United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 2011 No. 30

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 2, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KEVIN YODER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

THE ''MORAL THREAT'' IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. In a speech this past weekend to our religious broadcasters, the Speaker of the House called the Federal debt ''a moral threat'' to our Nation. It's an interesting choice of words from the leader of the House majority, who has been a cheerleader for the Nation's most morally objectionable policy of all—the disastrous, despicable war in Afghanistan.

For some reason, their moral sensibilities are not offended by a military conflict that has cost us hundreds of billions of dollars and 1,500 of our bravest, bravest people without advancing national security objectives or truly diminishing the terrorist threat at the same time.

So how are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle resolving their moral dilemma? By asking corporate special interests to give up handouts and tax breaks? By asking the wealthiest Americans to give back more to the Nation that has given them so much opportunity?

Nope. By their moral calculations, the answer is to demand sacrifice from the very Americans who are bearing the brunt of this recession—from the people and communities who depend upon public investment. Their moral compass tells them to cut vital programs to the bone or eliminate them altogether: food safety, family planning, health research, public housing, transportation infrastructure, college aid, and on and on.

There was an article in my home newspaper over the weekend about how local health clinics could be devastated by these cuts. California alone stands to lose nearly $13 million in homeland security grants needed to train and equip first responders. The Republican budget cuts also, according to one study, would destroy 700,000 jobs—but that's not keeping the Speaker up at night. He sees Americans out of work, and instead of saying this is a moral threat, he says, ''So be it.''

In what moral universe, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, does it make sense to destroy jobs at home but send more Americans to die in a senseless war abroad?

Programs like COPS and Head Start, which the majority wants slashed, save lives. The war in Afghanistan, which isn't even on the table in this budget debate, has ended nearly 1,500 American lives. Our surviving servicemen and -women are coming home with devastating physical and psychological wounds. Yet the majority party, so enthusiastic in its support for Afghanistan spending, wants to eliminate a homeless veterans initiative.

That's their version of morality: Send young Americans halfway around the world to be chewed up and traumatized. Then pull the plug on the support they need when they get home. That's what they call supporting the troops.

The majority could kill the proverbial two birds with one stone if they wanted. They could just about solve their debt crisis by bringing our troops home and ending the moral stain on our Nation—that is the Afghanistan war.

Somehow, I'm not holding my breath. Until the Speaker and my Republican colleagues are prepared to show moral courage on Afghanistan, I refuse to take their moral outrage about the deficit seriously.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, in October of 1890, four women, linked by their common lineage to heroes in the American Revolution, joined 18 others to organize the Daughters of the American Revolution. These founders began a campaign to serve the country through the preservation of American history. Since its founding, the Daughters of the American Revolution has expanded to nearly 3,000 chapters and over 850,000 members around the world.

In the middle of an era ripe with inequality for women, this organization flourished on a strong foundation of pride for the men and women who

Printed on recycled paper.

fought to gain American independence. Theirs is a rich history, filled with patriotism, self-sacrifice, and a dedication to education. For decades, the Daughters of the American Revolution has sponsored scholarships and supported schools for the underprivileged. Their support has aided construction and the preservation of dozens of now historic locations around the country. Their scholarships have provided thousands with the opportunity to attend institutes of higher education. Their outreach programs recognize and encourage service to their country and to their communities; and on March 15, the John Houstoun chapter of the National Society of Daughters of the American Revolution will observe its 100th anniversary in the city of Thomaston, Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today to celebrate, with the Houstoun chapter, 100 years of service to the great State of Georgia.

For a group devoted to the promotion of American history, it is with great pleasure that I am able to honor the years of education, historic preservation, patriotism, and service that the Daughters of the American Revolution has selflessly given to this great country.

They trace their heritage back to the very men and women who fought for American independence from British tyranny. Each member must prove blood relation to a Revolution Patriot, and throughout the years, a vast collection of family histories has been compiled and preserved for our children and our grandchildren to appreciate. With the motto ''God, home, and country,'' this nonprofit and nonpolitically aligned organization has positively impacted hundreds of thousands of lives.

I am very proud to represent several National Society of Daughters of the American Revolution chapters in the Third Congressional District of Georgia. I know Thomaston, Georgia, is especially grateful for the Houstoun chapter's presence in their community, and so am I.

HUMAN RIGHTS CRISIS IN PUERTO RICO: FIRST AMENDMENT UNDER SIEGE

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, I spoke about a serious problem in Puerto Rico. The problem is the systematic effort by the ruling party to deny the right of the people to speak freely, to criticize their government openly, and to make their voices heard.

