I know that you want to add to this, Ms. EDWARDS.

Ms. EDWARDS. Thank you for that.

I just want to remind our colleagues that for every $1 billion, $1 billion that we invest in repairing the Nation's infrastructure, we create 35,000 jobs: $1 billion, 35,000 jobs.

So the multiplier effect is really tremendous. It is the construction worker on the site, but it's also the canteen truck that drives up—that's the small business person at that site. It's the engineers and all of the technicians who develop that amazing engineering for these construction sites. It's the architects who are designing a revamped school in a neighborhood to educate our children to compete in the 21st century. So $1 billion equals 35,000 jobs.

Mr. GARAMENDI. There you have it. That's when we have the opportunity if we act now. If this Chamber, empty but for three of us and our staffs here and the desk crew, were to act tomorrow on the legislation that the President has brought before us—it's in proper form; it's before us—we could take it up, and these people, all that you talked about, could be at work in the next couple of weeks. That's the possibility.

Ms. EDWARDS, thank you so much for joining us and for your eloquence and for your determination to make this happen.

Our friend from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) has joined us. Please share with us your thoughts from middle America.

□ 1530

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, and I appreciate your leading this hour.

Just last week, the President stood just behind where you're standing and addressed this Congress—bipartisan, bicameral, Senators and House Members—and laid out a plan to fix this economy. Pass this bill, he said. And we need to pass the bill. The President and his team have put a lot of work into it. People want jobs. They want to work.

In my district, there are more unemployed. Every weekend when I go out in my district, people come up to me and tell me they are either looking for a job, have lost their job and are looking for a job. We need to find ways to put those people to work. We are working on ways to make schools better. Building infrastructure which is so important to Memphis, Tennessee, where we have rails, roads, rivers, and runways, the distribution center of America, is so important. And if you put the money in infrastructure, which this plan plans on, Make It In America, if you do infrastructure, it's got to be made in America. You can't export those jobs overseas, and you put people to work immediately. What they are building are avenues that make commerce move and work.

Federal Express moves more packages around the world than any other American company, and Memphis International Airport is the largest American cargo airport in the world. We create jobs by putting money into infrastructure. Teachers, policemen, and firefighters, 3 million kept their jobs because of the recovery bill that we passed that did successfully help this country stay out of a great depression.

Sometimes, Mr. GARAMENDI, I'm amazed at the rhetoric that you hear from some people, particularly from the other side, who blithely tell people that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act was $770 billion that didn't make a difference. The fact is that 40 percent of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, so as to pass the Senate where we needed Senator COLLINS' and Senator SNOWE's votes, were the Republican endorsed and loved tax cuts. How can they talk out of both sides of their mouth and say that a bill, 40 percent of which—which means over $300 billion of tax

cuts—didn't do any good, because now all they talk about is tax cuts.

But when the President of the United States proposes and the Congress with him in a bipartisan effort passes tax cuts—and I'm not sure that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act was bipartisan. That was strictly Democrats. But when we passed tax cuts with a few Republicans in the Senate, in their minds, it didn't create any jobs. But when they propose tax cuts, this is Christopher Columbus' new way to find the New World. Well, it's hypocritical.

We need to support our President because he is the President. There isn't a red America and a blue America. There is, as he said in his speech at the 2004 Democratic Convention, the United States of America. People need to understand that. We need to be here for that red, white, and blue flag, for this country, to put this country back to work, to keep it as the most competitive country in the world so we don't fall behind China and India in engineering and science, and coming up with programs that give our children an opportunity to be able to fill the jobs of the 21st century—the green jobs that the President has proposed that are the jobs of the 21st century, and the technology jobs that we haven't done a good enough job in filling, giving money to colleges to do the research for industry to create jobs.

In our caucus yesterday, we had Joseph Stiglitz, a Nobel Prize winning economist. I read Krugman a lot, a Nobel Prize winning economist. Both say basically the same thing: The austerity programs proposed by the other side don't work. They've used them in Japan; didn't work. Greece, England, didn't work—unless you're in the upper 1 percent. If you wear a crown and you're the queen or the prince or the leaders of whatever, it works. But in this country, we don't have that kind of royalty, but we're starting to have a separate society with the upper 1 percent who the Republican Party won't raise their taxes no matter what, and the rest.

The President is right. We need to think about the whole country. We need to come together as a United States of America, not a red, a blue, a Democrat or Republican, and create jobs. The President's plan, over half of it, is tax cuts.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say we can go for what we like there even though they said it didn't work when the President and the Democrats passed it in the Recovery Act, but they can't go for the infrastructure jobs that, of course, help businesses—trucking businesses, the airline industry, and the transportation industry. Automobiles and trucks have to have highways. So we need to pass this.

I support the President. I took an oath to do what I could to make this country better. We need to come together now because this is a crisis time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. COHEN, thank you so very much. Your experience from the great Midwest, along America's great river, is really important for us to understand.

We really have an opportunity here right now. This legislation is before Congress and the Senate, and we have an opportunity for a better deal for America. It's an investment in America. We talked about the infrastructure. That's an investment that will last for 50 to 100 years because it's in the ground. It's the roads, the sanitation system. It's also a critical investment in tomorrow's workers, in our children.

The American Jobs Act has money for 280,000 teachers; 280,000 teachers will be able to stay on the job. Right now in California, teachers are getting laid off as they are in most other States of this Nation. That means that classroom sizes are going up, and the educational opportunity for our children is diminishing. We have no more important investment. Roads are important and bridges are important, but the most important investment in any society, in any economy is the investment in education, in the children, in tomorrow's workforce. 280,000 teachers will be able to stay in the classroom. This money flows directly to the school districts, not a big administrative task at all but one that goes there directly.

Small businesses. Our Republican colleagues love to talk about small businesses, and they say, correctly, most jobs are created by small businesses. That's true. That's accurate. Sixty-four percent of the new jobs over the past 15 years were created by small businesses. But what are they doing for small businesses? Cutting the contracts that the small businesses depend upon as they push an austerity budget.

The American Jobs Act takes a different path. It tells small businesses: You get an immediate tax break; 3.1 percent of your payroll tax will be eliminated in the next year. That's a lot of money, and I'll explain how much it is. In addition to that, if you hire a long-term unemployed worker, your entire payroll tax will disappear.

Let me tell you what that means. Let's take a warehouse.

You've got warehouses in your district?

Mr. COHEN. We've got lots of warehouses. They're full of goods ready to go on Federal Express planes and service the rest of this Nation. It all starts in Memphis, Tennessee, and goes out from there.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thought they might have some of that Tennessee whiskey in them. Some of that, too?

Mr. COHEN. Some of that, too.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So a warehouse with a payroll last year of $7 million that this year hires 40 new workers, it would add $2 million to its payroll. It would get a full refund of the 6.2 percent payroll taxes paid on the $2 million of payroll. How much is that? That's $124,000 that goes immediately to the bottom line of that warehouse. In addition to that, they have already seen a 3.1 percent reduction—actually, it's a 50 percent reduction in their payroll tax for workers who were already there, and that's another $155,000. So we are looking here at $279,000 of reduced expenses, taxes, to that company. That means that they can improve the warehouse. That means they can expand or hire more workers. This is in the President's American jobs program specifically for small businesses.

Listen up, America. Listen up businesses out there. There is an opportunity here for you to immediately expand your business, reduce your payroll taxes, hire new workers, bringing a new worker on that has been on long-term unemployment and paying no payroll taxes for the next year. This is very, very important and very big, and it is immediately available as soon as the leadership, the Republican leadership in this House, brings the American jobs bill to the floor.

Mr. COHEN, if you would like to carry on here, I know you have some more thoughts.

□ 1540

Mr. COHEN. Well, just the whole prospect. Jobs are so important. I was thinking back about Stiglitz. I think you were there at the caucus. He and Krugman say the same thing, that there's several ways you can get yourself out of this deficit. He went back into a little bit of history about how during the Clinton years we had a big deficit from the Reagan-Bush years and that President Clinton, with a bill that was passed in this Congress with all Democrat votes in about 1994, I think, put us on a road to balance the budget, and got us a surplus. It got us a surplus by the time President Clinton left office.

Stiglitz said, which is so true—it's a factoid—the surplus was lost because of two wars, one of which was a volunteer war, not related to 9/11—Iraq—and Afghanistan, that were both passed through these Congresses, which were Republican-controlled, Republican Congresses, without being funded. Then the Bush tax cuts giving the wealthiest people the largest tax cuts and contributing to the largest disparity in wealth that we've ever had in this Nation.

