



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 22, 2010

No. 109

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 22, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ED PASTOR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord God, You are the Most High, the Almighty, yet Your love reaches out to us and surrounds each detail of human life.

The Members of Congress seek answers to the deepest questions facing the Nation. Attentive to their districts and the human cries of families they know and individuals lost in the void of unemployment, they hear tangible truth breathing beneath the blanket of pundits and pollsters.

Help them, Lord, to discover ways that will lead Your people from crisis to opportunity. With creative consultation and intellectual depth, Lord, we ask You fix a vision for the future. Let them build upon the known strengths of America.

By appealing to the Nation's innate sense of justice and generous patriotism, may they always seek Your presence and Your activity working within Your people and the country's democratic process both now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FLAKE 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 1376. An act to restore immunization and sibling age exemptions for children adopted by United States citizens under the Hague Convention on Inter-country Adoption to allow their admission into the United States.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the House that on July 24, 1998, at 3:40 p.m., Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police were killed in the line of duty defending the Capitol against an intruder armed with a gun.

At an appropriate point today, the Chair will recognize the anniversary of this tragedy by observing a moment of silence in their memory.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 10 requests

for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

BUYING LOCAL FOOD FOR SCHOOLS

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill that will make it easier for schools to buy local food. In America, we have slowly moved further and further away from feeding our children healthy, nutritious food in school. At the same time we have watched while thousands of family-run farms have literally disappeared.

In Maine, many of our schools go out of their way to purchase food from local farms. But dwindling school budgets and competing priorities have resulted in less money for local food options in cafeterias.

My bill frees up money for schools to buy locally produced food by giving them the option to spend 10 percent of what they receive for government commodities on food from local farmers. This will not only bring healthy, high-quality food into our schools, it will also pump more money into our local economies.

On average, an apple travels 1,500 miles from farm to school. This bill gives schools the freedom to buy apples from their neighbors and keep every dollar spent in the community instead of traveling across the country and back again.

I look forward to working on this bill with my colleagues, and I thank those who have already supported it.

OIL COMPANIES PLAN TO PROTECT GULF

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

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H5923

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, private industry is creating solutions to protect the Gulf of Mexico because the government really doesn't create anything. Government just stops things from being created like jobs.

ExxonMobil, Chevron, ConocoPhillips, and Shell Oil have announced a new coordinated plan. They're building a new emergency oil spill containment system to protect the Gulf of Mexico. Their deepwater rapid response system will capture and contain oil in a blow-out emergency. It will be engineered to be used in underwater depths of up to 10,000 feet and under different weather conditions as well. The initial capacity will contain 100,000 barrels of oil a day.

These oil industry leaders have committed \$1 billion to the initial cost. Engineering, procurement, and construction will begin immediately. Exxon-Mobil has taken the lead on behalf of the other companies. This is great news for drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. American private industry is taking the lead.

The administration needs to end the moratorium on drilling and get out of the way and quit killing jobs in the Gulf of Mexico.

And that's just the way it is.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4213, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2010

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-556) on the resolution (H. Res. 1550) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 4213) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE MOTEL KIDS OF ORANGE COUNTY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last night I had an opportunity to preview a documentary entitled "Homeless, the Motel Kids of Orange County."

In the shadow of Disneyland, filmmaker Alexandra Pelosi captures the stark reality of children who are living in motels. For all the legitimate policy differences that divide people in Congress, sometimes it's jarring how starkly we view different worlds, that we can believe in different facts. But these children live in a world, the reality of which can be denied only by people who don't bother to see and listen.

I hope my colleagues will watch the HBO documentary Monday, or better

yet, get a copy of the DVD to review themselves and with their staff.

We appear at times to be capable of arguing with a straight face about what the day's date is, but this is an area where we should agree to assign priority, spend precious dollars, and refine our policies. These children deserve our best.

□ 1010

FY 2011 APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, you know, this is a different kind of July than we usually experience here in Congress. Usually we're doing appropriation bills. We aren't doing them this month. We aren't likely to do any until after the election. Isn't that something? The one responsibility we have here in Congress, pass appropriation bills, we aren't doing until after the election. This might give you an idea why we're not doing that.

These are the bills that have gone through the Appropriations Committee, either the subcommittee or the full committee. When you look at the number of earmark dollars that are associated with powerful Members of Congress, either those on the Appropriations Committee or leadership or the chairs of committees, just take, for example, the MilCon-VA bill, 78 percent of the earmarks are going to 13 percent of the Members. Other bills are similar: 76 percent in Agriculture; CJS, 57 percent going to the most powerful Members.

It's often said that we earmark here because we know our districts better than those bureaucrats. Well, apparently, 13 percent of the Members know their districts; the rest of us don't.

That's just one of the problems with the earmarking system we have in Congress. It's a spoils system. Those who are powerful get the spoils.

EXTENDING UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of extending unemployment benefits to the hardworking San Joaquin Valley families of California who continue to search for work during these tough economic times. The current lapse in benefits is unprecedented. Since 1959, the government has never allowed these benefits to expire when the national unemployment rate is above 7.2 percent.

Californians are concerned with providing for their families and putting food on the table, not who scores the most political points in Washington.

Extending unemployment benefits isn't just critical to our Central Val-

ley's workers and communities where unemployment hovers around 20 percent in some of the counties but also to our economy. Every dollar in unemployment benefits creates at least \$1.63 in economic activity. That puts money in neighborhood businesses.

Now is the time to focus on middle class families and our economy, not the next election. It's time to pass this measure and to send it to the President for his signature.

YOU CUT AND ASO

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, America is struggling under the weight of its debt and a falling economy. Worse, Washington isn't listening.

One of two new tools that we're trying to put forth, and I think they're great opportunities for the American people, is America Speaking Out. I will be doing a town hall this Saturday in my community in Sarasota to be able to pick up their ideas, identify the challenges, and with the ideas we gather, these ideas across the country, put forth an agenda for the American people this fall.

The other tool that I think is very effective is YouCut. These are two different sites. You go on and make your suggestions heard. Our debt today is at \$13.6 trillion. We're expected to go to \$20 trillion. We've got to find a way to balance the budget. We would like to get your ideas as it relates to this.

I encourage all Americans to go to these two sites. Anyone that's interested could visit my Web site, buchanan.house.gov. They're available there. We need to start listening to the American people. We need your ideas.

PRESIDENTIAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

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

Mr. BACA. When President Obama took office, he inherited a \$1.2 trillion deficit, two wars, a growing recession, and disasters like Katrina that pushed our economy to the brink. Since then, his leadership has laid the groundwork to rebuild our economy and finally end the outsourcing of American jobs.

The President successfully worked to pass historic health care and financial regulatory reform. No administration has done more to improve care and the benefits for our veterans and returning troops.

President Obama and the Democratic Congress have strengthened the quality of health care for over 5 million American veterans, authorized 3.4 percent pay raises for our troops, invested millions for VA facility improvements, and improved health services for women veterans.

The President and the Democratic Congress will continue to do the right

things for the American people. The choice is clear. We must say “no” to the failed policies of the past and “yes” to continuing in a new direction looking forward.

MORATORIUM

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

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, a blanket moratorium is not the answer. It will not measurably reduce risk. It will have a lasting impact on the Nation's economy, which may be greater than that of the oil spill. We do not believe in punishing the innocent. Overcome emotion with logic. These are quotes from five engineers from the National Academy of Engineering who object to the President's moratorium.

This is not a drilling moratorium; it is a jobs moratorium. It is an assault on those most injured by the gulf oil spill. By some estimates, over 100,000 Americans—welders, pipe fitters, engineers, caterers, roustabouts—will lose their jobs because of this moratorium, decent, hardworking Americans.

Eleven thousand people yesterday filled the Cajun Dome in Lafayette, Louisiana, to protest the jobs moratorium. They're begging that politics be put aside, the President listen to the scientists, and let the workers return to work supplying our Nation's energy needs.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in 1935, President Roosevelt and a Democratic Congress envisioned and passed a safety net for senior citizens and the disabled. We call it Social Security. It has worked well, and I cannot imagine what we would be as a Nation without it.

The cash flows of the fund will see a deficit in just a few years because of the aging of the baby boom generation. We will fix this problem, and hopefully, our Republican colleagues will work with us for a bipartisan solution.

In December, I'm confident that the President's fiscal commission will present well-conceived ideas. We must use their recommendations to develop a bipartisan solution to protect Social Security. When those recommendations are presented, bipartisanship must prevail. Partisanship must take a hike.

I am committed to doing my part and look forward to the commission's report.

FINANCIAL REFORM BILL—A STIMULUS FOR MORE GOVERNMENT

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passes a 2,000 plus-page bill, it's not all that surprising to find objectionable items tucked away in the pages. Such is the case with the Dodd-Frank financial reform legislation. This bill creates many new financial regulatory offices for the very same Federal regulators who failed to foresee the financial collapse in 2008.

With this bill, Congress is giving the American people the gift of more bureaucracy with: an Office of Financial Research, a Financial Stability Oversight Council, 20 Offices of Minority and Women Inclusion, a Federal Insurance Office, an Office of Fair Lending and Equal Opportunity, an Office of Investor Advocate and Ombudsman, and a Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. It goes on and on with new czars.

Note that the problems with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are not even addressed. Yet these agencies were the cause of this economic crisis. So this bill is nothing more than a stimulus for more government.

SMALL MANUFACTURERS EXPORT INITIATIVE

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I not only stand in support of extending unemployment benefits to over 18,000 Washington State residents; I stand today in support of small manufacturers in my State of Washington.

Earlier this week, I introduced H.R. 5797, the Small Manufacturers Export Initiative. This legislation will help small- and medium-sized manufacturers export their products, not their jobs, overseas. I want to see the label “Made in America” again, and this bill is an important step in that direction.

The global market presents a fast and ever-growing market for U.S. exports. Nationwide, nearly 3.7 million manufacturing jobs are supported by exports. In my district alone, there are 182 aerospace production suppliers and other vendors. In Washington State, there are over 100 boat manufacturers, with many of these small businesses not only supplying the domestic market but also exporting their products.

We must do all we can to support these manufacturing companies to sell their products both here in the U.S. and overseas. The Small Manufacturers Export Initiative will build the infrastructure necessary to connect these small- and medium-sized manufacturers with export opportunities around the world and help them increase their productivity and expand their businesses.

I urge support for this legislation.

□ 1020

CANCEROUS DEBT

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the President's own Democrat co-chair of the debt commission, Erskine Bowles, said “This debt is like a cancer.” And he's right.

This debt cancer is spreading rapidly. Democrat spending is out of control and adding to the already staggering deficit. House Democrats canceled the 2011 budget and failed to propose and pass an annual budget resolution for the first time since 1974.

More and more tax dollars are being wasted. Job creation in the private sector remains at a virtual standstill. A trillion dollars was spent on the President's stimulus, and there are still more than 14 million people out of work.

This cancerous debt, a symptom of the failed stimulus and increasing government control, needs to be stopped immediately. Washington needs to start letting taxpayers spend their own money and start putting Americans back to work.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, 75 years ago this country recognized the plight of senior citizens who had no retirement, who were forced to move in with their kids when they got old; and we created Social Security. And it has been a tremendous success. Many people, however, don't realize what else Social Security does for this country.

About 8.5 million Americans who have a disability that limits their ability to work receive assistance from the program. Roughly 6.5 million children receive part of their family income through a program which has lifted nearly 2 million of them out of poverty.

When their breadwinner, when their father or their mother, dies, Social Security gives them a benefit. Some of them have used it to go to college. And through the Social Security program, another 7.5 million people, very low income and severely disabled people, receive critical financial support to meet their most basic needs.

I urge all my colleagues to review the entire record and support fixing Social Security next session.

COMMEMORATING 58TH ANNIVERSARY OF PUERTO RICO CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, 58 years ago this Sunday, the Constitution of Puerto Rico took effect. As we

mark this occasion, it is appropriate to reflect on the progress that Puerto Rico has made in fulfilling the aspirations expressed in our Constitution and to acknowledge the distance we have left to travel.

Our Constitution reflects the values and dreams of our people. Its words reinforce our commitment to democracy and equality and confirm that we treasure both our Puerto Rican roots and our American citizenship.

Over time, the bonds between Puerto Rico and the United States have grown stronger. Like so many American stories, this is the chronicle of progress, evolution, and the steady march towards a more perfect Union.

But the aspirations of our Constitution have yet to be realized. There will be no democracy for Puerto Rico until its people have a real voice in making the national laws that govern their lives, and there will be no equality so long as they can be treated differently than their fellow citizens simply because they live in a territory.

Today I renew my pledge to fight so that one day democracy and equality will prevail in Puerto Rico.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, on its 75th anniversary, August 14, Social Security is once again under assault by congressional Republicans. Social Security has been, for 75 years, a bedrock promise. You earned it with a lifetime of hard work, and it should be there for you for future generations.

If Republicans had succeeded, seniors would have lost trillions more in the stock market meltdown of the Bush recession. But, instead, no one lost a penny in Social Security.

Social Security is not the cause of our budget deficits, and benefit cuts should not be the solution.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4213, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2010

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1550 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1550

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4213) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, a

motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina, Dr. FOXX. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1550.

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

There was no objection.

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

This resolution provides for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4213, the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010, finally.

The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4213. The rule provides 1 hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Finally, the rule provides that the Senate amendment shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4213, the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2010, ensures that much-needed Federal assistance continues to reach the millions of Americans struggling to find a job, trying to keep their homes and doing the best they can to provide for their families.

This legislation is long overdue with unemployment benefits having expired on June 1 of this year. Though I am pleased that this legislation is retroactive to that date, millions of Americans who desperately needed our support were left hanging by the egregious obstructionism that prevented this legislation from moving forward.

While the other party is content with giving themselves a pat on the back for every roadblock they throw in front of the Democratic bill, I remind my col-

leagues that they are playing with the livelihoods of countless, hardworking Americans. What is merely a political win for them is, in reality, another family that can't make rent, can't send their kids to college, or can't pay their medical bills.

As we are well aware, much of the debate surrounding this bill has centered on its cost. Now, we, in the Democratic Party, believe that balancing the budget is vital for our long-term prosperity, but it cannot be done on the backs of struggling Americans.

Over the past few weeks, my Republican colleagues have railed on about Democrats not cutting the deficit or spending beyond our means. But I wonder if my Republican colleagues have looked in the mirror lately.

I have been here for some time; and I can't, for the life of me, remember any calls for fiscal discipline when their party was cutting taxes for millionaires and billionaires, sending a blank check overseas, or squandering \$127 billion Federal budget surplus.

Time and again, my colleagues' actions simply do not match their rhetoric. Further cutting the budget and denying unemployment benefits aren't going to make jobs magically appear.

□ 1030

Such actions will only cause our economy to contract and leave more people out in the cold. Our economy needs a deliberate, targeted approach to job creation and economic growth, and that is what Democrats will provide.

To say, as my colleagues often do, that Democrats are moving in the wrong direction and doing nothing to create jobs is simply a bold-faced lie. Over the last 1½ years we've gone from a period of negative growth to consistent increases in our GDP. We've gone from 22 months of job loss to 6 straight months of private-sector job creation, albeit not nearly enough. We've gone from shuttered factories to the largest 12-month gain in industrial production since 1998. Make no mistake, job creation is the number one priority for Democrats, but as the job market recovers, there remain far too many who are out of work and losing hope.

While my Republican colleagues question the need to lend a hand to those who are struggling, I question their aversion to provide opportunity to those who have none. Maybe there are no poor people in some of my colleagues' districts, but in the district that I am privileged to represent, people are hurting. From Pahokee to Pembroke Pines, people simply cannot find work. They are pounding the pavement, willing to take anything that comes their way, and in the meantime they need our help.

You see, Mr. Speaker, what Republicans seem to consider reckless spending, the people in the district that I serve consider a vital lifeline. There are 170,000 Floridians that are unemployed at this time. What Republicans

call government waste, the American people call an essential government service. And what Republicans see as a bloated budget, our citizens see as the only thing that is keeping them from financial ruin.

The other party can continue to play political theater, but we have serious work to do. The American people cannot afford to wait a second longer. They need this extension. They deserve this extension. And we will not let Republican obstructionism prevent them from getting this extension.

And, Mr. Speaker, I will make a prediction for you. After all of the talk for all of these months, all of the obstruction to us having unemployment compensation extended that had been routinely extended since 1959 without the kind of obstruction that it met, particularly in the other body, I predict for you that a significant number of our Republican colleagues today are going to vote for unemployment compensation. And in that regard, I'm glad they came to the dance, albeit a little late.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to this closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4213, a bill extending unemployment insurance. Republicans know that we must reduce the deficit, and if the underlying bill had been paid for, Republicans would have gladly supported it, but it is not.

Undoubtedly, the American people are suffering from the actions of this Democrat-controlled Congress. We go home every weekend and our constituents tell us that their concerns are both jobs and the debt. In fact, they tell us every weekend they are frightened to death for the future of this country. I've never had constituents tell me that before this year.

The simple truth is that while the liberals have repeatedly claimed their \$1 trillion 2009 stimulus plan was the right thing to do, it's hard to tell that from looking at the job situation across the U.S. The American people are facing high unemployment rates and economic uncertainty. In fact, we have a quote from our distinguished Chair of the Federal Reserve, "Economic future unusually uncertain" is the headline in *The Washington Times* today. But we need to go back to the drawing board and come back to the American people with real, common-sense solutions to their real problems that we must be willing to pay for.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to a former member of the Rules Committee, a good friend of mine, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

The question of unemployment benefits being conflated with the debt that was caused by tax cuts that we couldn't afford—\$2.3 trillion—by a war that was on the credit card, President Bush's war in Iraq that cost over \$1 trillion and rising, a Medicare part D program unfunded, put on the credit card, that drove this economy into a ditch. If there's going to be honest discussion about what caused this debt, then we've got to go back in history—and not distant history—to acknowledge that it was the reckless spending policies of the Republican administration and George Bush that contributed more to this debt than any other administration in the history of this entire country.

George Bush, in 8 years, accumulated more debt by more reckless decisions than all of the Presidents who preceded him. All of those decisions, incidentally, were discretionary decisions: A war of choice—wrong war, wrong time—put on the credit card of the American taxpayers; tax cuts that did not stimulate the economy but burdened us with generations of debt; a Medicare prescription drug program where the choice was not only to put it on the credit card but to make it embedded in law the unwillingness of the Federal Government to negotiate bulk price discounts with the drug companies. It guaranteed high prices at the expense of the taxpayers and our consumers. That is the legacy of debt that brought us to this situation.

Then, there is some joint responsibility. This economic collapse we had as a result of the implosion of Wall Street that happened basically 2 years ago today, there were many reasons for that, but it was excess debt, reckless speculation on the part of the folks on Wall Street, and it led to this economic crisis that we have right now.

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

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to providing unemployment benefits for people who had no responsibility for getting us here, when it comes to the question of who is going to pay the price, should it be the victims of these reckless decisions, the squandering of choices that we had to make the right decision at the right time to build jobs? Should the people who are the victims of reckless policies in Washington—and in many cases by the Republican administration, in some cases because of joint lax regulation by both administrations, Democratic and Republican—are we going to impose the burden of those bad choices on the people who had no responsibility and are the victims? That would be wrong.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would say in response that, yes, George W. Bush was responsible for what was then the worst debt in the Nation. That was a terrible public policy, and I make no apologies for it. But it needs to be pointed out that this administration and this Congress in just 2 years have run up as much debt as the irresponsible Bush administration did in all 8 years combined. Yes, that was irresponsible fiscal policy. Why in the world would you want to exacerbate and continue that bad policy? Republicans have learned their lesson. It appears that lesson has not yet been learned on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who has experienced firsthand the quiet panic that stalks every waking hour of an unemployed family knows how frightening and debilitating is chronic unemployment. You watch your savings evaporate, you watch your children going without the material things that their friends enjoy, and you count down the months or even days until you won't be able to make that crucial rent or house payment.

□ 1040

That unemployment check is a lifeline in such times, and I fully appreciate and understand how desperately an unemployed family is looking to the security of getting 99 weeks of such checks, but I can't go along with this for a simple reason: The only way out of this nightmare of unemployment for these families is a job.

Speaker PELOSI and others have said the most important thing we can do to create jobs is to extend unemployment benefits to 99 weeks because the unemployed would spend this money and stimulate the economy. Well, this analysis completely ignores the harsh and glaring fact that, before this money can be put back into the economy, it must first be taken out of the very same economy.

We will have to take \$34 billion more out of the economy in order to finance these extra benefits through November. In fact, this is the eighth such extension, totaling \$120 billion. That means over \$1,600 from the pocket of an average family of four in America. Since we don't have that money, we will have to borrow it from exactly the same capital pool that would otherwise have been available to loan to businesses seeking to expand jobs or to home buyers seeking to reenter the housing market or to consumers seeking to make consumer purchases.

Remember, two-thirds of economic growth depend upon consumer spending, but that money now won't be there to loan for jobs and homes and economic growth. This is \$34 billion of relief to the unemployed that they desperately need and that I desperately wish we could responsibly extend, but to do so would also mean \$34 billion of fewer jobs. It would mean perpetuating this never-ending nightmare of unemployment for these families and, indeed, throwing more families into that nightmare.

We have been told for several years now by Presidents Bush and Obama that stimulus spending would help the economy, but it hasn't, and there is a reason it hasn't. Government cannot inject a single dollar into the economy that it has not first taken out of that very same economy. Government cannot provide a dollar of temporary relief to the unemployed without first removing a dollar of permanent relief for the unemployed—namely, a job.

The talking point du jour from the other side is, well, the Republicans have no problems giving tax breaks to the wealthy but won't extend a lifeline to the unemployed. Well, once again, they just don't get it.

Milton Friedman once observed that spending is the effective rate of taxation. Spending can only be paid for in two ways—either by current taxes or by future taxes to retire borrowing. High taxes and deficits are just the symptom. The problem is the spending, and this is a spending bill.

On May 9 of 1939, after nearly a decade of unemployment checks and stimulus spending and with unemployment at 17.2 percent, Franklin Roosevelt's Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, made this stunning admission during a meeting with Democratic members of the House Ways and Means Committee:

He said, No, gentlemen. We have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent before, and it does not work. I have just one interest, and if I am wrong, as far as I am concerned, somebody else can have my job. I want to see this country prosperous. I want to see people get a job. I want to see people get enough to eat. We have never made good on our promises. I say, after 8 years of this administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started and an enormous debt to boot.

Mr. Speaker, let us heed the lessons of history before we totally destroy our economy. Perpetual unemployment checks put these desperate families farther and farther away from the only thing that can truly end their suffering—a real job. That is a fact nobody around here wants to face, but until we do, chronic unemployment will continue to stalk the land, and God forbid, a few years from now, another Democratic Treasury Secretary will have to make the same admission as Henry Morgenthau did 71 years ago.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I can't believe what I just heard.

I heard what Franklin Roosevelt said. I've read what Franklin Roosevelt said. I was alive during that period of time, and I saw what happened during Franklin Roosevelt's administration. My parents, among many others, got jobs during that period of time, and they came out of the Depression, and this country soared as a result of the policies of the Roosevelt administration. We will be very wise in this country if we could possibly implement the wonderful things that he did.

I yield, Mr. Speaker, 3 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California just said that, by extending and perpetuating unemployment benefits to families, it will somehow destroy the economic future of these families. Everyone is entitled to their own opinions, Mr. Speaker.

I think the reality is, if you take away people's ability to pay their rent or their utility bills or their credit card bills, you absolutely destroy them. The issue before the House today is whether or not 2.5 million Americans, whose unemployment benefits have expired or are about to expire, should get extensions. I emphatically believe that they should.

Now, the argument that we have heard from the other side—first, about not even taking a vote on this issue and now against extending those benefits—is twofold.

The first, which we just heard a version of, is that to extend their unemployment benefits somehow zaps the incentive for people to look for jobs. I would challenge anybody who makes that assertion to go meet 10 or 100 or 500 unemployed people and ask them just how many want ads they have circled, just how many resumes they have sent out, and just how hard they have looked for jobs, and I think that will put that argument to rest.

The second argument is a good faith argument that people do not want to add to the national debt. First of all, this is a selective argument. Nearly two-thirds of the national debt was accumulated during the administrations of Presidents Reagan, George H. W. Bush, and George W. Bush.

Most recently, when the past administration added to the national debt by prosecuting an endless occupation of Iraq with borrowed money, virtually no one on the other side raised this issue. Most recently, when the prior administration dramatically reduced the taxes of the top 5 percent of the people in this country by borrowing the money, virtually no one on the other side raised this issue.

Today, Members on the other side, both in the other body and here, have taken the position that, while extending benefits to janitors and bus drivers and salespeople who have lost their jobs is somehow fiscally irresponsible if you don't offset it, extending tax breaks to the top 5 percent of the people in the country on a permanent basis is completely responsible.

So, in other words, the person who was laid off from her job of cleaning an office building can't get unemployment benefits unless there is a spending cut or a tax increase to pay for it, but the person who owns the office building, who could get a \$500,000 tax cut, could

get that with borrowed money. This makes no sense.

What does make sense is a "yes" vote on today's bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HELLER).

Mr. HELLER. I appreciate the gentlewoman's extending some time.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be here in front of you and to spend some time talking about these unemployment benefits that we have in front of us today.

We had some, of course, unfortunate information come out of the administration as to the unemployment numbers for the last month. They actually went up in the State of Nevada. Right now, the unemployment rate in the State of Nevada is at 14.2 percent. In the city of Las Vegas, that unemployment number is at 14.5 percent. That is the worst unemployment of any place across this Nation, so it is very disheartening. The question, I guess, that I have, Mr. Speaker, is:

Who do we hold responsible? Who do we hold responsible for the failed economic policies of this Congress and this administration?

I want to make it clear that I do not believe that the unemployed are the ones who should be held accountable for these failures. Despite the promises from this administration that a stimulus bill would cap unemployment at 8 percent, we are seeing across this Nation numbers much higher than that. We continue to see Nevada grow from 10 percent, 11 percent, 12 percent, and now to 14.2 percent. It was supposed to be an immediate jolt. Clearly, it didn't happen. The truth is the stimulus has failed the American people and the people of the great State of Nevada.

I want to read a letter that I received recently from one of my constituents, Heidi, from the city of Sparks, Nevada.

She writes, "I need you to really try and understand just how difficult things are for some, if not most of us, still unemployed here in the lovely State of Nevada."

□ 1050

"I have been unemployed for just about 6 months now. My husband was laid off back in November, recently took a job for a considerably less amount just to get a job. I have been on several interviews, filled out countless applications, and sent my resume to countless companies."

Heidi worked for the same company for 6 years, her husband, laid off after working 13 years.

It just goes to expand the failed policies that we're seeing here in this Congress, coming out of this Congress and coming out of the administration.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield? I will yield the gentleman 15 seconds of my time if he would answer a question.

Mr. HELLER. I will be more than happy to.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. What do you think would have happened had the stimulus bill not passed?

Mr. HELLER. In other words, you're asking me what would have happened if we took all this money out of the private sector and put it in the public sector? Is that the question you're asking me?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. What would have happened to those teachers, what would have happened to those police officers who kept their jobs?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's 15 seconds has expired.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I believe we need private sector money given to private sector government given to private people, not more public jobs. And that's what the other side continues to argue.

But I will tell you that Members on both sides, both sides of the aisle are trying to help the unemployed. But what the argument here is, do we continue to add \$34 billion to the \$13 trillion in debt that we now have here in this country. And that's the argument.

And if you want to ask another question, how do you plan on paying for it, there was a rule. There was an opportunity for the Rules Committee to pay for this.

How often is the left and how often is the majority party saying that the unemployment is a stimulus to this economy? That's great. And if you want to go down that road, what I would argue is then take the stimulus dollars that are unused and use it to pay for these unemployment benefits. You can do it. You can do it. It's not that you can't do it; it's that you won't do it. And that makes no sense.

I had that substitute amendment in the Rules Committee. Of course it failed. I think it's unfortunate. What we're doing here today is that we're going to pass this bill. I'm going to vote against the rule. I will vote for the bill, but I'm voting against the rule.

And the problem with this is we're going to pass this bill and what we're going to do is we're going to go on a 6-week vacation. That's what we're doing here. We're going to go on a 6-week vacation. And what we're going to say is that, hey, we're going to extend these unemployment benefits, but we're going to get full pay for 6 weeks while we're on vacation. Why don't we stay here, Mr. Speaker?

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

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

Mr. HELLER. I want to stay here over the 6-week period, put some economic, bipartisan economic policies together so the people like Heidi from the city of Sparks, Nevada, can get a job. I think that's what we ought to be doing here in Washington, D.C. instead of casting a vote, ducking and hiding, running out for a 6-week vacation.

I ask a question: Who's to be held responsible for the failed economic policies of this Congress and this administration? And I don't believe it should be the unemployed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't take a degree in trigonometry to understand that if you spend \$34 billion helping unemployed people who should have been helped in the first place much longer ago, and according to the Congressional Budget Office, a very neutral concern that analyzes these matters, for every dollar spent, \$1.90 comes back into the economy. That would, by my count, add up to spending \$34 billion and having come into the economy \$64.6 billion.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is simply the morally right thing to do. And as I listen to the bantering and the chattering and the constant obstructionist policies of my friends, Republicans in this body and the other body, I'm amazed that there is no moral compass to say that millions of Americans, those who have worked, are simply asking that they be able to survive.

This is not a handout. This is a trust, a contract, that when you work you invest in unemployment insurance to a certain extent, first given by the States, and now, because the States have run out of money, our federal government, their government is extending those dollars. And we know that it's the right thing to do because those people on the other side of the aisle have allowed this obstructionism to go forward, but they couldn't fight it anymore.

They couldn't fight 62 percent of the American public who said this is the right thing to do. They couldn't fight the Congressional Budget Office who said this is the most cost-effective and fast-acting infusion of dollars to help people pay their mortgage and food and car payments and to stay off the streets, and to improve the economy.

And further, Mr. Speaker, Chairman Bernanke said, It's no time for the deficit hawks to raise their heads. Continuing to stimulate the economy is the right approach.

What we, as Democrats, are doing, infusing dollars into the economy, is the best approach to get the economy to grow. Corporate revenues grew in the last quarter, but corporations are hoarding their money, for now. I believe we will see more job creation soon.

We are creating jobs and therefore we must continue to stimulate this economy by these unemployed individuals having resources to buy into the economy and to make a difference.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding and allowing me to say that all of the economists point to the fact that we're doing the right thing. I ask the Republicans to join us today and stand as Americans and do what is right for America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4213, "The American Jobs and Closing Tax Loopholes Act of 2010". I am primarily concerned with the unemployment provision in this piece

of legislation. If passed, this bill will restore unemployment aid to 2.5 million Americans who have lost their benefits and are still seeking work in this emerging economy. It will give hope to the long-term unemployed and allow them a chance to survive by extending their benefits to November 30th, 2010.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a single federal program that is absolutely critical to people in communities all across this nation at this time, it would be unemployment compensation benefits. Unemployed Americans must have a means to subsist, while continuing to look for work that in many parts of the country is just not there. Families have to feed children. Unemployed workers, many of whom rely on public transportation, need to be able to get to potential employers' places of work. Utility payments must be paid. Most people use their unemployment benefits to pay for the basics. No one is getting rich from unemployment benefits, because the weekly benefit checks are solely providing for basic food, medicine, gasoline and other necessary things many individuals with no other means of income are not able to afford.

Personal and family savings have been exhausted and 401(K)s have been tapped, leaving many individuals and families desperate for some type of assistance until the economy improves and additional jobs are created. The extension of unemployment benefits for the long-term unemployed is an emergency. You do not play with people's lives when there is an emergency. We are in a crisis. Just ask someone who has been unemployed and looking for work, and they will tell you the same.

With a national unemployment rate of 9.5 percent, preventing and prolonging people from receiving unemployment benefits is a national tragedy. In the city of Houston, the unemployment rate stands at 8.3 percent as almost 250,000 individuals remain unemployed. Indeed, I can not tell you how difficult it has been to explain to my constituents who are unemployed that there will be no further extension of unemployment benefits until the Congress acts. Whether the justification for inaction is the size of the debt or the need for deficit reduction, it is clear that it is more prudent to act immediately to give individuals and families looking for work a means to survive.

H.R. 4213 is just the right measure at the right time. The legislation will send a message to the nation's unemployed, that this Congress is dedicated to helping those trying to help themselves. Until the economy begins to create more jobs at a much faster pace, and the various stimulus programs continue to accelerate project activity in local communities, we cannot sit idly and ignore the unemployed. As such, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4213.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by expressing my appreciation to my very good friend from Grandfather Community North Carolina for her thoughtful approach in dealing with what is obviously an extraordinarily difficult issue.

Night before last I had one of the telephone town hall meetings that many of our colleagues have regularly now, and there was an unemployed truck driver who was on the line saying that he had, for 1 year, been looking for a job. I said, are you going out every day? And he said, well, actually I'm going out every other day because I've got responsibilities taking care of my family. But he said that he is out working very hard to find a job. And he said we need to do what we can to ensure that those of us who are hurting do have access to those benefits.

Then he went on to say, after I had talked about the desire for us to, with our \$1 trillion-plus budget, we have a budget well in excess of \$1 trillion, that we might be able to find \$34 billion to pay for this.

He said, that makes so much sense. He said, please try to do that. And when you do it, then we'll be able to have the unemployment benefits that we need right now just to survive.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the notion of pay-as-you-go was not a Republican initiative. It was an initiative led by Democrats; and, in fact, as we saw the Democrats emerge to majority, pay-as-you-go has been the Holy Grail. In fact, we've heard constantly that pay-as-you-go would be utilized to deal with spending legislation, meaning we would offset it by bringing about spending cuts in other areas.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that my friend Mr. HELLER was absolutely right when he came before the Rules Committee this morning and made his case that he proposed an offset so that this truck driver in southern California with whom I spoke 2 nights ago would be able to get his benefits, and we would also be able to do what this unemployed truck driver wants, and that is for us to do what he said was a commonsense approach, to pay for it. I think Mr. HELLER really hit the nail right on the head when he said you can do it; it's just that you won't do it.

I have to say, and I said this when I stood here yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I like to be a positive, Ronald Reagan optimist. But when we know that the majority can in fact pay for this and they know that we are desperately concerned about the fact that an attempt is being made, as Mr. MCCLINTOCK pointed out in his thoughtful remarks, that we're exacerbating the spending problem, which did go on under the Bush administration, but has gotten substantially worse in the last 18 months—in fact, we all know we've seen an 84 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending. And so we've said, okay, we'll go along, and we want to see if we can find in this \$1 trillion-plus budget \$34 billion to offset so that we can pay for these benefits.

The other side of the aisle has chosen not to do it, I think in large part to put some of us in a position of saying, well, if you're not going to do this, if you're

just going to blindly continue with \$34 billion in additional spending, we're not going to go for it. And what is it they want to do, Mr. Speaker? They of course want to paint us as being on the other side of those who are trying to make ends meet.

Again, we've seen constantly this class warfare argument. And to me it's a failed argument. I like to quote the late Senator Paul Tsongas. We are very pleased to have his widow serve here as our colleague from Massachusetts. Senator Tsongas had this very clear approach when he was running for President in 1992. He said, "The problem with my Democratic Party is that they love employees, but they hate employers."

And, Mr. Speaker, as you look at that argument, this perpetuation of class warfare, tax cuts for the rich, throwing people who are on unemployment out into the streets without having any concern for them whatsoever, that argument really falls very flat because I believe that the American people understand that we truly do care. We do want to create opportunity for everyone. And those who are desperately in need should in fact have their needs met. And we want to do what we can.

Now, I will say that this measure extends for people going onto unemployment, unemployment benefits for 99 weeks. Ninety-nine weeks. Now, that's almost 2 years. Now, I hope very much, as Mr. HELLER said, that we can put into place a bipartisan approach, a bipartisan approach to deal with economic policy that can get this economy growing.

We know that we were promised an unemployment rate that would not exceed 8 percent if we passed the \$1 trillion stimulus bill. And in part of the area that I represent in southern California, the unemployment rate is 14.4 percent. Statewide for us in California, just announced this week, it's 12.3 percent. Nationally, it's 9.5 percent. Well, it's well in excess of what we were promised.

So why don't we try to do what has succeeded in the past, using again the model of John F. Kennedy and the model of Ronald Reagan. When John F. Kennedy's economic growth plan was put into place in 1961, marginal rate reduction, growth-oriented, growth-oriented tax cuts. I was just talking to my friend Mr. WELCH, the gentleman from Vermont. And it's true every tax cut does not generate economic growth. But if we had growth-oriented tax cuts, we could do, I would hope, what John F. Kennedy was able to do in the 1960s. He saw a 60 percent increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury. Economic growth generated more revenues.

We know that we need to increase revenues. We desperately need to increase revenues to deal with the spending that has taken place, and to try and pay down this \$13 trillion debt. In the 1980s the increased flow of revenues

to the Treasury was 90 percent when the Ronald Reagan tax plan was put into place. It's a bipartisan approach, exactly what Mr. HELLER said.

Mr. Speaker, let's use that as our model, which will be substantially better than what is being put before us today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 14 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman, my good friend and colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying bill. Mr. Speaker, all I can say is it's about time. And to my friends on the other side of the aisle, let me say it's a shame that it has taken this long. For 7 weeks, millions of Americans who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own have worried about how they are going to pay for their groceries, pay for their rent, pay for their mortgage, or pay for their children's college tuitions. They have sat around their kitchen tables and made tough decisions about their family budgets. And through this all they have continued to apply for job after job after job.

That's what unemployed Americans have been doing during these last 7 weeks. But what have the Senate Republicans done to help them, to restore benefits to Americans who have earned them through a lifetime of work? They've done nothing. My friends on the other side of the aisle talked about the need to extend the Bush tax cuts for their wealthy friends, which they don't want to pay for.

I mean here's the deal: they don't worry about the deficit when it comes to tax cuts for millionaires, but when it comes to working people who are confronting difficult times, who are faced with an emergency, all of a sudden they got religion when it comes to the deficit. They made a lot of noise about characterizing unemployment benefits as a government handout or somehow encouraging lazy behavior. But I would challenge any of my Republican colleagues to say those things face-to-face to someone who has been out of work for a year, who has applied for job after job after job after job without getting a response.

Mr. Speaker, the facts don't lie. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, extending unemployment benefits is the most efficient way for the government to generate economic growth. Each \$1 spent on unemployment benefits creates up to \$1.90 in economic output. Extending these benefits also creates jobs and decreases the chances that we slip into a double-dip recession.

In every other economic crisis in American history, Democrats and Republicans have put aside their partisan differences and provided emergency unemployment benefits to those Americans who have lost their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, House Democrats did our job. On July 1, we passed an extension of benefits that would have restored benefits for those who lost them in early June. It would have also ensured that jobless Americans would have the peace of mind of knowing that benefits were available to them to the end of November while they continue to apply for jobs. And since then we have worked and reworked this benefits extension to try to address Republican concerns. But every time, every single time we have been stonewalled by Republican obstructionism. They would rather use unemployed Americans as political pawns instead of restoring benefits to good, decent, hard-working people who have earned them over a lifetime of work.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. Enough of the politics. Let us extend these benefits to the hardworking people who have lost their jobs, who are dealing with this difficult economic time. This is the right thing to do. This is the decent thing to do. We should have done it a long time ago. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

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

I have to remind my colleagues across the aisle again that the Democrats have been in control of Congress since January 2007, and we have had a Democrat in the White House for almost 2 years. So the Democrats have been in control and Republicans are in the minority, and the Democrats can do what they want to because of their numbers in Congress.

While the Obama administration continues its so-called summer of recovery, Mr. Speaker, claiming the Democrats' stimulus bill saved or created 3 million jobs, the facts are 47 out of 50 States have lost jobs since the stimulus passed. Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee released a report on Tuesday that showed this data, and I would like to insert this report into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, this report compares the number of jobs created in each State that the administration currently claims in a White House report issued July 14 with the actual change in jobs since the stimulus became law as documented by the administration's own Department of Labor. It shows that only Alaska, Kentucky, and North Dakota, along with the District of Columbia, have shown any real job growth since the stimulus passed. And even in those States, the official job creation has fallen far short of administration claims.

□ 1110

The administration claims that every State and the District of Columbia

have seen a positive job growth. This is simply not true when you look at the actual numbers from the Department of Labor.

And let me say that in Alaska, only 2,200 jobs have been created since the stimulus passed. In Kentucky, 2,400 jobs; and in North Dakota, only 5,100 jobs. And most of us know that in North Dakota it's because of the discovery of energy. And that compares with what the administration has said they created 8,000 in North Dakota, they claim 41,000 in Kentucky, they claim 7,000 in Alaska. So the numbers are quite different.

But let me point out that in the District of Columbia where there are government jobs that have been created and lobbyist jobs that have been created as a result of this administration's policies, there are 7,800 jobs. So the bulk of the jobs that have been created are government jobs.

Republicans don't think this is right, neither do the American people think this is right. We need real jobs in the private sector.

47 OUT OF 50 STATES HAVE LOST JOBS SINCE DEMOCRATS' STIMULUS LAW—TUESDAY, JULY 20, 2010

While the Obama Administration continues their so-called "Recovery Summer" tour claiming the Democrats' stimulus bill "saved or created" three millions jobs, the facts show 47 out of 50 States have lost jobs since stimulus passed. The table below compares the number of jobs the Administration currently claims its stimulus has somehow created in each State (center column) with the actual change in jobs since stimulus became law (right hand column), as documented by the Department of Labor. It shows that only Alaska, Kentucky and North Dakota, along with the District of Columbia, have shown any real job growth since stimulus passed and even in those States the official job creation has fallen far short of Administration claims.

"Americans are asking where are the jobs, but all Washington Democrats are showing them is more unemployment, debt and higher deficits," said Ways and Means Ranking Member Dave Camp (R-MI).

State	Administration claims of change in jobs through June 2010	Actual change in jobs through June 2010
Alabama	+42,000	-45,500
Alaska	+7,000	+2,200
Arizona	+64,000	-80,300
Arkansas	+26,000	-12,600
California	+357,000	-520,200
Colorado	+50,000	-84,600
Connecticut	+38,000	-34,000
Delaware	+9,000	-5,500
DC	+16,000	+7,800
Florida	+167,000	-152,200
Georgia	+91,000	-124,600
Hawaii	+13,000	-12,700
Idaho	+15,000	-14,600
Illinois	+140,000	-155,000
Indiana	+68,000	-29,800
Iowa	+34,000	-23,700
Kansas	+28,000	-34,200
Kentucky	+41,000	+2,400
Louisiana	+39,000	-17,300
Maine	+14,000	-11,400
Maryland	+53,000	-14,300
Massachusetts	+79,000	-36,700
Michigan	+102,000	-91,400
Minnesota	+60,000	-47,900
Mississippi	+26,000	-25,400
Missouri	+59,000	-48,300
Montana	+10,000	-3,100
Nebraska	+17,000	-10,300
Nevada	+29,000	-64,300
New Hampshire	+13,000	-100
New Jersey	+94,000	-68,300
New Mexico	+19,000	-30,900
New York	+206,000	-115,400

State	Administration claims of change in jobs through June 2010	Actual change in jobs through June 2010
North Carolina	+90,000	-49,700
North Dakota	+8,000	+5,100
Ohio	+117,000	-131,500
Oklahoma	+35,000	-33,500
Oregon	+41,000	-49,000
Pennsylvania	+130,000	-71,600
Rhode Island	+11,000	-15,200
South Carolina	+41,000	-15,100
South Dakota	+8,000	-4,100
Tennessee	+60,000	-69,400
Texas	+225,000	-57,700
Utah	+27,000	-11,000
Vermont	+7,000	-7,300
Virginia	+73,000	-39,500
Washington	+67,000	-68,600
West Virginia	+16,000	-10,200
Wisconsin	+63,000	-82,000
Wyoming	+6,000	-9,900

Sources: July 14, 2010, White House. Council of Economic Advisors report and Ways and Means Republican Staff calculations based on Department of Labor data.

I reserve the balance of my time. Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Thank you very much for yielding.

Let me tell you something about the State of Nevada. We have the highest unemployment rate in the country—14½ percent unemployed—our fellow citizens with no jobs to go to and no jobs to seek. We have the highest mortgage foreclosure rate in the country. Nevadans are suffering.

It has taken far too long for this Congress to act. Unemployment benefits are not a handout. It's not welfare. It's giving a helping hand to our fellow citizens that need it the most, to get them where they are now—which is without a job—to where they're going to be when there is an economic recovery.

The gentleman from northern Nevada had an amendment in the Rules Committee that said unobligated stimulus money should go to pay for this. How many times does he have to hear that there are no unobligated funds in the stimulus bill? For any Nevadan to condemn the stimulus bill is to ignore what's going on in the State of Nevada.

Let me tell you what the stimulus bill did for us. It put \$700 billion into our education system. I'm not talking about only paying teachers and keeping them employed, I'm talking about the possibility of having to close schools. It put \$500 billion into Medicaid so that poor children and poor adults aren't going to be out on the streets dying for lack of medical care. Our unemployment compensation trust fund was broke. Zero. Zippo. We were able to put money into that.