I talked about student protests that have been met with resistance by the Puerto Rico police. I talked about closed meetings of the legislature and about the efforts to silence and destroy the local bar association.

I was not the first to speak about it, and I could have said much more. This report, entitled ''Human Rights Crisis in Puerto Rico: First Amendment Under Siege'' is searing.

□ 1010

It details the complaints of students, legislators, the press and the general public who were beaten, and pepper-sprayed by police; female students who were treated with gross disrespect; and the government's overreaction to demonstrations at the university and at the capitol over budget cuts and layoffs.

This next picture, this is the capitol in San Juan, Puerto Rico, surrounded by riot police as people attempted to gain entrance to the same assembly as this one here today, and this is how they were met by the police. This is how the police dealt with protesters.

The images of police tactics and behavior in these photos explain why our Department of Justice is investigating the Puerto Rican police for excessive force and unconstitutional searches as we speak today. How could you see these images and not speak out? I was hardly the first to speak out about these matters, and I probably won't be the last. Here it is, the Daily Sun in Puerto Rico, ''Sticks versus speech.''

As a Member of Congress, it is more than my right, it is my obligation to speak out when fundamental freedoms are attacked. And what was the response to my free speech defending the right of the Puerto Rican people to be heard? It was to challenge my right to be heard here in the halls of Congress. The Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico said in this very body that he is the only one authorized to speak about Puerto Rico at any time.

This week, the Puerto Rican Legislature debated a resolution of censure—yes, censure—condemning me for speaking out against these very abuses. A leading member of the ruling party even said, GUTIERREZ wasn't born in Puerto Rico, his kids weren't born in Puerto Rico. GUTIERREZ doesn't plan to die and be buried in Puerto Rico, so GUTIERREZ doesn't have the right to speak about Puerto Rico.

Well, let me tell you something, if you see injustice anywhere, it is not only your right but your duty to speak about it. We don't speak about injustice or apartheid or human rights abuses or the denial of rights of women in places around the world because we ourselves were born there. That would be silly. Where we see injustice we speak out because it is the right thing to do.

Ironically, by questioning my right to speak out on behalf of free speech, they have made my point crystal clear. By challenging my free speech, they have amplified the words of my 5-minute speech more than if I had spoken for 5 hours.

And it is their right, my critics have the right of free speech even as they deny the same right to others, but I want them to understand this: Your efforts to silence me—just as your efforts to silence so many in Puerto Rico who disagree with your government—will fail, just as every effort to blockade progress only makes the march toward justice more powerful and swift.

I may not be Puerto Rican enough for some people, but I know this: Nowhere on Earth will you find a people harder to silence than Puerto Ricans. You won't locate my love for Puerto Rico on my birth certificate or on my driver's license or on my children's birth certificate or any other piece of paper. My love for Puerto Rico is right here in my heart, a heart that beats with our history and our language and our heroes, a place where, when I moved there as a teenager, people talked and argued and debated because we care deeply about our island and its future. That is still true today. That freedom is still beating in the hearts of university students, working men and women, labor leaders, lawyers and environmentalists, and every person who believes in free speech. You will not silence them, and you will not silence me.

Abraham Lincoln, a leader who valued freedom above all else, said, ''Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves.'' It's good advice, and I hope the leaders of Puerto Rico take it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter the ACLU report titled ''Human Rights Crisis in Puerto Rico: First Amendment Under Siege'' into the RECORD, as well as a statement by the president of the Service Employees International Union and the essay, ''Exposing the Shadows of Civil Rights in Puerto Rico'' by the National Puerto Rican Coalition.

HUMAN RIGHTS CRISIS IN PUERTO RICO; FIRST AMENDMENT UNDER SIEGE

(By the American Civil Liberties Union of Puerto Rico National Chapter)

While the world celebrates the democratic revolution in Egypt, major violations of basic human rights are occurring in our own backyard. Since Governor of Puerto Rico Luis Fortuño came into power two years ago, free speech has been under all out assault. The following events have taken place recently:

Thousands of public workers have been laid off and had their union contracts terminated, leading to tens of thousands of people peacefully protesting over the past year. One event turned out over 100,000 peaceful protestors and while in NYC hundreds marched on May Day, in Puerto Rico May Day turned out an estimated 30,000 citizens.

At a protest at the steps of the Capital Building over the closing of access to legislative sessions, access that is constitutionally mandated, protesters were beaten mercilessly, pepper sprayed and shot at by Puerto Rico Police. The same has occurred at other locations.