Now, the wealthy can only spend so much. There are only so many Chanel purses a woman can buy. There are only so many Rolex watches a guy can have, but we are losing a middle class. Then we put all this wealth through these tax cuts on the richest, making their tax rates the lowest since the 1950s, and then extended it for 2 years, the inheritance tax, to where the wealthy get to keep more and more in perpetuity.

The middle class is disappearing in this country. Jobs are being shipped overseas. Taxes stay high on them. They're living paycheck to paycheck. They've got their children in school. Pell Grants are in danger. They almost

were reduced in the last month or two, but we salvaged them in the final bill. People are having trouble making ends meet, and the middle class has got to be there to be a consumer group. If you don't have consumers, you can't have an economy to service people who are making goods and services. You've got to have a customer. We're losing the customer base.

We can ship all the jobs we want off to Southeast Asia and China, where they don't pay any salaries and don't give any benefits; but those people aren't our market, and if our people can't buy goods, then we're not going to have any manufacturing base and the opportunity to make it in America.

So we've got to build up the middle class. We've got to produce jobs, and we've got to see to it that the middle class is given priority and not the richest 1 percent.

The President's plan, which is so great, is it's all paid for. It's paid for. But paid for by a tax that's appropriate for the people who can afford it.

Tell us how we can deal with that and keep this as a paid-for program.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I've been kind of shuffling the boards down here because you went through several subjects along the way, and each one is so terribly important and pertinent to the issue. But I think I can wrap it all up in this, and that is, America lost about 50 percent of its manufacturing jobs in the last 20, 25 years. We went from 20 million, 21 million manufacturing jobs to just over 10 million today, but we can once again rebuild the American manufacturing sector. That's where the middle class jobs are.

You had talked about tax policy, that the tax policy has shifted from one that was broad based and which the wealthy and everybody participated in in a progressive mechanism in which now the wealthy—and Warren Buffett has said it so very well—he actually pays a lower tax rate than does his secretary. He said, This is wrong. This is upside down and wrong. And he's quite correct. But if we take a look at the manufacturing sector of America and we apply a couple of principles, that is, that we're going to buy American—and this has to do with our policies here.

Trade policies. We've been giving it away in these international trade deals. On the taxes, we just talked about that. The tax burden has shifted from the wealthy down to the middle class, further eroding the purchasing power and the status of the middle class, so much so that just yesterday the Bureau of Labor Statistics came out with a report that the poverty level in America has reached the highest level in 52 years. That's the pushing down of the American middle class so that those at the bottom have been pushed out of the middle class into poverty.

Mr. COHEN. Out of six adults—think about that—one out of six adults. Now this body of which I am extremely proud to be a Member is not representative of America. Because if it were, one out of six, or 74 people, would be earning $22,000 a year or less for a family of four. So that doesn't happen. One out of five children in this country is now living in poverty—they're in my district—and people can't get along without having a job.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Exactly right. Twenty-two million children living in poverty, not knowing where their next meal is going to come from. At the same time, they're cutting the food programs.

This is our program. This is the President's program. Every one of the things that is in the American Jobs Act is here. Taxes. There are tax breaks for businesses. And this entire program is paid for by ending the giveaway of our tax money to the oil companies. That's $4 billion a year—$40 billion over the next decade—of our tax money going to support the oil industry, the wealthiest industry in this world.

Mr. COHEN. How about the hedge fund guys? There's another Steve Cohen. There's the one in New York that's got all the money, the hedge fund guy, billions and billions of dollars.

What does he pay on his income?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, he pays 15 percent. Somehow or another they got into the law. The hedge fund folks that are making hundreds of millions of dollars a year—in some cases, billions—are paying 15 percent on their income. Now they've got it classified as capital gains when, in fact, it's their labor. That is, it's their work. As you and I are working here and as people are working in the manufacturing plants, it's their work, but it's taxed at 15 percent, not at 35 or 38 percent. What's that all about? Where are we going to end that tax break? That's about $17 billion over 10 years.

Mr. COHEN. And that shouldn't exist. That's absurd. There's another Steve Cohen, the magician, and apparently he had something to do with the Tax Code when they took care of the other Steve Cohen.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So taxes are part of it. The energy policy, we haven't talk about that. We talked about labor—putting men and women back to work. And the education system, 280,000 new teachers or teachers in the classroom. Research and infrastructure, this is part of the Make it in America agenda which can be carried out with the American Jobs Act.

So, if we pass the American Jobs Act, we've got a really good opportunity to once again make things in America, because the legislation calls for about $50 billion in infrastructure and the establishment of an infrastructure bank for sanitation, water systems, Internet, high-speed cable, and all of those kinds of things in the infrastructure bank. So we may be looking at $60 billion, $70 billion a year of investment in these infrastructure projects. Coupled with that is Buy America, Make it in America. Buy American-made buses, American-made locomotives. The concrete and steel in the bridges, that's going to be American made.

I can tell you one of the greatest horror stories about infrastructure. It's right in San Francisco, just outside my district. The San Francisco Bay Bridge, a multibillion-dollar rebuilding of the Bay Bridge because it falls down in an earthquake. It did once. We don't want it to happen again. Multibillion dollars. To save 10 percent, the contract went to Chinese steel companies. All of the steel manufacturing in that bridge comes from China. Thousands of jobs in China. And to make things worse, the inspectors were over there, and they didn't do a good job. Beyond that, when the bridge parts came over here, Chinese workers came with the bridge. No more of that. We're going to make it in America.

I've got a bill in—others are working on this—and that is, if it's American taxpayer money, by God, it's going to be used to buy American taxpayer goods and services. We can do this, and the first step is the American Jobs Act.

Mr. COHEN. You mention on there—I looked at your chart—education. Part of the American Jobs Act is to rebuild our schools and to go to work and make them structurally sound and also energy efficient. When you look at labor, it's work. The labor movement has been attacked all over this country, and it's labor who's created the middle class and seen to it they got good jobs and opportunities and wages and benefits.

In my community, we just had a grocery store taken over by a large national grocery store. A grocery store from another city had come in and taken over some local owners. One man worked there for 44 years. He'd been making $9.85 an hour and working 40 hours a week. They came in and said, You can work 16 hours. You'll get $7.50 an hour. You won't get your benefits that you had accumulated, and you'll go to another store. He quit. They did a lot of employees that way.

What happened yesterday? Help inform me. Because I heard this, and it's difficult to believe: Bank of America, did they make something like $7 billion last year? And how many people did they lay off yesterday?

□ 1550

Mr. GARAMENDI. They're talking about laying off 40,000 people across America in the next year.

Mr. COHEN. So how does that jibe with what we hear from the other side about just trust business to hire people, that the jobs come from business and the private sector?

They're making $7.8 billion. They benefited from the TARP—a President Bush/Secretary Paulson plan that I supported in a bipartisan manner that kept Bank of America alive. I think they're on the hook, maybe, since some Federal recent action considering their loans and all. But $7 billion, and

they're laying off 30,000 to 40,000 people? Those people are going to need unemployment benefits, and it's not because they don't want a job. They've been put out.

A lot of qualified people who can do jobs and are intelligent don't have jobs because they are not there. But the people at the top are making more money than ever. They're eating at Masa in New York. They're eating the $500 dinner at the Japanese restaurant and not thinking twice about it, and they're firing people right and left. The limousines are still moving. The wealthy are still doing whatever they've been doing. They've got their jets—not the football team—their private jets. They're living great, but the American Dream is disappearing. The American Dream disappeared for my grocery workers. It's disappearing for Bank of America employees. It's disappearing for a lot of people.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The American public, through the TARP program, bailed out Wall Street, bailed out the banks, and the banks have done nothing. The big Wall Street banks have done nothing except enrich themselves at the expense of the American taxpayer. Those days should be over. We need to move in a different direction.

One of the groups we really need to help are those men and women that have been fighting the wars. Now, my personal view is that the war in Afghanistan ought to stop tomorrow. We ought to bring that $120 billion a year that we're spending in Afghanistan, bring it back here, invest it in America in education and bridges, infrastructure and debt relief; 120 billion a year in Afghanistan, and we're still spending a vast amount of money in Iraq. End those wars, bring that money home. Bring the soldiers home. And when we do, we're bringing home a lot of wounded Americans, wounded Americans who need our respect and who need jobs.