And in addition to that, the construction projects that came directly from the stimulus package—not public but private contractors bidding on these projects and then hiring construction workers, the downtown transportation center, the park-and-ride in Centennial Hills, the Boulder Highway Transportation Center, and so many more came directly from this stimulus bill.

In addition to that, we had a middle-income tax cut, we had \$250 that went

to every Social Security recipient, \$250 went to every disabled veteran in Nevada. We welcomed this money. We needed this money. It kept us afloat.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, yes, I've talked to several of our unemployed back home. And boy, I tell you, I empathize with them. It's a tough position. I just talked to an unemployed truck driver. His benefits are running out, but yet the trucks that have been idled over the last couple of years are yet to be back onto the road because this is a jobless recovery. Well, it's a very minimal recovery at best. But they aren't creating the jobs.

The public knows and we know that the stimulus hasn't worked. The business community feels that not only does the administration not understand business, but they are now attacking businesses, and the policies have created uncertainty where they won't create the jobs. That's the issue here. There's no jobs for them to go back to because of the policies that have been adopted in the last year and a half.

We should be growing the economy and getting these people back to work. That's what they want to do.

Now, again, I empathize. But the issue here is at a time when the majority is spending probably over \$4 trillion by the time this calendar year is done—and we're already at deficit spending of over a trillion dollars by June—the people are saying, Stop the spending. Stop the deficit spending.

And that's what the issue is here is the \$34 billion that's not paid for that's going to go to the deficit and ultimately to our national debt, and that's what the people are telling us to stop—even the unemployed truck driver that I talked to.

So, all we ask of the majority here, \$34 billion, you're telling me out of—well, we don't have a budget—but out of \$3.8 trillion you can't find \$34 billion to offset and keep your promises of PAYGO?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would tell my friend where that trillion-dollar deficit came from is the \$1 trillion combined in Afghanistan and Iraq that we spent that's off budget, never accounted for, borrowed and spent by the Republicans in the majority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, DAVID OBEY.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Talk, talk, talk. Blah, blah, blah. Yap, yap, yap. The country is sick of it all. They are sick of it all. Thank God finally there will be a cease-fire for the moment on the yap-yapping and the talk-talking while the Congress actually takes some action to restore unemployment benefits for nearly 85,000

people in my State and over 2½ million Americans who are caught up in the partisan delay game that was being played every day by some of our friends in the other body.

We're told, "Oh, we can't afford this." We hear that from the same people who blew up the economy in the first place with two wars paid for with borrowed money, with two tax cuts primarily aimed at the highest income people in this country paid for with borrowed money, and with years of economic policies that allowed Wall Street banks to morph into casinos because the referee was taken off the field.

And now they're crying crocodile tears at this late date about the cost of helping folks who are unemployed. And they want us to take actions in dealing with that that would further weaken the ability of the economy to grow.

And then some of them even have the gall to challenge the work ethic of Americans who are drawing unemployment. And some of them are off-the-wall enough to even believe that those folks would rather get a few hundred bucks a month rather than a steady paycheck. Well, if you believe that, I've got a lot of unemployed workers in Wisconsin I'd like to have you meet.

If you want, if you must, by all means debate economic theory, debate your academic theories, debate anything you want. But for God's sake remember that in this debate the people who are being affected are flesh-and-blood human beings. They are families who need our help. And it would be nice if we could quit yap-yapping long enough to provide that help.

Don't use the unemployed as cannon fodder in academic and political debates. For God's sake, remember there are simply people who need our help. Get it to them. We can have the phony political debates on another day.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I need to point out to my colleagues once more that when the Democrats took over the Congress in January of 2007, the deficit was about \$200 billion. There was a wonderful situation under Mr. Clinton, they like to point out, but that was because Republicans were in control of Congress and were controlling spending.

□ 1120

When the Democrats took control of Congress, that's when things started going downhill for this country. It's when unemployment started going up and bad things happened.

Let me say, Republicans have repeatedly called for cutting unspent stimulus spending to offset spending, but we're not alone.

The majority leader, Mr. HOYER, said on June 13 there's spending fatigue across the country and that, if we have dollars not yet expended in the Recovery Act, they should be redirected to pay for new spending like this.

The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, hailed

amendments to the supplemental appropriations bill made on July 1 that were paid for by repeatedly cutting unspent projects in the stimulus bill.

In the other body, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. BAUCUS, has suggested the same, pay for new spending by cutting stimulus.

Mr. Speaker, I enter the sources for my comments in my remarks for the RECORD.

Republicans have repeatedly called for cutting unspent stimulus spending to offset this spending. We are not alone. The Majority Leader, Mr. HOYER, said on June 13 there is "spending fatigue" across the country and that "if we have dollars not yet expended in the recovery act" that they should be redirected to pay for new spending like this. The Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, hailed amendments to the supplemental appropriations bill made on July 1 that were paid for by repeatedly cutting unspent projects in the stimulus law. In the other body, the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. BAUCUS, has suggested the same—pay for new spending by cutting stimulus.

[From the Hill's On The Money, June 13, 2010]

HOYER: WHITE HOUSE SHOULD LOOK TO REDIRECT STIMULUS MONEY

(By Silla Brush)

House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) wants the White House to look at unspent money from the 2009 stimulus package instead of asking Congress for a new fiscal package.

President Barack Obama on Saturday night wrote to congressional leaders urging them to pass legislation extending tax cuts and add new spending to prevent "hundreds of thousands" of teacher layoffs, among other cuts. Obama said that without such measures the economy could "slide backwards."

Hoyer said on ABC's "This Week" on Sunday that there is "spending fatigue" across the country and that he is encouraging the administration to look at last year's \$787 billion stimulus package to see if some money can be redirected.

"I have asked the White House to look at the package we already passed," Hoyer said. "I personally believe if we have dollars not yet expended in the recovery act we could apply to this immediate need."

Centrist Democrats in recent weeks have been more vocal about their concerns that new spending would lead to higher deficits and debt.

House Republican Leader John Boehner (R-Ohio) said: "To move without finding other offsets is irresponsible."

[From the Committee on Appropriations, July 1, 2010]

HOUSE CONSIDERATION OF THE 2010 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT: AMENDMENTS ON FULLY OFFSET EDUCATION AND OTHER FUNDING

(By Ellis Brachman and Jenilee Keefe Singer)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The House of Representatives passed two amendments to H.R. 4899, the 2010 supplemental appropriations bill for efforts in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Haiti and pressing domestic needs.

The Senate bill provides a total of \$45.5 billion in discretionary funding for FY 2010, of

which \$37.12 billion is provided for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. The bill also provides \$5.1 billion for FEMA disaster relief, \$2.9 billion for Haiti, \$162 million for the Gulf Coast oil spill, and over \$600 million for other domestic needs in discretionary appropriations. Additionally, the bill includes \$13 billion in mandatory funding for Vietnam veterans exposed to Agent Orange as requested by the President.

The House amendments add \$22.8 billion for important domestic needs, including \$10 billion for an Education Jobs Fund to help save 140,000 education jobs for the next school year, and funding for Pell Grants, summer youth jobs, the Pigford and Cobell settlements, border security, innovative technology energy loans, schools on military installations, additional Gulf Coast oil spill funding, emergency food assistance, a new soldier processing center at Fort Hood, and program integrity investments that are proven to produce 1½ times their cost in savings.

In order to hold the total amount to the President's requested level over a ten-year period, the amendments include a total of \$23.5 billion in offsets: \$11.7 billion in rescissions from programs that no longer require the funding, have sufficient funds on hand, or do not need the funding this year or next; \$4.7 billion in savings from changes to mandatory programs; and \$7.1 billion in increased revenues.

In total, the amendments save the Federal Government \$493 million over ten years compared to the President's request for Supplemental funding.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS IN THE HOUSE AMENDMENTS

Education Jobs: \$10 billion, fully offset, for an Education Jobs Fund to provide additional emergency support to local school districts to prevent impending layoffs. It is estimated that this fund will help keep 140,000 school employees on the job next year.

Process: The fund will be administered by the Department of Education. After reviewing State applications, the Department will make formula allocations to States based on total population and school age population. States will then distribute the funds to school districts through their respective funding formulas or based on each district's share of Title I funds. In the case that a Governor does not submit an approvable application for funds to the Department of Education, the bill directs the Secretary to bypass the State government and make awards directly to other entities within the State.

Requirements: The bill includes strict provisions to ensure that States use these funds only for preservation of jobs serving elementary and secondary education, and not to supplant State spending on education.

Amounts from the Education Jobs Fund may not be used for purposes such as equipment, utilities, renovation, or transportation.

The bill prohibits States from using any of these funds to add to "Rainy-Day Funds" or to pay off State debt.

In order to receive an Education Jobs Fund grant, each State must provide assurance that State spending for both K-12 and higher education (measured separately) in fiscal year 2011 will be at or above either:

1. the fiscal year 2009 level (in aggregate or per pupil);
2. the same percentage share of the total State budget as in fiscal year 2010, or;
3. for states demonstrating especially dire fiscal conditions, the 2006 fiscal year aggregate dollar level or percentage share.

NOTE: More stringent rules apply to the State of Texas.

Pell Grants: \$4.95 billion, fully offset, to address the current year shortfall in the Pell

Grant Program that was unanticipated last year. Over 8 million students received Pell grants this year.

Border Security: \$701 million to strengthen enforcement on the southern border, including:

\$208.4 million for 1,200 additional Border Patrol agents deployed between the ports of entry along the Southwest Border.

\$136 million to maintain current Customs and Border Protection (CBP) officer staffing levels and add 500 additional officers at ports of entry along the Southwest Border.

\$35.5 million for improved tactical communications on the Southwest Border, three permanent Border Patrol forward operating bases, and a surge of workforce integrity investigations designed to prevent corruption among CBP officers and agents.

\$50 million for Operation Stonegarden grants to support local law enforcement activities on the border.

\$32 million to procure two additional CBP unmanned aircraft systems.

\$30 million for Immigration and Customs Enforcement activities directed at reducing the threat of narcotics smuggling and associated violence.

\$201 million for Justice Department programs, as requested.

Gulf Oil Spill: \$304 million for the Gulf Coast oil spill. The Senate bill carried \$162 million, including: \$83 million for unemployment assistance related to the oil spill and an oil spill relief employment program; \$7 million for NOAA oil spill response activities, including scientific investigations and sampling; \$14 million to respond to economic impacts on fishermen; \$10 million for Justice legal activities; \$5 million for economic recovery planning; and \$31 million for the Department of the Interior to conduct additional inspections and enforcement and to strengthen oversight and regulation and for the EPA to conduct a long-term risk study. The House amendment adds \$12 million for the newly created Presidential Commission investigating the spill; and \$130 million for an unemployment benefits program for the self-employed (i.e., fisherman) and for training and employment services.

Emergency Food Assistance: \$50 million for The Emergency Food Assistance Program for food purchases to distribute through local emergency food providers.

Schools on DoD Installations: \$163 million to improve the capacity and condition of elementary and secondary schools located on DoD installations.

Energy Loans: \$180 million to allow \$18 billion in innovative technology energy loans, split evenly between nuclear and renewable energy programs.

Fort Hood Soldier Processing Center: \$16.5 million for the replacement of the Soldier Readiness Processing Center at Fort Hood, Texas, the site of the 2009 shooting.

Program Integrity Funding: \$538 million to strengthen waste, fraud and abuse prevention and enforcement for Medicare, Medicaid and the IRS. Research shows that for every \$1.00 invested into identifying and eliminating waste, fraud and abuse in government spending, we get \$1.50 back.

Cobell and Pigford Settlements: \$4.6 billion to pay for settlement of both the Cobell and Pigford class action lawsuits. The Cobell settlement concerns the government's management and accounting for over 300,000 American Indians' trust accounts, and the Pigford settlement ends a decades old discrimination lawsuit brought by black farmers against USDA.

Summer Jobs: \$1 billion to allow local Workforce Investment Boards to expand successful summer jobs programs that were funded in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The funds would support over

350,000 jobs for youth ages 14 to 24 through summer employment programs. This age group has some of the highest unemployment levels—25% unemployment for those aged 16 to 19.

Modifications to the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2010: Makes two changes to Title IV, the "Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2010," of the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment (HIRE) Act. First, the amendment would distribute the Projects of National and Regional Significance (PNRS) and National Corridor Infrastructure Improvement (National Corridor) program funding so that each State receives a share equal to the greater of either (1) the amount of PNRS and National Corridor program funding that the State received under the HIRE Act or (2) the amount of PNRS and National Corridor funding that the State receives under this Act. The provision authorizes such sums as may be necessary from the Highway Trust Fund to provide these amounts. Second, the amendment would distribute "additional" highway formula funds (which the bill makes available in lieu of additional Congressionally-designated projects) among all of the highway formula programs rather than among just six formula programs.

UNDERLYING SENATE PROVISIONS

FEMA Disaster Relief: \$5.1 billion for the FEMA Disaster Relief Fund, as requested by the President and included in the Senate bill. The request is necessary to pay for known costs for past disasters, such as Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Ike, and Gustav, the Midwest floods of 2008, and the California wildfires and for needs that emerge from new disasters.

Veterans: \$13.377 billion in mandatory appropriations in 2010, as included in the Senate bill, for the payment of benefits to Vietnam veterans and their survivors for exposure to Agent Orange, which has been linked with Parkinson's disease, ischemic heart disease, and hairy cell/B cell leukemia. An estimated 86,069 people will be eligible to receive retroactive payments and 67,259 people will be eligible to receive new benefits.

Haiti: \$2.93 billion provided in the Senate bill for Haiti, \$130 million above the request.

Farm Loans: \$31.5 million, supporting \$950 million in farm loans, included in the Senate bill for the Farm Service Agency (FSA) to provide direct loans to family farmers who may not qualify for agricultural credit through other commercial institutions in the tight credit market. The funding provided in the FY 2010 appropriation bill was estimated to meet demand at the time the bill was passed, but demand for the farm ownership and operating loan programs continues to rise above historical levels due to the lack of availability of conventional credit.

Disaster Assistance: \$100 million in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding included in the Senate bill to help local communities devastated by flooding this year.

Mine Safety: \$22 million included in the Senate bill to reverse the growing backlog of mine safety enforcement cases while ensuring that the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) can complete 100% of its mandated mine inspections.

Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission: \$2 million included in the Senate bill to allow the Commission to investigate the causes of the recent financial crisis. The Commission is tasked with submitting its report by December, 2010.

Capitol Police: \$13 million included in the Senate bill for the ongoing acquisition and installation of a modern digital radio system because of known security threats.

Port of Guam: \$50 million, as requested, included in the Senate bill to improve and provide greater access to port facilities.

Highway Safety: \$15 million included in the Senate bill for additional studies of sudden acceleration and to administer fuel economy standards.

Rural Housing Loans: the Senate bill provides authority to continue making loans, and protects low-income borrowers from the loan fee increase.

Army Corps of Engineers: \$178 million included in the Senate bill to respond to natural disasters.

Mississippi River and Tributaries: \$18.6 million included in the Senate bill to respond to disasters.

Emergency Drought Relief: \$10 million included in the Senate bill to respond to droughts in the West.

Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies: \$20 million provided in the Senate bill for the Army Corps.

Fisheries Disasters: \$26 million provided in the Senate bill and offset by a NOAA rescission.

Economic Development Administration: \$49 million provided in the Senate bill.

Emergency Forest Restoration: \$18 million provided in the Senate bill.

Coast Guard: \$16 million provided in the Senate bill for aircraft replacement.

OFFSETS

The bill includes \$11.7 billion in rescissions from programs that no longer require the funding, have sufficient funds on hand, or do not need the funding this year or next. It also includes \$4.7 billion in savings from changes in mandatory programs. Rescissions include:

\$69.9 million in funds appropriated before 2008 to the Department of Agriculture.

\$122 million in funding provided to the Department of Agriculture for emergencies that have been completed.

\$487 million in Recovery Act and other funding provided to the Department of Agriculture for WIC.

\$27.3 million in emergency funding for the Farm Service Agency provided as early as 2004 that are no longer needed.

\$602 million in Recovery Act funding provided to the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce for broadband grants.

\$112 million in funding provided in the Recovery Act for digital television.

\$15 million in funding provided in the Recovery Act for NIST construction.

\$2 billion in funding appropriated as early as 2006 to the Defense Department.

\$500 million in funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for military construction projects that achieved bid savings.

\$262 million in Recovery Act funding provided to the Department of Defense.

\$177 million in funding appropriated to the Defense Department for HMMWVs they no longer plan to purchase.

\$116 million appropriated for the Non-Line of Sight Launch System (NLOS-LS) which the Army has terminated.

\$100 million appropriated to the Army for Operations and Maintenance, because of slow execution of some programs within the account

\$87 million appropriated for SINCGARS radios and other Army procurement programs that have not been spent as quickly as planned.

\$237 million in funds appropriated for Army Corps of Engineers projects now terminated or completed, or for projects that have not utilized allocated funding for several years.

\$800 million in funding provided to the Department of Education for new discretionary grant awards.

\$329 million in funding appropriated as early as 2009 to the Department of Energy, (including out-year savings).

\$18 million in funding appropriated as early as 2005 to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

\$100 million in funding appropriated to the General Services Administration.

\$6 million in funds appropriated in 1995 to the Department of Health and Human Services.

\$2 billion in funding appropriated as early as 2004 to the Department of Health and Human Services for pandemic flu and procurement of new biological countermeasures.

\$200 million in funding for DHS border efforts currently frozen due to secretarial review.

\$36 million in funds appropriated in 2006 to FEMA.

\$7 million in funds appropriated in 2006 to the Coast Guard.

\$53.8 million in funds appropriated as early as 2007 for research in DHS' Domestic Nuclear Detection office.

\$6.6 million in funds appropriated in 2007 to the Transportation Security Administration.

\$80 million in Recovery Act funding appropriated to the Department of Interior, EPA, and Forest Service.

\$33 million in funding provided in 1997 and 2004 to the National Park Service and the Fish & Wildlife Service.

\$2.7 million in funds appropriated in 2010 to the Judiciary.

\$11 million in funds appropriated in 1989 to the Federal Highway Administration.

\$8 million in funds appropriated in 2004 and 2006 to the Federal Aviation Administration.

\$112 million in funds appropriated in 2008 for Hurricanes Ike and Gustav and Midwest Floods.

\$400 million in funds appropriated in 2008 for CDBG for Hurricane Katrina.

\$2.2 billion in highway contract authority.

\$44 million in unused Recovery Act funding from the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Program (aka Cash for Clunkers).

\$40 million in Recovery Act funding appropriated to the State Department.

\$150 million in funding appropriated for the Millennium Challenge Corporation.

\$70 million in funding appropriated to the Department of State and USAID for the Civilian Stabilization Initiative.

\$6 million in Recovery Act funding provided to the Department of Veterans Affairs for which the purpose has been completed.

\$5 million in funding appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol.

OTHER PROVISIONS

Iran Sanctions: The House amendment prohibits funding from being provided for any new contract unless the contractor has certified that it, and any entities it controls, does not engage in activity that could be sanctioned under section 5 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996.

No Fly List: The Senate bill requires the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to require commercial foreign air carriers to check the list of individuals TSA has prohibited from flying no later than 30 minutes after the list has been updated.

High-Value Detainee Interrogations: The Senate bill requires the FBI to submit the High-Value Detainee Interrogation procedures, and any updates to those procedures, to the Congress within 30 days.

Defense Jobs Estimates: The House amendment requires an assessment of the number of jobs and costs associated with new major defense acquisitions planned for 2011.

Preserving Access to Affordable Generic Drugs: The House amendment includes a provision to strengthen the Federal Trade Commission's ability to restrict lucrative "pay

for delay" payments by brand-name drug manufacturers to their generic competitors to delay the manufacture and marketing of more affordable generic drugs to consumers. In 2009, an FTC study found that a ban on these lucrative sweetheart drug industry deals would save American consumers \$35 billion over 10 years. CBO estimates that with the provision in this bill, the federal government will save more than \$2.4 billion over 10 years in lower drug costs for Medicare, Medicaid, military and veterans' health programs.

Medicaid AMP Computation: The House amendment includes a provision to clarify the calculation of the "Average Manufacturer Price" (AMP), which determines the amount of manufacturer rebates to the federal government for outpatient drugs purchased by the Medicaid program. This technical correction to the health care reform bill affects certain injectable, infusible, and inhalation drugs. It will save the American taxpayers \$2.1 billion over 10 years.

Public Safety Collective Bargaining: The House amendment guarantees collective bargaining rights for the nation's first responders employed by States and localities. Under the language, states would administer and enforce their own labor laws, while the Federal Labor Relations Authority would step in only where such laws do not exist or do not meet minimum standards. The language prohibits public safety officers from engaging in a lockout, sickout, work slowdown, strike, or any other organized job action that will disrupt the delivery of emergency services.

FHA Loan Authority: The House amendment increases the loan commitment authority for the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) to insure mortgages for multi-family housing, hospitals and health care facilities. This increase in authority is necessary in order to avoid a disruption or suspension in the financing of these facilities.

GRAT Minimum Term: Includes the President's 2011 Budget proposal to require a minimum 10-year term and other changes to Grantor retained annuity trusts ("GRATs"). GRATs allow taxpayers to structure a transfer of assets to avoid gift taxes. As a result, taxpayer would be required to take on greater risk in order to take advantage of the gift tax benefits of using a GRAT. This provision is estimated to raise \$5.297 billion over 10 years.

Crude Tall Oil: Limits eligibility for the cellulosic biofuel tax credit, which was created to encourage the development of new production capacity for biofuels that are not derived from food sources, to fuels that are not highly corrosive (i.e., fuels that could be used in a car engine or in a home heating application). The change would prevent taxpayers from claiming the credit for production of processed fuels that are highly corrosive, such as crude tall oil (a waste by-product of the paper manufacturing process). This proposal is estimated to raise \$1.849 billion over 10 years.

[From the Hill's On The Money] HOUSE DEMOCRATS TO USE UNSPENT STIMULUS MONEY FOR TEACHERS (By Walter Alarkon)

House Democrats will try to use money from their \$862 billion stimulus to help pay for education spending in a supplemental appropriations bill.

The package crafted by House Appropriations Committee Chairman David Obey (D-Wis.) would include \$10 billion to help states and local governments avoid teacher layoffs, \$5 billion for Pell Grant funding and \$701 million to increase security at the Mexican border.

House leaders will try this week to attach the measure as an amendment to a spending

bill already passed by the Senate that provides \$37 billion for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Obeys' \$11.7 billion domestic spending package wouldn't add to the \$13 trillion debt. It would be offset by redirecting money in the stimulus and with other spending cuts.

About \$1.6 billion in stimulus money that would have gone to the departments of State, Defense, Interior, Veterans Affairs, Agriculture and Commerce and for the "Cash for Clunkers automobile trade-in program will be used as an offset in the supplemental bill.

Obeys' decision to offset the spending with stimulus funds is aimed at shoring up support for the supplemental spending bill. Both Republicans and centrist Democrats have opposed more deficit spending to help boost the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

The jobless need jobs. Why is it that the majority doesn't understand that? We do not help the unemployed by making more of them.

The gentleman from Florida asked an important question: What would have happened without all of the trillions of dollars of stimulus spending? It's becoming increasingly clear what would have happened: a normal V-shaped recovery.

In every past economic recession, save one, the greater the economic contraction, the more dramatic has been the following recovery. That one exception was the recession of 1929 when Keynesian economics had come into vogue. Herbert Hoover responded to that recession by enacting the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act that was a tax on tens of thousands of imported products. He increased Federal spending 60 percent in 4 years. He increased the Federal income tax rate from 25 to 63 percent. These were policies that were extended and expanded under Franklin Roosevelt, and as Roosevelt's own Treasury Secretary admitted in 1939, it did not work.

The gentleman's history is simply wrong. The Depression ended and the great postwar economic boom began in 1946. You will find that, in 1946, Democrat Harry Truman cut Federal spending dramatically. In 1946, he cut the Federal budget from \$80 billion down to \$35 billion. He fired 10 million Federal employees. It was called demobilization, and the result was the entire postwar economic expansion.

Mr. Speaker, it's said that those who don't learn from history are bound to repeat it. I fear that the majority party is repeating a failed history of economic contraction at just a time when we need pro-growth policies.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my colleague and fellow Floridian, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled, and my constituents are appalled, at the Repub-

licans' disrespect and coldheartedness when it comes to extending unemployment benefits for out-of-work Americans. Some Republican Members of Congress and candidates in their party have suggested that unemployment insurance makes Americans too lazy to work. One Republican Member of the House even asked, "Is the government now creating hobos?"

Maybe my Republican colleagues don't understand how unemployment compensation works. You only qualify for unemployment if you were employed. Far from being a handout to someone who doesn't want to work, unemployment benefits are specifically designed for people who want to work but who can't currently find work.

The Bush recession drove our economy off a cliff creating the worst economic conditions since the Great Depression. As a result, millions of Americans lost their jobs. Nearly 800,000 Americans lost their jobs in the last month of the Bush administration alone. Those are the facts.

Now we are beginning to recover from this near economic collapse. We've seen steady economic growth, including six straight months of private sector job growth, but there are still five unemployed Americans looking for work for every one job opening available.

The continued Republican opposition to helping out-of-work Americans is preposterous. It flies in the face of history. Since 1959, Congress has never let extended unemployment benefits expire when unemployment is over 7.2 percent.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim that we can't afford to help unemployed Americans, but where were they when they ran up the deficit by passing tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans? Where were they when, year after year, President Bush's budget did not include the costs of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan?

Mr. Speaker, analysis from the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office finds that extending unemployment benefits is one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to stimulate the economy. Moreover, economists agree that extending these benefits will create jobs and decrease the chances of slipping into a double-dip recession. So not only is it the right thing to do to help people who are temporarily out of work, it is also one of the best ways to stimulate local economies, from the very smallest towns to the very biggest cities.

Let's do the right thing. Let's pass extended unemployment benefits.

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

You know, I've often said that being here in Washington is like being Alice in Wonderland. I didn't know that there are a lot of other people who feel the same way.

I did want to ask my colleague from Massachusetts who made the contention that if we get \$1.90 back for every

dollar we spend, we don't understand why the Democrats are stopping at spending \$34 billion for these unemployment benefits. But I do want to come back to the issue of being Alice in Wonderland.

And recently, there have been several articles that have been published that have talked about this being Alice in Wonderland and the tea party, and I would like to quote from one of those articles from The Washington Times this Monday.

"A recent CBS Poll reports that 74 percent of the population thinks the nearly \$1 trillion stimulus package either hurt or had no impact on the economy. Simply put, that means three-fourths of the American people think the stimulus package was a \$1 trillion waste of money. The same poll reports that 2.5 times as many people think the health care reform bill signed into law by Democrats will hurt them (33 percent) rather than help them (13 percent)."

It goes on to say, "Many Americans are seized with fear as what might normally be a benign, lame-duck session of Congress looms in November."

Another quote: "In Lewis Carroll's story, Alice finds herself in a bizarre, nightmarish world where the basic laws of logic no longer apply and familiar beings take on strange, unreasoning personas. More and more, many Americans view our progressive leaders on Capitol Hill and at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue as the insane hosts of an ongoing Washington-style mad tea party."

I think that's what many Americans feel. I agree with them. That is what we are hearing when we go home to our districts and talk to the people there. They're seeing Washington as Wonderland and that there is a mad tea party going on.

I would like to also point out that there's another article which came out in Bloomberg Opinion which talks about the discrepancy in the job numbers that have come out.

Mr. Speaker, we know Americans are hurting. We know there's a lot of unemployment and we're sympathetic, but this is not the right way to go.

[From the Washington Times, July 19, 2010]

A TALE OF TWO TEA PARTIES

(By Doug Mainwaring)

Two Tea Parties grip the nation in two very different ways. The first is the Tea Party movement, which traces its origins to a watershed historic event as its members attempt to bring sanity and sustainability back to government. The second finds its origins in literature—Lewis Carroll's "The Adventures of Alice in Wonderland"—and is descriptive of the surreal governance of the progressives in the White House and Congress as they continue their push toward governmental insanity and unsustainability. Like matter and antimatter, positive and negative charges, they are set in polar opposition to each other.

In Lewis Carroll's story, Alice finds herself in a bizarre, nightmarish world where the basic laws of logic no longer apply and familiar beings take on strange, unreasoning personas. More and more, many Americans

view our progressive leaders on Capitol Hill and at 1600 Pennsylvania Ave. as the insane hosts of an ongoing Washington-style mad tea party. Those leaders act not just counterintuitively, they act outside the bounds of logic, reason and historic precedent that normally tether this country to safety. They behave as political elites who think they know better than the American public what's best. They are ludicrously out of touch.

The madness of this Washington tea party is displayed in myriad ways, but most profoundly in the nearly limitless demonstrations of stunning disconnect between the political elites and the American people. Congressional approval hovers around 20 percent, while disapproval is around 70 percent. The president's approval rating has been in decline for a long time, now at about 45 percent and sinking. Despite the fact that a majority in this country disapprove of the work being done by the political class, the political elites continue to pass gigantic, overreaching, outrageously expensive legislation.

A Rasmussen survey released on Friday finds that 59 percent of likely voters are embarrassed by the nation's political class and its behavior while just 23 percent are not. A stunning 64 percent see the political class as a bigger threat to our nation than legislation such as Arizona's new immigration law. Just 20 percent say the opposite. In general, the nation sees the political class as both an embarrassment and, in some ways, a threat by about a 3-1 margin.

From the point of view of the ruling political class, it has racked up tremendous achievements: the stimulus package, health care reform, education reform, Wall Street reform and so on. While the elites lift their champagne glasses to toast themselves, outside the Beltway, no one is popping corks.

Most of the country looks on with jaws dropped, wondering: What are you folks on Capitol Hill thinking? Twenty-four-hundred pages of unintelligible health care reform and another 2,300 pages of unintelligible financial reform signed into law. Stacked together, they create a legislative Tower of Babel. How dare you pass this massive legislation while you lack the confidence of the American people by a 7-2 margin?

Undaunted, their mad tea party continues.

A recent CBS Poll reports that 74 percent of the population thinks the nearly \$1 trillion stimulus package either hurt or had no impact on the economy. Simply put, that means three-fourths of the American people think the stimulus package was a \$1 trillion waste of money. The same poll reports that 2.5 times as many people think the health care reform bill signed into law by Democrats will hurt them (33 percent) rather than help them (13 percent).

Many Americans are seized with fear as what might normally be a benign, lame-duck session of Congress looms in November. Will this be used as a window of opportunity for progressives to pass more unwanted legislation? "Cap and trade"? Card check? This could be their intention.

Our progressive leaders don't get it, and what's more, they don't care. They don't understand how starkly different, how irrational and just how unhinged they appear to folks outside the Beltway. While Lewis Carroll's mad tea party is literary fantasy, sadly, the progressives' mad tea party in Washington is very real.

Robert Weissberg offered his view in the American Thinker on April 29: "I finally realized that the Obama administration and its congressional collaborators almost resemble a foreign occupying force, a coterie of politically and culturally non-indigenous leaders whose rule contravenes local values rooted in our national tradition. It is as if the

United States has been occupied by a foreign power, and this transcends policy objections."

Dorothy Rabinowitz, writing in the Wall Street Journal a few weeks later on June 9, shares a similar sentiment: "A great part of America now understands that this president's sense of identification lies elsewhere and is in profound ways unlike theirs. He is hard put to sound convincingly like the leader of the nation, because he is, at heart and by instinct, the voice mainly of his ideological class. He is the alien in the White House. . . ."

Interestingly, the progressives' mad tea party in Washington is what has given rise to the august Tea Party movement. Washington leadership has abandoned the venerable, common-sense, salt-of-the-earth center and right of our nation. The movement has emerged to fill the gaping void in center-right leadership to stem the tide of this Washington madness. Republican leaders have been either clueless or unwilling to lead bravely and skillfully. When Republicans controlled both houses of Congress, they also spent profligately. With such a huge vacuum of leadership in Washington, the Tea Party movement has burst forth to lead the way.

The people at this country's admirable, sustaining center have been ignored, trampled and tyrannized for too long. They have been marginalized through political correctness and the constant motion of the dividing line between progressivism and conservatism far to the left. We now live in an upside-down, Alice-in-Wonderland, house-of-mirrors world where the most basic of mainstream American sensibilities are considered to be radical right-wing thought. This has led Americans from sea to shining sea to announce: Enough is enough.

Tea Partiers seek to end the madness in Washington and establish fiscal sanity and sound, reasonable, constitutionally limited government.

[From the Bloomberg Opinion, July 18, 2010]

OBAMA OMITTS JOBS KILLED OR THWARTED
FROM TALLY

(By Caroline Baum)

Can you believe they're still touting that silly metric?

When I heard last week that the White House would be announcing the number of "jobs created or saved" as a result of the 2009 American Reinvestment and Recovery Act, my first reaction was embarrassment.

Imagine how Christina Romer must feel. The chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors was dressed in a cheery, salmon-colored jacket, a complement to the upbeat news she had to deliver on July 14. The \$787 billion stimulus enacted in February 2009, which subsequently grew to \$862 billion, increased gross domestic product by 2.7 percent to 3.4 percent relative to where it would have been, and added anywhere from 2.5 million to 3.6 million jobs compared with an ex-stimulus baseline.

"By this estimate, the Recovery Act has met the president's goal of saving or creating 3.5 million jobs—two quarters earlier than anticipated," Romer said with a straight face. (More than 2.5 million non-farm jobs have been lost since ARRA was enacted in February 2009, all of them in the private sector, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.)

How does the CEA arrive at these numbers? It uses two methods, Romer said. The first is a standard macroeconomic forecasting model that estimates the multiplier effect of fiscal policy. (The government's spending is someone else's income.) The second method is statistical, using previous relationships between GDP and employment to project future behavior.

MODEL IMPERFECTION

These numbers might just as well have been pulled out of a hat. Recall that it was the same model and method the administration used in January 2009 to predict an unemployment rate of 7 percent in the fourth quarter of 2010 with the enactment of the fiscal stimulus and 8.8 percent without. The unemployment rate now stands at 9.5 percent.

This same model convinced policy makers that the subprime crisis was contained, encouraged the rating companies to slap AAA ratings on collateralized garbage, and led banks to believe they had adequately managed their risks and reserved for potential losses.

Econometric models rely on the assumption that \$1 of government spending generates more than \$1 of GDP, the so-called multiplier effect. There is no allowance for the negative multiplier on the other side.

Sure the government can spend money and generate GDP growth in the short run: Government spending is a component of GDP!

What it giveth it taketh away from the private sector via taxation or borrowing. Every dollar the government spends is a dollar the private sector doesn't spend, an investment it doesn't make, a job it doesn't create. This is what is unseen, as Frederic Bastiat explained in an 1850 essay.

HIRING DISINCENTIVES

"If the administration wants to take credit for 'jobs created or saved,' it should also accept responsibility for 'jobs destroyed or prevented,'" said Bill Dunkelberg, chief economist at the National Federation of Independent Business.

Ignoring the flaws in the stimulus for the moment, Congress raised the hurdle for hiring entry-level workers when it refused to delay the third step in a three-stage minimum wage increase last year. And the Department of Labor cracked down on unpaid internships, outlining six criteria that businesses had to satisfy in order to hire someone willing and able to work for nothing to get the experience.

For example, the employer must derive "no immediate advantage from the activities of the trainees, and on occasion the employer's operations may actually be impeded."

You can't make this stuff up.

RECESSION'S ADVANTAGE

At the White House briefing last week, Romer touted the leveraging of public investment with private funds, with \$1 of Recovery Act funds partnering with \$3 of outside spending. Romer said this public spending "saved or created 800,000 jobs" in the second quarter alone.

Once again, what would have happened in the absence of the government's targeted intervention?

According to a June 2009 study by the Kauffman Foundation in Kansas City, Missouri, well over half of the companies on the Fortune 500 list, and almost half of the fastest growing companies in America, were started during a recession or bear market. Dunkelberg calls this phenomenon "negative push starts." People might not be willing to quit their jobs, but if they get laid off during a recession and were thinking about starting a business, they might seize the day, he said. "When people ask me when the best time to start a company is, I tell them the day before the recession ends," Dunkelberg said. "They can do it on the cheap, and the next day you get cash flow."

MODEL THAT!

What's more, firms less than five years old are responsible for all of the net new jobs created in the U.S., the Kauffman study found. Job creation by start-ups is more stable, less sensitive to the business cycle.

So, if the goal is to create more jobs, and start-ups are the ones that create them, why is the Obama administration partnering up with existing firms?

“Job-creation policies aimed at luring larger, established employers will inevitably fail,” said Tim Kane, Kauffman Foundation senior fellow in research and policy and author of a follow-up study released this month.

Not to worry. The White House has a model that turns failure into success.

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

A little while ago, George Bush said this. Several months after taking office, he learned that his budgets had already erased the previous administration’s huge surplus that was paying off our country’s debt at a rapid rate and had instead forced the country to start borrowing heavily again. Bush said, The huge deficit was incredibly positive news because it will create a fiscal straitjacket for Congress.

□ 1130

That’s right, massive deficits were incredibly positive news.

Mr. Speaker, I got a little tired of hearing our colleagues saying what the Democrats haven’t done. Let me tell you what we have done.

We have done the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. We have done the Worker, Homeownership, and Business Assistance Act. We have done health insurance reform, Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibilities Act. The Cash for Clunkers Program alone spurred the sale of 700,000 vehicles.

We have done the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act that helped create 300,000 jobs. When they talk in terms of the stimulus, the teachers, the police officers and the firefighters, when you ask them whether or not their jobs were saved, I guarantee you they will give you an answer.

We did Wall Street reform passed by the House, American Worker, State, and Business Relief Act passed by the House and Senate, Small Business and Infrastructure Jobs Tax Act passed by the House. For those on the other side who argue that there haven’t been any tax cuts, there have been tax cuts, but those tax cuts were for middle class Americans, 93 percent of whom received the tax cut. We have done the Disaster Relief and Summer Jobs Act passed by the House, and it died over there in the Senate, and that’s regrettable and foolish.

We have done Jobs for Main Street Act, passed by the House. What’s next? Small business lending, clean energy jobs and the COMPETES Act. I can assure you, we have done a lot and have a lot more to do and many of the things that I just spoke of create jobs.

My colleagues see this legislation as a handout or a luxury, but to the millions who are depending on us to act, the extension of unemployment benefits will make the difference between

whether they can put food on the table, pay their rent, and just get by.

Years of bad economic and fiscal policies have brought us to our present situation, and there is no switch we can throw to provide an instant fix. In my home State of Florida, 147,000 individuals will run out of unemployment benefits.

I haven’t met these people, but I read about their plight, people like Joan McCammon of Kissimmee, a 50-year-old former administrative assistant who has been out of work for over a year. Though she and her husband tried to be prepared without this assistance, they will have to dip into their retirement savings just to make ends meet.

She is not much different from Pandora Evans of Fort Pierce in my congressional district who has been unemployed for almost 2 years after losing her job at a service station. Her benefits have run out and her bills piled up to the point she may soon be homeless.

And there is Joe Becker of Jupiter, Florida, who has applied for nearly 400 jobs, has put himself through additional training and is still unable to find work.

These are only three of the 3.2 million Americans who stand to lose unemployment compensation if we do not act positively. This is not mere charity for them.