At most events young women are the first to be targeted for police violence. At the University of Puerto Rico, female students, many of whom were beaten, were also sexually harassed, groped and assaulted (touched) by police. Students have been mercilessly beaten, maced and shot at with rubber bullets. Citizens have accused, which images captured confirm, police of applying torture techniques on immobilized student protesters. In the past two years, there have

been several riots at protests in and around the University of Puerto Rico. Many protesters have accused the police of causing the riots, which some videos also seem to confirm.

Since taking the oath of office, the current administration, which owns all three branches of government, has set out to quash Freedom of Expression. In Puerto Rico, Expression has been in the form of protests against government policies, such as the firing of approximately 26,000 workers in total, privatizing government, closing off access to public information and legislative sessions, attempting to close down the university FM radio station during periods of civil unrest and going after the Puerto Rico Bar Association, which was a mandatory integrated Bar and is Puerto Rico's oldest institution. The 171 year old Puerto Rico Bar Association (Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico) has historically been a known focal point for liberal dissent against government policies.

Puerto Rico Governor Fortuño, who is considered a rising star in the Republic Party, has publicly committed to not allowing what he calls ''extreme left'' protests and expression. On Friday, February 11, 2011, Governor Fortuño spoke about his administration's policies while speaking at a Conservative Political Action Conference of the American Conservative Union (ACU) in Washington, DC, an activity attended by members of the National Rifle Association, the Tea Party and the John Birch Society.

At the University of Puerto Rico all forms of expression have been prohibited, through a Resolution issued by UPR Chancellor Ana Guadalupe; a resolution which Governor Luis Fortuño ordered armed police officers to enforce. On Wednesday, February 9, 2011, a group of students participated in civil disobedience on campus, consisting of a paint-in. During the paint-in, students peacefully and without interrupting the educational process painted messages of protest in a limited area of the street at the front of the main library, in defiance of the Chancellor's absolute prohibition on any form of protest. Students immediately came under extreme physical and violent attack by members of the police force's elite and heavily armed SWAT and Riot Squad teams.

While the ACLU is looking to file charges on Human Rights violations and evaluating other legal options, the Puerto Rico Daily Sun, a conservative English language newspaper, published a damming editorial in which it called for the resignation of the university's president, chancellors and the Board of Trustees. On Friday, February 11, 2011, President Ramon De la Torres' resignation was unanimously accepted by the Board of Trustees. However, the Board Chairperson, Ygrí Rivera, immediately stated that she will not be removing armed Puerto Rico Police officers from the University of Puerto Rico campus.

In its editorial, the Puerto Rico Daily Sun, stated that ''[t]he indiscriminate aggression of police riot squads against students, who are exercising their constitutional rights in public areas without interfering with any academic or administrative activity, is a gross violation of their rights and an act comparable only to the acts of the dictatorships we all denounce and reject''. The Daily Sun added that ''[w]e do not want this new order, neither for our university, the Capitol, La Fortaleza or our neighborhoods. We reject it with all our might, Exercising our freedom of speech, or freedom of association, is not a crime''.

As we say in Puerto Rico, ''mas claro no canta un gallo'' (it could not have been more clearly stated).

On Sunday, February 12, 2011, just four days after students were mercilessly beaten by Puerto Rico Police agents, over 10,000 alumnus, parents, grandparents, family members and other citizens took to the streets and marched over to reclaim the UPR campus, demanding that the PRPD be immediately ordered off campus.

See news video: http://www.primerahora.com/milesseunencontralacuotaylainvasionpoliciacaenlaupr-474118.html.

In addition to the debacle and related violence at the University of Puerto Rico, in the past two years legislation has been passed that would prohibit protests at construction sites and most recently at any government building that renders educational services and other locations rendering government services, under penalty of criminal prosecution.

The Puerto Rico Bar Association was recently de-certified through legislation which the governor signed into law, which all but shut down operations. Several lawyers aligned with the views of the current administration pushed for de-certification and had previously sued the Bar Association in federal court alleging that the Bar was forcing them to purchase an unwanted insurance policy; its $78.00 per year cost was paid from Bar Association dues. Bar members were never informed of the particulars of the lawsuit and Federal Judge José Antonio Fusté issued a GAG order prohibiting the disclosure of important aspects of the case to Bar class members.

The Puerto Rico Bar Association is not being allowed to inform and counsel Bar members about their right to opt out of the lawsuit. Thousands of lawyers are not even sure why they are a part of this lawsuit. It is believed that an English language notice on the right to opt out of the lawsuit may not be sufficient guarantee that Bar members will fully understand the ramifications of their actions. Many members of the Bar have limited English skills, particularly lawyers in the smaller and rural towns.