In the American Jobs Act there is a special place for veterans, special advantage. They deserve it. They're the ones that have sacrificed. They're the ones that took time out of their lives to fight those wars. Whatever we may think about those wars, we can only think good thoughts and honor the veterans, and here's a way to do it.

There are 877,000 unemployed veterans in America today—nearly 1 million; 877,000 looking for work. In the American Jobs Act, there is a very special tax credit available to any employer who hires a veteran. You can reduce your taxes by $5,600 right off the bottom, $5,600 tax credit—not a deduction, but a credit. And if you happen to hire one of those wounded vets—and we know them, we've seen their pictures, we know what post-traumatic stress syndrome is all about—hire a wounded vet, and it's a $9,600 tax credit to every employer, whomever it happens to be, across this Nation. Now that's what we need to do.

All the talk about balancing the budget, all the talk about a deficit hasn't put one person to work in America; in fact, it has laid off hundreds of thousands of people. We need to put America back to work. The American Jobs Act does that, and it does it in a very special way. For those Americans that have been out there sacrificing in Iraq, in Afghanistan it gives them an opportunity. It gives every employer an incentive to hire those workers. We owe it to these men and women. And when these men and women go back to work, they become taxpayers. And when men and women in America go back to work and become taxpayers, then the deficit will be resolved, then we will solve the deficit.

We need to make cuts, we need to do those things, but those are in the out years. Right now, it is about jobs. The President has given us the legislation. The question for our Republican leadership here is—they control this House; they're the ones that set the agenda; they're the only ones that can bring a bill to the floor—When will you bring the American Jobs Act to this floor so that we can put Americans back to work?

Mr. COHEN, I know how deeply you feel about this. I know that in your district your people that you represent are hurting. They want jobs.

We're going to wrap this up in just a few moments. So for our closing remarks, go for it.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI.

Every weekend I'm home—and the weeks that I'm home, because we're home many weeks now, this Congress doesn't work them very much. We spend a lot of time at home. And that's a beautiful thing for us, but not a great thing for America because we need to be here, working on trying to get a jobs bill passed, which hasn't been introduced by the majority yet.

But Professor Stiglitz talked about the causes of the loss of the surplus that President Clinton and the Democratic Congress got in the late part of the 20th century. It was the two wars—voted for by this Congress, supported by President Bush, the Bush tax cuts—passed by this Congress, proposed by President Bush; and Medicare part D, President Bush's Medicare plan to take care of the insurance companies. That's what did it. Those were the causes.

Professor Stiglitz, and he has a lady that works with him—I think her name is Linda Bilmes—they've studied what it's going to cost in America in the years to come with the veterans. Now, the ones we can employ, we need to employ. But 1 to 2 percent are going to come back disabled, and they're going to need veteran services and they're going to need money for the rest of their lives. So these wars, particularly the Iraq war—President Bush and the Republican Congress' war—is going to cost this country for another 70 years, at minimum; and we need to be prepared for that.

We need to come together. And there's no question that when Professor Stiglitz said, when you can borrow money at like 1 or 2 percent and make a greater percentage on it, this is the time that you borrow because rates are so low. And the top people in economics say this whole idea of the austerity and the cut is wrong. What does it do? It helps the wealthy because they're immune to it. The benefit for the low-cost labor they get overseas and the salaries they get here, they get great tax rates, helps them.

But what else does it help? It helps what Senator MCCONNELL said was the number one job of this Congress the first day after President Obama was elected, to defeat President Obama. That's what Senator MITCH MCCONNELL said was the number one priority that he had. He's a focused man. I admire him for the fact that he gets an issue and he stays on it and he's focused. And he thought that and thinks that when he works on the debt ceiling, when he works on the deficit, when he works on the American Jobs Act. It's all about one thing—not employing Americans, but taking two Americans, Barack Obama and JOE BIDEN, and making them unemployed. That's not appropriate.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We have a different view here. I'm confident that the President will be reelected because he understands very clearly that we need to put Americans back to work, And he has given us the American Jobs Act—complete legislation. All the sections are there. All the writing is done. All the legal work is done. It is now before the United States Congress and the Senate, and it's up to us, 435 of us in this House. Are we ready to act? Are we ready to do what Americans want us to do? And that is to put them back to work.

Mr. COHEN. Pass the bill.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Pass the bill. Pass the bill. Put Americans back to work.

I'm going to quickly go through some of the parts of this bill and the way in which they affect Americans.

It's about investment, investing in our infrastructure: $50 billion directly available for the transportation sector—rail, high-speed rail, intercity rail, bridges, roads, $50 billion available this year to put men and women back to work repairing our transportation infrastructure. Another $10 billion for an infrastructure bank in which the pension funds of America, the public pension funds, could invest. And perhaps another $20 billion or $30 billion in that infrastructure bank to once again augment the development of the infrastructure that we need—water systems, sanitation systems, all of those communications systems that we desperately need.

□ 1600

That's on the infrastructure side.

On the education side, repairing our schools:

Thirty-five thousand schools to be repaired, repainted, classrooms, science laboratories, as well as the playgrounds; 35,000 schools out there. Your

neighborhood school, the opportunity for it to have a new paint job, a new bathroom, whatever is needed;

280,000 teachers. You could fill the entire stadium in Ann Arbor, Michigan, football, 100,000, and still have a third game with only 80,000 people. 280,000, think of it. The Ann Arbor, Michigan, stadium filled 2.8 times over. Teachers in the classroom. This is exciting.

Veterans, a very powerful incentive where a business can reduce its tax burden. That is the bottom-line tax reduced by $9,600 when you hire a disabled veteran. That man, that woman is going back to work, becoming a taxpayer. Once again, pride in our Nation. This is powerful.

For the unemployed, an extension of unemployment benefits, and we didn't even get to that today—and all of this in the context of rebuilding the American manufacturing sector.

More than 10 million American manufacturing jobs have been lost in the last two decades. We can put them back to work if we use our public policy, use our tax money that's going to build those bridges or those roads, buses and locomotives, use our tax money to buy American-made, American-made equipment. All it takes is a law, and it works.

Sacramento, California, near where I live, has built—or Siemens, a German company, has built a major manufacturing plant in Sacramento, California, to manufacture light railcars and Amtrak locomotives.

Why did they do that? They did that because the American Recovery Act, the stimulus bill that our Republican colleagues like to trash, said that the money for transportation systems—buses, light rail, and trains—must be spent on American-made equipment. So Siemens said, well, if that's the law, we want the business. They built the plant, and they're manufacturing light rail cars and locomotives today in America, using American equipment, using American workers. That's what we can do if we are willing to pass the laws to make it in America.

Photovoltaic systems, wind turbines, all of these things supported with our tax dollars. Why not use those tax dollars to buy American-made solar cells and wind turbines?

The President has given us the opportunity to do what we should do, as representatives of the American people. Put Americans back to work. Pass the American Jobs Act. Pass the American Jobs Act.

Mr. COHEN, wrap this up for us.

Mr. COHEN. I just thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI, for the leadership and for putting this hour together and allowing me to join you. And let's say it together. Pass the bill.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Pass the bill.

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

OUR COUNTRY IS IN TROUBLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it never ceases to be an honor for me to be able to speak on this floor. The freedoms we have, the blessings, we've received because of those who've gone before us.

The country is in trouble. People around the world cannot believe that the greatest nation in the history of mankind just cannot make itself live within its means. So businesses, manufacturing have flocked away from America.

I know there are some who believe that the greatest thing that can happen for America is for those manufacturing jobs to leave America because they believe, gee, they hurt the environment because they pollute, so just as well they go to some other Third World country or China or other place, when the truth is, apparently, when those same manufacturing companies leave the United States, they go to nations that, on average, pollute, depending on the nations, 4 to 10 times more than we do here in the United States. For those that understand the way the world turns, as pollution goes up in Asia, we usually breathe it here in the United States. So that hasn't worked out so well for the environment of the planet. We're hurting the planet as we drive manufacturing jobs out of America.

This administration has used the EPA as a sword, as a tool to drive more and more manufacturing and production out of the United States, hurting the country more and more, not because, necessarily, they want to intentionally hurt the country. I'm not saying that. They just think we're better off.

If they're not willing to have a draconian EPA being, as the President said in his speech, working side by side with them in private business, good riddance. Go somewhere else. Because, in the President's own words, that's what he said, and it was the scariest thing I heard that the President said last week, standing right here at the second level in this Hall, the line, and I'll read from his speech directly. He said, ''We need to look for ways to work side by side with America's businesses.''