I urge my colleagues to pass this much-needed extension and urge them to support this rule. I urge a “yes” vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 1550 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1469, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

[Roll No. 461]
YEAS—237

Ackerman	Boucher	Clyburn
Altmire	Boyd	Cohen
Andrews	Brady (PA)	Connolly (VA)
Arcuri	Braley (IA)	Conyers
Baca	Brown, Corrine	Cooper
Baldwin	Butterfield	Costa
Barrow	Capps	Costello
Bean	Cardoza	Courtney
Becerra	Carnahan	Critz
Berkley	Carney	Crowley
Berman	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Berry	Castor (FL)	Cummings
Bishop (GA)	Chandler	Dahlkemper
Bishop (NY)	Childers	Davis (AL)
Blumenauer	Chu	Davis (CA)
Bocchieri	Clarke	Davis (IL)
Boren	Clay	Davis (TN)
Boswell	Cleaver	DeFazio

DeGette	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Rangel
Delahunt	Kissell	Reyes
DeLauro	Klein (FL)	Sarbanes
Deutch	Kosmas	Richardson
Dicks	Kratovil	Rodriguez
Dingell	Kucinich	Ross
Doggett	Langevin	Rothman (NJ)
Donnelly (IN)	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Driehaus	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Edwards (MD)	Lee (CA)	Rush
Edwards (TX)	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Ehlers	Lewis (GA)	Salazar
Ellison	Lipinski	Sanchez, Linda
Ellsworth	Loeb sack	T.
Engel	Lofgren, Zoe	Sanchez, Loretta
Eshoo	Lowey	Sarbanes
Etheridge	Lujan	Schakowsky
Farr	Lynch	Schauer
Fattah	Maffei	Schiff
Filner	Markey (MA)	Schrader
Foster	Marshall	Schwartz
Frank (MA)	Matheson	Scott (GA)
Fudge	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Garamendi	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano
Gonzalez	McCollum	Sestak
Gordon (TN)	McDermott	Shea-Porter
Grayson	McGovern	Sherman
Green, Al	McIntyre	Sires
Green, Gene	McMahon	Skelton
Grijalva	McNerney	Slaughter
Gutierrez	Meek (FL)	Smith (WA)
Hall (NY)	Meeks (NY)	Snyder
Halvorson	Melancon	Space
Hare	Michaud	Speier
Harman	Miller (NC)	Spratt
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Stark
Heinrich	Mollohan	Stupak
Herseth Sandlin	Moore (KS)	Sutton
Higgins	Moore (WI)	Tanner
Himes	Moran (VA)	Taylor
Hinche y	Murphy (CT)	Teague
Hinojosa	Murphy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Hirono	Nadler (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Holden	Napolitano	Tierney
Holt	Neal (MA)	Tonko
Honda	Oberstar	Towns
Hoyer	Obey	Tsongas
Insl ee	Olver	Van Hollen
Israel	Owens	Velázquez
Jackson (IL)	Pallone	Visclosky
Jackson Lee	Pascarell	Walz
(TX)	Pastor (AZ)	Wasserman
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Schultz
Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter	Waters
Kagen	Perriello	Watson
Kanjorski	Peters	Watt
Kaptur	Peterson	Waxman
Kennedy	Pingree (ME)	Weiner
Kildee	Polis (CO)	Welch
Kilpatrick (MI)	Pomeroy	Wilson (OH)
Kilroy	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Kind	Rahall	Wu
		Yarmuth

NAYS—180

Aderholt	Cao	Graves (GA)
Adler (NJ)	Capito	Graves (MO)
Akin	Carter	Griffith
Alexander	Cassidy	Guthrie
Austria	Castle	Hall (TX)
Bachmann	Chaffetz	Harper
Bachus	Coble	Hastings (WA)
Baird	Coffman (CO)	Heller
Barrett (SC)	Cole	Hensarling
Bartlett	Conaway	Hergert
Barton (TX)	Crenshaw	Hill
Biggert	Culberson	Hunter
Bilbray	Davis (KY)	Inglis
Bilirakis	Dent	Issa
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jenkins
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (IL)
Blunt	Djou	Johnson, Sam
Boehner	Dreier	Jones
Bonner	Duncan	Jordan (OH)
Bono Mack	Emerson	King (IA)
Boozman	Flake	Kingston
Boustany	Fleming	Kirk
Brady (TX)	Forbes	Kline (MN)
Bright	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Brown (GA)	Fox	Lance
Brown (SC)	Franks (AZ)	Latham
Brown-Waite,	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Ginny	Gallely	Latta
Buchanan	Garrett (NJ)	Lee (NY)
Burgess	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Burton (IN)	Giffords	Linder
Buyer	Gingrey (GA)	LoBiondo
Calvert	Gohmert	Lucas
Camp	Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer
Campbell	Granger	Lummis

Lungren, Daniel E.	Olson Paul	Shock Sensenbrenner	Cassidy Castle	Heller Hensarling	Meeks (NY) Melancon	Shuster Simpson	Teague Terry	Wasserman Schultz
Mack	Paulsen	Sessions	Castor (FL)	Herger	Mica	Sires	Thompson (CA)	Waters
Manzullo	Pence	Shadegg	Chaffetz	Hersteth Sandlin	Michaud	Skelton	Thompson (MS)	Watson
Marchant	Petri	Shimkus	Chandler	Higgins	Miller (FL)	Slaughter	Thompson (PA)	Watt
Markey (CO)	Pitts	Shuler	Childers	Hill	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)	Thornberry	Waxman
McCarthy (CA)	Platts	Shuster	Chu	Himes	Miller (NC)	Smith (NJ)	Tiberi	Weiner
McCaul	Poe (TX)	Simpson	Clarke	Hinchev	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)	Tierney	Welch
McClintock	Posey	Smith (NE)	Clay	Hinojosa	Miller, George	Smith (WA)	Titus	Westmoreland
McCotter	Price (GA)	Smith (NJ)	Cleaver	Hirono	Minnick	Space	Tonko	Whitfield
McHenry	Putnam	Smith (TX)	Clyburn	Holden	Mitchell	Speier	Towns	Wilson (OH)
McKeon	Radanovich	Stearns	Coble	Holt	Mollohan	Spratt	Tsongas	Wilson (SC)
McMorris	Rehberg	Sullivan	Coffman (CO)	Honda	Moore (KS)	Stark	Turner	Wittman
Rodgers	Reichert	Terry	Cohen	Hoyer	Moore (WI)	Stearns	Upton	Wolf
Mica	Roe (TN)	Thompson (PA)	Cole	Hunter	Moran (WI)	Stupak	Van Hollen	Woolsey
Miller (FL)	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry	Conaway	Inglis	Moran (KS)	Sullivan	Velázquez	Wu
Miller (MI)	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi	Connolly (VA)	Insee	Moran (VA)	Sutton	Visclosky	Yarmuth
Miller, Gary	Rogers (MI)	Turner	Conyers	Israel	Murphy (CT)	Tanner	Walden	Young (AK)
Minnick	Rohrabacher	Upton	Cooper	Issa	Murphy (NY)	Taylor	Walz	
Mitchell	Rooney	Walden	Costa	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Tim			
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Westmoreland	Costello	Jackson Lee	Myrick			
Murphy, Tim	Roskam	Whitfield	Costello	(TX)	Nadler (NY)			
Myrick	Royce	Wilson (SC)	Courtney	Jenkins	Napolitano			
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Wittman	Crenshaw	Johnson (GA)	Neal (MA)			
Nunes	Scalise	Wolf	Critz	Johnson (IL)	Neugebauer			
Nye	Schmidt	Young (AK)	Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Nunes			
			Cuellar	Johnson, Sam	Nye			
			Culbertson	Jones	Oberstar			
			Cummings	Jordan (OH)	Obey			
			Dahlkemper	Kagen	Olson			
			Davis (AL)	Kanjorski	Olver			
			Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Owens			
			Davis (IL)	Kennedy	Pallone			
			Davis (KY)	Kildee	Pascarell			
			Davis (TN)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pastor (AZ)			
			DeFazio	Kilroy	Paulsen			
			DeGette	Kingston	Payne			
			DeLahunt	Kirk	Pence			
			DeLauro	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Perlmutter			
			Dent	Kissell	Perriello			
			Deutch	Klein (FL)	Peters			
			Diaz-Balart, L.	Kline (MN)	Peterson			
			Diaz-Balart, M.	Kosmas	Petri			
			Dicks	Kratovil	Pingree (ME)			
			Dingell	Kucinich	Pitts			
			Djou	Lamborn	Platts			
			Doggett	Lance	Poe (TX)			
			Donnelly (IN)	Langevin	Polis (CO)			
			Dreier	Larsen (WA)	Pomeroy			
			Driehaus	Larson (CT)	Posey			
			Duncan	Latham	Price (GA)			
			Edwards (MD)	LaTourette	Price (NC)			
			Edwards (TX)	Latta	Putnam			
			Ehlers	Lee (CA)	Radanovich			
			Ellison	Lee (NY)	Rahall			
			Ellsworth	Levin	Rangel			
			Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Rehberg			
			Engel	Lewis (GA)	Reichert			
			Eshoo	Linder	Reyes			
			Etheridge	Lipinski	Richardson			
			Farr	LoBiondo	Rodriguez			
			Fattah	Loeb sack	Roe (TN)			
			Filner	Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (AL)			
			Fleming	Foster	Rogers (KY)			
			Forbes	Fox	Rogers (MI)			
			Fortenberry	Frank (MA)	Rohrabacher			
			Foster	Franks (AZ)	Rooney			
			Fox	Frelinghuysen	Ros-Lehtinen			
			Frank (MA)	Fudge	Roskam			
			Franks (AZ)	Galleghy	Ross			
			Frelinghuysen	Garamendi	Rothman (NJ)			
			Gerlach	Garrett (NJ)	Roybal-Allard			
			Giffords	Garrett (NJ)	Royce			
			Gingrey (GA)	Gerlach	Ruppersberger			
			Gohmert	Giffords	Ryan (OH)			
			Gonzalez	Gingrey (GA)	Ryan (WI)			
			Goodlatte	Gohmert	Salazar			
			Goodlatte	Grijalva	Sánchez, Linda T.			
			Gordon (TN)	Guthrie	Sanchez, Loretta			
			Granger	Gutierrez	Sarbanes			
			Graves (MO)	Hall (NY)	Scalise			
			Grayson	Hall (TX)	Schakowsky			
			Green, Al	Halvorson	Schauer			
			Green, Gene	Hare	Schiff			
			Griffith	Harman	Schmidt			
			Grijalva	Harper	Schock			
			McCollum	Hastings (FL)	Schrader			
			McCotter	Hastings (WA)	Schwartz			
			McDermott	Heinrich	Scott (GA)			
			McGovern		Scott (VA)			
			McHenry		Sensenbrenner			
			McIntyre		Serrano			
			McKeon		Sessions			
			McMahon		Sestak			
			McMorris		Shadegg			
			Rodgers		Shea-Porter			
			McNerney		Sherman			
			Meek (FL)		Shimkus			
					Shuler			

NAYS—4

Broun (GA) Graves (GA)
Flake Paul

NOT VOTING—15

Brady (TX) Hoekstra Rush
Capuano King (NY) Snyder
Doyle Murphy, Patrick Tiahrt
Fallin Ortiz Wamp
Hodes Quigley Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1212

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5720

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to remove my name from H.R. 5720.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii? There was no objection.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2010

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1550, I call up the bill (H.R. 4213) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, and I have a motion at the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment to House amendment to Senate amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Section 4007 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

NOT VOTING—15

Cantor Hoekstra Quigley
Capuano King (NY) Tiahrt
Doyle Maloney Titus
Fallin Murphy, Patrick Wamp
Hodes Ortiz Young (FL)

□ 1200

Messrs. HELLER, CARTER, and BAIRD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1469) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a permanent background check system, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 4, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 462]

YEAS—413

Ackerman	Berry	Bright
Aderholt	Biggart	Brown (SC)
Adler (NJ)	Bilbray	Brown, Corrine
Akin	Bilirakis	Brown-Waite,
Alexander	Bishop (GA)	Ginny
Altmire	Bishop (NY)	Buchanan
Andrews	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Arcuri	Blackburn	Burton (IN)
Austria	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Baca	Blunt	Buyer
Bachmann	Boccieri	Calvert
Bachus	Boehner	Camp
Baird	Bonner	Campbell
Baldwin	Bono Mack	Cantor
Barrett (SC)	Boozman	Cao
Barrow	Boren	Capito
Bartlett	Boswell	Capps
Barton (TX)	Boucher	Cardoza
Bean	Boustany	Carnahan
Becerra	Boyd	Carney
Berkley	Brady (PA)	Carson (IN)
Berman	Braley (IA)	Carter

(A) by striking “June 2, 2010” each place it appears and inserting “November 30, 2010”;

(B) in the heading for subsection (b)(2), by striking “JUNE 2, 2010” and inserting “NOVEMBER 30, 2010”; and

(C) in subsection (b)(3), by striking “November 6, 2010” and inserting “April 30, 2011”.

(2) Section 2005 of the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act, as contained in Public Law 111-5 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note; 123 Stat. 444), is amended—

(A) by striking “June 2, 2010” each place it appears and inserting “December 1, 2010”; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking “November 6, 2010” and inserting “May 1, 2011”.

(3) Section 5 of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-449; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking “November 6, 2010” and inserting “April 30, 2011”.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 4004(e)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

“(F) the amendments made by section 2(a)(1) of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010; and”.

(c) CONDITIONS FOR RECEIVING EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—Section 4001(d)(2) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting before “shall apply” the following: “(including terms and conditions relating to availability for work, active search for work, and refusal to accept work)”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Continuing Extension Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-157).

SEC. 3. COORDINATION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION WITH REGULAR COMPENSATION.

(a) CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS NOT INELIGIBLE BY REASON OF NEW ENTITLEMENT TO REGULAR BENEFITS.—Section 4002 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) COORDINATION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION WITH REGULAR COMPENSATION.—

“(1) If—

“(A) an individual has been determined to be entitled to emergency unemployment compensation with respect to a benefit year,

“(B) that benefit year has expired,

“(C) that individual has remaining entitlement to emergency unemployment compensation with respect to that benefit year, and

“(D) that individual would qualify for a new benefit year in which the weekly benefit amount of regular compensation is at least either \$100 or 25 percent less than the individual’s weekly benefit amount in the benefit year referred to in subparagraph (A),

then the State shall determine eligibility for compensation as provided in paragraph (2).

“(2) For individuals described in paragraph (1), the State shall determine whether the individual is to be paid emergency unemployment compensation or regular compensation for a week of unemployment using one of the following methods:

“(A) The State shall, if permitted by State law, establish a new benefit year, but defer the payment of regular compensation with respect to that new benefit year until exhaustion of all emergency unemployment compensation payable with respect to the benefit year referred to in paragraph (1)(A);

“(B) The State shall, if permitted by State law, defer the establishment of a new benefit year (which uses all the wages and employment

which would have been used to establish a benefit year but for the application of this paragraph), until exhaustion of all emergency unemployment compensation payable with respect to the benefit year referred to in paragraph (1)(A);

“(C) The State shall pay, if permitted by State law—

“(i) regular compensation equal to the weekly benefit amount established under the new benefit year, and

“(ii) emergency unemployment compensation equal to the difference between that weekly benefit amount and the weekly benefit amount for the expired benefit year; or

“(D) The State shall determine rights to emergency unemployment compensation without regard to any rights to regular compensation if the individual elects to not file a claim for regular compensation under the new benefit year.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to individuals whose benefit years, as described in section 4002(g)(1)(B) the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note), as amended by this section, expire after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. REQUIRING STATES TO NOT REDUCE REGULAR COMPENSATION IN ORDER TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDS UNDER THE EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

Section 4001 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) NONREDUCTION RULE.—An agreement under this section shall not apply (or shall cease to apply) with respect to a State upon a determination by the Secretary that the method governing the computation of regular compensation under the State law of that State has been modified in a manner such that—

“(1) the average weekly benefit amount of regular compensation which will be payable during the period of the agreement occurring on or after June 2, 2010 (determined disregarding any additional amounts attributable to the modification described in section 2002(b)(1) of the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act, as contained in Public Law 111-5 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note; 123 Stat. 438)), will be less than

“(2) the average weekly benefit amount of regular compensation which would otherwise have been payable during such period under the State law, as in effect on June 2, 2010.”.

SEC. 5. BUDGETARY PROVISIONS.

(a) STATUTORY PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ‘Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation’ for this Act, jointly submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairmen of the House and Senate Budget Committees, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage in the House acting first on this conference report or amendment between the Houses.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.—Sections 2 and 3—

(1) are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-139; 2 U.S.C. 933(g));

(2) in the House of Representatives, are designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles; and

(3) in the Senate, are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

MOTION TO CONCUR

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Levin moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4213.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Senate amendment to the House amendment to the bill H.R. 4213 contains an emergency designation for the purposes of pay-as-you-go principles under clause 10(c) of rule XXI; and an emergency designation pursuant to section 4(g)(1) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

Accordingly, the Chair must put the question of the consideration under clause 10(c)(3) of rule XXI and under section 4(g)(2) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

The question is, Will the House now consider the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1550, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, this action should have occurred 2 months ago. This House acted to extend unemployment insurance on May 28. For 6 weeks Republicans in the Senate blocked unemployment insurance. They stood not on the side but in the way of millions of Americans. During those 6 weeks, over 2.5 million unemployed Americans exhausted their benefits, and they struggled to stay afloat while continuing to look for work in this difficult economy.

Americans like this person from Grand Rapids, Michigan, who wrote me, and I quote, “I worked 22 years in automotive, 60 to 70 hours a week, supported my family, paid my taxes, and worked in my community. Every single day I send my resume out, to no avail. I have lost my home, one vehicle, and my sense of the ability to take care of my family.”

Or this individual from Madison Heights, Michigan. “My family is not living large; we are surviving. Cutting unemployment insurance will take us out of survival mode and put us into homeless mode. After working 20-plus years, this is the first time that we have asked for unemployment.”

And to add insult to injury, after their filibuster was broken, Senate Republicans insisted on running out the clock and delaying the full 30 hours before they would let a final vote occur in the other body. Thirty hours for nothing. No excuse of theirs worked for working Americans out of work, out of work through no fault of their own and looking for work.

We have acted to extend unemployment insurance in Republican Congresses under Republican Presidents. So today we put this sad chapter behind us, and now we move forward to continue our efforts to support job creation and to continue to dig out of the jobs ditch inherited by this administration and by this Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, my State of Louisiana has faced four hurricanes, a recession, and now an oil spill. And every one of us in this body has faced and looked into the eyes of those who lost their homes and lost their jobs. And every one of us in this body feels deep compassion for those who are in those dire straits. And we all want to help. Republicans want to help those looking for work, we want to help those who are struggling with this current economic slowdown, but we also agree with the American people that new spending must be paid for.

□ 1220

This latest unemployment insurance extender bill fails to do what the American people want us to do. Instead, the Democratic approach adds another \$34 billion to the already staggering \$13 trillion national debt. And that's not because we have a shortage of ineffective, inefficient, wasteful spending that we could cut to offset what's needed to pay for this. We want to do this, but we want to do what the American people want us to do—and that is to pay for it.

Republicans have repeatedly called for the cutting of unspent stimulus spending to offset this new stream of spending. The majority leader himself, Mr. HOYER, said on June 13, there is "spending fatigue" across this country and that "if we have dollars not yet expended in the recovery act" that they should be redirected for new spending such as this.

Mr. Speaker, 18 months ago the administration told the American people that their trillion-dollar stimulus plan would create millions of jobs and keep unemployment below 8 percent. Instead, 2 million jobs more have been lost and unemployment surged to nearly 10 percent. Overall, 47 out of 50 States have lost jobs since the Democrats' February 2009 stimulus bill, including my home State of Louisiana.

Instead of supporting this economy and getting Americans back to work, jobs have been lost, our debt continues to spiral out of control, and the only solution we have here, without an ability to amend, without an ability to offer some alternative approach, is to add another \$34 billion in new spending without offsetting it. New spending is unnecessary, and Republicans have been calling for this wasted stimulus money to be put to better use by supporting the long-term unemployed. I suggest the best way to create jobs is to stop destroying good-paying jobs that already exist. And let me explain what I mean by that.

This is the single most important issue in my home State of Louisiana. The people of Louisiana are facing job loss. In addition to a failed economic policy, a failed stimulus, President Obama's ill-conceived and unwarranted and—in the words of a Federal judge—arbitrary and capricious ban on offshore drilling is galvanizing residents across the gulf coast like I've never seen before. And the long term implications of this, Mr. Speaker, are real. Real lives are affected by this.

Because of this policy, tens of thousands of good-paying jobs along the gulf coast are immediately at risk, and it doesn't have to be this way. But unfortunately, the elites in this administration and the President himself refuse to understand this.

Six weeks ago, the Louisiana delegation—the entire delegation, Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate—requested a meeting with the President in writing. And we have not even gotten a response back. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, that's just unacceptable, and it's irresponsible.

Already three gulf rigs have left American waters heading to other parts of the world, and the trend is going to continue at an accelerated rate. And once a rig is gone, it could be years before it returns—if it ever returns at all. Each one of these deep-water rigs employs 1,400 workers. You take 1,400 workers and multiply it by six, and those are the immediate support workers. These are jobs that are being lost.

And smaller companies that cannot afford to move are simply losing their workers. People are losing their jobs, costing thousands of jobs.

I met recently with about 35 companies. These are all small companies affected by this. And there was an African American couple. He got started doing janitorial work. And he worked very hard for years to do this, saved his money and started a small business, an oil service company that he was so proud of. The American dream, by God. He started this company and grew it to 20 workers. And he had accelerating work until this ban on drilling, and now he has no work, and he's seeing his life savings go down the drain. Why? Because of an ill-founded, government-imposed moratorium that makes no sense.

These are rig workers and energy engineers, they're plumbers, they're electricians, they're dock workers. They work in the maritime industry. And yet this is the kind of policy we're getting. This ban hurts everybody. We stand united on the gulf coast to support good-paying jobs.

This stimulus has failed, and it's time to direct these funds into more beneficial areas to help those who are chronically unemployed.

The last time this House acted, Mr. CAMP, the ranking member of our Ways and Means Committee, offered a motion to extend these benefits while paying for the spending by using unspent

funds from the failed stimulus bill. The House could immediately act on that same type of provision today with the Senate following suit to get these benefits to the long-term unemployed in a way that helps the economy, job creation—instead of hampering job creation even more.

That is what we should be doing and what would most help the unemployed get benefits that they need today and the jobs that they need tomorrow.

The American people want President Obama and this Congress to spur entrepreneurship and American competitiveness and to create good-paying jobs. Instead, the President and this Congress continue on a path of increasing uncertainty leading to high unemployment and runaway spending. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my very distinct pleasure and privilege to yield 1 minute to the most distinguished Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for bringing this important legislation to the floor today. And indeed, there is some good news in it, but there is some not-so-good news in it as well.

I listened very attentively to the previous speaker talk about why these unemployment benefits had to be paid for, and I was struck by the inconsistency in his remarks and that of the Republicans in the United States Senate and in the House of Representatives. It's important to note that while they demand that these benefits be paid for—\$34 billion in unemployment benefits going to those who have played by the rules, worked hard, who are unemployed through no fault of their own, \$34 billion, which injected into the economy will indeed create jobs—while they have said that \$700 billion of tax cuts for the wealthiest people in America shouldn't be paid for. "Inconsistent" is the politest word I can use to describe that.

Thirty-four billion dollars for those who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

Last week the Economic Policy Institute released a report making it clear that not only do unemployment benefits protect those who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own, but would lead to more jobs, higher wages, and a stronger economy for all Americans.

And why is that so? That is so because these benefits are given to people who need them. The money will be spent immediately on necessities injecting demand into the economy, creating jobs. In fact, the Economic Policy Institute figured that would be 1.4 million jobs relating to the unemployment benefits that are out there now.

The Congressional Budget Office which is independent and nonpartisan has confirmed that extending unemployment benefits is the most efficient way for the government to generate economic growth.

Now, I know why the gentleman may want to change the subject to other things. He mentions Katrina. We all supported Katrina. Did anybody talk about paying for that emergency? No. It was an emergency. We have a compact with the American people in the time of a natural disaster—even though that disaster was exacerbated by cronyism in the Bush administration.

But let's not go there. Let's just stay on this subject. And the subject at hand is when this bill was introduced today, this resolution, I'm sure you all heard that it was an amendment to an amendment. Well, the Senate amendment that we are voting on, the amendment that they put in took out the jobs initiatives. And those initiatives were paid for. Build America Bonds. That was part of the original bill, to build the infrastructure of America, the highways and infrastructure of America in a new green way creating new green jobs and new green technologies. And the Build America jobs that went beyond those investments; FMAP to stabilize our State economies.

Thirty States have written their budgets already on the basis of this funding being in the legislation and paid for—not increasing the deficit. We passed it in December. The Senate only now is sending it back to us because the Republicans have objected to that, and the amendment to the amendment eliminates that stability for States.

□ 1230

Summer jobs, well, it's too late for summer jobs, so youth jobs. In December, we passed the bill for summer jobs for America's youth. The amendment to the amendment takes out those youths. And they were paid for, because on the one hand they say everything has to be paid for. Well, when it's paid for, then are they just plain opposed to summer jobs for youths? Are they opposed to Build America Bonds to grow our economy and meet the needs of our country infrastructure-wise?

The Housing Trust Fund, very, very important initiative.

Concurrent receipt: I don't think there's any doubt that every person in this Congress supports our veterans. One issue that is a high priority for America's veterans when we meet with them on a regular basis is the issue of concurrent receipt. You may not be familiar with that term, but it's a disability tax on our veterans, and with so many veterans returning home with disabilities from Iraq and Afghanistan this is very, very important. It was in the bill. It was paid for. Again, money given to people who need it for necessities who would spend it, inject demand into the economy and create jobs. So the amendment to the amendment that the Senate Republicans would finally let pass in the Senate removed concurrent receipt, paid for, for our veterans.

The list goes on and on, a list of paid-for initiatives that benefit our veterans, grow our economy, create jobs, help our workers, help our young people, stabilize our States, all paid for. The Republican Senators said "no," and they held up this particular amendment to the amendment for over 6 weeks because they said it had to be paid for.

At the very same time, they were saying we must pay for \$34 billion for benefits for the unemployed but we don't have to pay for the \$700 billion for the wealthiest people in America to have tax cuts. Those same tax cuts, during the 8 years of the Bush administration, did not create jobs; they increased the deficit. And the Republicans have said they want to go back to the exact agenda of the Bush administration. They look with increased fondness on the Bush administration.

Well, let me say this here today. The good news about this is finally our unemployed will get their benefits. It will be retroactive. It's really sad that it has to come to this. Nonpaid-for tax cuts for the rich; paid-for benefits for our workers.

But it's important to note, contrary to what you might hear from some in this Chamber, that in the first 8 months of the Obama administration, more jobs were created—well, by the time we finish August, more jobs will have been created than in the 8 years of the Bush administration. While they increased the deficit by trillions of dollars, while we lost jobs, where they took us to a brink of financial crisis of our financial industry, where they took us deep into recession, where they took us deep into deficit, they want to return to the exact same agenda.

We are not going back and our step forward into the future, one step into the future is being taken today when we say to American workers, You have played by the rules. You have worked hard. You have lost your job through no fault of your own. You have these benefits, but we must do more to create jobs, to create more jobs.

I urge our colleagues today to understand how important this is, the distinction between those who support our workers. Respect the contract that we have with them so that when the economy ebbs and flows and the cycle of employment and unemployment is not in their favor, that we will be there for them. And being there for them is not just about them. It's also about the entire economy, the entire economy. The economy cannot flourish and be entrepreneurial unless it knows that there's a safety net in case the economy comes down.

The Republicans are saying "no" to that. They've said "no" over and over again, and they're saying "no" today unless it is paid for, again, while they still say, We want tax cuts for the wealthiest, \$700 billion worth, 20 times more than this bill for unemployment insurance.

But don't forget what they took out of the bill and don't forget that that

includes concurrent receipt for our veterans.

I urge our colleagues to proudly vote for this legislation.

I commend my colleague Mr. LEVIN for his hard work on this and other legislation, and I know, because it's absolutely essential, that at some point we will get a jobs bill that will come back from the Senate. We agree that it should be paid for. We've sent it over to them paid for, and that they will recognize that we need to create jobs, good-paying jobs that take us into the future and, most of all, that we're not going back to the failed economic policies of the Bush administration.

I urge a strong "aye" vote on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, this is the eighth time this unemployment benefit insurance is extended. I think that, in and of itself, speaks for the failure of the economic policies.

Secondly, a massive tax increase in the face of economic uncertainty is only going to hurt economic growth and job creation, and on our side of the aisle, we'll work to find the offset to avoiding these tax increases on the American people.

And finally, I just want to point out that private sector growth in the year 2010, the rate of private sector growth has actually been slower than what we saw in the Great Depression.

I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), the ranking member on one of the subcommittees of Ways and Means.

Mr. LINDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to consider legislation paying another \$34 billion in unemployment benefits. The other side says that these unemployment benefits stretching to almost 2 years are needed and must be added to the \$13 trillion debt, even as they claim their trillion dollar stimulus plan has been a success at creating millions of jobs. It makes you wonder if they are looking at the same jobs data as the rest of us.

Eighteen months ago, this administration said the stimulus would create 3.7 million jobs. It hasn't. Through June of 2010, the United States lost 2.6 million more private sector jobs, leaving millions of Americans to ask: Where are the jobs?

The administration also promised that the stimulus would keep unemployment below 8 percent. It hasn't. Instead, unemployment reached 10 percent and remains stuck near that level today, and that ignores millions of missing unemployed left out of the official statistics.

The administration also said that the administration would create mostly private sector jobs. It didn't. Managing all that spending helped government jobs grow by 201,000 since the stimulus was passed, which has made Washington, DC, the Nation's strongest job market. Meanwhile, in the rest of the country, 47 out of 50 States have lost

jobs since the Democrats' February 2009 stimulus.

While the job situation seems to have finally stopped getting worse, things are not getting much better. The trickle of private sector job creation in 2010 is so anemic that, at the current rate, it would take until 2017 to recover the jobs lost during the recession. That's longer than it took to recover the jobs lost during the Depression of the 1930s. Another estimate finds it will take until 2021 to get unemployment back to prerecession levels. Who knew that the administration's recovery summer would last a decade or more.

The fact is the only thing the Democrat stimulus has succeeded in creating is an enormous mountain of debt which is already hurting job creation. The bill before us will only make that worse.

□ 1240

Unemployed workers want real jobs with real companies in a real economy, not 2 years of unemployment benefits. But all this Congress offers is more debt and ultimately more pink slips. It is hardly what the unemployed need.

I urge Members to oppose this bill and insist that any further spending is actually paid for. If the Speaker is right that unemployment benefits are the most stimulative thing we can do, then it will help the economy to cut other less-effective stimulus spending and use it to pay for benefits like these.

That is the sort of budgeting, if we were inclined to pass a budget, that we should have been doing all along and is the only hope for turning this economy around and actually creating jobs that all Americans want and the unemployed need most of all.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), our subcommittee chair.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, when most of our Republican colleagues vote "no" against extending unemployment benefits for Americans today, these people who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own, they will say they are doing it out of concern for the deficit. But, in reality, they are simply trying to make the President fail at any cost.

We have precedent here for that. Back in the 1990s, when Newt Gingrich ruled this place, they thought the American people were stupid, but it didn't work then and it won't work now.

In December 1995, Newt Gingrich thought he could win the Presidency for the Republican Party by shutting down the government and proving that Bill Clinton was ineffective.

You all remember that. Instead, the American people caught on to this foolishness and overwhelmingly reelected Bill Clinton to office in 1996.

Now they have got the same play book again; they are running it again. The Republican leadership in Congress has decided that the way for the Republicans to get the White House back is by denying unemployment benefits to workers who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. Show them that this government doesn't work. For over 6 weeks they have held displaced workers as hostages.

Now, you would think they would have learned from Gingrich back in 1995. It doesn't work. He only held the country hostage for a few days, and then he gave it up because people need to look at what the Senate Republicans are doing in the other body to see exactly what they are doing again today.

Even after the Senate broke the Republican filibuster on restoring unemployment benefits 2 days ago, the Republicans insisted on running out every minute of time left on the clock before allowing a final vote on this bill.

They wanted to dangle those workers out there for yet one more day. They wanted them to sit at home and wonder is it going to happen. How am I going to feed my kids? Can I pay for my house? For families who are without income and rely on unemployment benefits to make ends meet, every day counts.

Republicans clearly couldn't care less, and they forced these unemployed workers to twist in the wind for one more day. This is a slap in the face to millions of Americans who are struggling to find work and rely on unemployment benefits as a lifeline.

This effort to undermine the effectiveness of President Obama by denying unemployment benefits to workers, and by denying the President the power to create jobs, will ultimately fail. Republicans have done nothing more than help ensure that Mr. Obama will be elected a second time.

Good move, guys. The American people will remember and despite what the Republicans think, the voters are not stupid. They don't want the ghost of Newt Gingrich running this country, and they don't want to return to the failed economic policies of President Bush.

They know that they want this government to help people when they need help, and they know that they didn't lose their job because they did something wrong. Greed on Wall Street got them. They are suffering because of that greed which we dealt with a couple of days ago, but they need a check to pay the rent and pay for food.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, just to briefly respond to the previous speaker, we want to look forward. We don't want to look back. We don't want a cynical look to the past; we want a positive vision to the future for the American people, which means we want to go along and promote growth in the economy and do an extension of unemployment benefits in a responsible way by paying for it, eliminating wasteful spending in the stimulus package as the offset.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE), a member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 15 percent of my constituents who have lost their jobs, but I also rise in support of the 85 percent who are struggling to hold onto their jobs.

Deficits do matter. Debt matters. What we have seen in the threat of default in Greece and what that did to the world economy and our own economy is similar to what we may be entering into. Given our tremendous reliance on borrowing, a similar loss of confidence in the United States would be devastating.

The administration may have its cheerleaders and spinmasters out in front telling all the cameras how swell everybody is going to be despite the work ahead; but businesses, those very entities that actually do the hiring, the innovating and the investing, aren't buying. They don't have a political motivation behind their analysis. It's simply reality as they see it. Small businesses are not confident about where this country is headed and neither are their customers.

Presidents can actually have a huge influence on consumer confidence; but every time this President gives a speech threatening American entrepreneurs, he makes things worse. As for debt, I understand the very childish playground temptation to point fingers and names and say, well, you borrowed too; but I also understand that businesses and consumers don't care about that because it doesn't fix the problem.

All we ask is that the unemployment, something we all agree on, be paid for using funds already obligated for the economic recovery. We and the American people point out—and not so subtly at times—that the way you are using the stimulus money is simply a waste of time, effort, and certainly money.

Borrowing more when it pushes us ever closer to the edge, just to continue spending money on self-serving stimulus road signs, is certainly unacceptable to them and is unacceptable to me.

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 20 seconds.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I am sorry that the other side refuses to compromise, but that's where we are today. Americans want us to pay for this bill and not borrow another \$34 billion.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on my motion.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

I also ask unanimous consent that Mr. McDERMOTT, the subcommittee chair, be allowed to control the balance of the time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you, Chairman LEVIN, for giving me this opportunity, and again to Congressman McDERMOTT for working so hard to try to protect those people who have lost their opportunity to take care of their families because they have lost their jobs.

□ 1250

I think we're hearing too much about Republican and Democrat today. We certainly are hearing too much about oil drilling and other issues. But as we go home, as Members of Congress, I don't think people come up and say I'm a Democrat and I need help or I'm a Republican and I need help; they say I need a job. I'm willing to do anything. I'm losing my dignity and my self-esteem. My daughter was in college, and I had to tell her that she won't be able to go back. I keep ignoring my creditors' calls because I lost my job. There were so many dreams and aspirations that I had for me and my family, so many hopes that I thought in this great country I could fulfill. I thought it because I thought I was on the road to economic success. I knew I was doing better than my parents, and I had hoped so dearly that my kids would be able to say they would do better than me. Those that have finished school can't find jobs, can't afford homes. Families have consolidated, they have limited resources.

The greatest thing about this wonderful country is that you don't have to be successful if you really trust and hope that you can be successful. It's not like other countries where you're stuck where you were born and you can't aspire to do better. But we are reaching that point where Americans have lost faith in our financial centers. They've lost faith in terms of insurance health providers. God knows they've lost faith in the Congress. But when they start losing faith in themselves, that's when our country is in trouble. When they start believing that they cannot make it, that they're losing their dignity, that they're unable to put food on the table, provide shelter for their families, provide hope for their kids, America is losing something that we may not be able to recover, notwithstanding what happens from our economy.

How can people talk about deficits and pay-fors when a person is just asking for a little help? What difference does it make if we're able to take the

\$30 billion—it's not spending, it's an investment. It's an investment not in foreigners, not in protecting democracy, it's an investment in people who love and want to work. I think, Mr. Speaker, we ought to give them an opportunity, because in taking care of their needs, they take care of our small businesses too.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, yes, it is an investment, but it is one we can pay for. And that's the sad state that we're in today because we are being refused the ability to even offer those kinds of amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my friend, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HELLER).

Mr. HELLER. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding time. And the answer to his statement is, it's absolutely correct, this can be paid for.

I come from a State, the State of Nevada, that has 14.2 percent unemployment, and these are very, very tough times. During the rules hearing, I submitted legislation that would actually pay for this piece of legislation. We can pay for it. It's not that the majority can't pay for it, it's that they don't want to pay for it. In fact, if you take a look at November 2009, facing the Unemployment Insurance Extension bill, back then in 2009 it was fully paid for, and the administration itself came out and supported a bill that was paid for. And at the time, unemployment was higher than it is today nationwide. Don't tell me the administration doesn't think this ought to be paid for. If they wanted to pay for it at 9.8 percent, why don't they want to pay for it today?

I want to speak a little bit about the failed stimulus bill because I think some general questions were pointed my way during earlier debate, and that is whether or not the stimulus bill has actually worked. We've lost 2 million jobs in this country since the stimulus bill was passed. Forty-seven of 50 States have lost jobs since this Democratic-crafted stimulus bill. And it's no wonder that in recent polls more Americans think that Elvis is alive than this stimulus bill has worked. That's failure.

Nevada's unemployment, Clark County unemployment has gone up 40 percent. That's indisputable, and that's failure. Take Clark County alone; there are those who say the stimulus is working in Las Vegas; yet just last month almost 3,500 people filed for unemployment benefits. Take since the stimulus down in Las Vegas, nearly 40,000 people have lost their jobs in Las Vegas. Tell me the stimulus is working in Las Vegas. Take Nevada as a whole. Just last month 4,100 people filed for unemployment claims. Take the State since the stimulus: Since the stimulus, almost 50,000 people have lost their jobs in Las Vegas. Tell me that the stimulus has worked in my district. I will debate anybody on this, and I'll wait for my phone to ring.

I will just talk a little bit about the fact that in Nevada our unemployment level is 50 percent higher than the national average. If we had the national average in the State of Nevada, there would be 60,000 fewer unemployed Nevadans right now. However, there is one place in America where the stimulus has worked, and I'll give the other side credit for this, and that's Washington, D.C. Government jobs have grown by 201,000; 201,000 jobs have been created in Washington, D.C., since the stimulus was passed.

Some have alleged or believe there are no unobligated stimulus funds, and I don't agree with that. We can use unobligated stimulus funds. Go to www.recovery.gov, the administration's own Web site. Take a look at their Web site. They will show you that half of the stimulus funds at this point have not been spent. Can't we take \$34 billion of more than \$300 billion that's in unused stimulus funds to pay for this unemployment extension? That would be the right thing to do. I think that our children and grandchildren's future are worth a dime on the dollar; some apparently don't.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. I thank Mr. McDERMOTT. I stand in full support of this emergency legislation that will restore the safety net to millions of American families. Those families have been waiting for this relief since June. Their faith in us has been tested, but today we are going to extend the help that they need.

I have spoken many times on this floor of the legendary mayor of Boston, James Michael Curley, a great orator. Curley spoke with great empathy about the forgotten man, and that's whom we're talking about today, the forgotten man and the forgotten woman, those individuals who have worked hard and played by the rules and have every reason to believe that America ought to provide them assistance in this difficult time.

He also would suggest that, in simplicity, the great ally of our civilization was a full stomach. We need to be reminded of that grim economic statistic for those who are outside the mainstream.

Let me also remind our friends here on the other side, in record time, in October of 2008, this Congress came to the aid of Wall Street. It didn't take us long to embrace the Troubled Asset Relief Program of George Bush to keep standing many of those institutions that helped create the problem that we currently find ourselves in.

There are millions of people, those who have served in Vietnam, those who have served in Afghanistan, and those who have served in Iraq and other theaters around the world, who are struggling in this economy. America is about building a community, a place where no one wants to be abandoned and no one wants to be left behind.

The great bounty of God's work has been to ensure that people in America, regardless of their political differences, have enough to eat and shelter. This opportunity to extend unemployment benefits for the American people ought to meet this moment, and I urge adoption of this measure.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, in addition to what Mr. HOYER said about using the unused stimulus funds, Mr. OBEY has hailed amendments to the Supplemental Appropriations bill made on July 1 that were paid for by repeatedly cutting unspent projects in the stimulus law. And in the other body, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. BAUCUS, has suggested the same. And that's what we're saying here. There is a better way to do this, a fiscally responsible way to not only take care of the forgotten man and woman today, but to prevent even more from being forgotten in the future.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE). Mr. SCALISE and I have worked together on American competitiveness, trying to achieve energy independence to meet our national security needs and to grow jobs.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my colleague from Louisiana for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, a year and a half ago, the liberals running Congress passed the stimulus bill, claiming they needed to add another \$787 billion to the national debt in order to keep unemployment below 8 percent. Of course, now, a year and a half later, unemployment is approaching 10 percent.

Their first plan failed miserably, so regarding unemployment, they are coming with a plan to add another \$34 billion to the national debt that they don't want to work with us on to at least pay for by using some of that failed stimulus plan. In fact, they are still trying to defend the stimulus plan that most Americans recognize only grew the size of government and which did nothing to help stimulate the economy. The sad irony of this is that millions of American people are unemployed as a direct result of the policies of this administration.

A very real example is occurring right now in south Louisiana. Just yesterday, there was a rally in south Louisiana where over 10,000 people showed up to oppose this arbitrary and capricious ban by President Obama on drilling in the gulf.

They try to hide behind safety and pit it as safety versus jobs. In fact, the President's own safety commission he appointed after the explosion of the Deepwater Horizon said that the moratorium is a bad idea. They went on to say that this moratorium will decrease safety in the gulf. That's right. This is the moratorium that the President, himself, imposed, which is costing our State thousands of jobs and thousands more people to be on unemployment,

people who would much rather have jobs than the unemployment checks that President Obama is offering them. Their jobs have been taken away from them by the President, yet not for scientific reasons but for political reasons, because the President's own scientists say the moratorium is a bad idea and will decrease safety.

In fact, as my colleague from Louisiana pointed out, our entire delegation has been trying for 6 weeks now to meet with the President to discuss this ill-conceived idea, and he refuses to meet with us. Though, you still have hundreds of people each week being added to the unemployment rolls because of the President's policy.

What the President needs to do is actually work with us to create jobs instead of continuing to push policies that are running people onto the unemployment rolls, putting more jobs overseas and putting our country at greater risk of energy dependence. Our energy supply hasn't decreased, but now you are going to actually have more oil imported from these Middle Eastern countries that don't like us. By the way, 70 percent of all oil spills come from tankers importing oil.

Now the President has just made our country more dependent on that imported oil with the addition of his ban on drilling. That is creating more unemployment in our State. These policies are wrecking our economy.

What we need is to create jobs. Part of that means you put good policies in place that help create jobs so that people don't continue to go on the unemployment rolls because of the Obama policies. That is what we need to do is to get a different agenda. The American people are saying, Where are the jobs? All they get is more deficit spending from this administration.

They just don't get it.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I can't help but respond to the change of subject from the gentleman from Louisiana.

I guess fishermen aren't worth anything. Fishermen are worthless. All that sea stuff that comes up and that they sell all over the place, they don't care about that. All they want to do is drill for oil. The President is careful and prudent and says let's look at this drilling before we go on with it because we have just proven that the oil companies are reckless. They have proven it for 79 days in the gulf, and if you can't learn from that and realize what it is doing to crabbers and to shrimp fishermen and to oystermen, then you have missed the point.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, people all over Illinois and all over America are waiting with bated breath, and they are waiting to pay utility bills, to pay house notes, to make mortgage payments, to catch up on their rent, to pay college tuition, and to buy food for their children.

They are also waiting to say, "Thank you, Nancy Pelosi." They want to say,

"Thank you, Harry Reid." They are waiting to say, "Thank you, United States Congress." They want to say, "Thank you, Barack Obama, because the action that you just took this day means to us that you are working for us. You have reinforced our confidence in our government. You have said to us that we do matter." I know that the people of Illinois will be saying, "Thank you, our government."

I urge passage.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I have to respond to my friend from the State of Washington.

I would say that I would not have the audacity to speak for the people of Washington, because I haven't had the chance to actually get to know them. I can tell the gentleman that I do know the fishermen, the oystermen, the shrimpers, and those who run boats down in my State of Louisiana.

If they were here on the House floor today, they would say, "Please do not kick us when we're down. Lift this ban on drilling because, if not, it is going to kill our economy." These are the same fishermen and oystermen and shrimpers who are losing their jobs.

That's why we need sensible policies, Mr. Speaker. We are all for extending the unemployment benefit insurance, but we know we can do it in a responsible way—by paying for it with unspent stimulus money.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, with almost half of the unemployed out of work for more than 6 months, I am extremely disappointed that partisan bickering has delayed this important relief to American families.

I want to share with you what one of my constituents wrote to me.

He said, "I've worked all my life and supported myself and didn't ask for any special treatment. There is pride that comes from work . . . No one is more ready and willing to work than me . . . but there just isn't any."

Since the lapsing of unemployment benefits, millions have lost the benefits which are keeping their families in their homes and food on their tables, but what we and people may not know or really appreciate is that this also includes tens of thousands of former servicemembers and reservists who have returned home to find themselves without work.

How, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, does prohibiting them from being able to pay their electric and grocery bills help our economy recover?

I urge my colleagues to join me in strong support of this extension.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for his steady and undying support for people

who really have had a very tough time and who have not had any opportunities for many years now.

Thank you, Mr. McDERMOTT, for your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I've been listening to the debate here about jobs. We, too, are asking, Where are the jobs?

From what I remember, there were very few Republican votes for the many job creation bills which Democrats have passed. So, if you are not going to support a real jobs initiative, I can't understand, for the life of me, why in the world you won't support just the basics for people, just a bit of help for those who have no jobs and for those who you won't help get jobs.

Support for unemployment compensation speaks, really, to who we are as a country. This is a moral and an ethical issue of which those who really care about the least of these should support. People have lost their jobs for a variety of reasons—primarily, yes, due to the economic policies of the previous administration. We know many people who have lost their jobs due to their not being able to find work in this new economy. People have lost their jobs because their communities have been shut down as a result of the foreclosure crisis. They have lost their homes. They have lost their jobs. They have no health care.

What in the world is going on in our country?

Some of us really get it in terms of the economic policies and what we need to do, but until we make the case in a way that Republicans get it, the least we could do is just help people pay their rent and, for those who still have mortgages, help pay their mortgages and, for those who don't have enough food, basically buy food for their kids.

We can't even get the Republicans to support a youth jobs initiative. My goodness. You know, we have over 40 percent minority youth—African American and Latino youth—who are unemployed. These young people need jobs. They need jobs not only to develop their work skills and work experience, but they have to help their families put food on the table and pay the rent.

□ 1310

So for goodness sakes, just help these people survive and weather these storms right now, because they need something to get through this. Otherwise, we're going to see a country that we all don't want to see, one that we don't recognize, one that does not care about the common good. And this is about the common good. We all have a duty and responsibility to make sure everyone at least is able to survive through these very terrible times.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), who serves on the President's Fiscal Responsibility Commission.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, indeed, this is the difference between the

two parties here today. As I've listened carefully to the debate, I haven't heard anybody say we shouldn't be extending unemployment benefits.

What I have heard is that one side wants to borrow 43 cents on the dollar, mainly from the Chinese, and send the bill to our children and grandchildren. Those are my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle.

On this side of the aisle, we're saying, you know, all the trillions of stimulus money, the \$1.2 trillion, when you add in the interest factor, those unspent funds, maybe some of the unspent TARP funds, these programs that have helped continue to mire us in almost double-digit unemployment, maybe we could use some of those funds instead and not add to the single largest debt in America's history that's only getting worse under their watch, Mr. Speaker. That's the primary difference here today. And we must show that we are a fiscally responsible Congress today to create jobs.

Ultimately, the people in America don't want more unemployment checks. They want more paychecks. And it's the policies of this President, the policies of this Congress, brought about by the Federal takeover of health care, brought about by this huge permanent Wall Street bailout bill, where the ink is barely dry, the threatened cap-and-tax bill, and the massive debt that we're drowning in.

Under the President's own budget, we will be paying almost \$1 trillion a year in interest alone on the national debt. I mean, that's the kind of policies that our distinguished Democratic majority leader at one time likened to fiscal child abuse. And so I haven't heard that rhetoric recently, but I hope he still believes it because that's what we're engaging in.

So I do not understand why my friends on the other side of the aisle refuse to pay for this. I certainly hear the phrase "pay-as-you-go" frequently. I just don't see it practiced.

And, indeed, I do serve as one of the Republican appointees on the President's Fiscal Responsibility Commission, many of whom consider that title to be an oxymoron. We will debate that later.

But the chairman, Erskine Bowles, former chief of staff, Democratic chairman, former chief of staff to President Bill Clinton, has said that our debt is a cancer that can destroy us from within. This isn't Republican verbiage. This is Democrat verbiage.

So why do the Democrats refuse to pay for this? Why do they continue to engage in what the majority leader once termed fiscal child abuse?

Again, that's where the debate is. The debate is, Are you going to pay for the unemployment insurance, or are you going to take the burden and put it on our children and grandchildren yet again? That is unconscionable, unsustainable, and it ought to be immoral.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from

Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the timeliness of my opportunity to speak is sometimes good, and I think this is one of them.

Mr. HENSARLING just spoke. I have great respect for Mr. HENSARLING. He works hard. He focuses. He's philosophically well-grounded, and he follows his philosophy. I disagree with his philosophy, his fiscal premises. And his fiscal premises that were part of the last administration's approach to the finances of this country increased our deficit by 87 percent, from \$5 trillion, essentially, a little over \$5 trillion, to a little over \$10 trillion. They didn't quite double it, but 87 percent more debt under the Bush administration.

That I called fiscal child abuse. Why? Because it was not done at a time of fiscal crisis with large unemployment. That unemployment was caused by the policies of the last administration.

Why do I say that? Because under the Clinton administration, we created 21 million jobs in the private sector, just a little short of 21 million jobs, 22.8 overall, when you include public employment.

And during the Bush administration, how did it relate to that 20.1 million new jobs in the private sector? One million. How did it relate per month to job production? 216,000 under the Clinton administration, and 11,000 per month under the Bush administrations. That's what their economic policies wrought. Their economic policies of cutting deeply, not \$40 billion or \$34 billion borrowed money, but trillions, with an "s," of borrowed money to fund tax cuts which they did not pay for.