The newly elected President of the now voluntary Puerto Rico Bar Association (Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico), Osvaldo Toledo, was jailed on Friday, February 11, 2011, at a federal detention center in Puerto Rico, where he remains on contempt of a court charges for refusing to pay a $10,000 fine imposed on him for having counseled Bar members who insist that they have a right to know the particulars of the suit and procedure for opting out.

Federal Judge José Antonio Fusté's GAG order extends not only to the President of the Puerto Rico Bar Association, but also board members, administrators, agents and servants. The Executive Director of the American Civil Liberties Union in Puerto Rico, William Ramirez, had previously been warned by the Bar that he may not be able to speak out against what is held to be an injustice and First Amendment infringement. Speaking out in defiance of the federal court order may result in the arrest of anyone covered by the court's GAG order and further fines imposed against the Puerto Rico Bar Association.

After studying the court's order, we at the ACLU do not, at this time, believe that the federal court order reaches class members or other members of the Bar, including the staff and cooperating attorneys of the ACLU in Puerto Rico. However, we do believe the order to be unjust and believe it should be set aside.

The ACLU will continue to fight for the right to free speech and peaceful assembly in Puerto Rico and fully intends to take on any challenges that it may face.

SEIU CALLS FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION OF PUERTO RICO RIOT POLICE ACTION

WASHINGTON, DC.—Mary Kay Henry, President of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), issued this statement today concerning the actions of the Puerto Rico Riot Squad in response to a non-violent protest led by university students at Puerto Rico's Capitol in San Juan on Wednesday, June 30.

''The right of individuals to openly and freely voice their dissent forms the foundation of a responsive, vibrant democracy. As working men and women throughout the island of Puerto Rico have shared their first-hand reports of the events that took place at the Capitol this week, we are deeply concerned that the actions of the police, and of the Puerto Rican government, were driven to stifle and repress the voices of these university students and citizens.

''What is even more troubling—the government's questionable use of force and the intimidation of citizens appear to be escalating on the island and no one is immune: journalists, gay men and women, our union brothers and sisters, and activists from every field who seek to make their voices heard and improve their lives and their communities.

''I am certain that many members of the U.S. media and many leaders in Washington are completely unaware of the disturbing events that took place Wednesday. I pledge that the more than 2.2 million members of SEIU, many of whom live in or were born in Puerto Rico, will change this by speaking out on behalf of the rights of the citizens of this island and calling upon their elected representative in Congress to fully investigate the events of June 30.

''When the lives and livelihoods of the people of Vieques were threatened by U.S. Naval bombing, SEIU members throughout Puerto Rico, the U.S. and Canada helped share their struggle to the international community. Today, we stand ready to do this once again and join our hearts and voices in service to the people of Puerto Rico.

''To the university students and their families, and to all who are fighting for democracy and equality for all the citizens of Puerto Rico, know that we stand with you, and you are not alone.''

[From Capital Wire PR, Mar. 1, 2011]

OP ED: EXPOSING THE SHADOWS OF CIVIL RIGHTS IN PUERTO RICO

(By Rafael A. Fantauzzi)

WASHINGTON, DC.—I find it peculiar how we Puerto Ricans continuously complain about our lack of voice and power in Congress, but when any Island issue is discussed on the floor someone always jumps at the opportunity to cry foul. As a collective, we all should praise the efforts by any Member of Congress to elevate our issues in the halls of democracy. Freedom of speech is paramount to our democracy, but the approach that if you are not one hundred percent with me then you are against me has destroyed our ability to collaborate and improve the economic and social stability of our people.

I assume that in a moment of frustration and courage on February 16th Congressman Luis Gutierrez (D–Illinois) answered the call to leadership by denouncing the most recent civil rights violations that occurred at the University of Puerto Rico and the abuse of power by federal Judge Fusté in helping dismantle the Puerto Rican Bar Association. I have not spoken with Congressman Gutierrez about his action or intentions, but anytime a Member of Congress brings to the floor the issues of my people, I see a glimmer of hope. Unfortunately, his delivery generated an overreaction by supporters of the local government which in response spun his decry by

engaging in cultural divisiveness and the always dynamic political rhetoric. I believe that Congressman Gutierrez had the right to denounce the violations for the following three reasons: (a) anyone of Puerto Rican descent or with family alive or deceased on the Island should care about their people; (b) given the fact that around 46 percent of the population depends on federal assistance, any American that pays federal taxes is a shareholder for the well-being of the people of the territories; (c) lastly, any member of the human race has the right to denounce negligent human treatment, as we are doing for Libya.