America's businesses do not need a government that wants to be their partner. The government in this country, according to the Constitution, metaphorically speaking, is supposed to be a referee—keep the playing field fair, keep it level, make sure everybody has a chance to compete and compete fairly, and stay out of the way. Do not interfere. Don't try to be a partner with business. Stay out of the way and be a referee.

It's when this United States Government has tried to be a partner that so often it gets in trouble, and it kills businesses and it kills jobs, and people flee and go to some other country where they're allowed to produce things without the government trying to be their partner.

Anybody that wants the government to be their partner should go to Venezuela or Third World nations. They're more than happy to partner with those businesses.

But some years back there was a group of us that went to China, and we met with a number of CEOs of international corporations that have taken their American jobs by the thousands, taken their businesses, their manufacturing production and gone to China. I had the feeling that when we talked to them and asked them the question, ''Why did you move all these jobs to China?'' that they would say, well, they just couldn't work with the labor unions. The price of labor was too high. Regulations were too much. But the number one answer was because of the corporate tax. The corporate tax in America, in the United States, is the highest corporate tax in the world.

□ 1610

Now corporations, those that understand business law, corporations, directors, and officers, have a fiduciary duty to their stockholders to try to make as much money as they can. Unless some, Mr. Speaker, do not know who the stockholders are, more and more they're union workers; they're American workers across their countries; they're small business owners and operators, franchise operators; they're the rank and file across the country—State employees, local employees, Federal employees. But more than that, businesses across America, they have retirement accounts that invest in these companies.

Those companies' officers and directors have a fiduciary duty that they have to—or they could be sued—have the best interests of the company and the stockholders at stake in the decisions they make. If you go to law school—I hopefully have saved somebody a lot of money—that's it in a nutshell.

So, when a group of corporate leaders is trying to decide how can we avoid being sued by the stockholders by doing the best thing to help them create the most revenue for their stock—what can we do? What will enhance their dividends?—they have to look. When they see the United States of America is taxing corporations at 35 percent and they see that China taxes at 17 percent, you would think it was pretty much a no-brainer. That's basically what they said.

I was gratified to hear that, whether it's union labor or nonunion labor, across the board, the experience that the corporate leaders that I talked to in China say really their best workers are right here in the United States—union workers, nonunion workers—and that, generally speaking, they have better quality control over products produced here in the United States of America. So, when they move plants from here in the United States to other

places like China, they have wonderful workers, but the quality control is not as good as what they have here.

But if you think about it and you realize, gee, they would pay half the corporate tax in China that they pay here by the billions, then they could afford to build state-of-the-art facilities, where facilities here in the United States, their manufacturing plants, may be falling apart and getting older. Well, you could go build a state-of-the-art facility in a place like China, and because of the tremendously reduced corporate tax, by the time you really get around to paying much tax, you've paid for the plant.

I was advised privately that it was possible the Chinese Government would make deals with some companies if they were big enough, and it might be, for example, they would say, Look, you move your manufacturing plant, hire these thousands of employees here in China instead of in the United States, and we'll make a deal with you. No corporate tax for 5 years.

Then, depending on the company and the negotiations, they might say, And then for the next 5 years, maybe 5, 7 percent, maybe 10 percent. Maybe then it goes to 17, or maybe by 15 years you get to the 17 percent rate.

But in those kind of scenarios, they say, We paid for a state-of-the-art facility by the time we ever get around to paying corporate tax. Whereas, if we kept those jobs in America, facilities getting older, we just can't produce dividends and returns on money for stockholders. We're just treading water. Here, because the corporate rates are half as expensive, then we can produce, we can compete anywhere in the world. Our goods are that much cheaper.

Now, it is true our labor is more expensive, but, in general, we have good laborers in this country, and there are Americans that are willing to work, willing to do the jobs. From talking to employers, though, we could use a lot more people willing to be employees who can pass a drug test. That's kind of important.

Now, I have had so many constituents say, Look, you have to pass a drug test in order to get employment for most important jobs nowadays, whether it's with a grocery company back home or a small operator. I was talking to an independent oilman this afternoon that drills wells from Longview, Texas, and he was saying, We have to give people drug tests.

He was telling me, because of the drilling that's currently going on in east Texas, he's having trouble finding enough workers right now, today. While people are unemployed around the country, he's having trouble right now, today, finding enough people who can pass a drug test and are willing to work hard on an oil well, and he would put them to work.

In fact, he was telling me this afternoon, they'd start out at $50,000 a year. They'd have health care. It's hard, dirty, long hours, tough work, but it's a good living. But so many of the people that apply can't pass a drug test. And because it's such difficult work physically and it requires that you be alert because all of the other people on the rig have to count on each other, kind of like in a military operation, the equipment is so dangerous, if somebody has taken drugs and is not at peak performance, they can get somebody killed. It's happened far too many times. They have to have people pass a drug test.

That's just this afternoon. Well, think about it. If we had manufacturers coming back into America because the corporate tax rate was less than 17 percent, then the manufacturing jobs show up like crazy.

Now, I realize from hearing all of the news, apparently the big emphasis of the national union leaders, who sure don't seem to be speaking to all of the union folks I know, but their emphasis seems to be basically we're not doing very well getting union members from private corporations. So they've gone all after government employees: Let's try to unionize government employees because maybe we can pick them up.

And what I think eventually rank-and-file union workers for private companies will begin to understand is it seems that they're being thrown under the bus. The concentration seems to be for more government workers, less private workers, which means they're driving for more jobs in the government sector, which kills off the private sector, which will kill off those jobs for the union members who have jobs in the private sector.

So, as I sat back here listening to the President's speech last Thursday night and as I struggled with what the President was saying—because some of it didn't seem to me that it was going to create the jobs he was promising, but I was willing to wait for the bill and not judge from a speech, because it's been said around here before that CBO cannot score a speech. Well, that was before, a couple years ago, when the administration got on to them, and basically they did score a speech, but that's because the White House is able to exert pressure on CBO that the Republicans have not been able to see fit to do.

I know Mr. Elmendorf was not happy with my reference, but the fact is, after Mr. Elmendorf met with the President in the woodshed, or the Oval Office, he came back and was able to bring down the scoring of ObamaCare by about a quarter of a trillion dollars or so. Then after ObamaCare passed, they said, Whoops, looks like maybe we underestimated by about a quarter of a trillion dollars.

That makes for a pretty big plus-or-minus margin of error when CBO can't do better than that, but CBO and the rules were created by the most liberal Congress in history until about 5 years ago. They created CBO. They created the rules for scoring. They yanked us out of Vietnam without a chance to make sure our allies there would not be killed, so most of them were. They also created an automatic baseline for government budgets that increases every year. They created a formula. It increases every year.

□ 1620

Now, I was here in '05 and '06, and I am embarrassed that, as Republicans, our party did not have the nerve to eliminate the CBO, to eliminate the ridiculous rules by which bills are scored. The actual reality and history and recurrent numbers of what happens—when you do this, you get this effect—you can't consider that. They have to use rules that don't apply in the real world and without taking into consideration the effects that have been had when an action is taken every time.

So we get terribly inaccurate scoring from a government entity, and we also have this automatic baseline that increases every year. There is not a business or home in America that can plan a budget by saying, We're automatically going to increase our budget every year from now on. No matter how much income or revenue we have each year, we're going to keep increasing our budget. That is what has been happening for 37 years, since 1974.

The Budget chairman back in '05 and '06 was not willing to do it, but I am extremely gratified that our bright chairman of the Budget, this Budget chairman, is going to do it, in that this year he's going to take up a zero baseline budget. I filed one in my first Congress back in '05 and '06, in my second Congress in '07 and '08, in my third Congress in '09 and 2010, and in this Congress. I am delighted. I don't care whose name is on the bill; but when we finally eliminate the automatic increases in the Federal budgets every year, that's going to be huge, and it's going to be better than anything that the President has proposed by way of producing revenue and balancing the budget.

I do appreciate the White House emailing their version of the American Jobs Act.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GOHMERT. If I might inquire of the Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry: If there are charts around on the floor, can anybody use those?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is free to use charts in debate.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, because I saw my friends across the aisle using a chart that said the ''American Jobs Act.'' It makes a wonderful chart if it's still on the floor, because that's what we're talking about, an American Jobs Act.