They weren't continuations of the Tax Code, as JON KYL, the second-ranking Republican leader in the Senate, now argues ought not to be paid for; \$687 billion, that we just ought to continue that for the wealthiest in our country, not the little children who are worried about whether their parents are going to be able to afford the mortgage or afford to put bread on the table. That's what we're talking about in this bill for literally millions of people who have run out of support.

Now, will they run out of support in this moral country? They will not ultimately run out of support; they'll be put on welfare and food stamps. And they won't be available for the insurance to which their employer and they participated in, providing for the contingency that we ran the economy into the ditch, the worst economy in three-quarters of a century, wrought by the Bush economic policies, to which Mr. SESSIONS, the chairman of their campaign committee, says that they want to return to the exact agenda.

I'm so pleased I had the opportunity to come and respond to my friend from Texas. It does demonstrate the difference between our two parties. Absolutely.

JON KYL, who says, we ought to borrow \$686 billion from the Chinese to

give to the wealthiest in America, and Democrats, who say we want to borrow \$34 billion to give to the children of America whose families are in need—yes, that is the difference, if my friend from Texas wants to make that the difference.

This is about saying that we have an emergency. And historically, from Ronald Reagan to today, Ronald Reagan, Bush the first and Bush the second, what did you do when you were in charge? You borrowed at times of economic trouble to give unemployment insurance.

□ 1320

We are doing the same thing. Why did we do that? Because we perceived it to be an emergency. An emergency that people in the richest Nation on the face of the earth were about to run out of the ability to keep their homes, buy their food, clothe their children. A moral and great country thinks that's an emergency. That's what this vote is all about.

This vote is also about, as the gentleman from Texas has said, expressing our values. I agree with that. And I'm going to express my values, and I urge the Members of this House to express their values this day on this vote, as millions of people have lost their unemployment insurance because we could not get 60 votes in the Senate. Had almost every Democrat saying we need to help now. People are running out of ability to support themselves now. We paid insurance for now. So I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

A few months ago, we passed unemployment insurance through this House by unanimous consent. The election wasn't as proximate then as it is today. The deficit is way too high, and we need to get a handle on it. And I just made a speech, and I have been criticized by some on my side of the aisle and some others for saying that we needed to put everything on the table. I reiterate that today. We need to put everything on the table. No sacred cows.

I have three children, three grandchildren, as all of you will get tired of hearing, and one great granddaughter. And I owe it to her personally, as a Member of this House, to say ladies and gentlemen of this House and of our country, we have a moral responsibility to get a handle on this deficit.

A reporter just asked me as I was walking down the aisle, did I agree with Mr. Bernanke's comment that we ought to pay if we extended the tax cuts? And I said to him this: At a time of fiscal crisis, when our economy is struggling to get back from the ditch it was in when this administration took over—how much of a ditch? During the last year of the Clinton administration, we added 1.9 million new jobs, I tell my friend from Texas. Last year, Clinton administration, 1.9 million new jobs in America. And it was a slowdown period.

During the last year of the Bush administration, after the economic policies that were pursued from 2001 and 2002 and 2003 and through 2009, even though we took the Congress we couldn't do anything because the President would veto legislation, and did in fact veto legislation, 3.8 million Americans lost their jobs. That's a difference of 1.9 million new jobs in the last year of Clinton to 3.8 million lost jobs in the last year of Bush, or a 5.7 million jobs turnaround. Is there any wonder why there is a lot of pain in America and families are in great distress and they're angry and they have angst? And we share that.

Today does not solve the problem. But today reaches out to those folks in distress and say in the short-term, on an emergency basis we are going to continue to give you help so you can support your families in this, the wealthiest Nation on the face of the earth. You worked hard. You paid in. And through no fault of your own, you lost your job.

Maybe because of the fault of Wall Street that my friend believes we were too harsh on, we are imposing rules on so they can play by the rules and not squander and take risks that put Wall Street profits before Main Street stability. Yes, and also we're not going to apologize to the BP oil company and say we're sorry that we expect you to be accountable for the negligence that caused millions of people to be in economic distress. We're not going to say sorry. Some people want to say sorry that the President of the United States suggested, hey, you need to help those people.

Maybe helping people is a difference between our two parties. I don't necessarily think that. I don't want to say that. But if that's the difference, today is a day when 435 of us can stand up and vote "aye" to help millions of Americans in deep distress through no fault of their own.

I urge my colleagues to stand up and let people know that you are on their side.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I remind my friend, the distinguished majority leader of the House, that in the 1990s, during the Clinton administration, there was a great bipartisan effort that led to those balanced budgets because there was a Republican majority.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield on that point?

Mr. BOUSTANY. I will yield.

Mr. HOYER. It's a good point. I ask my friend—that is true—why couldn't you do it when you had the House, the Senate, and the Presidency?

Mr. BOUSTANY. I will reclaim my time, and I will remind the majority leader that we have the opportunity to go forward now and not cast blame on the past. So I would say that President Obama actually got it right in a statement of administration policy on November 2009 regarding unemployment benefit extensions, which was fully

paid for. And here is what he said. I quote, "Fiscal responsibility is central to the medium-term recovery of the economy and the creation of jobs. The administration therefore supports the fiscally responsible approach to expanding unemployment benefits embodied in the bill."

All we're saying is there is a better way to do this, and that is to pay for this extension.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman for giving me a moment to speak.

Mr. Speaker, my friends from the party opposite refer to deficit and debts. Well, you know, debts are important. The deficit is important. The national debt, all these things are critical. But I guess my question is, you know, when the Republican Caucus voted to give the most wealthy and most privileged members of American society a \$700 billion-plus tax cut that they didn't pay for, they weren't that concerned about fiscal responsibility. Why no fiscal responsibility for the two wars? Ten billion dollars a month for Iraq, no fiscal responsibility for that. When the prescription drug handout was given to Big Pharma, \$400 billion, no fiscal responsibility then.

But when the poor, hardworking people of America find themselves without work and come and say, you know what, still looking for work, haven't found one, and need some help from my fellow Americans, it's like, "No, no, no, no. We cannot help you because we got to worry about the deficit." Why so much concern, so much heartfelt angst about what the wealthiest, most privileged Americans need but nothing but a cold heart and a closed purse for people who are in an emergency situation?

Mr. Speaker, I ask what about the debts of the people who are unemployed? What about them having to go to family and borrow money? What about them being captured by the payday lenders and the rent-to-owners and these kind of people, folks who take advantage of poor people when they don't have any money and they don't have any unemployment insurance benefits? What about their personal debt? The American people should respond.

I don't want to say that the party opposite is heartless, but this looks heartless. It looks that way. And I don't want my friends in the party opposite to look like they just don't care about poor people. So I urge everyone in this caucus to support and vote for this measure. It is important, it is the right time.

I will just say, finally, the fact is that for every dollar spent on unemployment benefits, \$1.60 goes into the economy, which means we begin to pull ourselves out of this situation and deal with this deficit.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the kind chairman, Mr. MCDERMOTT, for yielding me the 2 minutes.

Sometimes when they say gentlewoman, I don't feel so gentle on the subject of unemployment. And in fact, I rise in strong support of this bill, which is long overdue because of the delays in the other Chamber. And I want to thank Chairman MCDERMOTT for his extraordinary leadership and our Speaker for bringing this bill forward.

All the economic studies show that in fact direct consumer spending that results from the expenditure of unemployment checks on basics—paying for food, paying your mortgage so you don't lose your home, making your car payment on that old jalopy you use to go to work—that, in fact, this creates the largest bang inside our economy to move it up than any investment we can make other than in infrastructure investment, where we are employing people building bridges, building roads, some of the things that people on the other side of the aisle are making fun of.

It's no fun to go over a bridge that collapses. We saw that in Minnesota. These are issues that in a great Nation you take care of. In Ohio, we need unemployment compensation right now. We're one of the platforms that manufactures and grows jobs immediately to hold this country up. And our people, 100,000 of them, still remain out of work and utterly dependent on these benefits. They will be affected directly by the extension of these benefits. Indeed, Ohio has a total of between 600,000 and a million people who are unemployed, working in part-time jobs, or they have fallen out of the workforce through no fault of their own.

The Obama administration will have created more jobs by the end of August than the Bush administration did in the whole 8 years that it sat in office and did nothing except create more war and more unemployment and more outsourcing of jobs. I find my colleagues on the other side of the aisle out of touch—I can't even explain them. We don't live in the same world.

I respect people who go to work every day. I respect those who get injured on the job. I respect those farmers who are out in the fields right now harvesting crops. I respect those who work for them. I respect the people who work in our auto plants. I respect the people working in hundred-degree weather up on bridges around my district right now trying to fix things up and hold things together until a better day comes.

So the least we can do is return to them the money they already paid in, that their employers already paid in, that they already earned. They earned it. I say to the gentleman I support this bill a thousand percent. Ohioans are waiting for their unemployment checks. But most of all, they want to go back to work.

□ 1330

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak yet again on this subject, but to hear the last three speakers, clearly there appears to be a confusion on the other side of the aisle between unemployment checks and paychecks.

I mean, what we've heard the Speaker say—I wish I had her exact quote in front of me—that essentially by putting out more unemployment checks, that this is one of the best ways to create paychecks. I've never heard such circular logic in my life.

Now, clearly we need an extension of unemployment. I mean, I must admit I find it somewhat ironic that the President of the United States brings up three unemployed workers. To the best of my knowledge, they've been unemployed during his Presidency. What a testament to his policies and the policies of this institution.

Again, between a national takeover of our health care where employees don't know how much their health care costs are going to be. They're not creating new jobs. Threatened cap-and-trade. Nobody knows what their energy costs are going to be. No new job creation.

We have this financial regulatory bill. Nobody knows what the cost of capital is going to be, particularly with a bureau that has the ability to ban and ration credit for small businesses. You've got private business sitting on almost \$2 trillion that could be employed for paychecks but instead, once again, due to the policies of my friends on the other side of the aisle, we're having that debate on unemployment checks instead.

And let me make sure that people aren't drowning on all of this straw that's in the House Chamber today from all the straw men. Here's the debate. In the words of the Democratic majority leader, Are we going to engage in fiscal child abuse and borrow the money principally from the Chinese to pay for this, or are we not? That's the question. That is the only question before the House right now. Are we going to borrow the money from our children and grandchildren, send them the bill, or are we going to pay for it today and quit using it on failed stimulus plans? That's the debate. The American people are not confused. And again, they want paychecks, not unemployment checks.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This is about whether we're going to pay for this or not. Consider that this is the eighth time this Congress is going to extend these benefits. The eighth time. That's an indication that the current economic policy of this administration and this Congress is a failure.

I mentioned earlier the fact of the matter is we have a choice. We can do this in a fiscally responsible way, or we can choose to run up additional debt on our children and grandchildren to the tune of \$34 billion between now and November.

Again, I think the President, President Obama, got it right in the statement of administration policy in November 2009 when the unemployment benefit extension was actually paid for. Again, I'm going to quote what he said: "Fiscal responsibility is central to the medium-term of the economy and the creation of jobs. The administration therefore supports the fiscally responsible approach to expanding unemployment benefits embodied in the bill."

Now, if fiscal responsibility helps the economy and job creation, then the fiscal irresponsibility of this bill before us will hurt the economy and job creation.

And I think the American people have spoken. They want us to do this, but they want us to pay for it. Let's do the right thing and actually pay for the spending we approve and help our economy grow, help job creation. As the administration said, a fiscally responsible approach is what's needed.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as we close this debate and finally put this on the back burner until November when we have to come back and look at it again perhaps—we'll see—one of the speakers on the other side talked about confusion. My view is that the confusion here is between whether we're going to send unemployment checks or we're going to tell people, Go hungry. That's the confusion.

People say, Well, it's about paying for it. I will remind my colleagues on the other side Mr. Bush was President for 8 years, and when we did unemployment, we did it on an emergency basis. We never paid for it one time and you guys, the Republicans—I'm not supposed to address them directly—they didn't pay for it, Mr. Speaker. They were in charge and their President was in charge, but they called it an emergency.

Now under Mr. Obama, it's not an emergency.

Suddenly we're going to tie up people's minds and try and confuse them. But the fact is that for 6 weeks we have said to workers in this country, We are not going to extend benefits.

Now, we have never, in the history of this country, when unemployment was at 7.2 or above, failed to extend benefits until the Republicans got a serious case of fiscal—well, I'm not going to say exactly what I think—but fiscal disease has overtaken their mind. And they've suddenly caught this thing—it must be in the air around here or somewhere down around the Ohio River between Cincinnati and Kentucky. They've got leadership that said, You know, we can infect everybody with this fiscal fear. We'll just sacrifice a

few million. It's only 2½ million people who are going to lose their benefits. So it's not very many. There's 300 million in America. We can throw away 2½ million. That's easy. They won't vote. They're too stupid to know who's doing it to them.

That's the kind of message you're sending when you're saying you won't give unemployment benefits.

This is so easily understood by the American people. This is not climate change. This is not all the complicated stuff. Some people around here think the American people have a very short memory span, but they don't on stuff where it's right down to the bone.

And you will remember this day as the day when finally the Republicans came to their senses. They finally said, You know, this ain't going to work. It really ain't going to work. We're not going to admit it. We're going to say we were doing it on principle.

But there is no principle at the table when the mother opens the cupboard and there is nothing in it. Or when the lights aren't turned on because you haven't paid the utility bills. Or when the water is turned off because you haven't paid your water bill. What does a mother say the principle is? Now kids, get in the bathtub, but there is no water. Clean yourself up, right?

What kind of nonsense is this? Do you think this money is going for people to buy iPads or iPhones or i4Phones or whatever? This is going for the necessities of life. And you're saying to the ordinary people of this country, Well, we have a principle, under the Democrats, we have to pay for it. Now not under the Democrats.

And I can hardly wait until we get the proposals over from the Senate to extend the tax breaks and watch you guys do a double flip. You will get a "10" in Olympic terms for your ability to do a double flip and say, Well, now we don't have to pay for it. And watch, they're going to send over the estate tax. They are going to send over a bailout for the people at the very top. And you're going to say, We don't have to pay for them. Oh, no. No, no. They're very rich. No, no, no, no, no, we can't pay for that. No, no. But they're going to make us pay for the people who are in the most dire distress in this society.

It's really shameful, and I'm going to watch with pleasure as you vote "no" as you vote yourself out of here.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I strongly, resolutely, and steadfastly support this bill to extend critical unemployment benefits for our citizens through the end of November. This bill will provide vital assistance to over 137,600 Illinoisans, and to the 2.5 million Americans, who lost their benefits between June 2nd and July 17th. This bill helps ad-

dress a national emergency resulting from one of the worst economic recessions in our country's history.

Unemployment insurance is not a theoretical concept to these citizens. Unemployment is a very real lifeline. It allows mothers and fathers to buy food for their children. It allows people to help keep a roof over their families' heads. I have received so many tearful calls from my constituents who call to beg for my help. They are disheartened by their continued unemployment despite active and prolonged efforts to find a job. They are embarrassed that they cannot support their families, and they are frightened that their children will suffer from their inability to feed, clothe, or provide housing. When they learn that their government allowed these lifeline benefits to expire and failed to reinstate them for almost 8 weeks, they are shocked. They worked and paid taxes for years with an understanding that government would help them in a time of need. Yet, this assistance was not there.

I think it is unfortunate that Republicans have delayed this critical financial assistance for so long. To add insult to injury, while proclaiming that our government could not afford \$33 billion to help our citizens who are suffering during an economic emergency, the Republican leadership confidently asserted the position that we want the government to spend \$650 billion for tax cuts for the wealthy. This is approximately 20 times the cost of this critical unemployment assistance. This is the same leadership that had no difficulty spending a trillion dollars for two wars and giving tax breaks to the wealthiest of the wealthy.

The extension of the aid for 99 weeks is an important first step in helping our citizens who are struggling to find employment. I promise to continue to work with the Democratic leadership to push for ways to help those remain unemployed beyond the 99 weeks. Long-term unemployment is an unfortunate reality for Chicago and for my constituents.

Passing this bill today tells our citizens that we are working for them. Further, passing this bill today reinforces their confidence in their government—confidence that they will help care for them in the lean times. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote for its passage.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Senate amendments to H.R. 4213, the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010, which will extend unemployment benefits to millions of Americans that are in dire need of support. Without this legislation these families will lose the only lifeline that they can count on in this historic economic crisis.

Mr. Speaker, while I am glad that this bill is finally close to the President's desk, I deeply regret the weeks of partisan politics by Republicans, especially those in the Senate, which have obstructed this legislation and delayed benefits to struggling families across the country. Since Republicans allowed benefits to begin expiring in May, over 250 million individuals nationwide and 429,000 in California have lost benefits that help them feed their families, pay their bills, and sleep with a roof over their heads.

Republicans claim to oppose these benefits because of their cost. But, let us not forget that Republicans never bothered to find offsets for the Bush tax cuts. They never felt the need to pay for the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. Only

when unemployment benefits are on the table do Republicans suddenly discover an interest in fiscal responsibility. Republicans want to withhold relief from millions of Americans who, through no fault of their own, have lost their jobs in this economic crisis. But this vote offers a final opportunity to put partisan politics aside and work together for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has taken bold action to energize the economy during this historic economic crisis and lay the groundwork for long-term, stable growth. To be sure, these actions are working: to date, the Recovery Act alone has saved or created over 682,000 jobs nationwide. However, rebuilding our economy takes time and, despite the success of Democrats' job-creating legislation, many individuals and families across the country still need our help. We cannot abandon the families that have been left jobless because of the previous Administration's economic mismanagement. This important measure will retroactively extend unemployment assistance to individuals whose benefits started to phase out in May and will guarantee that benefits are available through November.

Mr. Speaker, this should not be a partisan issue. This is an American issue. Millions of Americans need our help and this is our opportunity to provide it. Let us help the people all across the country who have been hit hard by this recession, people who, through no fault of their own, are struggling to stay in their homes and feed their kids.

Moreover, in addition to providing relief to those in need, this bill is an important step in our economic rebuilding process. Unemployment benefits create economic demand that stimulates the economy and puts people back to work. This is a fast-acting and cost-effective way to energize the economy: every \$1 spent on unemployment benefits leads to \$1.90 in economic activity. This bill responds to both our immediate obligation to help the American people in a time of great need and the long-term goal of consistent growth and prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an obvious "aye" vote. The resistance it has seen in the past few weeks is shocking. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4213.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act. This legislation will extend unemployment insurance (UI) benefits, which expired seven long weeks ago, to millions of Americans families who rely on this assistance to make ends meet during these difficult economic times.

I regret that due to Republican objections, delays and stalling tactics, Unemployment Compensation was allowed to lapse for so long. My colleagues in the House of Representatives and I have already passed this legislation three times since May. Unfortunately, the bill was allowed to languish in the Senate while millions of Americans were forced to do without this critical lifeline.

With unemployment in Los Angeles County hovering at 12.2 percent, I continue to hear from my constituents how important these benefits are to them as they look for new employment during these difficult economic times.

One constituent, a college graduate who lives in Los Angeles, wrote to inform me that he has been searching for a job for 18 months without success. He has long since run out of savings and without unemployment benefits

cannot pay his rent. Another constituent, a mother of three children, was recently laid off and is relying on unemployment benefits to pay her mortgage payments and keep a roof over her family's head.

It is for hardworking Americans like these, making good faith efforts to secure employment and trying desperately to find some stability in these uncertain times, that I vote for this important measure.

While we act today to protect the unemployed and their families, I believe we must redouble our efforts to create job opportunities and get Americans back to work.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 4213, the "Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010." After weeks of needless delay, this legislation will ensure that the estimated \$2.5 million Americans who lost their coverage will again have access to the lifeline provided by unemployment insurance and again be able to pay their bills and put food on their table. During this unfortunate period, my friends on the other side of the aisle have repeatedly told out of work Americans that the human dignity they seek is a luxury we cannot afford. Let me be clear: There is nothing luxurious about barely getting by—having to decide between your mortgage, your health, or your family's well being.

The opposition to this legislation has been disingenuous, cruel and out of touch. Many of the unemployed people in my district spent years working hard, paying their bills, and contributing to their communities. Through no fault of their own, they found themselves out of work.

Beyond voting for this bill, my Republican friends ought to take responsibility for their role in precipitating this economic disaster. It was they who pushed policies that promoted unfettered free trade, tax cuts for the rich, and the casino culture on Wall Street. The least they could do is vote with the Majority to minimize some of the pain they caused.

For the sake of human decency for our fellow citizens, I encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, three weeks ago we were here talking about this. Two months ago we were here talking about this. And even if this bill becomes law, in four months we will likely be back again talking about this. The specific subject is extended unemployment benefits.

But the real issue, and what is driving the need for a record 99 weeks of unemployment benefits, is this Administration's woeful record when it comes to creating jobs that provide paychecks, instead of unemployment checks.

In February 2009, the President signed into law the Democrats' trillion-dollar "stimulus" plan. That was the plan Democrats promised would create 3.7 million jobs, keep unemployment under 8 percent, and stimulate strong private sector job growth.

None of that happened.

Instead, over 2 million more jobs were lost and unemployment spiked to 10 percent, though the number of government jobs has grown somewhat.

So here we are again—extending unemployment benefits because stimulus failed to create the millions of jobs Democrats promised.

But instead of doing this responsibly, this bill will simply add another \$34 billion to our \$13 trillion mountain of debt.

We can do better than this.

Both Republicans and Democrats support helping the long-term unemployed. And both Republicans and Democrats want to responsibly pay for these benefits.

That would be far better than adding to the unchecked growth in our debt that is already costing us jobs, and that threatens to overwhelm our economy in debt and higher taxes for decades to come.

The fact is, we can both provide this help and pay for it by cutting less effective stimulus spending.

The last time we debated unemployment benefits, I offered a motion to pay for that spending. That is what the Heller substitute to this bill would have done if it was made in order today. Even the Democrat Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS, has also proposed cutting stimulus to pay for certain extenders.

The American people know it isn't right to add these costs to our already overdrawn national credit card. They want to help those in need. But they also know someone has to pay when government spends money. That assistance must not put our fiscal house as a Nation in even worse shape—and we are already in terrible shape.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this bill today and instead work together to quickly pass a bill to extend Federal unemployment benefits while responsibly paying for it.

That is what we should have been doing all along, which would have prevented the lapse in benefits millions have already experienced. Democrat Leaders rejected that obvious compromise, leading to needless additional suffering in recent weeks by millions of unemployed workers who want a job. But it is not too late to fix this, and to do so responsibly, so that we do right by the unemployed, as well as future generations.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the over 150,000 residents in the State of Texas who have lost their unemployment benefits since June 2nd. Nationally, over 2.5 million Americans have lost their eligibility for unemployment insurance, at a time when our country is suffering through the most difficult economic slump it has witnessed since the Great Depression.

Unemployment insurance helps our country in two crucial ways:

First, unemployment insurance assists those hurt most by this recession.

Second, unemployment insurance is a major job creator.

Nearly 15 million Americans are out of work. Of these 15 million, 46 percent have been out of work for more than six months. In recent months, there have been at least five unemployed workers for every job opening.

These are proud, working Americans who have already been victimized by the state of our Nation's economy. Why are we victimizing them again by denying them this crucial lifeline?

Unemployment insurance is also one of the most stimulative measures the Federal Government can take to help the economy. The Congressional Budget Office has found that for every dollar spent on unemployment benefits, \$1.90 of economic growth is generated.

In a recent study by the non-partisan Economic Policy Institute, the expansion of unemployment benefits since 2007 has supported

1.7 million full-time equivalent positions. These jobs have raised GDP by \$244.8 billion, a 1.7 percent boost.

In sharp contrast to extending tax cuts for the wealthiest in our country, unemployed Americans will spend their benefits immediately to pay their rent, buy groceries and other necessary goods, thereby creating jobs throughout the economy.

This is not simply smart policy. This is a moral issue. We will be helping our friends and neighbors during their time of need.

I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a huge relief for millions of Americans who remain out of work through no fault of their own that the Senate has overcome the Republican filibuster to extend unemployment insurance benefits.

It is an insult to the American people to suggest that those who are unemployed are sitting back and not looking for work while taking unemployment compensation. In fact, in order to qualify for unemployment benefits, one must be diligently looking for a job. Extending these benefits is not only the right thing to do for these families, but it is also important for our economic recovery. If these individuals and families are unable to purchase groceries or pay their rent or mortgages, then the entire community suffers.

Washington Republicans say they are opposed to these emergency benefits because they claim to be concerned about the deficit. However, they recently announced that they wanted to extend the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy and add over \$700 billion to the deficit—a sum that would be paid by our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this much-needed legislation so that we can continue to help American families make ends meet during these difficult economic times.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4213, the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Act of 2010. This legislation extends unemployment benefits to millions of Americans in need through November and retroactively restores benefits to those that recently lost theirs due to Congressional inaction. Unemployment in Ohio is at 10.5 percent. It is the number one request when I talk to my constituents at home.

Even with passage of this important legislation, many of my constituents in the greater Cleveland area will continue to suffer. Many will be ineligible for the benefits provided by this bill because they have exhausted the emergency temporary assistance granted by Congress. Still others are at a greater disadvantage than most; according to the latest unemployment statistics from the Department of Labor, members of the African-American and Latino communities continue to experience disproportionately high long-term unemployment rates at 15.4 percent and 12.4 percent, respectively. While Congress endeavors to provide direct help to those needing it the most, we must also focus on creating jobs.

Our domestic manufacturing sector has been decimated under the weight of the economy, bad trade agreements like NAFTA and CAFTA, and policy neglect. We cannot have a strong American economy without a strong industrial manufacturing sector. We need a coordinated Federal policy that puts the manufacturing sector back in its rightful place as an

engine of the American economy. In recognition of that need, I authored H. Res. 444, which says that the steel, automotive, aerospace and shipping industries are vital to America's national and economic security.

Extending unemployment benefits alone will not address the needs of all Americans currently looking for work across various employment sectors, but it can serve to shore up our local communities and our economy. I urge passage of H.R. 4213, the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Act of 2010.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4213, the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2010.

Unemployment levels are high across the country, and in my state of Illinois unemployment has remained well above 10 percent for over a year. Millions of Americans are actively looking for work, and for these families, unemployment insurance (UI) is a necessary to assist with their medical bills, mortgages, and basic needs so they can continue looking for employment every week.

While I share the concerns of my colleagues regarding spending that is not paid for, canceling these benefits now will only hurt these families and our economy. We have a responsibility to support people out of work and in great need. Moving forward, we may not be able to provide as much assistance to people and the states as many would like, and we may not in the short-term be able to fully offset the cost of all Federal spending. But working together, we can continue to chart a course that builds on our economic recovery and helps those in great need while beginning to address long-term economic challenges.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4213.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1550, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to concur will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5341, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 152, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 463]

YEAS—272

Ackerman	Bishop (NY)	Cardoza
Adler (NJ)	Blumenauer	Carnahan
Altmire	Bocchieri	Carney
Andrews	Bono Mack	Carson (IN)
Arcuri	Boren	Castle
Baca	Boswell	Castor (FL)
Baldwin	Boucher	Chandler
Barrow	Boyd	Childers
Bean	Brady (PA)	Chu
Becerra	Braley (IA)	Clarke
Berkley	Brown, Corrine	Clay
Berman	Butterfield	Cleaver
Bilbray	Cao	Clyburn
Bilirakis	Capito	Cohen
Bishop (GA)	Capps	Connolly (VA)

Conyers	Kanjorski	Posey
Costa	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Costello	Kennedy	Quigley
Courtney	Kildee	Rahall
Critz	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rangel
Crowley	Kilroy	Reichert
Cuellar	Kind	Reyes
Cummings	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Richardson
Dahlkemper	Kissell	Rodriguez
Davis (AL)	Klein (FL)	Rogers (MI)
Davis (CA)	Kosmas	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis (IL)	Kratovil	Ross
Davis (TN)	Kucinich	Rothman (NJ)
DeFazio	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Delahunt	Larson (CT)	Rush
DeLauro	LaTourette	Ryan (OH)
Dent	Lee (CA)	Salazar
Deutch	Levin	Sánchez, Linda T.
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta T.
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lipinski	Sarbanes
Dicks	LoBiondo	Schakowsky
Dingell	Loeb	Schauer
Doggett	Loftgren, Zoe	Schiff
Donnelly (IN)	Lowe	Schrader
Driehaus	Lujan	Schwartz
Edwards (MD)	Lynch	Scott (GA)
Edwards (TX)	Maffei	Scott (VA)
Ehlers	Maloney	Serrano
Ellison	Manullo	Sestak
Ellsworth	Markey (MA)	Shea-Porter
Engel	Marshall	Sherman
Eshoo	Matheson	Sires
Etheridge	Matsui	Skelton
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter
Fattah	McCollum	Smith (NJ)
Filner	McCotter	Smith (WA)
Foster	McDermott	Smith (WA)
Frank (MA)	McGovern	Snyder
Fudge	McMahon	Space
Garamendi	McNerney	Speier
Gerlach	Meek (FL)	Spratt
Giffords	Meeke (NY)	Stark
Gonzalez	Melancon	Stupak
Gordon (TN)	Michaud	Sutton
Grayson	Miller (NC)	Tanner
Green, Al	Miller, George	Taylor
Green, Gene	Mitchell	Teague
Grijalva	Mollohan	Thompson (CA)
Gutierrez	Moore (KS)	Thompson (MS)
Hall (NY)	Moore (WI)	Tierney
Halvorson	Moran (VA)	Titus
Hare	Murphy (CT)	Tonko
Harman	Murphy (NY)	Towns
Hastings (FL)	Murphy, Patrick	Tsongas
Heinrich	Murphy, Tim	Turner
Heller	Nadler (NY)	Upton
Herseth Sandlin	Napolitano	Van Hollen
Higgins	Neal (MA)	Velázquez
Himes	Oberstar	Visclosky
Hinchey	Obey	Walz
Hinojosa	Oliver	Wasserman
Hirono	Owens	Schultz
Holden	Pallone	Waters
Holt	Pascrell	Watson
Honda	Pastor (AZ)	Watt
Hoyer	Payne	Waxman
Inslee	Pelosi	Weiner
Israel	Perlmutter	Welch
Jackson (IL)	Perriello	Whitfield
Jackson Lee	Peters	Wilson (OH)
(TX)	Peterson	Woolsey
Johnson (GA)	Petri	Wu
Johnson (IL)	Pingree (ME)	Yarmuth
Johnson, E. B.	Platts	Young (AK)
Jones	Polis (CO)	Young (FL)
Kagen	Pomeroy	

NAYS—152

Aderholt	Bright	Cooper
Akin	Broun (GA)	Crenshaw
Alexander	Brown (SC)	Culberson
Austria	Brown-Waite,	Davis (KY)
Bachmann	Ginny	Djou
Bachus	Buchanan	Dreier
Baird	Burgess	Duncan
Barrett (SC)	Burton (IN)	Emerson
Bartlett	Buyer	Flake
Barton (TX)	Calvert	Fleming
Berry	Camp	Forbes
Biggart	Campbell	Fortenberry
Bishop (UT)	Cantor	Fox
Blackburn	Carter	Franks (AZ)
Blunt	Cassidy	Frelinghuysen
Boehner	Chaffetz	Gallely
Bonner	Coble	Garrett (NJ)
Boozman	Coffman (CO)	Gingrey (GA)
Boustany	Cole	Gohmert
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Goodlatte

Granger	Lungren, Daniel E.	Rehberg
Graves (GA)	Mack	Roe (TN)
Graves (MO)	Marchant	Rogers (AL)
Griffith	Markey (CO)	Rogers (KY)
Guthrie	McCarthy (CA)	Rohrabacher
Hall (TX)	McCaul	Rooney
Harper	McClintock	Roskam
Hastings (WA)	McHenry	Royce
Hensarling	McIntyre	Ryan (WI)
Herger	McKeon	Scalise
Hill	McMorris	Schmidt
Hunter	Rodgers	Schock
Inglis	Mica	Sensenbrenner
Issa	Miller (FL)	Sessions
Jenkins	Miller (MI)	Shadegg
Johnson, Sam	Miller, Gary	Shimkus
Jordan (OH)	Minnick	Shuler
King (IA)	Moran (KS)	Shuster
Kingston	Myrick	Simpson
Kirk	Neugebauer	Smith (NE)
Kline (MN)	Nunes	Smith (TX)
Lamborn	Nye	Stearns
Lance	Olson	Sullivan
Latham	Paul	Terry
Latta	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)
Lee (NY)	Pence	Thornberry
Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Tiberi
Linder	Poe (TX)	Walden
Lucas	Price (GA)	Westmoreland
Luetkemeyer	Putnam	Wilson (SC)
Lummis	Radanovich	Wittman
		Wolf

NOT VOTING—9

Capuano	Hodes	Ortiz
Doyle	Hoekstra	Tiahrt
Fallin	King (NY)	Wamp

□ 1413

Messrs. CARTER, BROWN of South Carolina, and Ms. MARKEY of Colorado changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STUPAK). Pursuant to the Chair's announcement of earlier today, the House will now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

Will all present please rise for a moment of silence.

JOYCE ROGERS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 5341) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Orndorf Drive in Brighton, Michigan, as the "Joyce Rogers Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 411, noes 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

AYES—411

Ackerman	Conyers	Herger
Aderholt	Cooper	Herseth Sandlin
Adler (NJ)	Higgins	Hirono
Alexander	Costello	Hill
Altmire	Courtney	Himes
Andrews	Crenshaw	Hinchee
Arcuri	Critz	Hinojosa
Austria	Crowley	Hirono
Baca	Cuellar	Holden
Bachmann	Cummings	Holt
Bachus	Dahlkemper	Honda
Baird	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Baldwin	Davis (IL)	Hunter
Barrett (SC)	Davis (KY)	Inglis
Barrow	Davis (TN)	Inslee
Bartlett	DeFazio	Israel
Barton (TX)	DeGette	Issa
Bean	Delahunt	Jackson (IL)
Becerra	DeLauro	Jackson Lee
Berkley	Dent	(TX)
Berman	Deutch	Jenkins
Berry	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (GA)
Biggert	Dicks	Johnson (IL)
Bilbray	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.
Billirakis	Djou	Jordan (OH)
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Kagen
Bishop (NY)	Donnelly (IN)	Kanjorski
Bishop (UT)	Doyle	Kaptur
Blackburn	Dreier	Kennedy
Blumenauer	Driehaus	Kildee
Blunt	Duncan	Kilpatrick (MI)
Bocchieri	Edwards (MD)	Kilroy
Boehner	Edwards (TX)	Kind
Bonner	Ehlers	King (IA)
Boo Mack	Ellison	Kingston
Borzman	Ellsworth	Kirk
Boren	Emerson	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Boswell	Engel	Kissell
Boucher	Eshoo	Klein (FL)
Boustany	Etheridge	Kline (MN)
Boyd	Farr	Kosmas
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Kratovil
Brady (TX)	Filner	Kucinich
Bralley (IA)	Flake	Lamborn
Bright	Fleming	Lance
Broun (GA)	Forbes	Langevin
Brown (SC)	Fortenberry	Larsen (WA)
Brown, Corrine	Foster	Larson (CT)
Brown-Waite,	Foxx	Latham
Ginny	Frank (MA)	LaTourette
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Lee (CA)
Burton (IN)	Fudge	Lee (NY)
Butterfield	Gallegly	Levin
Buyer	Garamendi	Lewis (CA)
Calvert	Garrett (NJ)	Lewis (GA)
Camp	Gerlach	Linder
Campbell	Giffords	Lipinski
Cantor	Gingrey (GA)	LoBiondo
Cao	Gohmert	Loebsack
Capito	Gonzalez	Lowey
Capps	Goodlatte	Lucas
Cardoza	Gordon (TN)	Luetkemeyer
Carnahan	Granger	Lujan
Carney	Graves (GA)	Lummis
Carson (IN)	Graves (MO)	Lungren, Daniel
Carter	Grayson	E.
Cassidy	Green, Al	Lynch
Castle	Green, Gene	Mack
Castor (FL)	Griffith	Maffei
Chaffetz	Grijalva	Maloney
Chandler	Guthrie	Manzullo
Childers	Gutierrez	Marchant
Chu	Hall (NY)	Markey (CO)
Clarke	Hall (TX)	Markey (MA)
Clay	Halvorson	Marshall
Cleaver	Hare	Matheson
Clyburn	Harman	Matsui
Coble	Harper	McCarthy (CA)
Coffman (CO)	Hastings (FL)	McCaul
Cohen	Hastings (WA)	McClintock
Cole	Heinrich	McCollum
Conaway	Heller	McCotter
Connolly (VA)	Hensarling	McDermott

McGovern	Poe (TX)	Sires
McHenry	Polis (CO)	Skelton
McIntyre	Pomeroy	Slaughter
McKeon	Posey	Smith (NE)
McMahon	Price (GA)	Smith (TX)
McMorris	Price (NC)	Smith (WA)
Rodgers	Putnam	Snyder
McNerney	Quigley	Space
Meek (FL)	Rahall	Speier
Meeks (NY)	Rangel	Spratt
Melancon	Rehberg	Stark
Mica	Reichert	Stearns
Michaud	Reyes	Stupak
Miller (FL)	Richardson	Sullivan
Miller (MI)	Rodriguez	Sutton
Miller (NC)	Roe (TN)	Tanner
Miller, Gary	Rogers (AL)	Taylor
Miller, George	Rogers (KY)	Teague
Minnick	Rogers (MI)	Terry
Mitchell	Rohrabacher	Thompson (CA)
Mollohan	Rooney	Thompson (MS)
Moore (WI)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (PA)
Moran (KS)	Roskam	Thornberry
Moran (VA)	Ross	Tiberi
Murphy (CT)	Rothman (NJ)	Tierney
Murphy (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Titus
Murphy, Patrick	Royce	Tonko
Murphy, Tim	Ruppersberger	Towns
Murphy, Rick	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas
Nadler (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Napolitano	Salazar	Upton
Neal (MA)	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Neugebauer	T.	Velázquez
Nunes	Sánchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Nye	Sarbanes	Walden
Oberstar	Scalise	Walz
Obey	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Olson	Schauer	Schultz
Oliver	Schiff	Waters
Owens	Schmidt	Watson
Pallone	Schock	Watt
Pascarell	Schrader	Waxman
Pastor (AZ)	Schwartz	Weiner
Paul	Scott (GA)	Welch
Paulsen	Scott (VA)	Westmoreland
Payne	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Pence	Serrano	Wilson (OH)
Perlmutter	Sessions	Wilson (SC)
Perriello	Sestak	Wittman
Peters	Shadegg	Wolf
Peterson	Shea-Porter	Woolsey
Petri	Sherman	Wu
Pingree (ME)	Shimkus	Yarmuth
Pitts	Shuler	Young (AK)
Platts	Simpson	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Akin	Hoekstra	Ortiz
Capuano	Johnson, Sam	Radanovich
Cuberson	Jones	Rush
Davis (AL)	King (NY)	Shuster
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (NJ)
Fallin	McCarthy (NY)	Tiahrt
Hodes	Moore (KS)	Wamp

□ 1422

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 83. Joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1264, MULTIPLE PERIL INSURANCE ACT OF 2009

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on

Rules, I call up House Resolution 1549 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1549

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1264) to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to provide for the national flood insurance program to make available multiperil coverage for damage resulting from windstorms or floods, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas).

The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I am pleased to yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). And all time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1549.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 1549 provides for consideration of H.R. 1264, the Multiple Peril Insurance Act. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate controlled by the Committee on Financial Services. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, there is not a person in the Chamber today who can forget the terrible destruction left in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina 5 short years ago. Lives were lost, homes were destroyed, businesses closed. Schools and hospitals were underwater. Our Nation has never been the same.

The damage that Katrina inflicted on New Orleans and across the Gulf States left thousands of people homeless. There were refugees spread across more than a dozen States. I think I speak for all of us when I say the storm left an indelible mark on our collective psyche.

Although the storm and accompanying flood exposed many troubling failings, one of the most alarming was the fact that so many people who believed that they had adequate insurance, in fact, were not covered for Katrina's destruction.

Why? Because insurance companies engaged in a maddening shell game with homeowners about their coverage. Damage that seemed obviously caused by water would be attributed to wind, while wind damage was chalked up to flooding. The stalemate left far too many people with no claim.

The apparent loophole in coverage made it very difficult for many families to rebuild in the months and years after the storm. The same problem has cropped up after other hurricanes or large storms have struck over the years.

In the aftermath of Katrina, Congress worked collaboratively on legislation to address the coverage gap; and 3 years ago, legislation to do just that was approved by the House. However, the plan was unable to win passage in the Senate, so we are here again to try.

Despite the challenges, it is our contention that taxpayers will actually end up saving significant amounts of money if this type of coverage is made available to Americans.

In the aftermath of Katrina, the Federal Government spent more than \$34 billion on rental assistance, on vouchers, trailers, grants to homeowners and Small Business Administration disaster loans to homeowners.

Had there been a public option available to allow property owners to purchase insurance that provided seamless coverage of hurricane losses, some of that cost might have been avoided. With this bill we accomplish that goal.

The bill creates a new program within the National Flood Insurance Program to purchase both flood and wind storm insurance under one multi-peril policy, or to purchase wind storm coverage to supplement their already existing flood insurance.

It is a bipartisan bill and has been endorsed by the National Association of Home Builders, and the National Association of Realtors. The bill is also PAYGO compliant, since the program is required to pay for itself.

The most important thing to remember about this legislation is it simply gives Americans the option of buying coverage of getting some peace of mind.

The issue is far too important for us to wait around for the next round of storms like Katrina or Ike or Gustav to roar ashore and leave far too many families with nothing. This bill is a simple and effective way to permit people to purchase insurance so the next storm does not leave them high and dry.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the chairwoman of the Rules Committee for yielding me this time, my friend, Ms. SLAUGHTER.

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

Madam Speaker, this will be the 34th time I have handled a rule on the House floor, and this will be the 34th

time I have yet to handle one open rule this session of Congress. In fact, over the 130-plus rules this Congress, we have not yet debated an open rule. I guess I could add the word yet, but I would presume that moving forward during this session of Congress I don't think we expect to. What a shame, Madam Speaker.

I don't believe that closing debate or limiting amendments or shutting down Members of Congress who are elected by their colleagues and peers back home to come and represent them, whether they are Republicans or Democrats, makes a lot of sense. As a matter of fact, I think it's wrong. Yet today here we are again with my handling of the 34th time this session a closed rule.

I would once again question this agenda. I would question the agenda of the majority party, the Democratic Party, that we already know is about taxing, spending, and more rules and regulations, and more debt to this great Nation. But I think that it's important to look at how bad process delivers a bad outcome. And today that's exactly what we're looking at again, another flawed process to bring something to this floor that should be treated more respectfully than the topic that it is.

But I am going to use my time also to talk about some Republican ideas. One thing I have the opportunity today, Madam Speaker, is to call for a vote on the previous question to allow for this week's YouCut winner. We've over the weeks heard about YouCut.

YouCut is a Republican idea that's an online idea. It's a voting tool, a tool where people who are back home have an opportunity to pick what they consider to be wasteful government spending, something which this Congress is incapable of doing because the agenda does not allow for making wiser choices or even feedback from our colleagues about how we would cut and make this government more efficient. Over a million Americans have voted this week alone.

This week's YouCut winner is the elimination of subsidies to first-class seats on Amtrak's long-distance routes. This initiative would yield \$1.2 billion in savings over 10 years. And these people who have voted are hard-working Americans who are paying attention to what we're doing here in Washington. They don't want to have their tax dollars subsidize first-class travel on Amtrak.

I have long advocated for reforming Amtrak, especially the long-distance routes. These routes lose money year after year after year. They continue to receive money from the Federal Government, and Amtrak has no incentive to improve their operations as long as Uncle, that's Uncle Sam, is willing to pay.

This Congress I have introduced H.R. 5377, a bill that would require Amtrak to eliminate service on long-distance routes whose total direct costs are more than twice the revenue. That is,

where the costs are more than twice the revenue that comes in, the Federal Government should not be paying for that. The taxpayers should no longer be footing the bill for Amtrak's inefficiencies. And today you're going to have a chance to hear from the Republicans about how we think we ought to streamline this government and provide savings to the taxpayer.

Additionally, we're here today to discuss H.R. 1264, which would expand the National Flood Insurance Program, known as NFIP, to include wind storm insurance coverage. But once again today, based on the agenda that this Democratic majority has, it would create a massive new government program to offer government-paid coverage backed with taxpayer dollars. And while this legislation may be well-intended, I have no doubt that it would have a crushing impact on a very fragile U.S. job market that would add billions to the Federal deficit. That's why we're talking about YouCut today.

We're talking about YouCut today because the bill we're getting ready to pass here in just a few minutes is not even paid for. And our friends in the majority keep talking about, oh, we pay for things. We make the tough decisions. Well, another day in Washington where another tough decision is not being made by the leadership of this House, and the agenda of taxing and spending and more debt and long-term destruction of the free enterprise system is exactly what's on the floor of the House today with this bill.