It is disappointing when politically biased commentaries like the ones made by Mr. Rafael Rodriguez on his recent op-ed calling Congressman Gutierrez ''a paradoxical obstructionist'' are made. I believe Congressman Gutierrez was trying to shed some light on the dark shadows of social deterioration that our people are facing. This social deterioration is the result of desperation and fear that plagues our people. It is said that in Puerto Rico you cannot live, you can only survive (unless you are part of an elite that controls the political and economic channels). It is this elite that believe they have the right to dictate what the people want or need. It is this elite that hide behind the face of congressional processes to manipulate the political outlook of the Island. It is this elite that engage in manipulating the information instead of exposing the truth and generating trust. It is this elite that continues to enlarge the gap between Puerto Ricans on the mainland and those that remain on the Island. It is this elite that call those who are trying to defend the true elements of democracy and human respect obstructionist.

The issues of the Americans in Puerto Rico and the territories are continuously overlooked by the congressional collective. Even Presidents neglect to mention the people of the territories in their State of the Union speeches. So we are very hypersensitive about our place in the world, which in turn fuels the political philosophy frenzy that has become our white whale, the status of the Island. Although I have my own personal philosophy for the Island, I'm bound to protect the neutral integrity of the organization that represents the voice of the entire community inside the beltway. It is our mission to enhance the social and economic well-being of our 8 million plus constituents and nothing is more divisive than the status issues. We are in favor of a fair and executable process for self determination, and we also believe that for that process to be legitimate we have a principled responsibility to act civilized and respect all views. Change can only be accomplished when trust is at the core.

As the future of our Island we call on all students, educators, and administrators to hold each other to a higher standard. Respect those that want to express their frustrations and protect those that want to exercise their right to an education. To all local government institutions, we encourage dialogue, tolerance, professionalism, and personal restraint; for it is your duty to protect a functioning society. To our elected officials, engage in integrative processes for the benefit of your constituents and not for personal political gain. Only then will we be able to call ourselves both American citizens and responsible citizens of the world.

HONORING KARMA GAETANO HADJIMICHALAKIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to recognize Karma Hadjimichalakis.

Up until recently, Karma was the principal lecturer in business economics and finance at the University of Washington Foster School of Business. She was the faculty director of the Pacific Rim Bankers Program, and she was the Evert McCabe Faculty Fellow. She was also my professor while I was earning my Executive MBA.

Last Monday, February 21, Karma passed away after a long illness, and as her student, I wanted to acknowledge her incredible accomplishments, both professional and personal, over the course of an extraordinary life.

Born on January 21, 1944 in Utica, New York, Karma was educated at nearby Elmira College and earned master's and doctorate degrees at the University of Rochester. She joined the faculty at the University of Washington in 1970, initially in the department of economics, and then at the Foster School of Business.

The turning point in her career was a 2-year stint as Visiting Economist at the Federal Reserve Board from 1980 to 1982. In her work with the banking section of the Fed's Division of Research and Statistics, Karma developed the ability to provide penetrating analysis that paints an accurate assessment of the current economic situation. In other words, she learned to find meaning in the disparate data.

Karma's time at the Fed also led her to realize that teaching was her true calling. She returned to the University of Washington with a new insider's expertise in the inner workings of the Federal Reserve System and monetary policy, and she spent the next 3 years applying her economic knowledge with wonderful results.

Karma won more than 45 major teaching awards at the Foster School, including the first PACCAR Award for Excellence in Teaching, the school's highest faculty honor. Her twice-annual economic forecast lectures became a standing-room-only tradition. And her 1995 textbook, ''Contemporary Money, Banking and Financial Markets: Theory and Practice,'' co-authored with her husband, Michael Hadjimichalakis, became an influential classic.

Former students universally spoke of themselves as ''privileged'' and ''blessed'' to have had the opportunity to study under Karma. They told of her ability to decipher data with real-life examples to make macroeconomics fascinating, even fun. They spoke of her profound impact on their lives. As one of Karma's students, class of 2002, I wanted to add my own testimony to her impact.

When I was a student, learning under an experienced and dedicated professor such as Karma was one of the best parts of the University of Washington's eMBA program. In all of her classes, Karma went above and beyond the call of duty, not just to present the course material, but to make herself available to us outside of the classroom, to answer our questions and ensure our understanding and application of the course work. She challenged my study of economics and how to craft successful public policies in a free market economy. Quite simply, they don't come any better.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing Karma Hadjimichalakis for her four decades of excellent teaching, communicating knowledge with absolute generosity, boundless energy, and endearing warmth. Karma's impact on thousands of students will endure for decades and in ways we will never completely know. And she will always have a special place in my heart.