The President kept saying, Pass it right away. Act now. Pass this jobs bill. Pass it right away. Pass it again right away. Pass the bill right away. They'll get back on their feet right away if we pass the bill. Anyway, just on and on—pass the bill, pass the bill,

pass the bill. So I heard the speech. I got a copy of the speech, and I like to highlight stuff where I can find it easier. So we've got all this ''pass it now,'' ''pass it right away'' stuff highlighted.

Where is it? We were told to pass it now, to pass it right away. We heard the speech Thursday night. We didn't get a bill Friday. We didn't get a bill Saturday. Obviously, it can't be filed Saturday or Sunday if we're not in session. We didn't get it, though, through email. They send the stuff when it's needed, but nothing Saturday, nothing Sunday.

On Monday, we were inquiring of the White House by email, by phone, Look, when are you going to let us see what this bill we've got to pass last week is?

We finally got a copy, and I was up until 5 a.m. on Tuesday morning going through it—tagging it, highlighting it, being staggered by the stuff in here that will kill jobs instead of create them—oh, other than the jobs that are created for the government that will help kill the economy. I couldn't believe this was being called an American Jobs Act, but it was not a surprise to me even at noon today when we inquired and found that no one had been willing to file an American Jobs Act in the House of Representatives. It had been available. The President had been talking about it since last Thursday, but nobody had been willing to actually file that bill in the House.

I have been through the President's American Jobs bill, and I am absolutely convinced—absolutely no question—that this will hurt our economy. It creates massive, bigger government intrusion. If you like Freddie and Fannie Mae, you will love the new American Infrastructure Financing Authority. What a wonderful government creation that is. We're going to provide billions and billions of dollars to create this new government entity. But not to worry—these are people who will be running it who really know what they're doing—right?—because the Secretary of Transportation is going to be in charge. I do know the Secretary of Transportation right now, and I like him very much. He's a good guy. Nonetheless, we're creating another government nightmare called the American Infrastructure Financing Authority.

Unbelievable.

You would have thought we would have learned a lesson—but not to worry. These are people who will be appointed by the President. Some other people here in Congress can throw in some recommendations, but they're appointed. The seven voting members are appointed by the President. So that will be wonderful. They'll run all our infrastructure requirements for us, and of course the President will appoint the chief executive officer.

Having been a history major in college, I do believe that the best indication of future performance is past history, past performance. With the auto czars and the private committee composed of a bunch of auto czars, I read somewhere that not any of them had ever worked in the auto industry at all, and most of them didn't even own a car. Nonetheless, they had put them in charge of our auto industry.

That kind of scares you when you think about it and when you think this is the same guy who's going to appoint all these people to run the brand-new American Infrastructure Financing Authority. That's AIFA, and it is just another nightmare. It's going to help bankrupt America quicker than this administration has already been doing.

I know people like to throw blame around. There is plenty of blame to go around because I know, in 2006, I was on this side of the aisle, hearing people stand up at the Democratic microphones, saying what I knew to be true. They were right. We had no business spending $160 billion more than we took in. That was un-American. It was outrageous. This body had no business authorizing expenditures of $160 billion more than we took in. They were right. The Democrats were right when they said we should not spend in a year $160 billion more than we took in.

Nowadays, people like to say, Well, it's Afghanistan and Iraq that have broken this country and have made us bankrupt. That's not the case. We were in Afghanistan; we were in the worst part of the expenditures in Iraq during those days, and we overspent what we had coming in by about $160 billion. If anybody back then had told me that within 4 years those same people who condemned this side of the aisle for overspending by $160 billion would be just fine with overspending by $1.6 trillion, I would never have believed it.

□ 1630

There is no way, with the speeches that were given here in '05, '06, '07 about the Republicans' irresponsibility in '05 and '06, my freshman year, over $160 billion more being spent than we brought in, that they would have any nerve or ability to stand up and say I'm voting to spend $1.6 trillion more than we're going to take in. I just didn't think, I wouldn't have believed that anybody would be willing to do that. Well, they have, and we as a country have.

But I went through the President's bill. Yesterday I went through much of it, but there is a little more that needs to be said, for example, to illuminate the President's comments about he wants to go after the profits of Big Oil; and he does that in his bill, we were told. He was going to fix it for Big Oil.

Well, I was a little cynical, I was a little leery, because I have heard the President call the Wall Street executives fat cats. He has called them names, said we wouldn't be letting them do that, that we ought to go after them, that kind of stuff.

Yet I knew that, while he was calling them names, at the same time his governing made sure that an entity like Goldman Sachs made more money than they've ever made in their history. They should have had to file for bankruptcy. Instead, now they're making more money than they've ever made in history, and this President is presiding in such a way it's bad for America, but Wall Street is doing great, and some would say that doesn't make sense because we know that Wall Street is mainly Republicans.

But if you look into it, as the Heritage Foundation has—my friend Mike Franc there has done the research—you found out that, in essence, corporate executives on Wall Street, when you include their immediate family that donates with them, donate about 4–1 or donate about 4–1 for Obama over MCCAIN. And Mike had said, when he first saw that, he thought, wow, that's intriguing. That may be different from prior years, But as he checked on it, it wasn't that different from prior years, donations from Wall Street.

Then you get to realizing, wait a minute, Democratic Presidents, Members here in this body are constantly deriding these greedy, evil people on Wall Street; and yet they're generally giving 4–1 to Democrats over Republicans. There are 4–1 Democrats on Wall Street in executive positions than there are Republicans. Well, no wonder. It starts making more sense that they would do much better under Democratic administrations since it helps to know people in those kinds of positions.

But we were told by the President he's going after Big Oil. The provisions in this President's bill—it's at page 151—repeal the deduction for intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells. Now, the bill has a dishonest word here. It says repealing oil ''subsidies.''

A subsidy, you can look it up, Webster, wherever you want to, but the definition will basically be the same wherever you look it up. A ''subsidy'' is a grant or a gift of money. There are no grants or gifts of money, and there wasn't anybody that wanted to go after British Petroleum more than I did around here when we found out 800 violations or so and when all the other majors were having maybe one or two in the gulf.

Yet they were involved in crony capitalism. So the administration looked the other way over and over and over again until the Deepwater Horizon blew out. People were killed, you know, not only lives lost but fortunes lost. The Gulf of Mexico was devastated all because this administration and those inspectors that were sent looked the other way to all of this pitiful way that drilling was done because they were buddies, crony capitalism.

So when you look here at what the President actually has in his bill, who it's going to help and who it's going to hurt, what you see are these deductions here that he's repealing—the repeal of deduction for tertiary injectants, the repeal of the percentage depletion allowance for oil and gas wells. Section 199, the deduction attributable to oil, natural gas or primary

products thereof, the repeal of oil and gas working interest exception to passive activity rules.

I read through these, checked with experts and find out, CPAs, people that do the tax returns for independent oil companies, and I was reminded, this stuff basically applies only as a deduction for an oil company that produces less than a thousand barrels of oil. All of the majors that this President says he wants to go after and go after their profits, they're majors.

All of the deductions that he is trying to repeal, they're not going to affect, they're not really going to hurt the major oil companies. They're going to devastate the independent oil companies. That will be the result here.

So he says he wants to go after the majors, but that's just not what he is doing in his bill, and I know that, being a community organizer, he's not that well up on what he's going to hurt and what he's going to help. But the fact is there are figures that indicate American production activities are dominated by independent producers, who drill 95 percent of the Nation's natural gas and oil wells, accounting for 67 percent of total U.S. natural gas and oil production. That's the independent oil companies of America. Ninety-five percent of the drilling, 67 percent of the production is not ExxonMobil. It's not Shell. It's not British Petroleum. It's the independent oil companies in America.

And who are they? They're people that cannot go to the banks, for the most part, to get a loan. Any bank that would loan an oil company money to drill a particular well is probably going to get shut down because the chances are, in most cases—certainly in the investments I have had—you are more likely to have a dry hole than you are to hit anything that's really going to be of a sufficient, productive nature.

So, of course, once you have established a field, the odds go up dramatically, but most of these wells, when it's not an established field and it's just helping produce more from a known field, you can't get loans. The only way independent oil companies have to be assured of being able to drill oil wells is not to go get a loan, and they also know that if they invest and pay all of the 100 percent of their own drilling and they hit a few dry holes in a row, they're going to be bankrupt, if there were so many of them.