Transferring these liabilities from the private sector to the NFIP would be fiscally irresponsible. The NFIP currently owes the U.S. Treasury over \$18 billion—yet we're going to give them some more, we're going to empower them some more—the amount that it's been forced to borrow from the American taxpayers to pay claims and expenses in excess of the premiums collected.

Since 2006, the Government Accountability Office has included the NFIP on its list of high-risk government programs in need of comprehensive reform. And here today we're empowering a program that's on the high-risk series and encouraging them to do more business, taking business from the free enterprise system.

Additionally, the Property and Casualty Insurance Association of America, known as PCI, estimates that the legislation will eliminate 41,775 private-sector jobs so that Uncle Sam and the government can add jobs.

Madam Speaker, that is the hallmark of this Democrat majority. It is to empower the government against the free enterprise system. We saw this in May numbers, when the May numbers came out, 431,000 net new jobs. And our friends in the Democrats come down every day and say, Look at us, look at all these jobs we're creating. Yeah, 431,000 jobs in May, but of that figure 400,000 were government jobs. They were census jobs, they were temporary

jobs, and you're trying to fool this country. In Texas, if we were in the Texas legislature, that would be deceptive advertising. It should be deceptive advertising in Washington and be against the law.

With an unemployment rate at 9.5 percent and a loss of over 3 million jobs since January of 2009, now is not the time to be diminishing more. That's 41,775 jobs is the estimate. By increasing the taxpayers' exposure also, this program is \$22.1 billion in premiums that could be taken out of our economy. But it doesn't stop there. More than \$20 billion of investment in mutual, municipal, State, and local bonds will completely dry up. A line of business that the free enterprise system handled that the government did not need to. And government at all levels, State, Federal, and local, will lose billions in tax revenue from the free enterprise system.

During the last Congress, the Senate rejected this proposal by a vote of 74 to 19. Even the administration, shockingly, even the administration voiced opposition to adding wind to the NFIP, citing concerns that it would threaten the long-term viability of the program. Exactly right. It's called bankruptcy. Never forget the taxpayer is there, so it probably won't go bankrupt.

With the current Federal crisis, the financial crisis, and the government crisis, and record unemployment, why would the majority party be pushing for legislation to make unemployment worse? Or would this simply be to help the U.S. Treasury? I don't know. But either way it's government jobs. And I guess we should be careful and not complain too much, because I guess Uncle Sam needs the help.

Madam Speaker, the voices of the American public have been clear. Americans want pro-growth solutions that will encourage job creation and investment and that would keep Americans competitive with the world. Instead, today we find 41,000 more jobs that will dry up in the free enterprise system, jobs back home.

□ 1440

This legislation further diminishes not only these jobs but adds billions of dollars to our national debt. That is the hallmark of this administration and this Congress: more taxing, more spending, more taking of jobs from the free enterprise system to the government, and perhaps worst of all, a debt we may never, ever pay for.

When my friends on the other side of the aisle start to promote positive solutions instead of federalizing more sectors of our free enterprise system, they can count on receiving our support. I can't do it today. Today's another vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

We don't have hurricanes in Rochester, New York—for which we are ex-

tremely grateful. But all of us were affected by Katrina. All of us saw what happened to the city that we all loved. New Orleans belongs to every American. All of us have friends here in the House and some in the Senate who lost everything they had. These were people who had insurance on their homes. They thought they were covered. But because the fact the insurance companies said no, they would come to your house, which may have been completely overwhelmed with water, and say that was wind damage; we don't cover that. With the whipsawing back and forth, so many people lost everything they had.

As I said in my opening statement, the government paid \$34 billion to try to house and maintain people until we could find a permanent solution. If by passing this bill we can avoid that kind of expenditure again, I would call that money well spent. This program is self-sufficient, it is paid for by the premiums.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentlelady's courtesy in permitting me to speak on the rule.

I will support the rule, but I rise in reluctant opposition to the legislation.

I sympathize with my good friend from Mississippi and admire his passion and commitment to this issue and his tireless effort to try and help his constituents who have been put in a horrible situation in the aftermath of Katrina. But I do think this bill is a classic example of how our empathy interacts with a system that doesn't work to cloud our judgment and leads us to consider action that would actually make things worse over the long haul.

As Mr. TAYLOR has forcefully argued, Katrina exposed many problems with the National Flood Insurance Program. The confusion about wind and flood damage and the difficulty that his constituents had in getting insurance companies to cover their losses after Katrina is unacceptable. That was why I was pleased to support his amendment to the Flood Insurance Reform Act on the floor last week that would prohibit the write-your-own insurance companies from excluding wind damage under their own policy solely because flooding also caused damage to the property. I think that will go far in preventing insurance companies from taking advantage of consumers or the Federal taxpayers.

But extending the flood insurance program to cover wind hazards is like slapping a Band-Aid on a broken bone and then putting the patient on a skateboard while the bones are still mending.

I strongly support the goals of the flood insurance program and know that it has played an important role in insuring many American communities while encouraging mitigation and reducing risks. But with each additional disaster, it becomes clearer and clearer that the program is broken.

Right now, as my good friend from Texas pointed out, it's \$19 billion in debt. Adding for wind coverage, even if it's supposed to be actuarially sound, will only make this worse.

Now, it is very likely to result in significant short-term losses for the flood insurance program. Even though CBO has given the bill a neutral score, that's based on a highly questionable assumption that FEMA will charge actuarial rates that fully cover wind losses despite a 40-year history of failing to do so for flood losses. FEMA doesn't have the ability to calculate what actuarial rates for wind coverage should be, much less enforce them.

As Robert Hunter, who ran the program in the 1970s, has said, Poor management at FEMA—You're doing a heck of a job, Brownie—and lax enforcement of building requirements by local government has meant that the program hasn't worked the way it was supposed to. Some have even argued that it actually even encourages development in hazardous areas.

Let me speak for a moment about the building code requirements under this legislation. The NFIB already subsidizes unwise construction in floodplains, and this would make it worse. While the bill requires the adoption of building codes to mitigate against wind losses, this is not strong enough. It doesn't address development in hazardous areas itself, and by increasing the availability of Federally backed insurance in hazardous areas, this bill will give people a false sense of security and provide incentives for development in those various areas. And there is a serious gap in the actual enforcement of those building codes.

The current problems with the flood insurance programs must be addressed before we can even think of expanding it to cover yet more hazards.

The experts on flood insurance agree. The administration sent up a statement of administration policy against the bill yesterday. The bill is opposed by FEMA, the Association of State Floodplain Managers, the insurance and reinsurance industry, the environmental community, Taxpayers for Common Sense, the National Taxpayers Union, and the Consumer Federation of America. They argue that it would expand a broken program, further encourage development in hazardous areas by giving people a false sense of security, have the Federal Government unfairly compete in the private insurance market, and put the American taxpayer further at risk.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Richmond, Virginia, the minority whip, the favorite son from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. I rise in opposition to the previous question.

With over 1.3 million votes cast and counting, the YouCut movement continues to give people across America a

voice to help put a stop to Washington's never-ending shopping spree.

House Republicans have already offered \$120 billion in commonsense spending reductions. Yet week in and week out, the majority has astoundingly voted against the will of the people.

Proposed by Congressman MAC THORNBERRY of Texas, this week's YouCut winner highlights the latest example of egregious government waste.

Despite the fact that only 16 percent of Amtrak passengers choose sleeper class fare, which includes a turndown service and private entertainment, taxpayers are on the hook for more than twice as much for these passengers compared to those who ride in coach.

During these increasingly tough economic times, is it really fair to ask taxpayers to subsidize turndown service and pre-paid movies? The American people have emphatically said "no."

Just days ago, Madam Speaker, four House Democrats bucked their party's leadership to form a working group they say is devoted to cutting wasteful spending. As my House Republican colleagues and I have said since YouCut's launch, tackling our staggering national debt is not a partisan calling. It's an American calling because our country is at a crossroads.

It is only logical then, Madam Speaker, that the new Democratic group would support the elimination of first class Amtrak subsidies and save taxpayers up to \$1.2 billion over the next decade. I urge them, as well as all of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, to join us in voting to bring this week's YouCut to the floor for a vote.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Clarendon, Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, one of the things that most Americans don't realize is to what extent the Speaker, through the Rules Committee, controls this House and even what we can vote on. She determines what bills will be brought here, even what amendments may be offered. And there are very few ways to get another issue even considered here.

But that's what this next vote is about. It's about trying to get a vote on a proposal that most people who went on the YouCut Web site this week have chosen as something that should at least get a vote.

Now the gentleman from Mississippi has a serious proposal on the floor. But there are other serious proposals which ought to be considered as well.

□ 1450

One of them is to cut the subsidy that goes to Amtrak's sleeper class service.

Madam Speaker, the facts are this. Sixteen percent of the people who ride

Amtrak's long distance routes, 16 percent, choose the sleeper class service. Everybody else rides in coach, but the people who choose the sleeper class service, as the whip mentioned, get a private compartment, usually a private bathroom. They have turndown service where somebody comes and pulls back their sheets at night. They have unlimited meals in the dining car, all a very nice thing, but the problem is the taxpayers subsidize an average \$396 per ticket for every one of those people who choose that sleeper class service. You add it all up and it ends up being actually more than \$1 billion over 10 years that the taxpayers subsidize the people who choose the sleeper class service.

Now, our proposal doesn't eliminate that service. It doesn't change any Amtrak routes. It just says, if you're going to have that service, you ought to pay the cost of it. You ought to pay the cost of what you buy. I don't think that's terribly revolutionary, but it saves more than \$1 billion to the taxpayers.

Madam Speaker, in January I got to speak to a bunch of high school seniors in Randall High School in my district. At that time, their share of the national debt was about \$39,000. Today, their share of the national debt is \$42,739.

I think the next vote hinges on this question: Is it worth \$1 billion of subsidies for sleeper class service to add to the debt that those high school seniors have to pay? That's the question the Members will answer with the next vote.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) makes a great point, and we can today on the floor of this House of Representatives add to this bill with its own merits by saying let's also, as we're adding billions of dollars, at least simplify government and cut a billion off of what it does. It makes sense to me, and I applaud the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) for his great YouCut suggestion.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wheaton, Illinois, PETE ROSKAM.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman.

You know, if you were going to sit around and come up with a movie script of absurdity, you couldn't come up with a script that was this real. In other words, taxpayers out subsidizing first class passenger travel on railcars throughout the United States? If you trotted that out to Hollywood and said, "Oh, we've got one for you," the Hollywood types would throw it away and laugh at you and say there's no way, that's completely unrealistic, except in this Congress.

Congressman THORNBERRY from Texas has figured out by carefully reading an Inspector General report of the Department of Transportation that there is a way to save \$1 billion over 10

years. Now, think about that. You know something very interesting. You don't hear anybody coming to the floor, Madam Speaker, to defend this practice of subsidizing first class rail treatment. The reason is nobody can do it with a straight face. Nobody can say, Oh, no, no, no. We need to subsidize movies on Amtrak. We need to subsidize prepaid meals. We need to subsidize honest-to-goodness the bed turndown service in the sleeper car.

How absurd is that?

So oftentimes in political life we're asked what would you cut. What would you cut? How would you balance this budget? Well, I tell you what. You've got a whole host of Republicans that say let's vote "no" on this previous question and let's take up this effort, this time, this afternoon to cut \$1 billion.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the gentlewoman if she has any further speakers.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. At this moment, I do not.

May I inquire of the gentleman if he's ready to close?

Mr. SESSIONS. I wanted to ask the gentlewoman if she had additional speakers. I received a good answer. Thank you very much. I appreciate the gentlewoman.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. May I inquire if the gentleman is ready to close?

Mr. SESSIONS. I have about 45 or 50 more speakers, and I will consume my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Thirty-five or 50?

Mr. SESSIONS. I have a number of speakers. We did not receive enough time in this rule to be able to provide enough time for our speakers. It's a very important topic for us, and I understand that you don't have any speakers, but we've got a bunch. So, yes, ma'am, I do intend to use my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I know we're going to have a big debate on flood insurance and wind insurance and I'm going to be participating in that, but I wanted to talk about, obviously, the YouCut program.

There is nothing that is upsetting to more people across the State of West Virginia that I see every day than the overspending, the debt and deficit that is just overwhelming them and this country. But the YouCut program, since its inception, 1.3 million Americans have weighed in on where they think we can cut government spending. Folks from all across America are tightening their budgets. This summer, they're deciding? Can we go on vacation. Can we go for 2 days. Can we go for a week. Can we fly. Can we drive. Should we go out to dinner? Should we stay in?

All these are economic questions that we ask in our families every single

companies wanted to turn around and blame everything on the water. Why? Because they could stick the taxpayers with the bill.

The next house is a more typical home, more modest home. This one is about a mile inland, about a mile inland, pretty good ways from the water. Beautiful home. This is what the folks who lived there, when they left, looked at last.

This is what they came home to.

It's not just three houses; it's not 30 houses. It was 30,000 houses that this happened to. So, again, these folks, knowing this was a big part of their lives, had \$249,000 worth of insurance. Their insurance company was slightly more generous than the previous two times and offered them \$10,000.

Now, Mr. SESSIONS points out that, incorrectly, that maybe government shouldn't be doing this. Well, maybe he doesn't talk to his folks in his State capital often enough because if he had he would know that his State is already doing this.

In the aftermath of Katrina, on a State-by-State basis, the insurance industry pulled out, left a vacuum. People had to have some form of wind insurance; and so on a State-by-State basis, the State picked up that obligation.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 4 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the gentleman's State of Texas, the Texas wind pool in 2004 had an exposure of \$20.8 billion. That has expanded to \$58.6 billion. That's not private sector that's going to pay that bill; that's the Texas wind pool. They are on the hook for that.

In my home State of Mississippi, it has gone from \$1.6 billion to \$6.3 billion. I can't speak for every State, but I can tell you that pretty well equals the Mississippi State budget. If there was a catastrophic storm in Mississippi that hit all three coastal counties on one day—and, by the way, that's happened three times in my lifetime—it would break the State of Mississippi.

Now, at some point they are going to come up and say, well, they have got reinsurance, okay. Almost all the reinsurance is out of the Bahamas and the Caymans. So let me ask you a simple question: If the Benvenuttis couldn't get a company out of Illinois to pay their claim, if the Haddens couldn't get a company out of Illinois to pay their claim, if the other family couldn't get a company out of Illinois to pay their claim, does anyone really think a company from the Bahamas is going to willingly write these checks? Who is kidding whom?

On a State-by-State basis, Florida has gone from \$2.2 billion to \$436 billion; South Carolina, \$6 billion to \$17 billion; Georgia, the gentleman from Georgia's State, \$565 million to \$2.1 billion, a 265 percent increase, not private sector, State liability.

So why do we want to do this? Because, quite honestly, the purpose of

insurance, to people who pay their premium, to live the way they are supposed to, but they want the certainty that if something bad happens to them, they are going to get paid.

□ 1510

Secondly, why should the Nation do it? Because, quite frankly, it would break any one of these States. The chances of every coastal county in Mississippi getting hit all in the same day has happened three times in my lifetime. In 2004, Florida had four catastrophic storms, hit almost every square inch of the State. But the chances of the same storm hitting every State on the same day is minuscule. And if it does happen, don't worry about paying claims, it's just going to be called Armageddon.

So what we are proposing is a program that, instead of letting the private sector collect the premiums and the Nation pay the bill, would allow people to, as an extension, as an option to their flood insurance, pay for a wind option. That way if they come home to nothing, if they come home to a substantially destroyed house, it doesn't matter if the wind did it, it doesn't matter if the water did it; the fact is they built their house the way they were supposed to, they built it in a place that was safe, they paid their premiums, and they are going to get paid.

The last point of course the insurance industry doesn't want to tell you, so I will. In the same year the National Flood Insurance Program lost \$18 billion they made \$48 billion in profits. Why? Pretty simple. They collected the premiums; you, the taxpayer, paid the bill. You paid the bill for the FEMA trailers because, again, a typical insurance policy says if your house is destroyed, if your house is damaged to where you can't live in it, they will pay to put you up. But when they denied these claims in full, as they did thousands of times, then someone had to do something. President Bush, to his credit, stepped forward and said we're going to make FEMA trailers available. That cost the taxpayers \$4.3 billion; \$7.2 billion for temporary housing; CDBG grants totaling \$15.4 billion. And what was one of the prerequisites to get a CDBG grant? You had to have insurance and you didn't get paid. So who paid that bill? Uncle Sam, you, the taxpayers paid that bill. Lastly, SBA disaster loan, \$7.6 billion. So for a total bill of \$34.5 billion. It wasn't \$18 billion the Nation lost that year, it was over \$50 billion. We are trying to change that. We are trying to come up with a program where the premiums pay for the program.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. So, again, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this to the floor.

I would remind my Republican colleagues that in the 12 years that they ran the House, I don't ever recall a vote on cutting the subsidy for Amtrak. I would have voted with you, but I just don't remember your bringing it up.

So let's talk about this problem this day. I would remind my Republican colleagues that on a regular basis they come to the floor and say, you know what? We shouldn't be doing all these things that don't make sense, all these things that don't contribute to each other. Amtrak is not an insurance problem. This is an insurance program. It is a single-shot bill to do one thing, and that's to let those people who want to buy wind insurance as an option to their flood insurance so that they will know that if they paid their premiums, they built their house the way they were supposed to, if something horrible happens they will get paid.

Mr. SESSIONS. By the way, the gentleman from Mississippi is a very dear friend of mine with whom I engage on a regular basis. I just want the gentleman to know that while I know that under Speaker PELOSI we don't have any process with appropriations to strike or amend any appropriations bills, for 12 years I brought an Amtrak cut bill to this floor. So I will be providing that information, and I look forward to the gentleman joining me as soon as we get a Republican majority that will allow that to take place on the floor of this House, an open process.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Savannah, Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

While I oppose the rule and the bill, I want to say with great emphasis what a fiscal conservative my friend from Mississippi is, and how I know that he is struggling to find a solution to something that I would agree is a problem.

Now, I live in Savannah. I have a house on the waterfront, and I also have a beach house, so I have to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program and in the State wind-storm pool. And Mr. TAYLOR is right, if you've ever dealt with them, it is a pain in the neck. The bureaucracy is horrible, getting the claims paid is a really big problem. The debate as to what is flood and what is wind and what is wind-driven water is very complicated. And the insurance companies will get no sympathy from me on this situation.

The problem is that here we are again under the Pelosi Congress with a closed rule in which none of us can offer an amendment. I mean, think about that. We're all elected, 435 Members representing 600,000 people, and yet we're not allowed to offer an amendment because the Rules Committee has to play favorites. And unless you're on the A list, you can't offer an amendment, even though you

still represent 600,000 people like everyone else here. So we can't improve this.

A couple of suggestions I would have said is, why not give the State insurance commissioners—since, as my friend knows, insurance is a State matter, the McCarran-Ferguson Act, Public Law 15, says that States will regulate insurance. And why not make sure the insurance commissioners have the authority to say to an insurance company, if you want to sell insurance in my State, then you're going to have to take a percentage of the flood or the windstorm exposure? Give him the power to twist their arms. Because I can tell you, having been in the insurance system—I'm a CPCU, that's a Chartered Property Casualty Underwriter—that insurance companies will cede anything, anything that's difficult they will be glad to let the State government or the Federal Government take all the flood claims, take the crime claims, take the DUI drivers. They want the unprofitable stuff off their books because they make money two different ways, one is an underwriting profit, the other one is an investment profit.

Now, ironically, right now we're in a soft market. Insurance premiums on the commercial side are actually going down because insurance companies, for some unknown reason, are making their money elsewhere. So I think what Mr. TAYLOR is saying is right, there are some things that are going on, and an insurance commissioner should be able to get to the bottom of it. But again, since we can't amend this to try to put language like that in there, we need to bring this rule down to send the bill back to committee.

Now, I want to say we almost got through today without a new Federal program—I thought it might happen. This is a new Federal program. We did pass \$34 billion onto the next generation in increased debt—which I know some people were clapping about, I don't exactly follow that. We have a \$1.4 trillion deficit, the largest debt in the history of the Nation, 90 percent of our GDP, and yet we have Members on the Democrat side clapping about \$34 billion in new debt.

Now, put this in context. May of 2008, a Bush stimulus bill—which I voted against—\$168 billion; it did not create jobs. Bear Stearns bailout by the Federal Reserve in March of 2008, \$29 billion. Fannie Mae bailout, \$200 billion in July of 2008. September of 2008, AIG bailout—again by the Federal Reserve—\$85 billion, now up to \$140 billion. And then we had the infamous TARP, \$700 billion. I voted “no” on that. Then here comes the stimulus bill to keep unemployment from going to 8 percent. Unemployment at the time was 7.6 percent, and \$800 billion later we're at 10 percent unemployment. We are right now borrowing 37 cents on every dollar we spend. I hope you will vote the rule down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes re-

maining; the gentlewoman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time until the gentleman from Texas closes.

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

I appreciate the gentlewoman from New York for not only this time but getting through this thing.

Madam Speaker, as you can see, Republicans, and at least one Democrat, have a lot to talk about. I wish we had more time today. Republicans would have liked a lot more time to make sure that we could talk about not only this bill, but the implications that are on the floor.

Republicans continue to offer, Madam Speaker, commonsense solutions to rein in the current spending spree, a spending spree that's now in its fourth year by this Democrat majority. We, like the American people, would like transparency and accountability and common sense, creation of jobs, not the extension of unemployment benefits that are not paid for.

□ 1520

We believe in people having jobs, and if this majority were serious and if this administration were serious, they would do the things that work rather than the things that don't work. They are doing things that don't work, Madam Speaker, and that is what this Democrat majority will be held accountable for. It's really a sad thing to hear person after person who has lost his job, and people whom I know, and to see the malaise this country is in.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. The legislation before us today brings more uncertainty to the long-term solvency of the NFIP. This legislation risks more American jobs and adds more to our State, local, and Federal deficits. It is true, as the gentleman spoke of, that States take this on. It is a State's responsibility, not the Federal Government's, but that is part of what this agenda is all about. For this reason, I encourage a “no” vote on the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I want to remind those persons listening, particularly Members of Congress who are going to come to the floor to vote, that we are not voting on Amtrak cars. We are talking about legislation to try to protect those Americans who are victims of hurricanes and other related natural disasters from losing everything the way the gulf coast victims of Katrina have. The bill will help ensure that the insurance loopholes will be closed and that hardworking Ameri-

cans won't be denied legitimate claims when they desperately need them.

I call for a “yes” vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. SESSIONS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1549 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5801) to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the subsidization of Amtrak sleeper car service, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5801.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 179, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

YEAS—234

Ackerman	Berry	Capps
Adler (NJ)	Bishop (GA)	Cardoza
Altmire	Bishop (NY)	Carnahan
Andrews	Blumenauer	Carney
Arcuri	Boren	Carson (IN)
Baca	Boswell	Castor (FL)
Baird	Boucher	Chandler
Baldwin	Boyd	Childers
Barrow	Brady (PA)	Chu
Bean	Braley (IA)	Clarke
Becerra	Bright	Cleaver
Berkley	Brown, Corrine	Cleaver
Berman	Butterfield	Clyburn

Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Connolly (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Conyers	Kagen	Rahall
Cooper	Kanjorski	Rangel
Costa	Kaptur	Reyes
Costello	Kennedy	Richardson
Courtney	Kildee	Rodriguez
Critz	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ross
Crowley	Kilroy	Rothman (NJ)
Cuellar	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Cummings	Kissell	Ruppersberger
Dahlkemper	Klein (FL)	Rush
Davis (CA)	Kosmas	Ryan (OH)
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Salazar
Davis (TN)	Langevin	Sanchez, Linda
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	T.
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
Delahunt	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Levin	Schakowsky
Deutch	Lewis (GA)	Schauer
Dicks	Lipinski	Schiff
Dingell	Loebsack	Schrader
Doggett	Lowey	Schwartz
Donnelly (IN)	Lujan	Scott (GA)
Doyle	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Driehaus	Maffei	Serrano
Edwards (MD)	Maloney	Sestak
Edwards (TX)	Markey (MA)	Shea-Porter
Ellison	Marshall	Sherman
Engel	Matheson	Shuler
Eshoo	Matsui	Sires
Etheridge	McCarthy (NY)	Skelton
Farr	McCollum	Slaughter
Fattah	McDermott	Smith (WA)
Finer	McGovern	Snyder
Foster	McMahon	Space
Frank (MA)	Meeke (FL)	Speier
Fudge	Meeks (NY)	Spratt
Garamendi	Melancon	Stark
Gonzalez	Michaud	Stupak
Gordon (TN)	Miller (NC)	Sutton
Grayson	Miller, George	Tanner
Green, Al	Moore (KS)	Taylor
Green, Gene	Moore (WI)	Teague
Grijalva	Moran (VA)	Thompson (CA)
Hall (NY)	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (MS)
Halvorson	Murphy (NY)	Titus
Hare	Murphy, Patrick	Tonko
Harman	Nadler (NY)	Towns
Hastings (FL)	Napolitano	Tsongas
Heinrich	Neal (MA)	Van Hollen
Herseth Sandlin	Oberstar	Velázquez
Higgins	Ogden	Visclosky
Himes	Olver	Walz
Hinche	Owens	Wasserman
Hinojosa	Pallone	Schultz
Hirono	Pascrell	Waters
Holden	Pastor (AZ)	Watson
Holt	Payne	Watt
Honda	Perlmutter	Waxman
Hoyer	Perriello	Weiner
Inslee	Peters	Welch
Israel	Peterson	Wilson (OH)
Jackson (IL)	Pingree (ME)	Woolsey
Jackson Lee	Polis (CO)	Wu
(TX)	Pomeroy	Yarmuth

NAYS—179

Aderholt	Campbell	Giffords
Akin	Cantor	Gingrey (GA)
Alexander	Cao	Gohmert
Austria	Capito	Goodlatte
Bachmann	Carter	Granger
Bachus	Cassidy	Graves (GA)
Barrett (SC)	Castle	Graves (MO)
Bartlett	Chaffetz	Griffith
Barton (TX)	Coble	Guthrie
Biggett	Coffman (CO)	Hall (TX)
Bilbray	Cole	Harper
Bilirakis	Conaway	Hastings (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Heller
Blackburn	Davis (KY)	Hensarling
Blunt	Dent	Hergert
Boccheri	Djou	Hill
Boehner	Dreier	Hunter
Bonner	Duncan	Inglis
Bono Mack	Ehlers	Issa
Boozman	Ellsworth	Jenkins
Boustany	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Brady (TX)	Flake	Johnson, Sam
Brown (GA)	Fleming	Jones
Brown (SC)	Forbes	Jordan (OH)
Brown-Waite,	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Ginny	Foxx	Kingston
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	Kirk
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Burton (IN)	Clay	Kline (MN)
Calvert	Garrett (NJ)	Kratovil
Camp	Gerlach	Lamborn

Lance	Minnick	Ryan (WI)
Latham	Mitchell	Scalise
LaTourette	Moran (KS)	Schmidt
Latta	Murphy, Tim	Schock
Lee (NY)	Myrick	Sensenbrenner
Lewis (CA)	Neugebauer	Sessions
Linder	Nunes	Shadegg
LoBiondo	Nye	Shimkus
Lucas	Olson	Shuster
Luetkemeyer	Paul	Simpson
Lummis	Paulsen	Smith (NE)
Lungren, Daniel	Petri	Smith (NJ)
E.	Pitts	Smith (TX)
Mack	Platts	Stearns
Manzullo	Poe (TX)	Sullivan
Marchant	Posey	Terry
Markey (CO)	Price (GA)	Thompson (PA)
McCarthy (CA)	Putnam	Thornberry
McCaul	Radanovich	Tiberi
McClintock	Rehberg	Turner
McCotter	Reichert	Upton
McHenry	Roe (TN)	Walden
McIntyre	Rogers (AL)	Westmoreland
McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Whitfield
McMorris	Rogers (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Wittman
Mica	Rooney	Wolf
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Young (FL)
Miller, Gary	Royce	

NOT VOTING—19

Buyer	Gutierrez	Ortiz
Capuano	Hodes	Pence
Culberson	Hoekstra	Tiahrt
Davis (AL)	King (NY)	Tierney
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lofgren, Zoe	Wamp
Diaz-Balart, M.	McNerney	
Fallin	Mollohan	

□ 1550

Messrs. SHIMKUS, MITCHELL, RYAN of Wisconsin, and MICA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SCHRADER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, noes 183, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 466]

AYES—228

Ackerman	Butterfield	Crowley
Altmire	Cao	Cuellar
Andrews	Capps	Cummings
Arcuri	Cardoza	Dahlkemper
Baca	Carnahan	Davis (CA)
Baird	Carney	Davis (IL)
Baldwin	Carson (IN)	Davis (TN)
Barrow	Castor (FL)	DeFazio
Bean	Chandler	DeGette
Becerra	Childers	DeLauro
Berkley	Chu	Deutch
Berry	Clarke	Dicks
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Dingell
Bishop (NY)	Cleaver	Doggett
Blumenauer	Clyburn	Doyle
Boren	Cohen	Driehaus
Boswell	Connolly (VA)	Edwards (MD)
Boucher	Conyers	Edwards (TX)
Boyd	Cooper	Ellison
Brady (PA)	Costa	Engel
Braley (IA)	Courtney	Eshoo
Brown, Corrine	Critz	Etheridge

Farr	Loeb	Rothman (NJ)
Fattah	Lowey	Roybal-Allard
Filner	Lujan	Rubens
Foster	Lynch	Rush
Frank (MA)	Maffei	Ryan (OH)
Fudge	Maloney	Salazar
Garamendi	Markey (CO)	Sánchez, Linda
Gonzalez	Markey (MA)	T.
Gordon (TN)	Marshall	Sarbanes
Grayson	Matheson	Schakowsky
Green, Al	Matsui	Schauer
Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)	Schiff
Grijalva	McColum	Schrader
Gutierrez	McDermott	Schwartz
Hall (NY)	McGovern	Scott (GA)
Hare	McIntyre	Scott (VA)
Harman	McMahon	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Sestak
Heinrich	Meek (FL)	Shea-Porter
Herseth Sandlin	Meeks (NY)	Sherman
Higgins	Melancon	Sires
Hinche	Michaud	Skelton
Hinojosa	Miller (NC)	Slaughter
Hirono	Miller, George	Smith (WA)
Holden	Mollohan	Snyder
Holt	Moore (KS)	Space
Honda	Moore (WI)	Speier
Hoyer	Moran (VA)	Spratt
Inlee	Murphy (CT)	Stupak
Israel	Murphy, Patrick	Sutton
Jackson (IL)	Nadler (NY)	Tanner
Jackson Lee	Napolitano	Taylor
(TX)	Neal (MA)	Teague
Johnson (GA)	Nye	Thompson (CA)
Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
Kagen	Obey	Titus
Kanjorski	Olver	Tonko
Kaptur	Owens	Towns
Kennedy	Pallone	Tsongas
Kildee	Pascarell	Van Hollen
Kilpatrick (MI)	Pastor (AZ)	Velázquez
Kilroy	Payne	Visclosky
Kind	Perlmutter	Walz
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Peterson	Wasserman
Kissell	Pingree (ME)	Schultz
Klein (FL)	Polis (CO)	Waters
Kosmas	Pomeroy	Watson
Kucinich	Price (NC)	Watt
Langevin	Quigley	Waxman
Larsen (WA)	Rahall	Weiner
Larson (CT)	Rangel	Welch
Lee (CA)	Reyes	Wilson (OH)
Levin	Richardson	Woolsey
Lewis (GA)	Rodriguez	Wu
Lipinski	Ross	Yarmuth

NOES—183

Aderholt	Cole	Issa
Adler (NJ)	Conaway	Jenkins
Akin	Crenshaw	Johnson (IL)
Alexander	Davis (KY)	Johnson, Sam
Austria	Dent	Jones
Bachmann	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jordan (OH)
Bachus	Djou	King (IA)
Barrett (SC)	Donnelly (IN)	Kingston
Bartlett	Dreier	Kirk
Barton (TX)	Ehlers	Kline (MN)
Biggert	Ellsworth	Kratovil
Bilbray	Emerson	Lamborn
Billirakis	Flake	Lance
Bishop (UT)	Fleming	Latham
Blackburn	Forbes	LaTourette
Blunt	Fortenberry	Latta
Boccieri	Fox	Lee (NY)
Boehner	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (CA)
Bonner	Frelinghuysen	Linder
Bono Mack	Gallely	LoBiondo
Boozman	Garrett (NJ)	Lucas
Boustany	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Brady (TX)	Giffords	Lummis
Bright	Gingrey (GA)	Lungren, Daniel
Broun (GA)	Gohmert	E.
Brown (SC)	Goodlatte	Mack
Brown-Waite,	Granger	Manzullo
Ginny	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Buchanan	Graves (MO)	McCarthy (CA)
Burgess	Griffith	McCaul
Burton (IN)	Guthrie	McClintock
Calvert	Hall (TX)	McCotter
Camp	Halvorson	McHenry
Campbell	Harper	McKeon
Cantor	Hastings (WA)	McMorris
Capito	Heller	Rodgers
Carter	Hensarling	Mica
Cassidy	Herger	Miller (FL)
Castle	Hill	Miller (MI)
Chaffetz	Himes	Miller, Gary
Coble	Hunter	Minnick
Coffman (CO)	Inglis	Mitchell

Moran (KS)	Reichert	Smith (NE)
Murphy (NY)	Roe (TN)	Smith (NJ)
Rubens	Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)
Rush	Rogers (KY)	Stark
Ryan (OH)	Rogers (MI)	Stearns
Salazar	Rohrabacher	Sullivan
Sánchez, Linda	Rooney	Terry
T.	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (PA)
Sarbanes	Roskam	Thornberry
Schakowsky	Royce	Tiberi
Schauer	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Schiff	Scalise	Upton
Schrader	Schmidt	Walden
Schwartz	Schock	Westmoreland
Scott (GA)	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Scott (VA)	Sessions	Wilson (SC)
Serrano	Shadegg	Wittman
Sestak	Shimkus	Wolf
Shea-Porter	Shuler	Young (AK)
Sherman	Shuster	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Berman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Ortiz
Buyer	Duncan	Pence
Capuano	Fallin	Sanchez, Loretta
Costello	Hodes	Simpson
Culberson	Hoekstra	Tiahrt
Davis (AL)	King (NY)	Tierney
Delahunt	Lofgren, Zoe	Wamp

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1611

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOYLE. Madam Speaker, I wish to inform the House that I was unavoidably detained by a medical situation and, consequently, missed the vote to approve the final version of H.R. 4213, the Unemployment Compensation Act Extension of 2010, earlier this afternoon.

I want to state for the RECORD that I would have voted in favor of the legislation today, as I did on previous occasions when it came before the House for a vote. I've been a consistent supporter of legislation to extend unemployment insurance benefits to Americans who have lost their jobs, and I regret not being here for the vote.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On Monday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6 p.m. on Monday. The House, on Tuesday, will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list

of suspension bills, as is the practice, will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. In addition, we will consider the Transportation and HUD appropriations bill and the Military Construction and VA appropriations bill of 2011. We're also expected to consider items from the Senate, including Senate amendments to H.R. 4899, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2010. There are obviously other possibilities of bills coming from the Senate, and we will consider those as time permits.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.
Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that and would ask him if he could respond to some reports about several measures, perhaps, and the possibility of these measures coming to the floor next week, if he could give the House an update.

One would be the oil spill response legislation that's coming out of the Resources Committee, Energy and Commerce Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee; the small business taxpayer fund bill from the Senate; the FAA authorization bill from the Senate; the 9/11 compensation bill; and the Education and Labor OSHA bill relating to mining, if the gentleman could give us an update on those measures.

I yield.
Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. Rather than going into each one of them individually, I will say to the gentleman that each of those bills is under consideration. With respect to oil spills, there are significant discussions going on among the committees of jurisdiction, and we will, if we have a product to move forward, be prepared to do so.

We believe responding to the oil spill is critical. We've done so, as you know, with two bills this week, passed unanimously through the House, and so that we will be proceeding to look at the oil spill issue to try to ensure, to the extent we can, A, it doesn't happen again, and B, if it does happen, that we are prepared to respond to it and the industry is prepared to respond to it.

With respect to the other pieces of legislation, they are under discussion, some in this House and some in the Senate, as you know.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, and, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if the Members should be prepared for a possible Saturday session next week.

I yield.
Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Possibly. I say to my friend that, because next week is our last week and we will be recessing for the August break at that point in time, I would put Members on notice that there will be certain matters that we must complete and that we will complete and, as a result, Members ought to make sure that they have flexibility for next Saturday.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader announced two appropriations bills for

floor consideration next week. I'd note, Mr. Speaker, that the fiscal year ends just over 2 months from now, and yet we're only now just beginning consideration of the first of 12 appropriations bills that fund the entire Federal discretionary budget. But I would ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, if he could tell us whether to expect those bills coming up for consideration on the floor under an open rule.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will be talking to Mr. OBEY tomorrow and/or Monday to get his views on consideration of those bills, and at that point in time, I will be able to give you a clearer view on how those bills will be considered.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman whether he could commit to the House that he would continue to advocate for an open rule. I know the gentleman has always been and joins me in wanting full and open debate in the House, whether it will be his position that these appropriations bills would come to the floor on an open rule.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

As the gentleman knows full well, because he and I have been involved in discussions, I have consistently been for considering the appropriations bills in a timely manner with agreement between the majority and the minority, as occurred in 2006 when Mr. OBEY and Mr. LEWIS reached agreement on the consideration of those bills. The gentleman is accurate when he says that that is my preferred option on the consideration of appropriations bills. But, as I say, I have not talked to the chairman, and I will be talking to him to get his view on how these bills can most effectively be considered.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Turning to the issue of the troop funding bill, Mr. Speaker, the Senate sent the House the troop funding bill supplemental about 2 months ago, and it appears that that body will be sending us back the exact same version of the bill next week. I would ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is that his understanding of the bill, and is it his understanding that that is the bill that we can expect the House to be voting on?

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

The Senate, as you know, has not completed its consideration of the supplemental and are debating other issues, some of which we sent to them, and as a matter of fact, I think some of those have the majority's support. The small business lending bill, in particular, I would hope they would bring to us.

□ 1620

We included a number of things, not the least of which is trying to ensure that 140,000 teachers around the country remain on the job for our children and for our schools. I don't know

whether the Senate will include that or not.

We also included money for border security, which was not in the Senate bill. FEMA and Haiti, and oil spill money, I believe, were in the Senate bill initially. We have also included that. There are other items that we have included to try to grow jobs and expand the economy, which, unfortunately, the Senate at least at this point in time has not supported.

But I say to my friend that in light of the fact that the Senate has not yet passed the supplemental, I am not sure what's going to be in it. But I would say to the gentleman, once again, as he knows, it is my intention to ensure that the money for the troops is, in fact, passed before we leave here.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, that was going to be my question: When faced with the reality that the Senate will send us back the version that it did so 2 months ago, if faced with that, will the House be taking that bill up and then funding our troops before we adjourn for the recess in August?

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I am going to give him the same answer: I am not going to anticipate. I find it not a very productive endeavor to anticipate what the United States Senate will do. I have been so disappointed so often on that speculation that I am not going to enter into such speculation today.

However, I will tell the gentleman, as I have said some weeks running now, that it is my intention that we will have a bill pass this House and pass the Senate, for that matter, that funds the troops prior to our leaving for our August break.

Mr. CANTOR. I am reminded by my counsel, Mr. Speaker, that, as the gentleman would probably agree, the Senate is nothing but predictable.

Mr. Speaker, as we are discussing the schedule for next week, I would like to announce the ninth YouCut vote which will take place on the House floor next week. Over 1.4 million votes have been cast to date at the Republican youcut.house.gov site.

I would say to the gentleman, four of your Members announced a series of proposed cuts this week. While the gentleman did not mention them in his schedule for next week, I would note that we have included one of their proposals in our five YouCut options for next week. The proposal offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. ADLER, would terminate the Advanced Earned Income Tax Credit, saving \$1.1 billion.

The additional options for the public to vote on this week under the YouCut program include the elimination of duplicative Federal PE programs, saving \$790 million; the refocusing of the National Park Service on administering Federal parks, saving \$238 million of taxpayer money; the termination of funding for the DOD Innovative Readiness Training program at a \$200 million

savings; and the prohibition of the use of taxpayer funds for political campaigns in foreign countries, savings of \$23 million.

And so with that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the gentleman's consideration, perhaps if not at our suggestion, the suggestion of his colleagues on his side of the aisle, that perhaps maybe we should endeavor to have a vote on the floor about actually cutting spending.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Without getting into a long colloquy, and I appreciate the gentleman's trying to truncate this, let me simply say that I think the suggestions of how we can save money, how we can bring the deficit down from whatever source they come should be welcomed by all of us. Whether they come from your side of the aisle, my side of the aisle, from the public at large, Republicans, Democrats, independents, or totally non-partisan sources whatsoever, we ought to consider them.

We have a very significant deficit problem confronting us. I won't go into the reasons of why I think we have those deficit problems, but we have them and we have been try to go dig out of a deep economic recession, as all of us know. So I simply wanted to say that, as you know, this week we did vote in a very substantial reduction, the Surface Transportation Savings Act, which passed 402-0. We cut \$107 million.

Next week I expect that we are going to have at least one vote, maybe others, to cut substantial dollars. BETSY MARKEY has an idea that she has introduced that would save \$703-plus million. We hope to consider that. But I want to reiterate, which is all I want to say, that we welcome ideas on how to bring the deficit down.

I mentioned, of course, earlier that Mr. KYL indicated that paying for things were not necessary if they were in the tax field. But cutting other things, the problem is, that was \$678 billion that he suggested in borrowed money. And so we are going to have to look, as I said in a speech not too long ago, at all items of expenditure, wherever they may be found, to make sure that we are returned to the fiscal posture, frankly, that we were in when we had a \$5.6 trillion surplus in January of 2000.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that we are making some progress here if we are going to avoid pointing fingers and casting blame as to why we are where we are, in the spirit of trying to move forward together and addressing the real challenges that our constituents and the people of this country are facing.

I welcome the gentleman's desire to look for ways to cut spending. I would

just reiterate that there are four individuals on his side of the aisle, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey being one, having proposed a savings of \$1.1 billion that will be part of the YouCut activities over the Web this week. Mr. Speaker, if that is the winning proposal, then the gentleman will have an opportunity to join us in putting that measure to a vote. So I look forward to that next week, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I thank the gentleman for his time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 26, 2010

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRIGHT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

HONORING TERRY MCGHAUHEY

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a very heavy heart to join fellow cyclists throughout Minnesota in mourning the untimely loss of Terry McGhauhey, father, founder, godfather, midwife, impresario of the Paul Bunyan Bicycle Trail.

It was Terry McGhauhey who, 22 years ago, saw the notice of termination of rail service along central Minnesota's area from Baxter, Minnesota, up to Hackensack, and rode out like a modern day town crier to alert communities along the trail to join together, save the right-of-way, to build the Paul Bunyan trail, which now has 650,000 users a year. Every year Terry McGhauhey mobilized group rides, engaged the business communities all along the trail to see not only the physical and outdoors enjoyment and health benefits of a bike/ped, in-line skating trail, but also to see the business opportunities that have benefited all the communities along.

We didn't expect Terry's loss. He had suffered from Parkinson's, but he was there at the helm of this year's ride, and he was already planning for next year's ride. I shall miss him greatly as a friend, a treasured participant in bicycling. All of bicycling in Minnesota will miss Terry McGhauhey.

□ 1630

AMERICA'S ECONOMIC FUTURE

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President of the United States signed legislation into law that dra-

matically alters the way our financial sector works and makes it harder for our economy to recover. Instead of bringing much-needed reforms to modernize our financial system, this law grows government again.

As The Wall Street Journal put it, "What started as a promise to streamline and modernize the financial system turned into 2,300 pages of new agencies and new powers for the very authorities that fomented the financial crisis."

According to a recent U.S. Chamber of Commerce study, Federal regulators will have to write 520 rules, issue 81 studies and 93 reports. I opposed this measure as it came before the House. Business owners and constituents across my district are frustrated because the policies coming from Washington create more bureaucracy and stifle job creation.

It's time that Washington focuses on commonsense principles that put Americans back to work, reduce government expansion, and get our economy back on track. We must head back in the right direction for the future of this Nation.

THE JONES ACT

(Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Jones Act.

Enacted after World War I, the Jones Act ensures that America's domestic commerce is carried by U.S. vessels built and repaired in U.S. shipyards, and crewed and owned by U.S. citizens.

The Jones Act ensures a ready merchant marine fleet in time of war. And it prevents our economy from being dominated by foreign interests who don't pay American taxes, hire American workers, or even follow American health, safety, and environmental laws.

I would expect all patriotic Americans to support the Jones Act. In the past we have, but recently some in this body have tried to blame the Jones Act for BP's failure to clean up its own mess. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is no evidence that the Jones Act has interfered with the cleanup in any way.

We are in a recession. It's time to work together to expand American manufacturing and create jobs, not play partisan games. I urge my colleagues to stop posturing and start supporting American families by supporting the Jones Act.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

tleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

SESAME STREET-USO EXPERIENCE FOR MILITARY FAMILIES

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, back in May, I had the privilege of visiting Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune in my district for a special program put on by Sesame Street and the USO. The Sesame Street-USO experience for military families is a wonderful program aimed at helping children of service-members understand deployments. It also helps parents talk to their children about a parent who is coming home with a changed personality or not coming home at all.