ATTACK ON MIDDLE CLASS AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight a very serious and dangerous attack on middle class Americans being waged by the Republicans in the Congress and in Statehouses across the country.

The Wisconsin Governor's assault on public employees is getting most of the media attention, but it is just one of the fronts of the extreme right wing and anti-worker agenda trying to be carried out in this country. In fact, there is a well-financed and coordinated national attack against working families and the unions that they may belong to, the goal of which is to take away power from the middle class and give it to the wealthy special interests that have backed Republicans in their elections.

Here is how it is playing out: The Republicans are taking a real problem, a serious problem—budget deficits and long-term debt in this country—and they are assigning to it a fake cause. Under the guise of cutting deficits they say that working people's union rights and workplace protections must be eliminated. In fact, this attack against working people is designed to remove the vital check on special interest corporate power from overrunning our democracy.

This is an extreme agenda that they have always pursued, but they are now using their newfound political power to relaunch the attacks, to attack the guarantee to a decent wage, to attack the rights to ensure a safe workplace so when the workers leave home in the morning they know they will return safely at night.

□ 1020

They attack the rights to have access to affordable health care and secure retirement. And yes, they're even attacking the rights of working people to join together to bargain for a better life and better conditions in the workplace.

So at the same time that the Governors of Wisconsin, Ohio, Indiana, and

New Jersey are demanding more public and private union employee sacrifices, Republicans in Washington are using the budget fight to roll back the rights and protections of American workers.

Their spending priorities in their so-called continuing resolution of last week show their hand. They voted to take away workers' ability to repeal unjust and unfair and illegal actions in the workplace by getting rid of the National Labor Relations Board. They voted to undermine the wages of construction workers on Federal projects. They voted to roll back workplace health and safety protections guaranteed by Federal law.

While protecting subsidies for corporate interests, they have sought to cut education funding and critical support for workers in need of job training, and yes, even kids in Head Start.

These rights and services helped to build and sustain our Nation's middle class in the last century making the United States the greatest economic power in the history of the world. We have the greatest workers in the world because of these rights. But now the rights and economic strength of America's middle class are at risk. It's under a systematic assault in the statehouses controlled by Republican legislatures and Republican Governors and in this House of Representatives controlled by the Republicans—a systematic assault that goes beyond after the unions, after the workers have agreed to givebacks, to furlough days, to give back health care benefits, pension benefits. They want more. They want their union. They want their rights in the workplace to be terminated. It's un-American.

There's a reason that we have collective bargaining in this country, because we know that workers should have a right to bond together to improve the workplace, to improve their working conditions. And when they do, those rights flow to the rest of middle class working families in this country. In even the non-union workplaces, those rights are there. That's how we achieved an 8-hour day, that's how we achieved vacation time, that's how we achieved health care, that's how we achieved overtime whether you're in the union or not.

But now they want to take away the rights of unions to organize in the workplace, the rights of workers to organize.

But the Republicans have asked for no sacrifices. In all these cuts, they have asked for no sacrifices of the well-off and the well-connected. In fact, these cuts are being made in the name of the well-off and the well-connected so that they will be able to push for lower wages, for lower benefits, for lower health care for our workers, for lower take-home pay. And what does that do to the economy? It makes America poor.

How do you build a strong middle class community on the back of low-wage earners? You can't do it. It's never been done.

But the fact is, many years ago America decided we wanted a strong and a vibrant middle class, and we did that by forming a union and by giving people the right to have a say at work. We know study after study where workers have a say in the workplace, they work harder, they're more productive, they're more innovative, they're more open to new ideas.

But what do we say to workers with the Governors of Wisconsin and Ohio and Indiana? Do what we tell you to do, do it for less pay, do it for less benefits, and do it because we told you so. That doesn't sound like America to me. It doesn't sound like a powerful country that has the best and most productive workers in the history in the world. That sounds like something that we're not familiar with in this country. That sounds like an autocratic system that just demands and takes but never gives.

EPA ''DUST'' POLICE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, ''Houses were shut tight, and cloth wedged around doors and windows, but the dust came in so thinly that it could not be seen in the air, and it settled like pollen on the chairs and tables, on the dishes.''

Ma and Pa Joad did everything they could to save their farm from slipping away into the dust bowl, but ultimately they lost to a force far greater than any effort they could muster.