What most independent oil companies do, they do studies geologically. They have to hire geologists most of the time. I am told they were independent geologists. I know a great number of those. They do great work. They will study an area, and they will hire a landman to come in and study who owns what interests in the minerals, who owns what rights that they're going to have to acquire in order to do drilling, and then they hire people that are involved in drilling.

They're not like the majors where they've got all they need to go do all the drilling. They hire independent mud companies, independent wire line companies. They will often have to have people come out and feed them, and if they don't, they're going to have people who need to go eat somewhere.

It is hard, nasty, 24-hour-a-day work. You don't stop 8–5. You have to do shifts because you can't afford to get somebody too tired for staying on a rig too long. But they employ millions of people. They cause the employment of millions around America even though there aren't that many that actually work on the wells, themselves.

□ 1640

They create jobs. They don't just save them like this President says he's been doing. And so what's the President doing? He, in his bill, is not touching, he's not going to hurt the Big Oil companies. They're going to apparently do as well as his good friends at General Electric.

So what we have seen is, if you're really friends with this administration, or to be fair, the parties in power, then odds are you're going to get your tax bills through and you are going to be like General Electric, you're going to be like Warren Buffett, and you're going to be able to skate through without paying virtually any tax.

I loved the way Art Laffer explained to it me in his living room after a Sunday lunch one day last year. We talked about these taxing concepts. I just love the guy. He is so brilliant. He's charming and funny. He sure got us out of a mess back in 1980–1981 because he was the adviser to Ronald Reagan. Art Laffer was his economic adviser.

Many people have heard about the Laffer curve because for people in government who want to maximize the amount of revenue to the Federal Government so they can spend more, how do you do it? Well, if you don't have any kind of tax at all, the government has no tax at all, then the revenue of the Federal Government would be zero on this end. If the government taxed a 100 percent tax, very, very quickly nobody would work. Nobody's going to work to produce 100 percent revenue for the Federal Government unless the whole Nation is enslaved, and God forbid that that will happen.

So on the two ends of the graph, you have zero revenue to the Federal Government, if it is zero percent tax altogether, and on the other end you have zero revenue to the Federal Government if there's 100 percent tax. So somewhere in between, you reach the maximum efficiency for bringing in revenue to the Federal Government. If you tax too high, then you start hurting the amount of revenue percentagewise coming in, and so you actually get less revenue when you pass that maximum point. Before that point, you can continue to raise taxes and actually increase revenue. Beyond that, the revenue starts coming down. So as Art has described it, you need to cut taxes 30 percent, and you will get us out of this horrific doldrums of an economy.

I was back at Fort Benning, Georgia, at the time, and things were not good. The military was not respected at all. I liked Ronald Reagan a lot. Of course, when you're in the military, you can't say anything negative about the Commander in Chief or you've committed an offense under the UCMJ. You can't criticize someone in your chain of command, including the Commander in Chief. So we just had to bite our tongues, but we could see Jimmy Carter was doing such damage to this country economically and in the foreign arena. It was just tragic.

I liked Ronald Reagan. He said he was going to be able to help bring down double-digit inflation, double-digit unemployment and double-digit interest rates. As much as I liked him, I recall telling my wife, Kathy, back at Fort Benning, I like him, but I don't care who the President is, there's no way a President can actually help do all that, really have that kind of effect.

He proved me wrong. With Laffer's guidance, taxes were cut 30 percent, and the economy took off. Because the economy took off and there were more jobs, unemployment dropped dramatically. Interest rates were able to come down dramatically. We had a 12¼ percent or something loan on our first home in Georgia just off post in Fort Benning. It may have been 12¾ percent. Some folks told me that was crazy—it was too high—but it wasn't long before interest rates some places were 18 percent, so 12 wasn't so bad. Now, interest rates came down under Reagan, but it was Laffer who said bring down the taxes by 30 percent, and you'll do dramatic work on creating a better economy.

I love the story Art Laffer tells about getting a call from President Reagan. He said, Art, great news. We got your tax cut.

Art said, in essence, this is my paraphrase: That's great, Mr. President. Congratulations.

Art, you don't seem excited. Why aren't you excited? This is great news. We got the tax cut with the Democratic House and Senate. They're going to cut it 30 percent.

He said, Congratulations, Mr. President. That's great.

President Reagan said, Why aren't you more excited?

He said, Mr. President, I understand you're going to cut it like half a percent the first year, 10 percent the next year, and another 20 percent the third year.

He said, Well, that's the deal we had to cut with Congress. We couldn't get all 30 percent at once.

As I recall, he said something like, Mr. President, if you were going shopping and the place you were going to go shopping had a half of one percent sale this month and then 10 percent sale next month and then 20 percent sale the next one after that, when are you going to go shopping?

He said Reagan was quiet for awhile and then finally said, Are we going to have a couple of bad years?

He said, Yes. Now it's going to be 3 years before the economy heals. We could have had it this year.

President Reagan got the best he could in 1981 and 1982, and those were not good years. In 1983, the economy surged, and more money was brought into the coffers.

The problem, though, is that the Democratic Party got so excited controlling the House and Senate—Reagan and Laffer had set up such a situation here, and there was so much more money coming into the coffers, the Federal revenues—that they started spending like never before. They can blame Reagan, but the Constitution makes very clear, Congress spends the money.

So really, this year, we are still working off of what Congress did or didn't do last year under Speaker PELOSI. Next year, beginning October 1, will be the first full year we are back at least as Republicans being in control of one House. So I think it is very, very important what we try to do to generate jobs and when you know that these provisions are going to devastate independent oil companies that do 95 percent of the drilling in continental America and won't hurt Exxon, British Petroleum, and, in fact, because 95 percent of the drilling will not get done in the continental United States.

I guess that's why the President was trying to do this. They apparently don't like drilling. They don't like mining. They don't like any of this stuff occurring on our soil. They would rather it go somewhere else where they pollute a lot more. But we are talking about millions of jobs that will be lost because of the devastating effect of destroying independent oil and gas businesses—and all of that when we've gotten such great news over the last few years. We went from having basically no natural gas reserves to having 100—some say 200, some say 300—years of natural gas reserves.

Some fleets of trucks are starting to convert to natural gas. If we converted cars and trucks—you can't order them from Detroit yet that come equipped with natural gas. You can get them done after they leave the factory. But if we started getting natural gas vehicles like some fleets have done, travel is a lot cheaper. You don't have the pollution you have with gasoline. It burns clean. You do have CO_2.

So look out. We're going to grow more plants, because plants have to have CO_2 in order to have photosynthesis, in order to produce O_2 as a byproduct from growing as a plant. So, gee, if we use more natural gas, we may end up with more healthy plants. So that may be a difficult thing if people don't like green plants.

I couldn't help but notice on page 155—and I have read through here—the President has things like eliminating deductions. He says this bill is paid for. In his speech he says—and I want to read it correctly. He told us back 2 years ago during his health care speech, if you misrepresent my bill, I'm going to call you out. So let me read what he says.

He says, ''And here is the other thing I want the American people to know. The American Jobs Act will not add to the deficit. It will be paid for.''

That's what he said.

What he's counting on, what he references on page 4 of his speech—and it's on page 155—yes, there is elimination of deductions. In reality, it's going to cost this government revenue. It's not going to create more Federal revenue.

□ 1650

It's going to cost jobs. There will be fewer people paying as much income tax. That will hurt the Federal coffers more. We'll have more deficit spending. We can't get that under control. But we just passed a deficit bill I didn't support because it didn't have adequate cuts in there. There was no restraint on spending that was really adequate. If you only cut $1 trillion over a 10-year period, and we all know—everybody in here knows—you can't bind future Congresses. So all the cuts that do not occur within the next year or year and a half, there's no reason to think that they will happen. You can't bind future Congresses.

Anyway, even if we did cut $1 trillion—not much the next year, but it gets heavier toward the end of the 10 years. If we were to cut $1 trillion over 10 years and we were to do that every 10 years, within exactly 150 years we will finally balance the budget, and we will have only added $120 trillion to the $14.3 trillion or $14.6 trillion that we've run up in deficit spending now. If we were able to reach this wonderful goal of $2 trillion in cuts in the next 10 years and do that ever 10 years, then we can balance the budget in only 80 years. We'll only add around $72 trillion in additional deficit spending to our deficit.

So the joint committee was charged: Find $1.5 trillion somewhere between now and basically Christmas, the end of the year. Actually, we found out today they're really going to need to find it by the 1st of November. This is how the President pays for his $450 billion spending spree, where we create the American Infrastructure Financing Authority—a new Fannie and Freddie on steroids. We create a new massive government bureaucracy.