This program has spanned nine countries and 84 military bases. The Sesame Street mission is to improve the connection between parent and child during the long absence of deployment and help children understand the harsh realities of war.

During my visit, I was thrilled by the enthusiasm of the Sesame Street actors and the excitement it brought to the children as well as the parents. This was a very heartwarming experience that brought hope and understanding to the very special children of our very special parents who make up our military.

It is never easy to try to explain death or war to a child, but with the helpful tools this program uses, like a video using the Sesame Street characters explaining the death of a parent to a small child or a young person, the difficult issue becomes much easier to talk about.

I would like to thank the USO and Sesame Street for their hard work and concern for our troops. These are people that have not forgotten our men and women overseas and their brave families back home waiting for the return of their loved one. I encourage my colleagues to attend one of these shows at a base in your State or near your district. You will realize, as I did, how important this program is to our military families. It is definitely something worth seeing.

Again, I would like to say to Sesame Street and USO, thank you for making this commitment to these families. We know how difficult it is for our families going on these frequent deployments to Afghanistan and Iraq, and Sesame Street and USO, you are making a commitment that those of us in Congress are very grateful for.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, as I do always on this floor, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask

God in his loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I ask God to bless the House and Senate, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for His people. And I ask God to please give strength, wisdom, and courage to President Obama, that he will always do what is right in the eyes of God for his people. And Mr. Speaker, I will ask three times, God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

THE INTELLIGENCE BUREAUCRACY: THINKING BIG INSTEAD OF THINKING SMART

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I imagine many of my colleagues have read The Washington Post report on "Top Secret America," and I hope they are reacting as I am, with horror and outrage at the sprawling national security and intelligence bureaucracy that has grown like a weed in recent years. This series of articles should shock us into action, at the very least leading us to question the conventional wisdom about how best to keep America safe.

According to the Post, the counterterrorism and homeland security apparatus has ballooned to some 1,271 government organizations working in roughly 10,000 locations around the country. There are now so many agencies analyzing so much information and issuing so many reports that the whole thing has become redundant, unmanageable, and ineffective.

Actually, we can't measure its precise effectiveness because so much of it is shrouded in secrecy. Much of the information about these agencies is classified and therefore not subject to the scrutiny it so badly needs.

If this system, which is so big that the Post refers to it as a fourth branch of government, were a domestic social program, my friends on the other side of the aisle would call it out-of-control spending.

□ 1640

Yet somehow, when the antigovernment rhetoric starts flying, it is never the wasteful defense and intelligence programs that come in for the harshest criticism. I'd be curious to hear, for example, why we can afford this behemoth, but we can't afford to pass a comprehensive jobs package. The organizational chart for this system looks like an octopus family on steroids, Mr. Speaker, and there are so many tentacles that it makes the proper information sharing and dot connecting nearly impossible.

I couldn't help but note the irony. If memory serves me, 9/11 exposed the inability of our intelligence agencies to coordinate and communicate properly with one another. So what have we done in response to 9/11?

We've grown our intelligence infrastructure in a way that makes it even harder to coordinate and communicate.

Of course, we would tolerate a little bit of bloat if the evidence were clear that the system were working; but according to the Post's analysis, both the Fort Hood shooting and the Christmas Day bomber could have been intercepted early on if this bureaucracy hadn't been so unwieldy, so inefficient and unresponsive. The intelligence was there, but it never got into the right hands or it was lost in an avalanche of other data.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to protecting America, we are thinking big instead of thinking smart. There has to be a better way. We can have the intelligence capabilities we need at a fraction of the current cost, and we can use much of the savings on initiatives that attack terrorism at its roots—in places where despair and hopelessness lead people to turn to terrorism in the first place. We need to dramatically increase our investment in everything from agriculture to education to democracy-building to conflict resolution in the trouble spots of the world.

Maybe if we increased our global humanitarian outreach, if we empowered nations instead of invading and occupying them, then top secret America wouldn't even be necessary.

A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR PAUL COVERDELLE

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who was a champion from my home State of Georgia.

It has been 10 years this week since the passing of Senator Paul D. Coverdell, and I am proud to honor the life, the work, and the spirit of such an influential man today.

Described by his colleagues as a "soft-spoken workhorse," his strong passion for his country was shown throughout his distinguished public service in the United States Army, the Georgia State Senate, the United States Senate, and as Director of the Peace Corps.

Senator Coverdell was a devoted hard worker who was a pioneer for the conservative movement in Georgia. Some might say he was a "pillar of the community," but that is an understatement. He was the foundation upon which the pillars were built.

As a key figure in the establishment of a strong Republican Party in Georgia, he was the first Republican since Reconstruction to be reelected to the United States Senate. He was notorious for his ability to work on both sides of the aisle. He saw ways through the bitter partisanship, and he was one who was well-liked and respected by all of his colleagues.

Apart from being a brilliant man in his work, he was also a humble and

kind man, characteristics that helped in the advancement of the cause that he fought for. As a testament to his humble and gentle nature, I will share with you a story about Senator Coverdell and a special friendship that he developed that would change his life.

While vacationing in Maine in 1978, Senator Coverdell decided he would look up the former chairman of the Republican National Committee, George H. W. Bush. He simply found his address in a phone book. He went to his home. He knocked on his door and he introduced himself. He introduced himself to the man who would later become the President of the United States. The pair became the closest of friends over the next 14 years, and they helped each other in many different ways. When George H. W. Bush was elected President, Senator Coverdell sent him a letter that read, "If I can help, I'd like to help."

It was at this time that the 41st President then appointed Senator Coverdell as Director of the Peace Corps.

Five years after his death, at the dedication of the Paul D. Coverdell Center for Biomedical and Health Sciences at the University of Georgia, President Bush said of Paul Coverdell, "In the Washington world of bitter partisanship, Paul was, indeed, a voice of reason, always reaching out, always putting the good of the country first, always finding solutions where others may try to find blame or an issue to use as a political weapon. He was successful in bringing together people across the political aisle. I've heard it said that, to the end, Paul Coverdell was the great unifier, and so he was."

Senator Coverdell's legacy is particularly important to me as I am the first graduate of the Coverdell Leadership Institute to be elected to the United States Congress.

Senator Coverdell founded the Coverdell Leadership Institute to support the Republican Party in Georgia through the building of the farm team through the Republican Party. At the time, Georgia was not far removed from being a single-party State. No Republican had served as Governor since Reconstruction. Senator Coverdell began working with current and future Republican leaders, training them in the practical aspects of politics and government service to ensure that, going forward, there would be a bipartisan presence among Georgia elected officials.

Today, I am especially grateful to Senator Coverdell for starting this forward-looking program that continues to be relevant and impactful today, 10 years after the Senator's death. That is certainly a life to be proud of.

From the Paul D. Coverdell Center for Biomedical and Health Sciences at my alma mater, the University of Georgia, to the Paul D. Coverdell Peace Corps headquarters building here in Washington, D.C., to the Coverdell Leadership Institute, itself, and many

other honors in between, Senator Coverdell's great legacy lives on. I ask that his life be remembered today.

**HONORING THE LIFE OF
COUNCILMAN WILLIE COOK**

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

Mr. BRIGHT. Madam Speaker, on July 8, the city of Montgomery lost a great public servant. Councilman Willie Cook unexpectedly passed away after suffering a massive heart attack. He was only 53 years old.

Willie was not just a colleague; he was a trusted friend. Willie and I were first elected to office in the same year, 1999, and it was an honor to work in partnership with him to move our great city forward over the 9 years that we served together in the city government of our capital city of Montgomery, Alabama.

Willie was known to be a tireless advocate for those he represented in Council District 6. As the Montgomery Advertiser noted following his death, "Cook provided a strong public voice for his constituents and was an aggressive advocate for what he perceived as their best interests." I couldn't agree more.

Last Thursday, Willie was laid to rest at the Montgomery Memorial Cemetery after a memorial service at the convention center. Hundreds of friends, family, and admirers were in attendance to honor the life of a great city leader. It was a fitting way to pay tribute to someone as accomplished as Willie Cook.

My thoughts and prayers continue to be with his wife, Lorna; with his children Vaneka, Benito, and Christopher; with his five grandchildren; and with his parents, Willie Cook, Jr., and Daisy, as they continue to mourn the loss of their son, their husband, and their father.

Willie will surely be missed at our State capital, Montgomery, Alabama. He truly was a friend that I served with, and he made a big difference in our State capital. So I thank you for allowing me to honor his life today.

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

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

**FAIRNESS FOR SMALL
BUSINESSES**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, the Joint Economic Committee, which

I chair, has just issued the latest edition of our series of State-by-State snapshots of the economy. It notes that, in June, private sector employment grew in 32 States and the District of Columbia while the unemployment rate declined in 39 States and the District of Columbia. Yet the report also makes clear that our economic recovery is at a crossroads and still faces major challenges, in large part because of the staggering job losses caused by the policies of the prior administration.

You can see on this chart how a steady descent into a red valley of severe job loss began in December 2007. The red is the prior administration. The last month that the former President was in office, this country lost 790,000 jobs. The journey back up, under the Obama administration, began in early 2009 and coincided with the passage of the Recovery Act. As you can see, we have been trending in the right direction and gaining jobs these past few months.

□ 1650

It's not victory, but it certainly is movement in the right direction.

But as our report notes, even if the private sector was currently creating jobs at the rate of 217,000 jobs per month, as occurred during the Clinton administration, the highest sustained rate of job creation in our Nation's history, it will still take over 3 years to recreate the 8.5 million private sector jobs lost during the Great Recession.

The lingering high unemployment rates, particularly the long-term unemployment rate, suggest that targeted actions such as our recent extension of unemployment insurance benefits are sorely needed to support growth and provide a safety net for the millions of families hurt by the recession.

But there is still much more that Congress can and should do, particularly to help small businesses recover.

As Chairman Bernanke pointed out today, we need to find ways to provide small, credit-worthy businesses with additional lending, something that I have supported and the Democrats have supported from day one.

Small businesses and establishments, these small businesses are the backbone of the U.S. labor market. Seventy-five percent of working Americans are employed at businesses with fewer than 250 employees.

But a study earlier this year by the Joint Economic Committee found that, in the wake of the financial crisis, limited access to capital and credit continues; and it has a serious impact on small business hiring.

The tough credit standards that banks are now imposing, even on credit-worthy small businesses, have hamstrung their ability to expand and create jobs.

You can see the results of that in this chart, which the Joint Economic Committee prepared. And this chart looks

at the business hiring by mid- and large businesses, and compares it with the small business hiring, which is still in decline.

In most recoveries, it is small businesses that are the first to hire. But in this recovery, we see that it is the mid-sized and the large businesses that are hiring, and that small businesses are not hiring, so they do need more support and more help in this economy.

One additional thing we should do is ensure that small businesses are able to compete fairly for the Federal contracts for which they are qualified. And the Federal Government contracts out roughly \$435 billion every year. And under current law, Federal agencies are required to establish contracting goals with at least 23 percent of all government buying targeted to smaller firms, because they are the backbone; they hire the majority of Americans.

But according to an analysis prepared by the American Small Business League of Federal data, some of the "small businesses" that have been awarded Federal contracts under the provision for small business contracts include some of the largest companies in America. Boeing, Northrop Grumman, General Dynamics, Hewlett-Packard, AT&T and Rolls Royce. These are all extremely fine companies, but by no stretch of the imagination are these small companies.

That's why I urge my colleagues today to join me in supporting the Fairness and Transparency in Contracting Act of 2009, sponsored by my good friend and colleague, Congressman HENRY JOHNSON. H.R. 2568 would modify the definition of small businesses in the Small Business Act to include the requirement that no publicly traded company can qualify as a small business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRIGHT). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, may I request additional time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy the Chair is constrained, not to entertain, such a request. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mrs. MALONEY. Well, it would require the publication of a report; and, in short, it would require that small should actually mean small, and require fairness and transparency. So I urge my colleagues to join me in co-sponsoring this important bill.

**REPORT ON H.R. 5822, MILITARY
CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS,
AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2011**

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-559) on the bill (H.R. 5822) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for

other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Americans all over this country are

asking, Where are the jobs? Where are the jobs?

We just heard from the previous speaker bragging about the Recovery Act, which has been an abject failure, an abject failure. There have been very few private sector jobs created around this country.

What has been created are a lot of government jobs here in Washington, DC. If someone's looking for a job here in Washington, they have a lot of opportunities because government continues to grow exponentially. Exponentially. But what's not happening are jobs are not being created out in Georgia or around this country where they're so desperately needed, private sector jobs.

I was talking to one of my county commission chairmen just recently and he said, PAUL, 1 year ago in our country, the employment rate was 14.3 percent. I said, oh my goodness.

Of course, in my district we have a very poor district, except for the two major cities, Athens and Augusta, the Augusta area and the Athens area. And this is not one of those counties.

He said, a year ago the unemployment rate was 14.3. Now it's 10.7 percent officially. And I said, that is great. Hallelujah. Praise the Lord. Where'd the jobs come from?

He said, PAUL, there aren't any jobs. People have just gotten discouraged and quit looking. They've fallen off the unemployment roles. There are no new jobs here. We're losing jobs and our people in our county are leaving. They're just disgusted. They're disappointed. And that's what's happening all over this country.

□ 1700

How do I know that? Republicans a couple of months ago launched a Web site asking the American people to speak out. It's called AmericaSpeakingOut.com. And we are asking Americans to go on AmericaSpeakingOut.com to register—it's very simple, no cost—and to tell us what we should be doing here in Congress right now today not only to create jobs, but to get the economy back on track. How to deal with health care. How to deal with the issues that the American people are facing today. We are asking America to speak out.

You see, Mr. Speaker, we live in a republic. Representative government. And the only way we can continue representative government is if Representatives listen to the American people. And I've got a sad, sad thing to say—that the leadership in this House doesn't listen to the American people.

I will give you an example. When we were debating ObamaCare, three-fourths of America did not want that bill passed. Three-fourths of America said no to ObamaCare. Two-thirds today say—at least 60 percent or more—say repeal it. Repeal it. Our leadership here in the Democratic side didn't listen to the American people. President Obama didn't listen to the

American people. They forced down the throats of the American public a bill, which is now law, that was designed to fail. It's designed to fail, America.

Why do I say that? Because it was designed to push people off private health insurance, designed to push people into a what's now called a public exchange. And that's going to force people into more and more government. It's designed to lead us where the President just before ObamaCare was passed into law said that he wanted to go, where everybody in this country would be on one insurance policy. One pool is what he said. That means socialized medicine, where bureaucrats here in Washington, D.C., direct the health care for everybody in this country, to tell doctors like myself—I am a general practice medical doctor—how to practice medicine, who we can give care to, what medicines we can use, what tests we can do.

And in fact right now today, the Federal Government tells me or other physicians across this country whether we can admit a patient that's on Medicare to the hospital or not. It's not determined by the doctor or the patient; it's determined by a government bureaucrat that's not a doctor, not even a nurse or even a health care professional.

But more importantly, what is ObamaCare going to do? I spoke to just recently the head of a manufacturing entity in my district in rural north Georgia that hires over 400 people. And he said, PAUL, with the tax burden ObamaCare's going to put on me as a businessman, with all the big government programs, the stimulus bill and TARP bailouts and taking over of the private sector, he said, PAUL, I'm trying to find a place to move my company offshore, away from America.

Think about that, Mr. Speaker. If we continue down this road that this leadership and the Democrats are leading us down, that plant will close. Over 400 people in rural north Georgia will be put out of work. They're going to lose their jobs. And in fact, we knew that while we were discussing ObamaCare. We knew that it was estimated by experts that at least 5 million to 5.5 million Americans were going to lose their jobs strictly because of ObamaCare. And that has not changed. We must repeal it and replace it with something else.

I introduced a bill, H.R. 3889, comprehensive health care reform system, totally constitutional according to the original intent of the Constitution. Totally in the private sector. Would radically change healthcare financing. Would radically lower the cost of health insurance for everybody in this country. Would solve most of all of the problems with portability and uninsurability, et cetera. Would leave the doctor and patient in control of their health care decisions. It's 106 pages, a major piece of legislation, not almost 3,000 like ObamaCare was. And it's very simple. You can read it and understand what that bill says.

Our Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI, said we've got to pass ObamaCare to find out what's in it. Just the other day we heard about this financial reform bill that we've got to pass it to find out what's in it. The American people deserve more, Mr. Speaker. They deserve to know what's in a bill and deserve to know how it will affect them.

Mr. Speaker, we are killing jobs by bill after bill, by bigger government program by bigger government program. It's going to hurt our economy, destroy our economy. And we're borrowing from our children and our grandchildren's future.

Mr. Speaker, our children and grandchildren are very probably going to live at a lower standard than we live today if we don't stop this outrageous spending that's been going on ever since NANCY PELOSI has been Speaker of this House. And even more so since President Obama has been in office. It's got to stop. It's got to stop.

Now, I've done many America Speaking Out town hall meetings all over the 10th Congressional District in Georgia, just listening to my constituency. I have done these in small groups. We've done big town hall meetings. We've gone into factories and asked factories and companies to speak out and to tell us what we should be doing in Congress right now today. In fact, I went to the Coca-Cola plant in Athens, Georgia, and spoke to the employees there and asked them to speak to me, and encouraged them to go on AmericaSpeakingOut.com.

I did a town hall meeting in Columbia County in Evans, Georgia, and did the same thing. Did one in Athens, which is the most liberal county in my district. In fact politically, it's a speck of blue in a sea of red. It's a very Democratic county. It's where the University of Georgia is. It's a very liberal county. And I did an America Speaking Out town hall there. Invited the whole public to come, anybody who wanted to come, because I wanted to hear.

That's what America Speaking Out's all about. We want to hear what America thinks we should be dealing with here in Congress. And offer us suggestions of how to create jobs. We're asking where are the jobs? The policy that's being followed by the Democratic majority is taking away jobs. I already mentioned how ObamaCare is going to eventually put over 5 million Americans out of work, Mr. Speaker, just because of that one bill. The stimulus bill's going to put people out of work. It's put a few people to work, more government employees than private-sector employees.

But we're asking Americans to speak out, to go on AmericaSpeakingOut.com to tell us what we should be doing here in Congress today, to offer suggestions, to vote on suggestions that are already made or comments already made. Americans can make their own comment.

These are just some of the things that—these are sheets actually that

my staff wrote to suggestions of legislation that people in the 10th Congressional District of Georgia suggested that we do. No energy tax. Boy, if that energy tax—I call it tax-and-trade, my Democratic colleagues call it cap-and-trade—but it's about taxes. In fact, the President himself said that his energy tax, the tax-and-trade bill is necessary to fund ObamaCare. It's all about revenue.

The experts tell us that the national energy tax is not going to reduce carbon emissions worldwide. It's going to hurt our economy, and it's going to put millions of Americans out of work. And Americans understand that. And they said no to the energy tax. No to the finance bill that was just signed into law this week. Defund ObamaCare. No to socialized medicine. Repeal ObamaCare. Pass alternatives to health care reform.

I would love to see my bill, H.R. 3889, be put into place. In fact, I reintroduced it as a repeal ObamaCare to repeal all of this onerous bill, onerous law that's going to lead to socialized medicine here in the country, as the President has said that he wants to go to, and replace it with something in the private sector to maintain the doctor-patient relationship and to lower the cost of health care for everybody. Alternatives to health care reform.

□ 1710

Keeping bills germane. The American people have told me, even the liberals, in Athens, Georgia, "We need to have bills that are germane." In other words, we shouldn't tack onto bills things that aren't germane to those bills.

The House passed, and in fact we're waiting on the Senate amendments to the emergency appropriations for the war supplemental bill, a \$75 billion bill. Only \$33 billion of that \$75 billion have to do with the military and war supplemental. All the rest of that \$75 billion is bigger government programs, bigger spending, that the Democratic majority pushed through.

Americans—liberals, conservatives, independents, Republicans, Democrats—have told me, keep bills germane. No to cap-and-trade. I can go on down this list, but the overwhelming thing I heard, Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? What are we going to do to create jobs in the private sector?

And I've heard my Democratic colleagues just speak over and over again about how great this stimulus bill has been. It's been an abject failure. Where are the jobs, Mr. Speaker? Where are the jobs, Mr. President? Where are the jobs, my colleagues on the Democratic side? They're not there. In fact, the policies and the spending that we see going on over and over again from bill after bill since this President has taken office will actually take away jobs. And it's going to push jobs and manufacturers to go overseas.

I talked to one manufacturer and asked him, What can we do to get you

to start hiring employees? And he said the best thing you could do is lower my corporate income tax rate. My Democratic colleagues say that we need to tax the rich, so we need to keep those corporate tax rates high. Mr. Speaker, we have the second highest corporate tax rate in the world. It's 35 percent. Second only to Japan. In fact, I've talked to manufacturer after manufacturer and they tell me, "Paul, if you just lower my corporate tax rate to 25 percent, that would help me be able to create jobs in my company." Just lower it 10 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I think corporate tax rates should be zero. In fact, Mr. Speaker, not only should corporate rates be zero but dividend taxes should be zero. Death taxes should be zero. Capital gains taxes should be zero. We should have an immediate write-off of capital expenditure for business, not have this prolonged depreciation schedule that the Internal Revenue Code forces them into. They have to write the check; they should be able to write it off. If we could change just the tax law, we would create jobs. In fact, I introduced H.R. 4100, the JOBS Act. My JOBS Act is an acronym for Jumpstart Our Business Sector. What it would do is for 2 years, it would cut in half the payroll tax for business as well as for individuals. It would lower the corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 25 percent. It would suspend the death tax; suspend the dividend taxes for 2 years. And it would lower the two lowest income tax brackets down to 10 percent and 5 percent respectively.

And if you think about that, Mr. Speaker, what would that do from a monetary perspective? What it would do is it would leave dollars in the hands of small businesses and it would leave dollars in the hands of the American public; the consumers. That would give small businesses the opportunity to expand their business, to buy inventory, to modernize, to hire new employees. And it would give dollars to the consumers so that they could buy the goods and services that they need. It would give some stability to our economic situation so we don't see the stock market jumping up and down as we do today. It looks like a yo-yo. Why is that? Because there's so much uncertainty. And why is there uncertainty out there? It's because of what this Congress and what NANCY PELOSI and Company are doing right here and what Barack Obama is proposing for more and more government; more and more of the Federal Government taking over the private sector. That uncertainty is creating a lot of fear.

I've had businesses, small businesses, large businesses, in my district tell me they're sitting on cash but they're afraid to hire new employees. Why? Because of ObamaCare. Because of the debt. Because of the outrageous spending. Because of the so-called "financial reform bill" that was just signed into law this week. They're afraid, and I don't blame them. I've said in multiple

floor speeches here that we have a steamroller of socialism being driven by NANCY PELOSI, HARRY REID and fueled by Barack Obama. We need to put that steamroller of socialism in a parking lot. If we would do so, if we would put the steamroller of socialism that my Democratic colleagues are driving, if we would put that in a parking lot, we would put certainty back in the financial sector and we would see a growth in our economy. But with that uncertainty that our leadership of this House and the Senate and the President are giving to the private sector, we're going to see the business sector afraid; afraid to hire new people.

Some economists say we're fixing to go into a great depression. In fact, some even say we're going into a depression worse than we saw in the previous Great Depression. I hope and pray not. I pray that God prevents that. But whether we do or don't, I know this: The simple truth is bigger government, bigger government spending, more debt being created for our children and grandchildren to have to pay is not going to solve the economic problems of our country. We've got to stop the outrageous spending here that Congress has been doing, that this administration is doing, that the previous administration was doing.

I wasn't here during the first 6 years of the Bush administration. I was elected in 2007, is when I took office. But I voted against the TARP bill, the toxic asset relief program, because I thought it was wrong. It hasn't helped. The second tranche that President Obama forced through the Congress, it hasn't helped. Taking over GM and Chrysler hasn't helped. Taking over the student loan program; taking over the health care system hasn't helped. The stimulus bill has been an abject failure, by and large. The company that makes these huge signs to proclaim that Barack Obama and his policies are the messiah which costs Lord only knows how much has helped that company, but it hasn't helped the American taxpayer. It hasn't helped small businesses around this country by and large.

America Speaking Out gives the American people an opportunity to give us ideas about what they think, what America thinks about what we should be doing now to solve the problems. You see, I'm excited about the so-called "Tea Party movement" in this country. I've spoken to many Tea Party rallies. But, Mr. Speaker, there's a great misunderstanding, particularly in the press, particularly with my liberal friends, what the Tea Party is all about. We started a Tea Party Caucus just this week. I was one of the original signers of membership into the Tea Party Caucus. I've done a number of interviews. Just yesterday I did one on FOX. I just did one this afternoon. I've done many interviews recently. And it's very apparent to me and it's apparent to me to the questions that were asked during the news conference that

we held yesterday, after the Tea Party Caucus started, that there's a tremendous misunderstanding, particularly by my liberal colleagues and by the press, about what the Tea Party movement is all about. And I'm excited about it.

The Tea Party simply is this: It's freedom-loving Americans, people who just basically want to live their lives without all the government intrusion. They're teed off. Tea in the Tea Party stands for Taxed Enough Already. It's an acronym. And they see the so-called "jobs bill" that my Democratic colleagues keep bringing to the floor of the House. I've already mentioned my JOBS Act which is an acronym for Jump-start Our Business Sector. I believe every one of the so-called "jobs bills" that my Democratic colleagues have introduced is an acronym for just one big slush fund, because that's what it seems to be.

The American people are angry. They're angry about not being listened to. They're angry about seeing their freedom being taken away; their jobs being taken away. The previous speaker during the 5-minutes was touting how great the stimulus act has been, but it's not been great. They have to try to spin how disastrous the spending bill has been. It's not created very many jobs. It's created some, but not very many. And certainly not very many in the private sector.

The American people are asking, where are the jobs? When are we going to get this economy back on course? We've seen a liberal icon, my Democratic colleagues, one of their icons, one of this country's icons, John F. Kennedy, considered to be very liberal at the time.

□ 1720

Today they'd call him a wacko, a crazy man, because he proposed tax cuts.

I hear from my Democratic colleagues that they want to tax the rich, they want to tax them even more. Well, who are the rich? It's the small businesses of this country. Most small businessmen and women file their taxes as a Sub S corporation, which means they file their business taxes on personal income taxes.

My Democratic colleagues say they're making too much money. We want it here in Washington to create a bigger government, a bigger socialistic government. And what's that going to do? It's going to kill jobs. It's going to take jobs away from millions of Americans. And my Democratic colleagues want to tax small business to the hilt. They're not happy with the high tax rates that small business are already suffering from. They want more taxes on the so-called rich, the rich of the little mom-and-pop grocery stores, the little hardware stores, the small community businesses, men's stores. It's not the Wal*Marts, the AT&Ts, the Boeings. Those aren't small businesses.

But we have developed policy, and the policy of the Democratic majority

is anti-business, it's anti-freedom, it's anti-job creation. Why do they want to do that? It's because they believe, in my opinion, that government is the solution to everything. You see, they think, in my opinion, that government has to tell them how to run every aspect of their lives.

I'll give you some examples.

We've already seen where our Democratic colleagues want to tell us how much salt we can have in our food. I'm a physician, and I have prescribed low-salt diets to my patients. I don't use salt. I hardly ever pick up a salt shaker. I don't even salt watermelon or eggs when I eat those, or tomatoes. And I know as a physician we have plenty of salt for most of our bodily needs unless somebody has a particular reason that they lose salt in an abnormal way. Even athletes, for the most part, don't need salt. When I was playing football in high school, our coach would give us salt tablets. That was absolutely the wrong thing to do.

But my colleagues want to say they want to control salt in our food. They say they want to control what kind of light bulbs we can put—in fact, that's what they've done—what kind of light bulbs we can have in our lamps at home. They want to tell us what kind of cars we can drive, how much water comes out of our shower heads. They want to control every aspect of our lives, Mr. Speaker, every aspect.

There's a word for that, Mr. Speaker. That word is socialism. Central control from Washington, D.C. We have had a greater takeover of the private sector since Barack Obama's been the President of the United States than Hugo Chavez—we've had a greater takeover in the private sector in this administration than the communist dictator Hugo Chavez has nationalized the private sector in Venezuela. That's a shock to most people when you tell them that, but that's factual. We've had a greater takeover of the private sector under President Obama than Hugo Chavez has done in Venezuela.

It's got to stop. The American people are understanding that. They're sick and tired of it. They want their freedom back. They want their Nation back. They want their jobs back. They're asking where are the jobs, when are we going to put our economy back on the right track. That's what we're asking here as Republicans. We've got to stop this policy of bigger government and higher taxes, more intrusion in people's lives. And Mr. Speaker, that's all we've seen over and over again from the Democratic majority.

In fact, not all Democrats believe in that. I'll give you an example. During the debate on ObamaCare, I proposed—in fact, I wrote an op-ed along with Congressman DENT and Congressman SHADEGG—one's from Pennsylvania and one's from Arizona—challenging our Democratic colleagues to introduce a Democratic bill that I had the language for. All they had to do was write

the name of the sponsor in a blank and introduce it. It would be a Democratic bill. They could claim it to be ObamaCare.

It would do four things: cross-State-line purchases for businesses and individuals; number two, anybody in this country could join an association pool—all across the country, multiple associations—to have the opportunity to buy and own their own health insurance through the association; number three, to encourage States to set up high-risk pools to cover those who are uninsurable; and number four, to have tax fairness so that everybody in this country could deduct 100 percent of their health care and health insurance cost off their income taxes.

I had Democrat after Democrat tell me this: They said, PAUL, that makes sense. It really makes sense. But I can't do it. I can't do it because my leadership would punish me if I did. If I introduced that bill and tried to push it through the Democratic Caucus, my leadership would punish me for doing to so. I was told by Democrat after Democrat that they were focusing on only one thing, and that's ObamaCare as we know it.

The debate was over whether we were going to have a robust public option, a public option not so robust, or a public exchange. And that's what we wound up getting, which is actually "public option lite"—public option on a diet. All three of those are geared and guaranteed to force everybody in this country into a government-controlled health insurance program controlled from Washington, D.C.

The only bipartisan vote on ObamaCare was "no." We had Democrats and Republicans voting "no." Every Republican voted "no." Seventy-five percent of America said "no." But we have it now as law because Ms. PELOSI and the Democratic leadership are not listening to America. They're not listening to America when America says, Where are the jobs? We're doing that. I'm doing that.

I hold America Speaking Out town hall meetings. Republicans are going to be doing that all over this country during this August district work period. We want to hear from America. I encourage every American who is concerned about where we're going as a Nation, that's concerned about public policy—whether you're a Democrat or a Republican, Independent, whether you're a liberal or a conservative, whether you consider yourself a moderate—I'm encouraging everybody in this country to go to AmericaSpeakingOut.com and speak out. Give us your ideas about how to solve the problems, the economic problems. Give us your ideas about how to solve this unemployment problem.

□ 1730

I want to hear. That's the reason I've done many, I have even lost count, somewhere between 10 and 20 America Speaking Out town hall meetings and

meetings with small business and large groups over the last several months, and I will continue to do so. Republicans are doing that all over the country. I wish my Democratic colleagues would do the same thing and listen to the American public.

Since last August, our Democratic colleagues went and hid because of the ire of the American public, at least most of them did, a lot of them did. Some you can see that didn't, you can see the result on YouTube right now today, Mr. Speaker. There's a tremendous anger expressed all across this country to our Democratic colleagues about that bill.

I held town hall meetings last August in the 10th Congressional District in Georgia, multiple of them, and I was cheered because I was against ObamaCare. I was cheered. America has an opportunity to speak out now through americaspeakingout.com, but we need to change the policies, Mr. Speaker. We've got to stop this socialization, nationalization of our private sector. We've got to stimulate small businesses, and the only way we can do that is to give them the money they need to expand their business, to buy inventory. My jobs act, H.R. 4100, will do just that.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the American public that are watching right now will ask their Congressmen to cosponsor it. I ask my Democratic colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 4100, and let's make it a bipartisan jobs act, jump-start our business sector. The way I pay for all that is to take the unspent stimulus dollars to pay for the tax reduction. So it's paid for, won't create any more debt. It won't borrow from our children's and our grandchildren's future. It is a commonsense solution.

But that's not what we're getting from our Democratic colleagues. We're getting more government, more central control from Washington, bigger bureaucracy, higher taxes that are going to cost Americans jobs, send jobs overseas where people in the Philippines or in China or whatever are working and doing jobs that Americans could very well be doing. But Americans are not having the opportunity to do those jobs because the policies of NANCY PELOSI, Barack Obama, and HARRY REID are driving jobs offshore, driving jobs away from America. We've got to change those policies.

We do that through tax cuts. John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President Kennedy, cut taxes, and what happened when he did? We saw a tremendous growth of the economy. President Reagan did the same thing, tremendous growth of the economy. George W. Bush cut taxes, tremendous growth of the economy.

The leadership of the House right now, today, wants to see those tax cuts that were put in place during all the years of the Bush administration, wants to see them expire. That's going to kill more jobs here in this country,

and it's going to mean that farmers and small businesses are going to have to close down and sell their assets just to pay their higher taxes that are going to be required.

I'm told from some of my Democratic colleagues that there are many Democrats that don't want to see those tax cuts expire. There's some of our Democratic colleagues that understand that allowing those tax cuts to expire at the end of this year is going to cost jobs. So, again, the bipartisan approach to creating jobs is for us to at least keep those tax cuts because the jobs that are going to go away if those tax cuts expire won't go away. So we'll save jobs.

The President has a fondness to talk about the jobs he's created or saved. Well, nobody can know how many were saved. We've seen some kind of funny finance calculations or accounting here because I know of one instance, for instance, as an example, that one company got some stimulus funds and they gave everybody in their company raises. They didn't hire any new persons, not the first new employee. But the government counted every one of those increases in wages as a new job, as a new job. That's inane. It's disingenuous. It's deceptive. That's what we see over and over again.

We've got to stop that, Mr. Speaker. The American people deserve better, and I'm excited about the grassroots movement. If you want to call it the Tea Party movement, it's not just the Tea Party Patriots, Tea Party Express, Americans for Prosperity, FreedomWorks. I can go on and on about different groups, the 9/12 Group. There are many.

What my liberal colleagues and the press don't understand is that this is a grassroots organization, an effort, in all these organizations. It's not one monolithic thing. It is American citizens all over this country in their local communities that are speaking out. They're saying that they're taxed enough already. They see their jobs going away. They want to go to work. They see that the policies that we have been handed by Barack Obama and NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID, those policies are destroying jobs. They're putting millions of Americans out of work. And what they see is more of the same, and they don't want more of the same. They're taxed enough already. They want to see some changes. And I'm excited because I believe we're going to see some big changes in November, big changes on November 2.

See, Mr. Speaker, the most powerful political force in this country today is written about in the Constitution of the United States, and if you look at the document, if you look at the document itself, our Founding Fathers when they wrote the document, those three first words of the Constitution were bold and much, much larger, about four times larger, three or four times larger than all the rest of the text. What are those three words? "We the People."

We the people are speaking. They're saying, Where are the jobs? Republicans are saying, Where are the jobs? What I'm hearing from the leadership on the other side, from Ms. PELOSI and company, We're going to give you more government, more taxes, more government control, bigger government, more government jobs, but less in the private sector is what the bottom line's going to be.

Mr. Speaker, we've got to stop this. We've got to stop growing government and shrink it. We've got to stop this outrageous spending. We've got to repeal or replace ObamaCare with commonsense solutions that will maintain the quality of health care in this country, continue to allow the doctors and the patients to make decisions instead of some Washington bureaucrat, which is going to happen under ObamaCare.

We've got to stop bailing out Wall Street and start bailing out small businesses by giving them the money that they need by allowing them to do business and leave the dollars in their pockets. Mr. Speaker, that's what's going to create new jobs. That's what's going to put our economy back on track. That's what's going to solve this economic downturn.

I heard, when the President signed the financial reform bill—so-called, which it's not. It puts in place permanent bailouts for Wall Street. It's going to hurt Main Street banks, the community banks. It's going to create bigger bureaucracy, more government jobs.

□ 1740

It is going to make it more difficult for small businesses to go to their local banker and get a loan.

The President, my liberal colleagues, blamed a lack of financial regulations on the economic downturn, but that is not what caused the economic downturn. They are blind. They want to blame, as the previous speaker to me just blamed, the Bush administration. That is what I keep hearing. It is all Bush's fault. When are they going to take time?

Mr. Speaker, when is Ms. PELOSI going to take responsibility? When is Barack Obama going to take responsibility for the disastrous, disastrous policies that they are forcing down the throats of the American people? It is past time for them to take responsibility, but they are not doing it.

They are blaming the Bush administration. What caused the financial collapse was the government. It is the Community Reinvestment Act, Freddy and Fannie, poor Fed policy.

There is some blame on Wall Street, absolutely. There is some blame, even in Main Street, Main Street banks. Greed is part of the cause of that, but it was policy that was established by Congress under the Carter administration with the Community Reinvestment Act, then a reform, so-called reform, which essentially forced banks to make loans to people who couldn't pay it back.

Then we have Freddie and Fannie who would buy off those loans, poor Fed policy, that kept the interest rates low so that Freddie and Fannie could set up these no-documentation or low-documentation loans. That is what created the bubble and the burst.

So it is government. Mr. Speaker, the best way to control quantity, quality and cost of all goods and services is a free enterprise system, unencumbered by taxes and regulations. You have two things. On the one hand you have government control, socialism. On the other hand you have the free market system, and the free market system will create jobs if we will allow it to do so.

That is not what we are getting. We are getting bigger government, which is going to kill jobs. We need to stop that, Mr. Speaker. We need to create what has made this country so rich, so powerful, so successful as a political experiment in all of history. We have got to go back to those foundational principles, those foundational principles that are expressed in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the governing force in the Constitution of the United States, as it was intended.

Psalm 11, God asked a question He says, if foundation should be destroyed, what are the righteous to do? God goes on talking about that He is sovereign and He reigns.

But how does He reign in public policy? How does He reign in this country? Well, certainly our Creator reigns supernaturally, but He also reigns through those of us who know Him as Lord and Savior, those of us who look to our Creator for direction, those of us who look to the Judeo-Christian principles that our Founding Fathers held so firmly. And those principles are based on personal responsibility and accountability. Those principles are based on the free market system, on free enterprise, where people have the ability and opportunity to succeed.

But they also have an opportunity to fail. Without an opportunity to fail, you don't have an opportunity to succeed. We see class warfare by our Democratic colleagues, where they hate the rich. They want to tax them to the hilt. They want to have a redistribution of wealth, as President Obama keeps talking about.

But what is he saying? He is saying that he knows how to run everything in human endeavor. That is what the leadership here believes. They believe in central planning. They believe government knows best. They believe that government should tell us what to eat, what car to drive, and how to live our lives and what kind of health care we can have.

Those policies destroy the free market, destroy small business. We see examples all over the world. Socialism has never worked, never will work, and I don't care whose socialism it is, whether it is Stalin's, Mao Zedong's, Castro's, Hugo Chavez's or Barack

Obama's. It is not going to work; it never will work.

We have got to stop it, and it is up to the American people to stop it. The American people need to speak out. Go on americaspeakingout.com. Demand from your Congressman, your Senator, that we stop this inane policy of creating bigger government, higher taxes, more regulation, more government, more control from Washington.

Say "no" to all of that and say "yes" to tax cuts, to the free market system, to freedom. They want socialism. I want freedom. America wants freedom. We have got to demand it, Mr. Speaker, and it is up to the American people to do so. America can speak out, can speak out to my Democrat colleagues, can speak out to the President, can speak out to their Senators, speak out by going on americaspeakingout.com. Demand policy that's going to create jobs.

I see I have been joined by my great friend and an excellent Member of this body and the Republican Conference, my good friend, STEVE SCALISE from New Orleans, Louisiana. He knows about this inane, disastrous policy that this administration has put in place, how it has killed jobs in Louisiana throughout the gulf coast, directly as well as indirectly.

Mr. SCALISE, thanks for joining us.

Mr. SCALISE, I want to thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding and for talking about this important issue.

When we talk about jobs, today we had a long debate here on the House floor about unemployment. And, of course, if you look at what's been happening this last year and a half, the policies that have been brought forward by this President and by this leadership here and the people that are running this Congress, these policies have been creating a lot of the unemployment we have today; and you look, since the stimulus bill passed a year and a half ago that you and I opposed because we knew that it would be doing nothing other than growing the size of government, \$787 billion of money that we didn't have, that was not only spent to grow the size of government, but the President said it had to be spent to keep unemployment from breaking 8 percent.

Of course, now we are approaching 10 percent unemployment after that bill, after that massive amount of debt dumped onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. And then we look at more and more policies that have been coming since then that are eroding, eroding the economic base of this country.

Of course, we are experiencing some very direct consequences firsthand in our State of Louisiana because of the President's ill-advised moratorium on energy exploration. The President came up with this plan after the explosion of the Deepwater Horizon tragic event that was both a human tragedy and now an environmental tragedy,

which the President still to this day is not doing his job under the law in helping direct the effort to keep the oil off our marsh, which our local leaders are battling to do every day.

Unfortunately, our local leaders tell us—and I have spoken to them. Anybody who speaks to them will tell you they are spending more of their time fighting the Federal Government than fighting the oil. But the biggest insult lately has been this moratorium because the moratorium, first of all, was actually opposed by the scientists and experts that the President put together after the explosion of that oil rig.

They were tasked by the President to come up with a 30-day report on safety improvements. They actually came back with that 30-day report, and they made some good safety recommendations that I support. But the other thing they said was they opposed the moratorium on drilling that the President came out with.

So when the President gets this report, he doesn't agree with it because for political reasons he wants to go and ban drilling, so he just discarded the science and trumped it with politics. Not only did they say in that report that they were opposed to the moratorium. I have spoken to a few of those scientists and experts and they said, they lay out a good case why the moratorium imposed by the President actually reduces safety in the gulf.

So here you have got a double whammy kicking people when they are down. The people of south Louisiana are down, and yet the President who is supposed to be helping us is coming up with policies that are hurting the people of south Louisiana. Then this moratorium, not only does it go against the safety recommendations of his own scientific experts, but it actually now is costing us thousands of jobs.

□ 1750

There was an unemployment debate going on in this House today. Well, one of the reasons we've got unemployment is because of the President's policies. He should rescind that moratorium. A Federal court twice now told him to rescind it, and he refuses to do so. He refuses to listen to his own scientific experts who say it actually reduces safety in the gulf because you lose your most experienced crews. You actually increase our dependence on foreign oil, and it's imported by tankers. And 70 percent of all the oil spills occur on tankers. So now the President has increased the likelihood for future spills in the gulf with his moratorium that's running more jobs out of our country. And I yield back.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. SCALISE, I appreciate that. And not only is it killing jobs, but it's going to make everybody's gasoline go up. It's going to make electricity prices go up.

I said here on the floor in a speech that the President's energy tax, cap and tax—or cap and trade, as they call it, some call it cap-and-tax, I call it

tax and trade because it's all about taxes—is going to hurt the most vulnerable people here in America. It's going to hurt the poor people. It's going to hurt the seniors who are on limited income more than anybody else. And it seems to me that this disastrous economic as well as environmental disaster that has happened in the gulf is being utilized by this President to try to force his energy policy, his tax and trade bill.

I've been criticized by the liberals around the country because I've said it's going to hurt the poorest people in this country, and it will. In fact, the President himself said, "It will necessarily make electricity prices skyrocket," make electricity prices skyrocket, necessarily, that's what the President said about the energy tax. It would necessarily make electricity prices skyrocket. Who's going to have the hardest time paying their electric bill? The poor folks in America, those people on limited income, the senior citizens, who can least afford to have their gasoline go up, to have their electricity go up. It's going to be disastrous. And it's going to kill jobs.

In fact, the President talks about all the green jobs that are going to be produced. Spain put in a similar type of tax, a similar kind of policy in Spain, and it did produce green jobs. But Mr. Speaker, for every green job produced I think it was 2.3 jobs were lost, a net loss of 2.3 jobs for every job that was created. For every green job that was created, every green job created they lost 2.3 jobs. And that's what our President wants to force on the American public.

I'm wondering whether he's closing down exploration in the gulf just to try to force through his energy tax. I don't know. But I've had people, as I've listened at my America Speaking Out town hall meetings I've had people across my district say that they wonder about that. I was doing an America Speaking Out town hall meeting in Athens, Georgia and a lady got up and she said she wanted to see all new energy exploration stopped, all new drilling for energy and gas to stop in this country. We had about 100 people there. I said, okay, let's find out what everybody else thinks. Now, mind you this is the most liberal county in my district, very Democratic. I didn't carry it as a Republican in any of my elections when there was a Democrat and Republican on the ballot. I did carry it in the special election when I was first elected, but not since. And I asked the public, we invited the general public, I said, how many of you in this audience want to see us stop any new exploration of oil and gas? Eight people held up their hands. Then I said, how many of you want to see us lift the moratorium and start back to exploring and tapping into our own resources here in America and continue drilling for oil and gas and continue developing our own natural resources our own energy sources? Everybody else. I think we

had a total of 98 folks, so 90 people held up their hands that they wanted to see it continue, eight people said they wanted to see it stopped.