Mr. Speaker, though this is just one line ripped from the pages of ''The Grapes of Wrath,'' farmers and ranchers today are facing a modern day dust storm—the wrath of the EPA. Just when you think you've heard it all, bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. come up with some hair-brained idea that leaves you scratching your head in wonderment.

The Environmental Protection Agency has apparently run out of things to regulate and tax so they are considering new guidelines for regulating ''particulate matter emissions''—more commonly known to you and me as ''dust.''

Now, I know what you are thinking, this just cannot be true. What kind of crazy scheme is this?

Well, the EPA ''Dust Police'' would specifically regulate farm dust. Farmers would be required to have dust collectors on their harvesters, planters, combines, and haying equipment.

But my personal favorite is the crackdown on dust created from driving a pickup truck down a dirt or gravel road. I am not making this up. The Federal Government is considering farm dust regulations that are caused from driving on a dirt road.

So I thought, well, maybe this is just some backdoor attempt to rid America of our majestic four-wheel-drive pickups that liberals loathe so much and find some way to force these battery-operated toy cars on the rest of us.

But the new proposals don't just apply to dust created from driving. No, they are fair and they are balanced in their overreaching authority. Farmers and ranchers are going to have to somehow limit the dust created by livestock on their property as well.

So, say Bessie the cow kicks up too much dust running over to your pickup truck at feeding time. The EPA is going to fine you for Bessie's misconduct. You need to move your cattle to another pasture during the daytime? Well, don't do it on a dry day because they may kick up too much dust.

The Dust Police solution is to manage dusty dirt roads with water, or—get this—pave them with asphalt. Now, this is another can of worms.

Every farmer and rancher will have the ''Water Police'' raining down on them by the time the first drop hits the dirt. I would think EPA would be aware of the fact that we already have a shortage of water on ranches and farms in our country. But make no matter to them, they still want you to control it.

And what about this paving the asphalt over these roads? Really, they can't be serious. Aside from the sheer magnitude of this undertaking, the idea is completely unfeasible and it's cost prohibitive.

The absurdity of these types of Federal regulations is what makes normal Americans all across our country frustrated with Washington, D.C.

I will say there is a little good news on the horizon. We're not all out of touch here in Congress. My colleague, Representative KRISTI NOEM from South Dakota, filed an amendment to the continuing resolution last week to eliminate funding to the EPA to enforce the dust regulations. I'm proud to say that this passed the House of Representatives, and it's now down the hallway with the Senate. Let's see what they do.

This type of Federal meddling is exactly what causes businesses to go out of business, lay off workers, and in many cases fail. These types of expensive regulations will finally shut the barn door on the American rancher and farmer for good.

I understand that dust may seem like a serious threat to someone who has never been outside the EPA's marble Potomac palaces or elite castles of academia. But let's use some common sense here. Farmers and ranchers are the best environmentalists in our country. No one respects the land or animals more than those who actually live on it and depend on it for a living.

Instead of burying us in ridiculous regulations that do nothing to improve the quality of life or the environment, the government should look for incentives to encourage farmers and ranchers to produce more, not less. We don't need the EPA-inflicted dust bowl to devastate the American heartland.

The EPA should just head on down the road and leave this regulation in the dust.

And that's just the way it is.

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today, March 2, 2011, marks Texas Independence Day. A hundred and seventy-five years ago, the Texas Declaration of Independence was ratified by the Convention of 1836 on Washington-on-the-Brazos in Texas. This is an important day for Texas, and patriotic Texans observe this occasion with great pride.

In 1824, a military dictatorship took over in Mexico abolishing the Mexican constitution. The new military dictatorship refused to provide trial by jury, freedom of religion, public education for their citizens, and allowed for the confiscation of firearms—this last one particularly intolerable, particularly for Texans.

The Texas Declaration of Independence states that Texas' government had been ''forcibly changed, without their consent, from a restricted federative republic, composed of sovereign states, to a consolidated central military despotism.'' It stated that because of the injustice of Santa Anna's tyrannical government, Texans were severing their connection with the Mexican nation and declaring themselves ''a free, sovereign, and independent republic fully invested with all the rights and attributes'' that belong to independent nations; and a declaration that they ''fiercely and confidently'' committed their decision to ''the Supreme Arbiter of the destinies of Nations.''

□ 1030

The Texas Declaration of Independence was needed because this military dictatorship had ceased to protect the lives, liberty, and property of the people of Texas. Failure to provide these basic rights violated the sacred contract between a government and the people, and Texans at that time, and want to still today, stand up for their rights. In response, the Mexican army marched to Texas, waging a war on the land and the people, enforcing the decrees of the military dictatorship with brute force and without any democratic legitimacy.