The FCC wanted to have a fairness doctrine and control what people said on the airwaves. They want to dictate everything that gets done in the media on the airwaves, but they were realizing more and more people are going to broadband and less and less to the airways. They're losing control of things. So the President addresses that. It's not a jobs bill in the private sector, but it creates a brand-new authority, government entity. Well, actually, he describes it in his bill as a private nonprofit group. He appoints the directors, of course, and it's called the Public Safety Broadband Corporation. Wow, it's going to kill the private sector. But more government jobs. Good news there.

And here's the pay-for. If we had a drum roll, Mr. Speaker, we could ask for it. The Budget Control Act of 2011 is amended by striking $1.5 trillion that they have to find in cuts in the next month or so and inserting $1.95 trillion in cuts. That's it. Magically, he just found $450 billion in cuts, but it's because he told the supersubcommittee: Go find this extra money. What a great revenue-enhancing deficit spending cut that is.

This bill is a disaster. It sets up a program that will allow people who have their hours reduced by 10 percent to start collecting unemployment compensation. It requires State agencies to start mandating that those employers involved certify that even if they cut an employee's hours, they're going to still have the same health care benefits, retirement benefits. I talked to some employers today about it. They said, We'll have to give up providing health care and retirement benefits because we need the flexibility. If we're all taking a cut, then let's take a cut.

I want to challenge my own Republican leadership, Mr. Speaker. Most of America is not even aware that this year we put our mouth where our money is, and we actually voted to cut our own budgets by 5 percent. And next year we're cutting our own budget by 6 percent. Well, we haven't done enough with that. I would challenge our own leadership, and I hope that we'll seize the day—seize the moment—and be able, because we would have the right to do this since we're cutting our own budgets. America doesn't know that, but we are.

Okay. All Federal Government, here's the deal. We're cutting our own budget in Congress by 5 percent this year, 6 percent next year, and we're doing it to every department In the country. We have the moral authority to do that since we're cutting our own. We should do that. Let's get spending under control. But the President uses, apparently, Rahm Emanuel's own philosophy about: Don't let a good crisis go to waste. So he's got this 155-page bill that he finally made available Monday night but that nobody has filed here in the House.

We need American jobs. We need American jobs now. I am convinced that if we eliminated the corporate tax altogether, you would hear a gigantic sucking sound, I believe Mr. Perot used to say, of manufacturers leaving other countries and flocking back to America, making more income than they had in the past, because for the first time—Donald Trump is a sharp man. He has made a lot of money. He has advocated that we put a 25 percent tariff on everything we buy from China.

If you studied the situation and understand the treaties—I don't like most of them, but if you look at what we've done, if we set a 25 percent tariff on everything America buys from China, we

have violated a number of contracts and agreements. There's penalty phases to that. We start a trade war. I don't think China wins, but I know we don't either. I don't think anybody wins a trade war that that would start.

So inspired by Donald Trump saying, Why don't we put a 25 percent tariff on everything we buy from China—and I've talked to Art Laffer. He likes the idea. He's got some other alternatives as well, but one of them is you eliminate the corporate tax altogether. I really think it's one of the most insidious taxes in America because people have had to be sold a bill of goods to believe that you won't have to pay it. We're going to make these evil, greedy corporations do it.

And I will admit to you, sometimes unions are very helpful because greed does take over. But the thing is, if you eliminate the corporate tax, who's been paying that? The consumers and lower wage earners in those corporations. In some cases, there are studies that have indicated that. But it's the consumers that have to pay the corporate tax. If a corporation doesn't pass that tax on, they can't stay in business.

If you eliminate the corporate tax, you'll have jobs flooding back into America, and you'll have more people paying income tax. The Laffer curve won't be zero taxes on this side with zero revenue. It will be zero corporate tax. But even at the same tax levels, you will have dramatic increases in the Federal revenue because so many more people will be employed, things will be going well, and the economy will have a jump-start like we've never seen before.

So after nobody else would file an American Jobs Act, as the President proposed, and having examined it over and over in the last couple of days, having checked today at noon to see if anybody had the nerve to file this disastrous bill that will kill jobs, run up the price of gasoline and oil and make everybody's life more miserable, more government intrusion into broadcast, more government intrusion into financing things—not Fannie or Freddie because we've still got them around, but a new infrastructure financing authority—I realize this is a disaster for America.

So I filed not a 115-page bill but actually a 2-page bill today at about 1:20, and it says: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the corporate income tax. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America and Congress assembled. This Act may be cited as the ''American Jobs Act of 2011.'' It repeals the corporate income tax, repeals the alternative minimum tax, and there will be so many more people paying income tax, people will not believe the kind of money that will flow into the Federal Government, not that that's a good thing, but we can at least pay down our debt if we're responsible.

□ 1700

I'm so excited that the Tea Party is getting fired up. I see people from all races, all walks of life in the Tea Party. The one thing they seem to have in common is they're paying income tax, and they're tired of carrying half of the country on their backs. So this is a start, I believe—it is a jobs bill—and you will see jobs flood this country, and we'll get on track.

In the few minutes I have left, let me just tell you about a man that probably had the most influence on my life behind my father. His name was Sam Parker. There have been wonderful men in my life, women in my life, teachers in my life that affected me.

Sam Parker was hired by the Mount Pleasant School Board in 1952 to be a coach and to teach history. He was the head coach of the Mount Pleasant Tigers football team. In 2 years' time, in 1953, he had led them to being undefeated after the first nine games. He turned the program around. He was a devoted Christian, belonged to the Methodist church there, started teaching Sunday school. His wife, Norween, was the librarian at the junior high.

After nine games, we went to play Sulphur Springs, and people were saying, This looks like the best team in 3A, in Texas; they very well could win the State. They went to Sulphur Springs. Some team members told me it was their fault; they didn't take it serious enough, and they lost by one touchdown. That was Friday night. Monday morning, the school board fired Sam Parker.

Then he and his wife had a tough decision. They believed that God had called them to Mount Pleasant to plant their roots, invest their lives, and change America from that small place. Well, he did the unthinkable. He stayed and taught American history after being fired as head football coach.

And 7 years later, I met him in a park recreation program he put on for young kids in the public park down there each summer. I worked with him one summer as a teenager with the kids. He taught more kids how to play baseball in Mount Pleasant during those years than anybody else in town. He was my scoutmaster. He had a troop there. He was my scoutmaster through my becoming an Eagle Scout there at Mount Pleasant, and he taught me American history. He continued to teach Sunday school.

The man that coached 2 years at Mount Pleasant High School changed Mount Pleasant in an incredible way. He was still alive in 1991. Before he died, they renamed the football field Sam Parker Field. He taught me American history. He served in World War II. He loved this country. His son was my best friend—is still a dear friend.

Those are the kinds of people that have changed America. Those are the kinds of people who are the reason we have been blessed like we've been blessed, And if we don't have more people willing to put pettiness aside, goofy ideas that enrich their cronies, goofy ideas that increase power for some people and get back to what made America great, we're going to lose this country. As Ben Franklin said in 1787, we will become a byword down through future generations because we had the greatest country ever given to mankind, and we became irresponsible and lost it.

It's time for major changes.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1841

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD) at 6 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAPUANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and September 15 on account of a death in the family.

Mr. NADLER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and September 15 on account of a family emergency.

Mr. BARLETTA (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of severe flooding in his district.