Over and over again I've talked during this special hour about how the leadership—Ms. PELOSI and company—have gone against what the American people want. They want to see jobs created. We asked them, where are the jobs? They want to see their economy stimulated, not government. We asked them that.

Mr. SCALISE, I know that you've seen the disaster of the moratorium on the jobs in Louisiana, but it affects all the Gulf Coast States certainly, not only directly, but indirectly. In just the few minutes we have left, could you give us some examples of some of those non-directly affected people, the fishermen, the people on the platforms, et cetera, could you give us some examples of those people who have been affected by this moratorium?

Mr. SCALISE. Sure, I would be happy to share that with my colleague from Georgia.

Of course Speaker PELOSI earlier today, during the debate, she actually said that unemployment creates jobs. Now, the logic of that I don't think anybody can understand, but that's what her statement was.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Real quickly, the people I talk to don't want an unemployment check, they want a paycheck. And I yield back.

Mr. SCALISE. And that's exactly what the people in the gulf want. The people don't want an unemployment check, they want jobs. They've got good jobs, and they're being taken away by the President. And what they've said is keep this industry going, let's do it safely. And there are good outlines of how to do it safely. In fact, most of the companies out there in the gulf in even deeper waters than BP weren't cutting corners, weren't doing things the wrong way. They were doing everything safe, and they were shut down. BP is the only one out there drilling right now.

If you listened, we had tragic testimony from two of the widows who lost their husbands in that explosion in the committee I serve on. And both of them said it's tragic what happened. The rules should have been enforced that weren't enforced, the safety rules should have been followed. But they said don't shut down this industry, it's our way of life. We know it can be done safely. You need to insist that those rules are enforced, which they weren't. Don't shut down the industry.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? We need to have different policies to create jobs than what we've been given by Ms. PELOSI and company.

I yield back.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

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

60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will claim the time on behalf of the Progressive Caucus tonight to bring a progressive vision about our great country.

My friend poses the question, where are the jobs? That's a good question coming from the Republican Caucus because they're the ones who destroyed the jobs. The fact is, the Democratic Caucus has been rebuilding jobs, and I have proof.

Now, if you look at this graph, very simple graph, what it shows is—the red is under the Bush administration, under the Republican Caucus. And as you can see, December of 2007 we see a steady decline in the number of jobs with the Bush administration. The Bush administration, because of policies of not regulating Wall Street, because of allowing the industry just to run wild, because of tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans, because of deficit spending—they paid for two wars—a giveaway to the pharmaceutical industry, and massive tax cuts—over \$700 billion in tax cuts which they never paid for—we saw a decline in American jobs. And then when the Obama administration comes in, we see ourselves digging out of this hole. It's slow, it's tough, it's very, very tough to come out and clean things up after the Republican Caucus has been in power. You know, the toughest job in the circus is cleaning up after the elephants. But the fact is that you see the Obama administration and the Democratic Caucus digging us out of this recession.

Private-sector jobs have increased for 6 straight months. Where are the jobs? Well, the Republicans should know where the jobs were; they're the ones who said we favor the rich over everyone else, we favor the privileged, the comfortable over everyone else. The working people have to go figure out what they're going to do because we're in it for the wealthy.

□ 1800

The fact is the Democratic Caucus is helping to pull our country out of this situation. Again, it was proven on the House floor today, Mr. Speaker, because today what we saw on the House floor were the Democrats who moved to pass the unemployment insurance extension. Our Republican colleagues, our friends in the party opposite, despite all of their highest pronouncements, said “no” to the American people who are in dire straits.

What kind of heart is that?

You know, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk a little bit about our economy today, but I think more of what we're talking about today are values and who values what. We are talking about values—the value of how you rate one kind of person versus another.

The Republican Caucus says they're for tax cuts. We heard my friend in the party opposite say a little while ago he is for tax cuts. I find the gentleman a

fine person and a pleasure to work with personally, but we couldn't disagree more when it comes to economic policy. He says he likes tax cuts—not when it comes to working people's tax cuts.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act gave tax cuts to 95 percent of Americans. Ninety-five percent of Americans got tax cuts under the Recovery Act. Guess how many Republicans voted for it? Zero percent.

They don't like tax cuts for working people, only for really, really rich people. The reason is that they believe the rich folks who get all of the tax cuts are going to use those tax cuts, you know, after they've bought enough yachts and enough houses and enough Tiffany watches and stuff like that. They might just use some of it to, maybe, invest in a factory or something. That's what they think is going to happen. It never happens that way, but that's what they think is going to happen. It's called “trickle down.” There is even a name for this kind of economics that the Republican Caucus is so very in love with.

They talk about John F. Kennedy. It's amazing to hear these guys talk about how much they love John F. Kennedy because of tax cuts. Look, the Democratic Caucus is not anti tax cuts. It is important for the American people to know we're not against tax cuts. If tax cuts to the middle class will help stimulate the economy, we will do it. We have done it. We couldn't get any support from them when we did do it, but the fact is this is another sort of distortion that our colleagues are just absolutely committed to telling the American people—that Democrats don't like tax cuts. Yeah, we're fine with tax cuts, but we want fair tax cuts. We want tax cuts that actually stimulate the economy.

Here is an economic lesson for you:

If you want to stimulate the economy, do you give a tax cut to the people who need the money and who will take it and then buy things with it? Then at the stores where they bought them, there will be business at those stores, and at those stores, the people who work there will see some revenue coming into the stores, and the owners of the stores will be able to, therefore, continue keeping people on the payroll.

On the other hand, do you give the money to people who don't need it, who are wealthy by all definition, who can just let that money sit there or buy luxury items that they really don't need? Maybe they'll just go out and buy up other companies—mergers and acquisitions—stuff like that.

The fact is, if you want to stimulate the economy, you give a tax cut to the middle class and to the working class, not to the very rich people. That's what the Democrats did. That's what the Republicans absolutely oppose. That's what they are against. The fact is it is wrong. It is incorrect. It is bad policy. You would think they would know better. The Republicans are just

not good at economics. They are good at other things, but economics they're not so good at.

During the time that the Republican Caucus was in control, you know, they cut taxes and gave us the biggest deficit this country has seen. Yet, when they came into office, they inherited one of the biggest surpluses we have seen. Yes, it's true. Bill Clinton left the Republican Caucus a surplus. They came in well above the water, and they handed things over well below.

The American people don't have short memories. We remember 2006. Do they think we forgot? Do they think we forgot who would not regulate predatory loans? The American people know that the House, the Senate, and the White House were controlled by the Republicans from 2000 to 2006 as the American people were being preyed upon by unscrupulous lenders who were pushing loans on them, deceiving them, tricking them into deceptive practices in lending, which really set the stage for the recession that we are in. As soon as they couldn't refinance their homes again, they couldn't afford those mortgages as they ballooned upward, we began to see the foreclosure crisis. That's what happened, but our friends who don't like regulation say, Give us the wheel back.

Interesting.

Now, as I said, I respect my colleagues. I think they are good people. The question is not who is a nice guy and who isn't. That is not the issue, but here is a fact for you. Here is a quote from Congressman PETE SESSIONS, a Republican from Texas.

This is a question from David Gregory, the journalist. David Gregory: I think what a lot of people want to know is, if Republicans do get back in power, what are they going to do?

You hear these guys in the party opposite, Oh, give us back the reins of power. Let us be in the majority. Let us rule this place. We know what to do.

They act like they have the answers.

Well, one of their caucus leaders says: We need to go back to the exact same agenda.

Really? Oh, my goodness. Do you mean to tell me we need to go back to some more wars that we don't pay for? Do you mean that we need to get back into another Iraq? They're actually looking for another Iraq right now. Another Iraq? \$10 billion a month that war cost us, and they offered us reasons to go, and none of them were true. So, literally, 4,500 young people later—Americans later—and \$1 trillion later, that is what their war in Iraq has given us—disaster. It was absolutely the worst foreign policy failure in American history.

More of the same? Oh, my goodness. We're going to have a pharmaceutical giveaway to the tune of \$400 billion. Again? That's their answer to health care. As they stand up here and talk about ObamaCare and as they beat on the health care bill, do you know that Americans are benefiting from the

health care bill already, and yet they want us to go back to the time before health care reform when 56 percent of all bankruptcy filings were from people who were suffering the load of medical debt? This is what they want the American people to go back to.

My friend from Texas says: We need to go back to the exact same agenda.

Oh, no. It's just better to keep the Republican Caucus over there, in the minority, complaining about everything that we do, without helping at all, but at least they can't do much harm if they're not in the majority.

David Gregory asked: I think what a lot of people want to know is, if the Republicans do get back into power, what are they going to do?

You heard it right from their caucus leadership: More of the same.

Why were the Republicans literally thrown out of office in 2006? Why were they tossed out? Why did the American people chase them out? Because of their absolute failure on every measure of governance.

Now, you shouldn't be surprised that the Republicans are bad at governing. They don't like government. They have nothing good to say about it. They think government is the problem, and of course, it's hard to be good at anything you don't believe in in principle. So they're not good at governing. They might be good at other things. I think, a few years in the past, they had a pretty good congressional baseball team, but when it comes to governing, they're just not very good at it. The proof is, whenever they're in power, we have failure in government.

If you wonder what they're doing, we need to go back to more of the same agenda. I am so grateful for my friend from Texas' candor because he has pretty much told us what we have to expect. See, the Republican Caucus, they try to argue that they should be running things. All they want to do is shine the light on the Democratic Caucus and on President Obama and ask, Did President Obama and the Democrats create heaven on Earth within 2 years? That's what they want the American people to ask. Did they create heaven on Earth in 2 years? If they didn't, then let us run it.

But you know what? That is not what's at stake. It is either the Democrats' working out the problems and the failures of their leadership or the Republicans, who created the failure in the first place.

Imagine somebody who is out in the middle of a loch, drowning. A lifeguard swims out there to grab him, holds onto him and pushes him in, and then has to push on his chest to get him back in shape.

Then the person who failed to save the other person, the other lifeguard who sat around and didn't do the right thing, says, You're pushing too hard.

I say, Wait a minute, man. I'm over here, trying to save a life that you almost lost, and you're over here, confused about how it's being done.

The fact of the matter is the Democratic Caucus is investing in Americans, in green energy, in human capital. It is investing in our infrastructure. It is investing in small business, and we are slowly seeing ourselves climb back to the America that we knew before the Bush era as we see jobs going in this upward direction—clear and unmistakable progress.

□ 1810

A similar graph that I would like to show you, that goes to show how Democrats, despite difficult circumstances, because the Republicans have done massive damage to the economy, are bringing things back is this one. This graph shows net change in private payroll employment between 2004 and 2010. And this is thousands of jobs, so just add a couple of zeros after you see these 200, 400, just add a couple of, three more zeros. You see things really plummet because of the Republicans, and now you see Democrats pulling the economy back in shape, and we're back up to where we should be going. So that's a little bit.

Now, here's another fact I think is important for the American people to know. The economy has been picking up. In fact, this graph shows that after-tax profits in billions, the property insurance after-tax profits in billions. Profitability has been going up, going up.

The fact is that American GDP has been increasing. American gross domestic product has been increasing. The economy is starting to pick up. Unemployment is still unacceptably high. More has got to be done. I want to talk about that in a minute. But the fact is that things are headed in the right direction.

So when you hear Republicans stand up and complain about what Democrats are doing, and all they're doing is complaining about what we're doing, you should look at the numbers. The numbers are going in the right direction. The jobs are being added. Gross domestic product has been increasing, and we see the economy going in the proper direction.

It's Republican support for special interests, Republican support to the most privileged and wealthy, the Republican support for all of these types of special interest things that has landed us in this problem; and it is Democratic resolve, along with the will of the American people, that is getting us back into the right spot.

Should we go back? Absolutely not.

Now, my friend in the party opposite, before he gave up the microphone, he said something that really must be challenged. You might have heard him say, oh, you know what, if the tax cuts expire, if the Bush tax cuts expire, then what's going to happen is that the farmers are going to have to sell their farms in order to pay the taxes. You heard him say that. He said, Mr. BROWN, fine man, but we just disagree bitterly on the issues.

He said that if the Bush tax cuts are not extended, or if they're allowed to expire, then farmers will have to sell their farms to pay payroll taxes.

Now, you know, this is the whole debate about the estate tax. And it's very important to remember that the Republicans argued this thing before, and they were challenged. The reporters, smart reporters said, okay, you guys are talking about saving the family farm, because it's always about poor people and the family farm. That's always why they say they do what they do, but it never really is.

But the fact is that they were challenged. Find one family farm that has been taken away for taxes. They couldn't find one because it just isn't so.

These Bush tax cuts, the ones that help the middle class, the Democratic Caucus, we believe, need to be saved. The ones that only benefit the well-to-do and the rich folks who've benefited so much by being in this great country, we think they ought to be allowed to expire and go back to rates that were quite similar to what they were during the Clinton days. It makes sense to me, and I think it's what we should do.

Now, I just want to talk a little bit about unemployment insurance extension. It's an important issue. Today the House passed the Senate amendments to H.R. 4213, the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act, and this emergency legislation will extend unemployment insurance benefits to millions of American families, 2.5 million, in fact. This is an important piece of legislation, and now it's on its way to the President's office.

Now, I reemphasize that it's emergency legislation. Because it's emergency legislation, it's not set off, we don't have to find a pay-for in the budget. We basically find the money, even if we have to borrow it to make sure that Americans have the money they need to make ends meet.

This is money, this is money that will go to groceries. It will go to buying eggs, it will go to buying bread, it will go to buying oatmeal. It will go to buying cereal. It will buy toilet paper, basic household items. That's what people do with their unemployment insurance money. That's what they do with it. That's what folks do.

And it's amazing to me that my Republican colleagues would say that, no, it should be set off, because the fact is they didn't want to set off all of that money, they didn't want to set off all that money they gave away during the Bush tax cuts, over \$700 billion, plus another \$400 billion for the big prescription drug giveaway to Pharma, plus two wars that they didn't want to pay for.

But now, when people are in an emergency situation, people are having to live with family, people are facing foreclosure, people are facing bankruptcy, people are in real trouble when they're out of work and their unemployment runs out, now our friends say, no, we

can't open up the wallet. We've got to worry about the deficit. You know, we can't help you.

This is an amazing thing. It's an emergency for people out there, and so we should act accordingly.

Republicans have blocked this bill for more than 7 weeks. They have literally stood in the way. In fact, this bill could have been done earlier this week, but the Senate Republican delay tactics stopped it, up until we're able to pass it today.

Republicans have blocked this bill for 7 weeks, causing an estimated 2.5 million Americans—actually, it's more than that. Congresswoman DONNA EDWARDS has it to the person, and she's got a Web site that tabulates it to the individual person. Families.

And the fact is that it's more than 2.5 million families to lose their lifeline that they have earned through their work during their economic work years.

It's important to bear in mind that unemployment insurance is insurance. It's not a giveaway. It's not a hand out.

And it is galling and appalling and downright insensitive and insulting for anyone to imply that people who receive unemployment insurance are lazy. Yet, you have heard people in the party opposite say that folks just don't want to work and they're just sitting up and not really trying to find a job. That is really ridiculous.

There are five people applying for every one job. There's not enough jobs. We're trying to create more. The unemployment rate is unacceptably high. Democrats are committed to chopping that rate way down.

But the fact is that until we're able to do that, we need real support, and folks need to get in there and get some unemployment benefits so they can make it.

□ 1820

The bill, which is virtually identical to the one the House passed, the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Act, would extend emergency unemployment compensation and extend benefits for programs through November 30, 2010. So it's a short reprieve. I mean it's unfortunate, but folks will benefit from the short period of time of the help.

Now, unemployment benefits have periods of time, some longer, some shorter. But there are a lot of people who will benefit because benefits will be retroactively restored to people who started losing their benefits at the end of May. They will be retroactively restored. Important to point out as the Republicans are saying, yes, we gave all of our friends buckets and buckets of money, but we've got nothing for you, Sam and Jane and your two kids, we can't help you. You lost your job. Good luck. Can't do any deficit spending, you know.

But the fact is that these folks, some of them have been worried what are they going to do because they have

been without these benefits since May. Now they are going to be retroactively restored. Very important. Very, very pleased to be able to report that.

Republicans continue to fight for hundreds of billions of dollars in deficit-busting tax cuts. The Bush tax cuts were never paid for, and yet they want to oppose us extending unemployment insurance benefits to hard-working Americans.

The fact is that unemployment insurance benefits really are something that help to stimulate the economy. It's not the best way to do it; having a job is. That's obvious. But every dollar in unemployment benefits creates at least \$1.61 in economic activity. So every \$1 in unemployment benefits, \$1.61 goes into our economy. That's a lot of money. It's obvious why. Let's just say somebody has no money. They are going to a food shelter. They are not getting anything at all. They are surviving on the charity of others, or the best they can. But if they have unemployment insurance benefits, which they earned because they worked, then they have money to go to the store and they buy something. And at the store, that then helps stimulate the economy because you are spending a real source of revenue with somebody, which helps them maintain and add to their employment rolls.

This is a very important fact. We should know about it. And this is something that chief economist Mark Zandi, who is a pretty conservative guy himself, had to say before the House Budget Committee back on September 1. "The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has found extending unemployment benefits to be one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to stimulate the economy, creating, they said, up to \$1.90 in economic activity for every dollar." So Mark Zandi says \$1.61, the Congressional Budget Office says \$1.90. The fact is these things are hard to know with exact specificity, but the reality is that both agree, there is a consensus among economic experts that unemployment insurance benefits benefit the economy as a whole.

Unemployment benefits were responsible for creating 1.1 million jobs since the recession started, and adding 1.7 percent to the gross domestic product of our country. Unemployment insurance benefits has a stimulative effect on the economy. There's no doubt about it. So the Republican Caucus trying to stop it really is dangerous to the economy. Not only to the individual family, not just to Jane and Sam and their two kids, who are unemployed and need those benefits, but also to all of us as a whole.

And let me just explain one reason why. Our economy is one where corporate profits, as I just pointed out before, have been up in the first quarter of 2010, up about 43 percent. There's a lot of firms that are sitting on cash. They have money. But they haven't really added to their payrolls. Why?

Because they're nervous. The consumer demand is still weak. Consumer demand is not robust and strong. They're not really seeing the volume in sales that they've seen in the past because consumer demand is weak.

Now, if our Republicans had their way what they would do is take unemployment benefits from people, which would then do what to demand? Lower it. Which would then make the firms think what? Oh, my God, I really got to sit on this cash because I just don't know what's going to happen next. So unemployment benefits have the effect of priming the pump, of getting the economy stimulated and moving. And not having them not only creates a crisis for an individual family, but even worse than that, it creates a crisis for the economy because firms who have cash and are looking to add people but who are cautious and nervous are thinking, hey, you know, sales volume has gone down, I better not spend this money to add on more workers. It's very important to understand that psychology and economics are tightly tied together.

Most employers, by the way, particularly small employers, are very, very reluctant to want to lay people off. I mean it's always said for any employer with a heart—and most of them have them. They are people. They don't want to lay anybody off. But when they do, it's tough. And it's nothing you want to go back to. So you want to be real confident that you can sustain those extra workers before you add on more people. This has to do with consumer confidence, which has to do with things like unemployment insurance. And therefore, my point is that you need—not only is it a crisis for the individual family when you don't extend those benefits, it is a crisis for our economy because it undermines confidence and consumer demand, which our economy needs.

So, I think it's important that the American people know this and they know that when the Republicans, particularly the ones who are always, you know, acting really religious and more holy than everybody else, they're voting against unemployment insurance, that's really kind of a head scratcher to me.

Anyway, today there are 15 million people out of work who got an extension of unemployment benefits. Today 15 million people, 15 million people out of work got an extension of unemployment benefits, which contribute to paying mortgages, health care bills, utility bills, food costs, eggs, groceries, cereal for the kids.

The Democrats' unemployment bill provides up to—and it is the Democrats' unemployment bill, by the way. Republicans want no part of it. They don't want to be part of the unemployment bill. So it gets to be our bill. We would love to share it, but they didn't want any. The Democratic unemployment bill provides up to 99 weekly unemployment checks averaging about

\$300 to people whose 26 weeks of State-paid benefits have run out. The benefits would be extended through the end of November 30. November 30, as I said.

In the new Washington Post-ABC News poll that was released just a few days ago, more than 6 in 10 Americans, 62 percent, support Congress's action to extend unemployment benefits for jobless workers. Now, 62 percent is a lot. That's a very healthy, strong majority of Americans. And I daresay, you know, I'm glad I voted for the bill, because I wouldn't want to go back to my constituents, unemployed people, and say I know you needed help, but I wasn't there for you. Sorry.

Earlier this month the House passed the Restoration of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act to restore and extend emergency unemployment benefits. That was passed again today, and now it's off to the President. Eighty-three percent of Republicans opposed the bill. Eighty-three percent of the Republicans said we can't do anything for you, Sam and Jane. You are on your own. If you are well to do and need a tax cut, then we can talk. But if you are not rich, we really, really don't have any time to help you out. We've got to worry about the deficit. Not that we have to worry about the deficit if you are part of the top 1 percent. But if you're not, then we've got a deficit, and we can't help you out.

The analysis of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, as I mentioned before, suggests that extending unemployment benefits is one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to get the economy moving again. It's something that we've got to do, and it's something that we need to do right away to make sure that our economy is strong, and make sure that Americans are getting back to work. Very important. And I'm so glad we are here to talk about it.

Now, one of the things that my Republican friends like to say is that they only want private jobs, they don't want public jobs. But I want to bust that myth up for folks tonight, Mr. Speaker, because public jobs are important jobs. Are they saying they don't like police? Are they saying they are against teachers? Are they saying that they don't want anybody to fix the roads? And the potholes all over the place, just fine? Are they saying they don't want people to fix the bridges and they don't think that these bridges need to be painted so they don't get corrosion? And they don't think those gusset plates holding those bridges up need to be replaced so they don't fall down like they did in my State of Minnesota? I just don't understand what they mean when they start attacking public jobs.

I actually have to confess to you, Mr. Speaker, that I resent it when they attack public workers. I think public workers do great work. I think public workers do a great service for the American people. When I had a break-

in at my house, I called a public worker, also known as a police officer, and that officer came to my house. He took down my report. He took the report of all the things that that thief had taken from us. And he was cordial, and he was kind, and I felt a whole lot better seeing him there.

□ 1830

He's a public worker. And it is public workers just like that police officer who are facing layoffs all across America.

What about teachers? They don't like teachers? We're seeing classroom sizes increase and increase. There are over 250,000 teachers facing layoffs across America because I guess our friends in the party opposite, the Republican Caucus, feel that, oh, those are not private sector jobs.

Teachers do a valuable service for our country. Teachers are important. Or what about medical professionals who work for public hospitals? Or what about people who make sure that our roads and our bridges and our other infrastructure are in good working order? All these jobs are important.

What about the people who work at the DMV, the Department of Motor Vehicles? Do you want to get your tags on time? Do you want to get your registration on time? These are all folks who perform a valuable, important public service, and I think it's really ugly when we hear our Republican colleagues say, oh, well, they just want public jobs. They admit that we've had public jobs. We've also had private sector jobs. But I don't like this idea of them attacking public sector jobs. It's not right. In fact, my opinion is we need to pass a local jobs for America act. We need a bill that says we're going to help State and local government hire the people they have had to lay off over the last year and a half. Nearly every State in the union, not every State but nearly every State, has had massive deficits and these States have seen themselves have to cut off a lot of State workers. Now the Federal Government can't cover all of those losses, but we can cover some of the essential ones.

There are cities in this country who have police forces of one and two and three people, and they've had to lay off one. So if they lay off one person or two people, that's basically the whole department.

This is a serious issue. We don't need larger class sizes as we're trying to educate young people to be more competitive in the global arena. We don't need our fire departments to have fewer firefighters. We don't need to have our streets have fewer cops and be less safe. Since the recession began, an estimated 500,000 Americans have lost their jobs in local communities because of tight local municipal budgets. That's public workers that the Republican Caucus doesn't seem to respect very much.

The Economic Policy Institute, which is a think tank, estimates that

by the year 2012, more than 400,000 jobs would have to be restored just to return local government services to pre-recession levels. That's worth repeating. The Economic Policy Institute estimates that by 2012, more than 400,000 jobs would have to be restored just to return to pre-recession levels. This means a critical loss of services. This means that, yes, you have potholes; yes, you have longer response times for police and fire; yes, you have infrastructure that's not in the same kind of repair that it used to be. Yes, you have a streetlight that has not been replaced. And as your daughter or your son are walking home at night, you want that streetlight there if you're a parent and I know it. Not even for your daughter or your son; for yourself. If you're walking home, you want that streetlight working. Well, who replaces that? They don't get up there by magic. My friends in the Republican Caucus act like they just appear. No, they don't. Municipal workers put them there.

Cuts to public jobs also reduce employment in the private sector. This is an important point that bears repeating as well. Cuts to public jobs reduces employment in the private sector. What is the point, Mr. Speaker? Well, look. A dollar is a dollar. Whether I'm a cop or I work for a private security company, if I get my check and I spend it at the local store, it's revenue for that store and it will go to pay the workers at that store and pay a profit to whoever owns the store. Now if the public worker doesn't have a job, that's one paycheck fewer that that store has to rely on in order to make it.

So public sector jobs contribute to private employment. Why? Because public sector jobs contribute to the economy just like private sector jobs do, too. It's not a good thing that public sector jobs are going down. Not only is it loss of vital social services in our cities, but it also decreases consumer demand for those public workers who are now laid off and for our economy as a whole.

Again, the Economic Policy Institute has important information for us here. They estimated that for every 100 public sector jobs, 30 private sector jobs are let go because of the reduction in consumer spending. For every 100 public sector jobs, 30 private sector jobs are laid off because of a reduction in consumer spending. This forces local governments to choose between cutting services like public safety and raising taxes during an economic recovery which, I already talked about, no one likes to do.

Now there's a bill out there that I think the people of America ought to know about, Mr. Speaker, and that is the Local Jobs for America Act. The goal of the Local Jobs for America Act is to create 1 million public and private jobs in local communities this year. This jobs legislation directs targeted resources to communities hardest hit by the economic downturn. Federal

funds will be provided directly to States and municipalities with the greatest number of people out of work to restore critical services like teachers, police and fire. Our bill is about getting America back to work and making investments for the long term and the prosperity of our country.

Throughout the recession, local governments have been one of the hardest hit as cities have had to reduce budgets as their revenues have declined. Local governments across the country lost over 140,000 jobs in 2008 and 2009, and the number just keeps on growing. In 2009, 62 percent of all cities dealt with their budget deficits by delaying or canceling construction projects. Now when a city says, we're not going to build that ramp, that parking ramp; we're not going to fix that road; we're not going to build that community center, that means that the contractors they were going to hire don't get that job. So what that means is that the people who work in the private sector on the construction site, they're not working on that job. They're not bringing food back home based on the money they earned at that construction job.

The bill funds teachers, firefighters, child care workers and other critical services:

\$23 billion to help States support 250,000 teachers who are scheduled to be laid off very soon; \$1.18 billion to support 5,500 law enforcement officers on the beat; \$500 million to hire and train firefighters; \$75 billion to save or create 750,000 jobs to help the local community fill those jobs where they need it; 50,000 on-the-job training slots to help private businesses expand employment.

The goal is to have family wage jobs and help people get back to work, promote our good services for our cities, which is safety, which is education, and then also help the private sector by moving forward on needed construction projects and making sure public workers have their paychecks to make sure there's adequate consumer demand.

The Local Jobs for America Act will target funding to community based organizations serving communities with poverty rates 12 percent, or unemployment rates that are 2 percent or more higher than the national average. Now it's not State by State. It's community by community. So even if your State has an unemployment rate lower than the national average, if your community has one that is higher, then you would be eligible.

Local Jobs for America will help ensure that local communities can still operate essential services; and the Local Jobs for America Act will include on-the-job training for thousands of workers, and this bill would target communities hardest hit by the recession.

□ 1840

Now, that's just one good idea that I think we need to use.

I just want to take you back and say, you know, I'm from Minneapolis, and in my town we boast the finest series of lakes and trails and bike paths in the country. In fact, even though we're a cold weather State, we commute by bicycle more than any other city, including Portland, Oregon. Now, I know those people from Portland are coming after us on this great honor, but we're determined to keep Minneapolis in the first place on bike trails.

My point is simply this: I was riding my bike along the bike trail the other day, and I stopped to rest and sip a little water, and I saw a picnic table that really looked like it had been around for a while. What I saw on that picnic table was interesting. It was a plaque. It said, "WPA 1934." That picnic table had been around since 1934, and the Roosevelt-era program that put Americans of that generation back to work had caused that picnic table to be built.

Some of you young people are like, What is WPA? Go ask your grandparents. WPA is the Works Progress Authority. This was something that put valuable people to work doing valuable work that needed to be done—making trails, making picnic tables, doing things that last to this very moment. And Americans all across America are benefiting from them right now. This is what the WPA is.

And what I'm saying about the Local Jobs for America Act is that if that generation had a heart for its people and would respond to their needs and the needs of the unemployed by putting them back to work, I don't think this generation should do less. I think this generation should do at least as much as prior generations have done. Let it not be said that Americans have grown more stingy over time. Let it be said that Americans still care about other Americans whether they're working or not. Very, very important.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to begin to wrap up my remarks right now because it is getting late in the hour. But I just think it's important to just point out that from the Progressive Caucus' point of view, what we need is we need a stronger, more robust economy that has more people working at livable wages; that when people don't have enough, don't have a job, that they can get unemployment benefits until they can find that next job.

We don't think of our people as lazy and who don't want to work. We think of our people as active who do want to work. And when they get a job, we know that they're proud to have that job. But right now in America, we just don't have enough jobs. And we don't need the Republican Caucus standing in the way of jobs.

There are many people of faith in the Democratic Caucus, but we live our values. We don't pontificate about our values like some Members of the Republican Caucus are wont to do. The fact is you have to live caring, you have to live charity, you have to live

commitment to other people, you have to live empathy. And just lecturing to others about your religion is not a valuable exercise in a country dedicated to religious tolerance.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say it's always a pleasure coming before you and the people on the House floor. It's important to get back to real policies that work for real people. I'm so proud that the Democratic Caucus responded to the American people's needs for health care reform, responded to the American people's needs for financial Wall Street reform, as the President signed the bill yesterday. I am so proud that the Democratic Caucus was able to pass unemployment insurance benefits despite very little help from the Republican Caucus.

I look forward to being back soon to talk about the Progressive Caucus and progressive values in the United States Congress.

THIS ADMINISTRATION MUST FIND ITS VOICE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

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

Mr. WOLF. This administration must find its voice on human rights.

On April 21 the New York Times columnist Nicholas Kristof authored a piece that closed with the following words: "If President Obama is ever going to find his voice on Sudan, it had better be soon."

Two weeks after the article ran, I wrote the President, and I submit a copy of the letter for the RECORD, putting forth a number of recommendations in the hopes in salvaging the administration's languishing Sudan policy. My concerns echoed those voiced by six respected NGOs who the week prior had run an ad in the Washington Post and Politico calling for Secretary Clinton and Ambassador Rice to exercise "personal and sustained leadership on Sudan" in the face of a "stalemated policy" and waning U.S. credibility as a mediator.

Sadly, Kristof's assessment can be applied elsewhere around the world. It seems that President Obama and the administration as a whole have struggled to find its voice when it comes to the promotion and protection of basic human rights and religious freedom. These most cherished ideals, which are at the very heart of the American experiment, have time and again been sidelined by this administration's foreign policy. This is a grievous mistake which has dire implications for the world's dissidents and democrats who yearn for freedom and look to America to be their advocate.

Looking back to Sudan, a nation I first visited in 1989, and most recently in 2004 when Senator SAM BROWNBACK and I were the first congressional delegation to go to Darfur where there is genocide, I remain deeply concerned

that the country is headed for a resumption of a civil war if the U.S. fails to exert its necessary leadership. While there were certainly times that I was critical of the Bush administration's policy, it is indisputable that President Bush and former Special Envoy John Danforth were instrumental in securing, after 2½ years of negotiations, the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, the CPA, which brought about an end to the brutal 20-year civil war in which more than 2 million perished, most of whom were civilians.

A recent New York Times column by author David Eggers and Sudan activist John Prendergast titled, "In Sudan, War is Around the Corner," spoke to this reality. The pair wrote, "Shortly after George W. Bush entered the White House, he decided he would put the full diplomatic leverage of the United States to work in ending this war, one of the bloodiest conflicts of the 20th century. He succeeded."

Eggers and Prendergast rightly noted that when the South is given the opportunity to vote for independence in January, as guaranteed by the CPA, the conventional wisdom is that they will waste no time in severing ties with Khartoum. This shouldn't come as a surprise considering that President Bashir remains at the helm of Khartoum. Long an indicted war criminal, he was earlier this month also officially charged by the International Criminal Court with orchestrating genocide in Darfur. Bashir's murderous aims in Darfur are not without precedent.

With just 6 months to go, Khartoum persists in dragging its feet, undermining installing the process at every turn. Furthermore, the deeply flawed April elections do not bode well for the fate of a free and fair and timely referendum process. Failure to deliver on the long-awaited promise of a respectable referendum could have grave implications.

While some of the administration's rhetoric has improved of late, notably during Vice President BIDEN's trip to Africa, we have yet to see the administration apply real consequences to Khartoum. In fact, most Sudan watchers would agree that we have seen little to no evidence since the administration's release of their Sudan policy that they have any intention of utilizing sticks. Rather, they appear to be relying exclusively on carrots.

A July 14 Associated Press article entitled "Promises, Promises: U.S. Fails to Punish Sudan" described the administration's track record on Sudan this way: "The words of the Obama administration were unequivocal: Sudan must do more to fight terror and improve human rights. If it did, it would be rewarded. If not, it would be punished. Nine months later, problems with Sudan have grown worse. Yet the administration has not clamped down. If anything, it has made small conciliatory gestures."

Eggers and Prendergast, in their New York Times piece, close with a chilling

warning as it relates to the months ahead in Sudan: "This is President Obama's Rwanda moment, and it is unfolding now, in slow motion. It is not too late to prevent the coming war in Sudan, and protect the peace we helped build 5 years ago."

□ 1850

President Obama and his advisers need not rely on the warnings of those in the advocacy community and on Capitol Hill when it comes to the high stakes in Sudan in the days ahead. Rather, they can simply look to the Annual Threat Assessment of the U.S. intelligence community, which recently predicted that over the next 5 years, listen to this, "a new mass killing or genocide is most likely to occur in southern Sudan," more than any other country.

A welcomed step toward preserving the tenuous peace would be to provide Southern Sudan the air defense system that the Government of Southern Sudan requested and President Bush reportedly approved in 2008. This defensive capability would help neutralize Khartoum's major tactical advantage, a virtual necessity in light of the scorched earth tactics and Antanov bombers that have marked their genocidal campaigns of the past and would make peace and stability more likely following the referendum vote.

During the campaign for the Presidency, then-Candidate Obama said, "Washington must respond to the ongoing genocide and the ongoing failure to implement the CPA with consistency and strong consequences." These words still ring true today, and yet, apart from a recent National Security Council statement expressing support for "international efforts to bring those responsible for genocide and war crimes in Darfur to justice," we have seen an administration and a President struggling to find its voice on this most pressing human rights issue. Special Envoy Gration, at a recent event on Capitol Hill, reportedly went so far as to say that the genocide charges against Bashir will make his job harder.

What about the people who died as a result of this genocide in Sudan? Sudan is not an anomaly. Consider China, a country where human rights, religious freedom, and civil society continue to be under fierce attack by the country's ruling Communist Party.

From the outset, this administration chose to marginalize human rights in the context of U.S.-China bilateral relations. On the first trip to Asia, Secretary of State Clinton was downright dismissive of human rights concerns saying that "those issues can't interfere" with economic, security, or environmental concerns.

A firestorm of criticism ensued. Human rights organizations were rightly dismayed. How had impassioned advocacy for the dignity of every person been relegated to a position of mere interference? And this in

spite of Obama campaign promises to be "frank with the Chinese" and "press them to respect human rights."

In China, we again see an administration which seems unable to find its voice on human rights. A glance at the news from the last several weeks alone makes it painfully clear that that voice, the voice which speaks out on behalf of those enduring tremendous persecution and oppression at the hands of their own government, has never been more necessary.

A July 5 Associated Press story reported that Yu Jue, "A best-selling author and fierce critic of the Communist Party was taken into custody by the police on Monday for reasons that were unclear."

The AP reported on July 15 that "dozens of blogs by some of China's most outspoken users have been abruptly shut down while popular Twitter services appear to be the newest target in government efforts to control social networking."

Veteran dissident Liu Xianbin, an original signatory of Charter 08, a historic pro-democracy manifesto, was arrested by Chinese authorities on June 27 on suspicion of "inciting subversion of state power."

July also marks the 1-year anniversary of the deadly suppression of Uighur protestors last summer in the northwest of China. China's beleaguered Uighur Muslim community continues to face severe repression in the aftermath of the violence. According to multiple independent news sources, authorities installed 40,000 security cameras throughout the city in anticipation of the 1-year anniversary.

Carl Gershman, president of the National Endowment for Democracy, authored a piece in the Washington Post on the occasion of the anniversary. He highlighted a report by the Uighur Human Rights Project aptly titled, "Can Anyone Hear Us?" which documents "the firing on protesters that led to hundreds of deaths, as well as mass beatings, the arbitrary detention of thousands, and a 10-month communication shutdown that cut off the region from the outside world."

Gershman closes his piece with the following charge: "The United States and the international community should also support the Uighurs' 3-month-old call for an independent international investigation into the events of last July and the opening of a meaningful dialogue with Chinese authorities. Uighur voices have been crying in the wilderness. It's time to listen."

It is indeed time to listen. It is also time to add America's voice to the chorus of voices within China pressing for greater freedoms and basic human rights.

Just last week, I had the honor of meeting with two courageous Chinese human rights lawyers visiting the U.S. for legal training and to brief policymakers on the situation facing those defending rule of law in China. These

lawyers often choose to represent, at their own peril, those human rights activists, house church leaders, bloggers, et cetera, who face persecution in the form of trumped-up charges and the absence of due process. The lawyers said quite pointedly that their lives improve, and those of their cohorts in prison or facing other pressures by the Chinese Government, when the West speaks out for their plight and raises their cases by name. Why does not the Obama administration speak out for the plight and raise their cases by name?

This sentiment is nothing new. I remarked that they are China's Sakharovs and Solzhenitsyns. Similarly, these giants in the cause of freedom time and again recounted how their lives in the gulags improved when the West and President Reagan championed their cause and challenged the lies that were at the foundation of the Soviet system.

It seems this administration, the Obama administration, has forgotten the lessons of history to the detriment of China's young democrats.

In their annual Freedom in the World Report, the NGO Freedom House documented a litany of abuses perpetrated by the Chinese Government and then made the following observation: "While these acts of repression are disturbing, so is the absence of protest from the democratic world. When the Soviet Union arrested a dissident or suppressed religious expression, it drew widespread condemnation by figures ranging from heads of state to trade union leaders, as well as by human rights organizations and prominent humanitarians. China's current actions, by contrast, elicit little more than boilerplate criticism, and just as often they provoke no response whatsoever."

Elsewhere in Asia we see an administration seeming to align itself with the oppressor over the oppressed. Look at Vietnam. On July 19, AFP reported that Kurt Campbell, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian Affairs, said, "As I look at all the friends in Southeast Asia, I think we have the greatest prospects in the future with Vietnam."

This is a strange affinity and statement to have with a government that our own State Department said "increased its suppression of dissent, arresting and convicting several political activists" during the reporting period of the 2009 Country Report on Human Rights Practices.

□ 1900

The State Department report continues: "Several editors and reporters from prominent newspapers were fired for reporting on official corruption and outside blogging on political topics. Bloggers were detained and arrested under vague national security provisions for criticizing the government and were prohibited from posting material the government saw as sensitive or critical. The government also mon-

itored email and regulated or suppressed Internet content. The government utilized or tolerated the use of force to resolve disputes with a Buddhist order in Lam Dong and Catholic groups with unresolved property claims."

Today, Secretary Clinton is in Vietnam for the ASEAN meetings. Initial news reports indicate that she raised human rights concerns in a meeting with the foreign minister and afterwards with journalists, and I appreciate that. However, a new New York Times story today pointed out that the timing of her comments on the sensitive issues "suggested that she wanted to make her point and move on." If the administration is truly concerned about human rights and religious freedom in Vietnam, they would take the concrete step of placing Vietnam back on the Countries of Particular Concern, the CPC list, as has been recommended by the bipartisan U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Leonard Leo, chairman of the commission, rightly points out that Vietnam's human rights record has only improved when its "feet were held to the fire." Leo continued: "But once Vietnam, with U.S. help, joined the World Trade Organization in 2007, religious freedom and human rights advocates have experienced waves of arrest," Leo said. Waves of arrests from our "friend" in Southeast Asia? Are the Vietnamese, who are persecuting the Catholic Church, the Montagnards, the bishops, and killing people our friends?

Or consider North Korea. Without question, this country is one of the darkest places on the globe. More than 200,000 North Koreans, including children, are being held in political prison camps. It is estimated that between 400,000 and 1 million people, 400,000 and 1 million people, have died in these camps, having been worked to death or starved to death. Is anyone in this administration going to speak out or say anything or do anything about that?

Last summer an op ed in *The Wall Street Journal* featured a quote from a North Korean refugee woman who said: "If I had a chance to meet with President Obama, I would first like to tell him how North Korean women are being sold like livestock in China and, second, to know that North Korean labor camps are hell on Earth." Let me just repeat what she said again. She said: "If I had a chance to meet with President Obama, I would first like to tell him how North Korean women are being sold like livestock in China and, second, to know that North Korean labor camps are hell on Earth."

However, because North Korea possesses nuclear weapons and threatens not only to use them against neighboring countries, but also to share nuclear weapon technology with such rogue states as Burma and Syria, the international community, the U.S. included, has tended to downplay or out-

right ignore the horrendous human rights abuses in North Korea in the interest of trying to negotiate, through the so-called six-party talks, an end to its nuclear program. When North Korea falls and freedom comes, a lot of people in the West, and this administration, I think, will really feel guilty for not having spoken out and advocated for these people.

But nothing has been achieved by these negotiations, and the recent sinking of the South Korean ship has stalled efforts to revive the six-nation talks. Even in the face of North Korea's nuclear ambitions, it is inexcusable that its abhorrent human rights record is relegated to the back burner and that the North Korea Freedom Act, passed by Congress, has not even been fully implemented. Why has the Obama administration had so little to say about those trapped in "hell on Earth"?

Now, looking to the Middle East, we again see an administration whose advocacy on behalf of persecuted peoples has been sorely lacking. A February 6 ABC news story opened with the following observations: "Across the Middle East, where Christianity was born and its followers once made up a sizeable portion of the population, Christians are now tiny minorities."

This is perhaps no more true than in Iraq. With the exception of Israel, the Bible contains more references to the cities, regions and nations of ancient Iraq than any other country. Abraham came from Iraq.

Tragically, Iraq's ancient Christian community is facing extinction. The U.N. High Commission for Refugees estimated that some 250,000 to 500,000 Christians have left the country since 2003 and about half the Christian population and a large number also have been killed.

While I have appreciated and am very grateful for Ambassador Chris Hill's commitment to this issue during his time as U.S. Ambassador, and while I believe that Michael Corbin, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State who is in charge with working on Iraqi minority issues, cares deeply about the issue, and both are good men, I see a continued unwillingness, unwillingness, at the highest levels of the State Department to acknowledge and ultimately address the challenges facing these ancient-faith communities.

A 2009 column in *The Wall Street Journal*, Daniel Henninger summed it up this way: "Candidate Obama last fall sent a letter to Condoleezza Rice expressing 'my concern about the safety and well-being of Iraq's Christian and other non-Muslim religious minorities.' He asked what steps the U.S. was taking to protect 'these communities of religious freedom.' Candidate Obama said he wanted these groups represented in Iraq's governing institutions. Does President Obama believe these things?"

I long advocated, both during the previous administration and in the current administration, for the U.S. to

adopt a comprehensive policy to address the unique situation of these defenseless minorities. I have also pressed for a high-level human rights representative at the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad. Such a U.S. presence is critical with a U.S. presence in Iraq drawing down and our bilateral relations now governed by the Strategic Framework Agreement.

Among other things, we must be actively engaging the Government of Iraq to press for adequate security at places of worship and ensure minority representation in local police units. These are just some of the steps that could be taken to assist in the preservation of these ancient-faith communities. We have a moral obligation to do so. The Obama administration has a moral obligation to do so.

I was reminded of this again last week while meeting with a visiting high-level delegation of Iraqi bishops. Their impassioned pleas must not be ignored. We do not want to see the eradication and the elimination of the Christian community, the Assyrian, Chaldean Catholic community, in Iraq. We need to protect them.

Turning now to Egypt. Eli Lake pointed out in a July 18, Washington Times piece: "The Obama administration ended support for a small fund operated by the U.S. Embassy in Cairo that supported groups promoting Egyptian democracy and that bypassed any clearance from the Egyptian Government." They ended it.