Mrs. NOEM (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for September 12 until 2 p.m. and September 13 on account of family reasons.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 15, 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:

3094. A letter from the Director, Regulatory management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Change of Address for Region 1; Technical Correction [FRL-9449-3] received August 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3095. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cobalt Lithium Manganese Nickel Oxide; Significant New Use Rule [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2009-0922; FRL-8878-2] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received August 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3096. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — TSCA Inventory Update Reporting Modifications; Chemical Data Reporting [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2009-0189; FRL-8872-9] (RIN: 2070-AJ43) received August 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3097. 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; West Virginia; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0157; FRL-9447-6] received August 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3098. 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; Delaware; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0158; FRL-9447-7] received August 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3099. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Attainment Demonstration for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard, and Approval of Related Revisions [EPA-R08-OAR-2010-0285; FRL-9276-8] received August 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3100. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Limited Federal Implementation Plan; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; California; North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2011; FRL-9448-5] received August 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3101. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Adjustments to the Allowance System for Controlling HCFC Production, Import and Export [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-1040; FRL-9448-4] (RIN: 2060-AQ82) received August 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3102. A letter from the Chief, Broadband Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 101 of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate the Use of Microwave for Wireless Backhaul and Other Uses and to Provide Additional Flexibility to Broadcast Auxiliary Service and Operational Fixed Microwave Licensees Petition for Rulemaking Filed by Fixed Wireless Communications Coalition to Amend Part 101 of the Commission's Rules to Authorize 60 and 80MHx Channels in Certain Bands for Broadband Communications [WT Docket No.: 10-153, RM-11602] received August 22, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3103. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Extreme Sailing Series Boston; Boston Harbor, Boston, Massachusetts [Docket No.: USCG-20114-0103] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1070. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to authorize the Securities and Exchange Commission to exempt a certain class of securities from such Act; with an amendment (Rept. 112–206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. HULTGREN:

H.R. 2910. A bill to require parental consent to release records of home-schooled students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. MICA, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 2911. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the corporate income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 2912. A bill to establish the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area in the San Juan Islands, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado (for himself and Ms. FOXX):

H.R. 2913. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the termination of further retirement benefits for Members of Congress, except the right to continue participating in the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on House Administration, 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 Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. BASS of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FILNER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 2914. A bill to create an emergency jobs program that will fund 2,242,000 positions during fiscal years 2012 and 2013; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Agriculture, the Judiciary, Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 2915. A bill to repeal the Western Area Power Administration borrowing authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 2916. A bill to enforce the tenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States as it relates to the autonomous sovereign police powers of the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 2917. A bill to restore State sovereignty, and to dedicate excess grant funds to deficit reduction; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 2918. A bill to strengthen and clarify the commercial, cultural, and other relations between the people of the United States and the people of Taiwan, as codified in the Taiwan Relations Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and 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 Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BONNER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BROOKS, and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 2919. A bill to eliminate the reimbursement requirement for certain tornado shelters constructed with Federal assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 2920. A bill to establish the Detroit Jobs Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 2921. A bill to amend the Small Business Act with respect to assistance under section 8(a) of that Act and goals for procurement contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2922. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana:

H.R. 2923. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan for security contractors operating in Afghanistan and in support of other contingency operations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 2924. A bill to expedite the deployment of highway construction projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2925. A bill to establish a smart card pilot program under the Medicare program; 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. GOWDY (for himself and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.R. 2926. A bill to abolish the National Labor Relations Board and to transfer its enforcement authority to the Department of Justice and its oversight of elections to the Office of Labor-Management Standards of the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 2927. A bill to give priority to local and State artists when selecting appropriate artwork for Federal buildings; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 2928. A bill to provide relief to the Pottawatomi Nation in Canada for settlement of certain claims against the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 2929. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide an exception to that Act for actions carried out against grizzly bears in self-defense, defense of others, or a reasonable belief of imminent danger; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 2930. A bill to amend the securities laws to provide for registration exemptions for certain crowdfunded securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2931. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to eliminate the statutory cap on the public debt and to place limitations on the purposes for which public debt may be issued; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PENCE:

H.R. 2932. A bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 2933. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to remove the exclusion from Federal copyright of sound recordings fixed before February 15, 1972; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 2934. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of certain retirement plan contributions picked up by governmental employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 79. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and 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 Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. HAHN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Sickle Cell Disease Awareness Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Libya's frozen assets be utilized to pay for NATO's military campaign; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. HULTGREN:

H.R. 2910.

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. GOHMERT:

H.R. 2911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Article I Section 8 Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes...

U.S Constitution—Amendment XVI

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 2 of the Constitution, ''the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States.'' As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.'' I was elected in 2010 to serve in the 112th Congress as certified by the Secretary of State of Washington state.

Article III, Section 2 states that the Supreme Court has ''the judicial power'' that ''shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States.'' Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution provides that the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land when stating ''The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court.''

The power of judicial review of the Supreme Court was upheld in Marbury v Madison in 1803, giving the Supreme Court the authority to strike down any law it deems unconstitutional. Members of Congress, having been elected and taken the oath of office, are given the authority to introduce legislation and only the Supreme Court, as established by the Constitution and precedent, can determine the Constitutionality of this authority.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado:

H.R. 2913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power of Congress to make law regarding the compensation for the services of Senators and Representatives, as enumerated in Article I, Section 6, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, as amended by the 27th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 2914.

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 9, Clause 7

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. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 2915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 1 and Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment, Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment, Constitution of the United States

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 2918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

(The Constitutional authorities cited in our Committee reports on legislation during the past several years are highlighted on the other side of this page.

The overwhelming majority have cited ''article I, section 8 of the Constitution.''

A handful had slightly more specific citations to ''article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution.''

A couple bills with trade/sanctions components have cited ''article I, section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution.''

And one anti-trafficking bill (with significant domestic law enforcement components) cited ''article I, section 8 of the Constitution and the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution.''

The one consistent exception is Resolutions of Inquiry, which always cite ''article I, section 1 of the Constitution.'')

By Mr. BACHUS:

H.R. 2919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States).

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 2920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 2921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill, the ''Expanding Opportunities for Small Business Act of 2011'' is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and amends the Small Business Act with respect to assistance under 8(a) of that Act and goals for procurement contracts.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 and Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana:

H.R. 2923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution (Clauses 12, 13, 14 and 16) grants Congress the authority to raise and support Armies, provide and maintain a Navy, make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, and regulate the militia.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 2924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 2925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOWDY:

H.R. 2926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 2927.

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. KILDEE:

H.R. 2928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8: The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 2929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: 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. MCHENRY:

H.R. 2930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, sec. 8, cl. 1 (to pay Debts), cl. 18 (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. PENCE:

H.R. 2932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Amendment I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 2933.

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 Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 2934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Amendment XVI: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several states, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 79.

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 . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. LOBIONDO and Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 36: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 58: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 104: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 192: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 250: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 333: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 369: Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 409: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 420: Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 451: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 618: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 640: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 646: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 674: Mr. PETERS, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 687: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 719: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 734: Mr. ROSS of Florida.
H.R. 735: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 817: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 876: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 923: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 931: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 984: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 1001: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1090: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1167: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 1172: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1173: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1175: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1195: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1259: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. TURNER, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1283: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 1297: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 1307: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1314: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1335: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1340: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 1348: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1356: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1366: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1370: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1404: Mr. KISSELL and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1416: Mr. WATT.
H.R. 1418: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1427: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 1456: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1465: Mr. OLVER and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1558: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1612: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 1672: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BILBRAY, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1699: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
H.R. 1744: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1749: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. HOCHUL, Ms. LEE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 1756: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 1834: Mr. NUGENT and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1864: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1916: Mr. KEATING and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1941: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1971: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
H.R. 1993: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 2009: Mr. MACK.
H.R. 2016: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2042: Mr. KIND and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2069: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2077: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 2092: Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 2108: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2193: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2236: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2245: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2250: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 2267: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 2299: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 2304: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2307: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 2324: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2369: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. DENT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. STARK, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WATT.

H.R. 2401: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2407: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2432: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 2453: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 2457: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2471: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 2483: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 2485: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2499: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2505: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2514: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 2524: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2528: Mr. WOMACK and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 2529: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. ROSS of Florida.
H.R. 2568: Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 2569: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2579: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 2580: Mr. ROSS of Florida and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2634: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2674: Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 2681: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BENISHEK, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 2752: Mr. FLORES, Mr. LANDRY, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 2759: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 2760: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 2763: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 2815: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 2820: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.
H.R. 2822: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 2830: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 2833: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. AUSTRIA, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2834: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 2840: Mr. LANDRY.
H.R. 2847: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2848: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 2852: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. HERGER, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 2853: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2854: Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. LONG, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 2855: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. LEE, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 2865: Mr. LONG and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2867: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 2882: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2884: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. STARK, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2885: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WEST, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.J. Res. 20: Mr. WOODALL.
H.J. Res. 69: Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.J. Res. 72: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H. Res. 134: Mr. NUGENT.
H. Res. 137: Mr. MORAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. OLVER.
H. Res. 241: Mr. AUSTRIA.
H. Res. 333: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. CARDOZA.
H. Res. 378: Mr. TOWNS.
H. Res. 385: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H. Res. 394: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FLORES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

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. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 2883, the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 2883, the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 79, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2012, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2881: Mr. Hastings of Washington.