Ellen Bork, director of democracy and human rights at the Foreign Policy Initiative, summarized the situation well in a recent Weekly Standard piece. She said: "Doing something for democracy in Egypt would require a policy reversal in Washington. Since the end of the Bush administration and the beginning of the Obama administration, there has been a retreat," and let me say I was critical during the Bush administration. More should have been done then, but equally now under the Obama administration. "There has been a retreat, including a cut in funding for democracy programs and acquiescence to an Egyptian veto over which groups may receive U.S. funds." They are going to let the Egyptian Government that is doing the persecution decide which group gets the funds.

Ironically, U.S. support for democracy promotion in Egypt is dwindling at a time when the people of Egypt are increasingly dissatisfied with the current regime. A Washington Post story yesterday reported that "a protest in Alexandria last month was attended by 4,000 people, a high number in Egypt, where many people are afraid to join demonstrations."

Lorne Craner, president of the International Republican Institute, who has a history of caring deeply about human rights and religious freedom, echoed these sentiments about the administration's human rights and democracy promotion policy in Egypt and elsewhere around the world, in recent tes-

timony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

□ 1910

He said, "A lack of strong, consistent leadership from the top of the administration has become apparent to the bureaucracy. One result is the cutting or slowing of funding for democracy programs in countries like Belarus, Cuba, Egypt, Iran, North Korea, Venezuela, and Zimbabwe. Another consequence is that our embassies abroad"—and this is painful to hear—"are providing less diplomatic support on human rights and democracy. Asked about the U.S. position on democracy in Egypt, our Ambassador to Cairo praises the country's press freedoms." The American Embassy in Cairo should be an island of freedom. The American embassy in every country should be an island of freedom.

Those yearning for greater freedoms in Egypt are not alone in facing the ire of their government. So, too, Egypt's Coptic Christian community faces increasing hardship. USCIRF, the commission, in its recently released report, described a deteriorating situation for this community. USCIRF found that "the reporting period marked a significant upsurge in violence targeting Coptic Orthodox Christians. The Egyptian Government has not taken sufficient steps to halt repression of and discrimination against Christians and other religious believers, or in many cases to punish those responsible for violence or other severe violations of religious freedom. This increase in violence and the failure to prosecute those responsible forces a growing climate of impunity. And even though our own State Department has concluded that the last 3 years have been marked by a decline of religious freedom conditions in Egypt, there has not been a significant change in U.S. policy.

Elsewhere in the region, Morocco is actually an example where American citizens, many of whom are people of faith, are receiving hostile treatment by the Moroccan Government. Over the last 4 months, dozens of American citizens and scores of other foreign nationals have been deported and denied reentry into the Kingdom of Morocco for allegedly proselytizing. Authorities have refused to turn over any evidence or offer any explanation of the charges. Among the individuals who were deported or denied reentry were businessmen, educators, humanitarians, and social workers, many of whom had resided in Morocco for over a decade in full compliance with the law. Additionally, those deported were forced to leave the country within 2 hours of being questioned by the authorities, having to leave everything behind.

Over the past several weeks I have met with and heard from scores of Moroccan Christians. Many feel their voices have long been silenced, and these events highlight some of these pressures they experience. On March 19, I wrote to the U.S. Ambassador to

Morocco, Sam Kaplan, sharing my intent to meet the Moroccan Ambassador to the U.S. and urging Ambassador Kaplan to "convey to the Government of Morocco that Members of Congress are watching these events closely and the outcome could negatively affect our bilateral relations."

I've also spoken with Ambassador Kaplan on several occasions and shared with him my deep disappointment that the U.S. Embassy and the State Department have not been more publicly outspoken on behalf of these American citizens. It is the primary responsibility of the United States Embassy to defend and advocate for U.S. citizens and interests abroad. Unfortunately, the Moroccan Government has been utterly unwilling to compromise. Perhaps they think they don't need to, given the number of high-powered lobbyists, including several former Members of Congress, that the Moroccan Government has on retainer. I don't know how a former Member of Congress could ever go out and represent the Moroccan Government knowing what they're doing to American citizens and feel very, very comfortable. And do the American people know about this?

And the American people should understand not only are they expelling Americans from Morocco, but they should also know that I have urged the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the MCC, to suspend the 5-year compact with Morocco, which is worth \$697.5 million. That's right, you, the American taxpayer, are giving the Moroccan Government \$697 million. They're expelling Christians from Morocco—although they've hired a couple of former Congressmen that, unfortunately, used to serve in this body. I mean, can you believe it? They're expelling Americans, and yet the Moroccan Government expects that we will give them \$697.5 million?

I will offer an amendment on this floor when the foreign operations bill comes up to suspend or cut this program, and I urge any Member who wants to vote the other way to go home to wherever you're from, whether it be the north, south, east or west, and tell your constituents, that's right, I understand; I voted to continue to send all this money to Morocco, \$697 million. Yes, I understand we have a deficit. Yes, I understand we have great debt. Yes, I understand they're expelling Christians, Americans from the country, but I'm still going to give them that money.

The MCC awards compacts on the basis of 17 key indicators of eligibility, six of which fall under the category of "ruling justly." However, recent events raise serious questions regarding the Moroccan Government's willingness to abide by the principles outlined in the MCC indicators. And—and I am very appreciative of this—a recent Wall Street Journal op-ed rightly pointed out that during a time of economic hardship, the unemployment rate at 9.5

percent, “U.S. taxpayers won’t tolerate financing governments that mistreat Americans solely because of their religion.” I appreciate the Wall Street Journal doing that editorial.

Can the administration not find its voice when it comes to the rights of U.S. citizens being trampled abroad? I’ve been assured that the State Department is raising the matter privately with the Moroccan Government. Frankly, this is insufficient. The manner and the means by which we raise concerns of this nature with foreign governments communicate a whole host of unspoken messages. I hope the lobbyists for Morocco—particularly those who have been former Members of Congress—are not influencing the State Department and are not influencing the Millennium Challenge Corporation.

Do we simply have a private meeting with the ambassador and ask him to look into the matter, or does the Department’s press secretary issue a statement expressing deep concern? Or better yet, does President Obama call the King of Morocco and make it clear that treating American citizens this way will not be tolerated? The President should pick up the phone and say to the head of the Moroccan Government, we will not give you \$697 million in the Millennium Challenge grant as you’re expelling Americans from your country. Each approach has distinct undertones which highlight the level of priority and seriousness that the U.S. Government places on a particular issue. Privately raising the issue with Moroccan Government officials is a far cry from what we used to see by doing it publicly.

Even as the administration is struggling to find its voice on human rights, changes within the State Department threatens to institutionalize the marginalization of these core issues. The State Department’s International Religious Freedom Office, IRF, has been without ambassadorial leadership, as is required by law, for more than 18 months. After increasing pressure from Congress and religious advocacy groups, Obama named Suzan Johnson Cook to this post in June. She has not been confirmed. Eighteen months, nobody’s there.

□ 1920

With a void in senior leadership at the IRF office, I have been increasingly alarmed by reports that the office is being subsumed into the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor.

Tom Farr, the first Director of the U.S. State Department Office of International Religious Freedom, described what is happening this way in a Washington Post online column: “The ambassador will not report directly to the Secretary of State as do other ambassadors at large, all of whom are experts in their fields. The staffers who reported to predecessors will not report to Johnson Cook should she be confirmed. The position will be emas-

culated, in direct contravention of the legislation that created it.”

In a May 25 letter to Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor Michael Posner, I raised these concerns in detail.

I submit a copy of the letter for the RECORD.

If the changes described by Farr move forward, this could potentially violate U.S. law and break with 10 years of established practice under previous administrations, both Democratic and Republican. The Ambassador-at-Large position was established under the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, of which I was the primary author, to promote religious freedom abroad. The legislation specifically states, “There is established within the Department of State an Office on International Religious Freedom that shall be headed by the Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom.”

Considering the importance of religious freedom to U.S. foreign policy and human rights promotion, I am alarmed by the possibility that DRL could be removing supervisory control from the Ambassador-at-Large over the Office of International Religious Freedom.

These reported changes, combined with the long ambassadorial vacancy, do not bode well for the Baha’i leader imprisoned in Iran’s notorious prisons or for the Ahmadi Muslim in Pakistan, subject to officially sanctioned discrimination and persecution. Who will be their advocates? Who will advocate for the Baha’is? Who will advocate for the Ahmadi Muslims in Pakistan? Who will be their advocates?

The IRF office is but one example of internal changes at the State Department. Not many people know this, but the congressionally mandated Office to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism, headed by a special envoy, only has a single dedicated staff person. During the Bush administration, there were three to five employees at various points. An April 2010 CNN story featured the findings of a study released on the eve of the Holocaust Remembrance Day, which found that the number of anti-Semitic incidents more than doubled from 2008 to 2009. At a time when anti-Semitism is on the rise globally, the special envoy is relying almost exclusively on the already stretched thin IRF office for her staffing needs, therefore making it more difficult for the IRF office to fulfill its congressional mandate.

If the old adage “personnel is policy” is true, then you could surmise that the absence of necessary personnel is itself a shift in policy priorities.

There are staff vacancies also at the State Department that are deeply troubling. On June 24, I wrote Secretary of State Clinton about the Office of the Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues.

I submit the letter for the RECORD.

I was prompted to write the letter, in part, because it had come to my atten-

tion that there was only one person working in the office. Have you seen how China has plundered Tibet, and there is one person working in the office?

Congress codified the position of the Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues as part of the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002. Not long after the establishment of the office, Congress approved language directing that the office “consist of three professional, full-time staff members and additional support staff, as needed, in addition to the special coordinator.” Their current inadequate staffing levels, at that point 17 months into the administration, were troubling and at odds with congressional intent.

Further, the congressionally mandated Report on Tibet Negotiations, which is due to Congress by March 31 of each year—and we are in July—has not yet been submitted. These developments, or lack thereof, send a message about the priority this administration is placing on Tibet. Does this administration care about the plundering and the persecution in Tibet?

I have visited Tibet. I have been there. I have seen what has taken place in Draphchi prison. I have seen and talked to Buddhist monks who have told me about their times. I have seen the cameras on all of the buildings. I have seen the areas that they have bulldozed and large areas of loss. They have taken away the Tibetan culture. I have seen that. So does not this administration care about that?

That message is not inconsistent with the message the White House sent last fall in declining to meet with the Dalai Lama when he was visiting Washington—the first time since 1991 that the Nobel Prize recipient and spiritual leader was not afforded a meeting with the President of the United States.

In closing, the complexities of foreign policy do not escape me. I am well aware that there are multiple dimensions to our bilateral relations with countries around the globe, but if the United States of America cannot be relied upon to speak out on behalf of those whose voices have been silenced, then it is, indeed, a dark day for millions around the world who are yearning to breathe the sweet air of freedom.

Where the administration fails to find its voice, Congress must stand in the gap. For decades, human rights enjoyed bipartisan support in this body. Now I fear these issues have fallen victim to bipartisan apathy. Too often, we underestimate the power of our words or, worse yet, the power of our silence.

The late Robert Kennedy, speaking in 1966 Cape Town, South Africa, to a gathering of students committed to challenging the injustice of apartheid, famously said, “Each time a man stands up for an ideal or acts to improve the lot of others or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring those ripples build a

current which can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance.”

America must stand up for the ideals upon which our own experiment in self-governance was founded. America must strike out against injustice, whatever form it takes. America must believe that even the mightiest walls of oppression can tumble and work toward that end.

The hour is late and the stakes are high. Will the administration accept this charge? Will the Obama administration accept this charge? Can President Obama find his voice? Will the “ripples of hope,” of which Bobby Kennedy spoke, once again infuse America’s foreign policy? We’ll see.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
MAY 5, 2010.

Hon. BARACK H. OBAMA,
*President, The White House,
Washington DC.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: “If President Obama is ever going to find his voice on Sudan, it had better be soon.” These were the closing words of New York Times columnist Nicholas Kristof two weeks ago. I could not agree more with his assessment of Sudan today. Time is running short. Lives hang in the balance. Real leadership is needed.

Having first travelled to Sudan in 1989, my interest and involvement in this country has spanned the better part of 20 years. I’ve been there five times, most recently in July 2004 when Senator Sam Brownback and I were the first congressional delegation to go to Darfur.

Tragically, Darfur is hardly an anomaly. We saw the same scorched earth tactics from Khartoum in the brutal 20-year civil war with the South where more than 2 million perished, most of whom were civilians. In September 2001, President Bush appointed former Senator John Danforth as special envoy and his leadership was in fact instrumental in securing, after two and a half years of negotiations, the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), thereby bringing about an end to the war. I was at the 2005 signing of this historic accord in Kenya, as was then Secretary of State Colin Powell and Congressman Donald Payne, among others. Hopes were high for a new Sudan. Sadly, what remains of that peace is in jeopardy today. What remains of that hope is quickly fading.

I was part of a bipartisan group in Congress who urged you to appoint a special envoy shortly after you came into office, in the hope of elevating the issue of Sudan. But what was once a successful model for Sudan policy is not having the desired effect today. I am not alone in this belief.

Just last week, six respected NGOs ran compelling ads in The Washington Post and Politico calling for Secretary Clinton and Ambassador Rice to exercise “personal and sustained leadership on Sudan” in the face of a “stalemated policy” and waning U.S. credibility as a mediator.

In that same vein, today I join that growing chorus of voices in urging you to empower Secretary Clinton and Ambassador Rice to take control of the languishing Sudan policy. They should oversee quarterly deputies’ meetings to ensure options for consequences are on the table.

There is a pressing and immediate need for renewed, principled leadership at the highest levels—leadership which, while recognizing the reality of the challenges facing Sudan, is clear-eyed about the history and the record of the internationally indicted war criminal

at the helm in Khartoum. We must not forget who we are dealing with in Bashir and his National Congress Party (NCP). In addition to the massive human rights abuses perpetrated by the Sudanese government against its own people, Sudan remains on the State Department’s list of state sponsors of terrorism. It is well known that the same people currently in control in Khartoum gave safe haven to Osama bin Laden in the early 1990s.

I believe that this administration’s engagement with Sudan to date, under the leadership of General Gration, and with your apparent blessing, has failed to recognize the true nature of Bashir and the NCP. Any long-time Sudan follower will tell you that Bashir never keeps his promises.

The Washington Post editorial page echoed this sentiment this past weekend saying of Bashir: “He has frequently told Western governments what they wanted to hear, only to reverse himself when their attention drifted or it was time to deliver . . . the United States should refrain from prematurely recognizing Mr. Bashir’s new claim to legitimacy. And it should be ready to respond when he breaks his word.” Note that the word was “when” not “if” he breaks his word. While the hour is late, the administration can still chart a new course.

In addition to recommending that Secretary Clinton and Ambassador Rice take the helm in implementing your administration’s Sudan policy, I propose the following policy recommendations:

Move forward with the administration’s stated aim of strengthening the capacity of the security sector in the South. A good starting point would be to provide the air defense system that the Government of Southern Sudan (GOSS) requested and President Bush approved in 2008. This defensive capability would help neutralize Khartoum’s major tactical advantage and make peace and stability more likely following the referendum vote.

Do not recognize the outcome of the recent presidential elections. While the elections were a necessary part of the implementation of the CPA and an important step before the referendum, they were inherently flawed and Bashir is attempting to use them to lend an air of legitimacy to his genocidal rule.

Clearly and unequivocally state at the highest levels that the United States will honor the outcome of the referendum and will ensure its implementation.

Begin assisting the South in building support for the outcome of the referendum.

Appoint an ambassador or senior political appointee with the necessary experience in conflict and post-conflict settings to the U.S. consulate in Juba.

Prioritize the need for a cessation of attacks in Darfur, complete restoration of humanitarian aid including “non-essential services,” unfettered access for aid organizations to all vulnerable populations and increased diplomatic attention to a comprehensive peace process including a viable plan for the safe return of millions of internally displaced persons (IDPs).

When the administration released its Sudan policy last fall, Secretary Clinton indicated that benchmarks would be applied to Sudan and that progress would be assessed “based on verifiable changes in conditions on the ground. Backsliding by any party will be met with credible pressure in the form of disincentives leveraged by our government and our international partners.” But in the face of national elections that were neither free nor fair, in the face of continued violations of the U.N. arms embargo, in the face of Bashir’s failure to cooperate in any way with the International Criminal Court, we’ve seen no “disincentives” or “sticks” applied. This

is a worst case scenario and guaranteed, if history is to be our guide, to fail.

Many in the NGO community and in Congress cautiously expressed support for the new policy when it was released, at the same time stressing that a policy on paper is only as effective as its implementation on the ground. More than six months have passed since the release of the strategy and implementation has been insufficient at best and altogether absent at worst.

During the campaign for the presidency, you said, regarding Sudan, “Washington must respond to the ongoing genocide and the ongoing failure to implement the CPA with consistency and strong consequences.” These words ring true still today. Accountability is imperative. But the burden for action, the weight of leadership, now rests with you and with this administration alone. With the referendum in the South quickly approaching, the stakes could not be higher.

The marginalized people of Sudan yearn for your administration to find its voice on Sudan—and to find it now.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
MAY 25, 2010.

Hon. MICHAEL POSNER,
Assistant Secretary, Department of State, Washington, DC.

DEAR ASSISTANT SECRETARY POSNER: I write regarding a matter of great concern—namely the reported plans by the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL) to reorganize the Office of International Religious Freedom. It has come to my attention that structural changes may be implemented that could result in the Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom losing direct supervisory control over the staff of the Office of International Religious Freedom. Such changes could potentially violate U.S. law and break with 10 years of established practice under previous administrations, both Democratic and Republican.

As you know, the Ambassador-at-Large position was established under the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (IRFA), of which I was the primary author, to promote religious freedom abroad. The ambassador is charged with making policy recommendations for the U.S. Government toward “governments that violate freedom of religion or that fail to ensure the individual’s right to religious belief and practice . . .” The ambassador also serves as the “principal adviser to the President and the Secretary of State regarding matters affecting religious freedom abroad . . .” IRFA created the Office of International Religious Freedom to support the Ambassador-at-Large in his or her work. Section 101(a) under Title I of IRFA specifically states that “there is established within the Department of State an Office on International Religious Freedom that shall be headed by the Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom.” [Emphasis added]

Considering the importance of religious freedom to U.S. foreign policy and human rights promotion, I am alarmed by the possibility that DRL could be removing supervisory control from the Ambassador-at-Large over the Office of International Religious Freedom. Given my intimate involvement in IRFA’s passage, I can say with assurance that such a decision would directly contradict the intent of the act and undermine the critical role of the position. The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom shares this concern, and in its 2010 annual report urged the administration to ensure the ambassador’s direct oversight of the office.

I have been concerned for some time at the priority, or lack thereof, that this administration places on religious freedom. For 16 months now, the president has failed to appoint an Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom. This persistent vacancy, and these reported changes within the State Department are alarming and do not bode well for the Tibetan Buddhist monk forbidden from having a picture of the Dalai Lama or for the Iraqi Christian who has helplessly watched their ancient community be decimated by violence.

In light of these concerns, I urge you to ensure that the Ambassador-at-Large maintain direct oversight of the Office of International Religious Freedom, and only those DRL officials reporting directly to the Ambassador-at-Large be given managerial authority over the office staff. IRFA was clear in creating direct lines of authority from the office staff to the ambassador. It is critical that the Ambassador-at-Large continue to head the office, consistent with IRFA.

As these concerns directly relate to the inner-workings of DRL and the IRF office, I respectfully request that any reply to my letter come from you rather than the assistant secretary for Legislative Affairs. Thank you for your assistance. I look forward to hearing from you.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
JUNE 24, 2010.

Hon. HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY CLINTON: I am writing about some areas of concern related to the Office of the Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues that I believe merit attention. Specifically, I am concerned that the Office of the Special Coordinator is understaffed. It has come to my attention that there is only one person currently working in the office, and that another position has been unfilled since January 2009. It is my understanding that a third position has never been filled.

After years of congressional advocacy for the creation of a special office in the Department of State on Tibet, the Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues was established by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright in 1997 and charged with protecting the human rights of Tibetans, preserving their religious, cultural, and linguistic heritage, and promoting substantive dialogue between the Chinese government and the Dalai Lama or his representatives.

As you know, Congress codified the position of the Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues as part of the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002. Both you and I were cosponsors of the original stand-alone bills in the House and the Senate respectively. The legislation detailed the duties and responsibilities of the special coordinator which included coordinating "United States Government policies, programs, and projects concerning Tibet" and maintaining "close contact with religious, cultural, and political leaders of the Tibetan people, including regular travel to Tibetan areas of the People's Republic of China, and to Tibetan refugee settlements in India and Nepal."

Not long after the establishment of the office, Congress identified that the special coordinator needed additional resources in order to effectively carry out its mission. In fiscal year 2006, the House and Senate Appropriations committees approved language directing \$1 million for the Office of the Special Coordinator to carry out its statutory responsibilities. The committees also di-

rected that the office "consist of three professional full-time staff members and additional support staff, as needed, in addition to the special coordinator." Congress's interest in these funding and staffing levels has been reaffirmed in subsequent appropriations bills. Given this history, the current inadequate staffing levels, 17 months into the administration, are troubling and are at odds with congressional intent.

Further, I have also learned that the one staffer in the special coordinator's Office was pulled back from a previously scheduled visit to Dharamsala, India, in early May 2010. I understand that one of the goals of this staffer's trip was to participate in a selection process for students under the Tibetan Fulbright program, and that the meeting was cancelled. I expect that she was also scheduled to meet with officials of the Central Tibetan Administration as part of routine oversight of the U.S. government programs that benefit the Tibetan refugee communities in India. Staff members from the special coordinator's Office have been travelling to Dharamsala ever since the creation of the office. Such trips, which include engagement with the leaders of the Tibetan exile community, are essential for the fulfillment of the responsibilities of the office and are explicitly authorized by the Tibetan Policy Act. The oversight provided by these trips is vital to ensuring that taxpayer investments in these communities and programs are sound.

Additionally, I understand that the Report on Tibet Negotiations, which is required by section 613(b) of the Tibetan Policy Act and is due to Congress by March 31 of each year, has not yet been submitted. These developments or lack thereof send a troubling message about the priority this administration is placing on Tibet.

A recently released report by the International Campaign for Tibet makes clear that the need for this office is as pressing as it has ever been. The report titled, "A 'Raging Storm': The Crackdown on Tibetan Writers and Artists after Tibet's Spring 2008 Protests," found that over 50 Tibetans, including 13 writers, have "disappeared" or have faced torture or harassment as a result of expressing their views. The Chinese government's deplorable human rights record, specifically in Tibet, necessitates the department's immediate and unwavering attention.

Given these concerns, I respectfully request that you provide my office with the following information:

A report on the department's efforts to fill expeditiously the two vacant positions in the Office of the Special Coordinator for Tibetan Affairs;

An explanation for the cancellation of the scheduled May trip to Dharamsala by the staffer from the special coordinator's Office; and

The status of the Tibet Negotiations report and any explanation for why it has not been submitted to Congress by the required date.

Best wishes,
Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

□ 1930

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Virginia, truly a conscience in this body, for those profound words of challenge, bringing us back to the roots from which this great Nation has grown.

And I realize the time grows late, and it is the last hour that we will be in session this week. And if the gen-

tleman would indulge me, I know that we have a President who has said we're not a Christian Nation, and I will not debate that.

But it is so critical to look at our roots. And so I would like to direct, Mr. Speaker, back to the words of Roger Williams when he said: "That forced worship stinks in God's nostrils, that it denies Christ Jesus yet to come; that in these flames about religion, there is no other prudent, Christian way of preserving peace in the world, but by permission of different consciences."

These are the words of our Founders that set this Nation in motion, that pointed us in the direction of religious tolerance.

1701, William Penn drafted the Charter of Privileges and said: "First because no people can truly be happy, though under the greatest enjoyment of civil liberties, if abridged of the freedom of their consciences, as to their religious profession and worship: And Almighty God being the only Lord of Conscience, Father of Lights and Spirits, and the Author as well as Object of all divine knowledge, faith and worship, who only can enlighten the mind, and persuade and convince the understandings of people, I do hereby grant and declare that no person or persons inhabiting this province or territories, shall confess and acknowledge one Almighty God, the Creator, upholder and ruler of the world; and profess him or themselves obliged to live quietly under the civil government, shall be in any case molested or prejudiced in his or their person or estate, because of his or their conscientious persuasion or practice."

Going back to our heritage, that this country was based on these principles, taught in the Bible, discussed by our Founders, and made the basis of our beliefs in religious freedom, Thomas Jefferson said: "God who gave us life gave us liberty. And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are a gift of God? That they are not to be violated, but with His wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, that His justice cannot sleep forever."

And it ought to cause every American to tremble when they think of the injustice we're allowing to be perpetuated on our citizens around the world. It ought to break the hearts and minds and consciences of everyone.

A United States President said these words, referred to a Mr. Levi, a Galveston, Texas lawyer and a president of the National B'nai Brith, drafted President Theodore Roosevelt a telegram denouncing a Russian pogrom in 1903. The Czar of Russia was so stung by Roosevelt's message that he formally refused to accept it. Some Americans complained that Roosevelt had gone too far. He replied that there were crimes so monstrous that the American conscience had to assert itself. And there still are.

“No one is a better witness to the transience of tyranny than the children of Abraham. Forty centuries ago, the Jewish people were entrusted with a truth more enduring than any power of man. In the words of the prophet Isaiah, ‘This shall be my covenant with them, said the Lord: My spirit which is upon you, and the words which I have placed in your mouth, shall not be absent from your mouth, nor from the mouth of your children, nor from the mouth of your children’s children, said the Lord from now for all time.’

“It is not an accident that freedom of religion is one of the central freedoms in our Bill of Rights. It is the first freedom of the human soul: the right to speak the words that God places in our mouths. We must stand for that freedom in our country. We must speak for that freedom in the world.”

Could the current administration and President dare to do any less than this President that is so reviled in this administration, President George W. Bush?

I would like to just finish with one other thought, and that was what was related to have happened in Iraq after United States troops liberated Iraq, not for any purpose other than to liberate and to free the people there, and to assure us that they would not be a threat to their neighbors or the rest of the world.

President Bush appointed a retired general named Jay Garner. I had heard the story relayed before and I called him this evening to ask if I could retell it here.

He was in charge of looking about, talking to people all around Iraq, and seeing what kind of government would be best suited for Iraq so that we could help the Iraqi people establish a nation of strength and a representative, hopefully, a representative government. And he talked to people around the country. And over and over, people kept referring him to this huge man, a Shia, a cleric, who wore the black turban, the black robes, and was a descendant, apparently, of Mohammed. And everyone kept telling him he had to talk to this man because everyone looked to him for insight, for words of wisdom.

And so eventually General Garner went, made an appointment, visited with him. He had a number of people with him, including a reporter. He was often a freelance report, but at this point a reporter for Time magazine.

And apparently this cleric spoke very good English, but he said he’d like to tell in his own language what should be done. And he talked for quite some time in his language. Everything was recorded.

And then he said, let me tell you in a nutshell what I’ve said. We need a constitutional process, perhaps like yours in the United States, where we create a constitution. But it must be written by Iraqis. The government must be of Iraqis. And it must be based on the lessons of Jesus Christ and bring all the nation together.

General Garner said when he left that interview with the people in the entourage, he asked the others, did everybody hear what I just think I heard? And they said, yes. Could you believe he said you needed a constitution based on the teachings of Jesus Christ?

And he asked the reporter from Time, are you going to put that in the story? He said, no one would believe that.

But when you think about the wisdom of this great Shia cleric, apparently, Shari’ah law does not allow for freedom of religion and worship when it’s considered in context too often. That’s the way it’s interpreted. It’s only the teachings of Jesus that allow for a constitution that allow for freedom of worship. Whether you’re Muslim, whether you’re following the teachings of Mohammed or Jesus or Moses, it’s only those teachings that give us the kind of Constitution we have.

But since we have that Constitution, and we have been given the foresight by our Founders of what is required to do justice, to love mercy, we can do nothing less than what my friend from Virginia has indicated. We must stand for those who seek to worship as the directives of their heart lead them.

And I thank my friend so much for the very touching time he has spent here on the floor. And I hope and pray that this administration will take those words to heart. I thank my friend.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of illness.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 1:45 p.m. on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extra-neous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRIGHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SABLAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extra-neous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, July 29.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, July 26, 27, 28, and 29.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, July 29.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, July 29.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PUTNAM, for 5 minutes, July 27 and 28.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker’s table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1376. An act to restore immunization and sibling age exemptions for children adopted by United States citizens under the Hague Convention on Intercountry Adoption to allow their admission into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4213. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o’clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 26, 2010, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

8489. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System’s “Major” final rule — Truth in Lending [Regulation Z; Docket No. R-1384] received July 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8490. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System’s final rule — Truth in Savings [Regulation DD; Docket No. R-1315] received July 1, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8491. A letter from the OTS Paperwork Clearance Officer, Office of Thrift Supervision, transmitting the Office’s “Major” final rule — Unfair or Deceptive Acts or Practices; Amendment [Docket ID: OTS-2010-0009] (RIN: 1550-AC38) received July 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8492. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission’s “Major” final rule — Political Contributions by Certain Investment Advisers (RIN: 3235-AK39) received July 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8493. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of General

Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Carol M. White Physical Education Program; Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 84.215F received June 30, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

8494. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) — Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program — Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers (RRTCs) — Improved Outcomes for Individuals with Serious Mental Illness and Co-Occurring Conditions. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 84.133B-5 received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

8495. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Reasonable Contract or Arrangement Under Section 408(b)(2) — Fee Disclosure (RIN: 1210-AB08) received July 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

8496. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Interim Final Rules for Group Health Plans and Health Insurance Issuers Relating to Coverage of Preventive Services Under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (RIN: 1210-AB44) received July 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

8497. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Attainment for PM10 for the Mendenhall Valley PM10 Nonattainment Area, Alaska [Docket: EPA-R10-OAR-2010-0432; FRL-9171-4] received June 30, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8498. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0120; FRL-9169-2] received June 30, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8499. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of New Export Control Classification Number 6A981 Passive Infrasound Sensors to the Commerce Control List of the Export Administration Regulations, and Related Amendments [Docket No.: 080724907-91435-01] (RIN: 0694-AE44) received July 1, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8500. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 08-10 informing of an intent to sign a Project Agreement with the NATO AEW&C Programme Management Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8501. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 10-12 informing of an intent to sign a Project Agreement with the Kingdom of the Netherlands; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8502. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedule of Fees for Consular Services, Department of State and Overseas Embassies and Consulates [Public Notice: 7018] (RIN: 1400-AC57) received July 1, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8503. A letter from the Chair, Election Assistance Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Nonprocurement Debarment and Suspension received July 14, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

8504. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Trade-mark Technical and Conforming Amendments [Docket No.: PTO-T-2010-0014] (RIN: 0651-AC39) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8505. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Correspondence with the United States Patent and Trademark Office [Docket No.: PTO-C-2006-0049] (RIN: 0651-AC08) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8506. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Golden Guardian 2010 Regional Exercise; San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0221] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8507. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; U.S. Navy Submarines, Hood Canal, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-1058] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8508. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Marathon Oil Refinery Construction, Rouge River Detroit, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0333] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8509. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Clemente 3 NM Safety Zone, San Clemente Island, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0277] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8510. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation for Marine Events; Temporary change of dates for Recurring Marine Events in the Fifth Coast Guard District [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0102] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8511. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Portland Rose Festival Fleet Week, Willamette River, Portland, Oregon [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0196] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8512. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmit-

ting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gallants Channel, Beaufort, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0120] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8513. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zones; Marine events within the Captain of the Port Sector Northern New England area of responsibility [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0239] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8514. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Annual events requiring safety zones in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan zone [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0129] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8515. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Sea World Summer Nights Fireworks, Mission Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0213] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8516. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; KFOG Kaboom, Fireworks Display, San Francisco, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0162] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8517. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tri-City Water Follies Hydroplane Races Practice Sessions, Columbia River, Kennewick, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0277] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8518. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Under Water Clean Up of Copper Canyon, Lake Havasu, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0168] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8519. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; May Fireworks displays within the Captain of the Port Puget Sound Area of Responsibility (AOR) [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0285] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8520. A letter from the Project Council, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Brandon Road Lock and Dam to Lake Michigan including Des Plaines River, Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Chicago river, and Calumet-Saganashkee Channel, Chicago, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0166] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8521. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Potomac River, Washington Channel, Washington, DC [Docket No.: USCG-2010-

0405] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8522. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Riser for DEEPWATER HORIZON at Mississippi Canyon 252 Outer Continental Shelf MODU in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0337] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8523. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Temporary Suspension of Certain Oil Spill Response Time Requirements to Support Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill of National Significance (SONS) Response [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0592; EPA-HQ-OPA-2010-0559] (RIN: 1625-AB49; 2050-AG63) received June 30, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8524. A letter from the Acting Director, Acquisition Policy and Legislation Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Homeland Security Integrators [HSAR Case 2009-003] [Docket No.: DHS-2009-0006] (RIN: 1601-AA49), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

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. HASTINGS of Florida: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1550. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 4213) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-556). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 5681. A bill to improve certain administrative operations of the Library of Congress, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3837. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for clarification on the use of funds relating to certain homeland security grants, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5822. A bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 847. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and improve protections and services to individuals directly impacted by the terrorist attack in New York City on September 11, 2001, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-560, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 847. A bill to amend the Public

Health Service Act to extend and improve protections and services to individuals directly impacted by the terrorist attack in New York City on September 11, 2001, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-560, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 5493. A bill to provide for the furnishing of statues by the District of Columbia for display in Statuary Hall in the United States Capitol (Rept. 111-561). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. PITTS (for himself and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 5813. A bill to designate additional segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, in the States of Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 5814. A bill to transform neighborhoods of extreme poverty by revitalizing distressed housing, to reform public housing demolition and disposition rules to require one for one replacement and tenant protections, to provide public housing agencies with additional resources and flexibility to preserve public housing units, and to create a pilot program to train public housing residents to provide home-based health services; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 5815. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to provide authority for Inspectors General to subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MINNICK (for himself, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. MARSHALL):

H.R. 5816. A bill to establish a commercial real estate credit guarantee program to empower community banks and other lenders to make loans while stabilizing the value of small denomination commercial real estate assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 5817. A bill to provide children in foster care with school stability and equal access to educational opportunities; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 5818. A bill to amend title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Rules of the House of Representatives to make Federal private sector mandates subject to a point of order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 5819. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a grant program

to develop a roadway safety training institute to deliver comprehensive and uniform roadway safety training to roadway workers; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 5820. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to ensure that the public and the environment are protected from risks of chemical exposure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5821. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to provide competitive grants to States, Indian tribes, and local governments for rebates, loans, and other incentives to eligible individuals or entities for the purchase and installation of solar energy systems for properties located in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Texas:

H.R. 5822. A bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 5823. A bill to establish a covered bond regulatory oversight program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SIRES, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 5824. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish a process for incorporating transportation costs associated with the location of housing into affordability measures and standards, and to develop a transportation affordability index to measure and disclose the transportation costs associated with the location of a home; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 5825. A bill to review, update, and revise the factors to measure the severity, magnitude, and impact of a disaster and to evaluate the need for assistance to individuals and households; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ALTMIRE (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 5826. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the definition of active duty for purposes of the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs to include certain service in National Guard; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOCCIERI (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SPACE, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WAMP, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 5827. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to include firearms in the types of property allowable under the alternative provision for exempting property from the estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 5828. A bill to reform the universal service provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COBLE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. KISSELL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. FOXX, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 5829. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to accept additional documentation when considering the application for veterans status of an individual who performed service in the merchant marines during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 5830. A bill to provide for competitive grants for the establishment and expansion of programs that use networks of public, private, and faith-based organizations to recruit and train foster and adoptive parents and provide support services to foster children and their families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 5831. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1081 Elbel Road in Schertz, Texas, as the "Schertz Veterans Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. DAHLKEMPER:

H.R. 5832. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Office of International Trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. KLEIN of Florida):

H.R. 5833. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require issuers to make disclosures related to Iranian investments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 5834. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, to provide for cash relief for years for which annual COLAs do not take effect under certain cash benefit programs, and to provide for Social Security benefit protection; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Rules, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Veterans' Affairs, 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. ELLISON (for himself and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5835. A bill to authorize the use of subpoenas by the Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in investigations of potential violations of the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 5836. A bill to provide for improved border security and to ensure that employers that participate in the E-Verify Program are

not subject to unjustified penalties; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 5837. A bill to require persons to certify that they have not violated foreign corrupt practices statutes before being awarded Government contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. HALVORSON (for herself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 5838. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the multifamily transitional housing loan program of the Department of Veterans Affairs by requiring the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue loans for the construction of, rehabilitation of, or acquisition of land for multifamily transitional housing projects instead of guaranteeing loans for such purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. LUJAN, and Mr. TEAGUE):

H.R. 5839. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the types of energy conservation subsidies provided by public utilities eligible for income exclusion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 5840. A bill to prevent the participation of the Attorney General in any lawsuit that seeks to invalidate certain provisions of Arizona law relating to aliens unlawfully present in the United States without first satisfying certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5841. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish public-private partnerships for the treatment and research of post-traumatic stress disorder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 5842. A bill to deem any adjournment of the House of Representatives which is in effect on the date of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held during a Congress to be adjournment sine die, and to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing appropriations if a regular appropriation bill for a fiscal year does not become law before the date of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held during such fiscal year; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. REYES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CARTER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. INSLER, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 5843. A bill to amend title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Education to complete payments under such title to local educational agencies eligible for such payments within 3 fiscal years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey:

H.R. 5844. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide all Medicare beneficiaries with the right to guaranteed issue of a Medicare supplemental policy and annual open change-in-enrollment periods, and for other purposes; 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. SABLAN:

H.R. 5845. A bill to authorize 700 incremental vouchers for tenant-based rental assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to help meet the housing needs of low-income families in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 5846. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require the chief executive officer of each drilling and production operation under a lease under that Act to annually certify the operator's compliance with all applicable laws and operating regulations; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

H.R. 5847. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to establish grant programs for the development and implementation of model undergraduate and graduate curricula on child abuse and neglect at institutions of higher education throughout the United States and to assist States in developing forensic interview training programs, to establish regional training centers and other resources for State and local child protection professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 5848. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise the amount of minimum allotments under the Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. NYE, Mr. KISSELL, and Ms. GIFFORDS):

H.J. Res. 94. A joint resolution recognizing the 20th anniversary of the outbreak of the Gulf War and reaffirming the commitment of the United States towards Gulf War veterans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, 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. KUCINICH (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

H. Con. Res. 301. Concurrent resolution directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Pakistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 302. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the signing of the Social Security Act into public law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H. Con. Res. 303. Concurrent resolution recognizing the growing threat that al Qaeda and its affiliates in Africa, particularly al Shabaab and al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb, pose to the United States and its allies and interests; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H. Res. 1551. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should promote respect for and full application of the provisions of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples consistent with United States law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H. Res. 1552. A resolution supporting a legally binding global agreement to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and provide financial assistance to the poorest and most vulnerable nations for adaptation and mitigation measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. CARTER):

H. Res. 1553. A resolution expressing support for the State of Israel's right to defend Israeli sovereignty, to protect the lives and safety of the Israeli people, and to use all means necessary to confront and eliminate nuclear threats posed by the Islamic Republic of Iran, including the use of military force if no other peaceful solution can be found within reasonable time to protect against such an immediate and existential threat to the State of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida):

H. Res. 1554. A resolution recognizing the services provided by school resource officers and their dedication to the safety, security, and well-being of students, teachers, school support staff, and school communities in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

350. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 23 memorializing the Congress to remove the financial eligibility requirements for patients stricken with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis to be approved to receive Medicaid; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

351. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 117 memorializing the President of the United States, the Congress and the Federal Communications Commission to refrain from regulating Internet broadband services as common carrier services under Title II of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

352. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 96 memorializing the Congress to consider recommendations to amend the Stafford Act regarding disaster recovery in Louisiana; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

353. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 14 memorializing the Congress to take such actions as are necessary to promptly consider and pass the New Alternative Transportation to Give Americans Solutions Act of 2009 (H.R. 1835 and S. 1408); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, and Science and Technology.

354. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8 memorializing the Congress to support expansion and use of domestic natural gas reserves and alternative energies to reduce our reliance on imported oil by supporting H.R. 1835 and S. 1408; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, and Science and Technology.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 336: Mr. POLIS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

H.R. 393: Mr. DJOU.

H.R. 442: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 560: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 564: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 571: Mr. THORNBERRY and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 634: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 673: Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 678: Ms. KILROY, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 789: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 847: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 874: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 881: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 903: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 1067: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1074: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1124: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1179: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1229: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 1230: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1314: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 1351: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1549: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1618: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1625: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1745: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 1751: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1826: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 1829: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 1874: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1878: Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 1929: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1943: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1995: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. REYES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 2084: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2103: Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 2112: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 2262: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 2373: Mr. HODES.

H.R. 2429: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 2570: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2575: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2598: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2616: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 2648: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2766: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2882: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3377: Mr. FILNER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HARE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 3408: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 3464: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SCHAUER, and Mr. CARDOZA.

H.R. 3652: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. ELLSWORTH.

H.R. 3668: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 3716: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 3729: Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 3786: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 3936: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 3974: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 4037: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 4116: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4129: Ms. BEAN.

H.R. 4197: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 4322: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SIREs, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 4533: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 4557: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 4662: Ms. LEE of California and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 4671: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 4678: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 4689: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 4722: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 4746: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 4764: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. BERRY, Ms. KILROY, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 4787: Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 4790: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 4808: Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WU, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4852: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 4875: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 4914: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 4925: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 4940: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 4959: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 4986: Ms. FOX and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 4993: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 5023: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 5034: Mr. KISSELL.
 H.R. 5037: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 5040: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HARE, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 5042: Mr. WATT, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 5078: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 5081: Mr. TANNER.
 H.R. 5141: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. JONES, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 5162: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.
 H.R. 5235: Mr. MELANCON.
 H.R. 5248: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 5258: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 5318: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
 H.R. 5323: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 5412: Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 5422: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 5424: Mr. DENT and Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 5434: Ms. HARMAN and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 5461: Mr. HOLDEN.
 H.R. 5473: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 5476: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 5478: Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 5504: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 5510: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 5529: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 5533: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 5537: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 5567: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 5575: Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 5597: Mr. NUNES.
 H.R. 5599: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 5600: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 5644: Mr. HODES and Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 5647: Mr. DJOU and Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H.R. 5654: Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 5657: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 5660: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 5662: Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 5663: Mr. SPACE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 5664: Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 5679: Mr. OLSON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 5693: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 5694: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 5730: Mr. FLAKE.
 H.R. 5766: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. GIFFORDS, and Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 5768: Mr. SABLAN.
 H.R. 5769: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
 H.R. 5772: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 5778: Mr. BONNER, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 5786: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 5790: Mr. CARTER, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 5791: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
 H.R. 5792: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 5793: Mr. FATTAH.
 H. Con. Res. 226: Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. TITUS.
 H. Con. Res. 259: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H. Con. Res. 266: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H. Con. Res. 274: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. BLIRAKIS.
 H. Con. Res. 281: Mr. MCHENRY.
 H. Res. 111: Ms. BEAN, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. KIND.
 H. Res. 732: Mr. NYE.
 H. Res. 767: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H. Res. 913: Ms. LEE of California.
 H. Res. 1102: Ms. WATERS.
 H. Res. 1129: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H. Res. 1217: Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 1309: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. BOYD.
 H. Res. 1311: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
 H. Res. 1319: Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BACA, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H. Res. 1326: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H. Res. 1346: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H. Res. 1402: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H. Res. 1420: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H. Res. 1431: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. FALCOMA VAEGA.
 H. Res. 1433: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. COBLE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. KISSELL.
 H. Res. 1452: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. HONDA.
 H. Res. 1458: Mr. SABLAN and Mr. BAIRD.
 H. Res. 1485: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. HUNTER.
 H. Res. 1499: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. SIRES, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. TANNER, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. BOREN, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BARROW, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FARR, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HARE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. PAYNE.
 H. Res. 1504: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. TONKO.
 H. Res. 1507: Mr. TURNER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LANCE, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MINNICK, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. AUSTRIA.
 H. Res. 1518: Ms. WATERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BERKLEY, and Ms. WATSON.

H. Res. 1522: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H. Res. 1523: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
 H. Res. 1525: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TURNER, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COLE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FARR, Mr. BOYD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H. Res. 1527: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DREIER, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. TONKO.
 H. Res. 1528: Mr. FARR and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
 H. Res. 1529: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ARCURI, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
 H. Res. 1541: Mr. CAO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. PETERS.
 H. Res. 1546: Mr. LEE of New York and Mr. HALL of Texas.
 H. Res. 1547: Mr. RANGEL.
 H. Res. 1548: Mr. SABLAN.

DELETION 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. 5720: Ms. HIRONO.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—
 ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 11 by Mr. KING of Iowa on H.R. 4972: Frank A. LoBiondo, Sam Johnson, Paul Ryan, John L. Mica, Michael R. Turner, Aaron Schock, Cliff Stearns, Devin Nunes, David Dreier, Christopher John Lee, Kevin McCarthy, Bill Shuster, Leonard Lance, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, Ander Crenshaw, Elton Gallegly, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Ed Whitfield, Walter B. Jones, and Vernon J. Ehlers.