Today, 175 years later, Texas President and Governor of Texas, Sam Houston, and other delegates signed the Texas Declaration of Independence. General Santa Anna's army besieged the independence forces at the Alamo in San Antonio. Four days after the signing of this Declaration of Independence, the Alamo fell with her commander, Lieutenant Colonel William Barret Travis, and former Tennessee Congressman Davy Crockett and approximately 200 other Texas defenders. All these men were killed in action in a heroic sacrifice for Texas freedom.

If this tragedy were not enough, weeks later Santa Anna's Army massacred 300 unarmed Texans at Goliad on March 27 of 1836. In a dramatic turnaround, Texans achieved their independence several weeks later on April 21, 1836. Roughly 900 members of the Texan army overpowered a much larger Mexican army in a surprise attack at the Battle of San Jacinto in Harris County, Texas. This battle is memorialized along the San Jacinto River with the San Jacinto Monument in our congressional district. The monument's larger than the monument here in Washington, the Washington Monument. Sam Houston High School, which we have a lot of schools in our district named for Sam Houston, actually received a Texas historical marker about 3 weeks ago.

Today we give thanks to the many Texans that sacrificed for the freedom we enjoy today. God bless Texas and God bless America.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 32 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Lord God of the Universe, Our Hope in times of testing, Our Consolation and Strength always, while this Chamber goes about its work to establish security and good order for the Nation, breathe forth a new Spirit of creativity and learning in the hearts of Your people and guide the course of world events.

By drawing closer to Your Holy Will and revealed Word, may the hidden treasures of lasting freedom empower Your people to seek the truth and do what is right in conscience so we may witness to Your presence in our midst 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 Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CARNAHAN 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 agreed to without amendment a Joint Resolution of the House of the following title:

> H.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

> S. 388. An act to prohibit Members of Congress and the President from receiving pay during Government shutdowns.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

GAO REPORT ON WASTEFUL SPENDING

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Government Accountability Office released a report detailing billions of dollars of waste in the Federal Government. Redundant and ineffective programs infect the government like a plague. For too long, Congress has punted on its responsibility to rein in wasteful spending. And when I read this report, I had the same feeling as my constituents did. I hated it.

According to the report, there are 15 agencies implementing Federal laws on food safety. There are 80 different programs and numerous agencies that work on economic development, 24 Federal agencies for information technology, and 82 programs dealing with teacher quality across multiple agencies. What is this costing us? Billions. Who's paying for it? You guessed it, the American taxpayer.

The American taxpayers' dollars are being wasted by keeping these redundant programs on the books. We should immediately begin looking at ways to eliminate redundancy, stop wasting billions of tax dollars, and allow hard-working Americans to keep more of what they earn.

SPENDING CUTS

(Ms. SCHWARTZ asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I rise today to offer some truth on the Republican spending bill. Over 300 economists believe the Republican bill to cut $61 billion in midyear would eliminate 700,000 American jobs and shrink economic growth by 2 percent just this year. These are shortsighted cuts that could threaten our economy and our economic competitiveness. Our goal should be job creation, not job destruction.

Our Republican colleagues only care about cutting, without regard to where the cuts come from, how they negatively affect American families, or how detrimental they could be for our economy. This is not governing. Spending cuts should not be politically motivated or economically harmful.

We do need to cut spending to reduce our deficit, but these cuts must be targeted, and they must be responsible. They shouldn't cut into our core obligations to our seniors, to our safety, or to our future. Our Nation's economy and our economic growth depends on investing in education, infrastructure, and innovation, all critical to private sector competitiveness. Balancing spending cuts with sound investments is the only way to ensure job growth and new jobs. It's time for the Republicans to move beyond political rhetoric to actions that really work to grow our economy.

MEDICAID COSTS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, in the coming years the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will have to find $2 billion additional to pay for ObamaCare's mandated Medicaid increases. There is little flexibility in State budgets this year, and Pennsylvania, like many States, will have to make up a significant budget gap this year. The entire State budget is only $29 billion. Adding $2 billion more means significant cuts in services or significant tax increases.

Pennsylvania is not alone. According to a new report released yesterday, this expansion will cost States $118 billion additional. That is twice what was just recently estimated by CBO. We want to provide good health care, but we also want to educate our children, keep citizens safe, and maintain our rails and roads. Our State governments must be more than just health care providers. We must provide governors with the flexibility to determine the needs of their States.

Under ObamaCare, Medicaid is more rigid and more expensive, and an even greater burden on States struggling to balance their budgets.

NO GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted for a 2-week compromise to keep our government's most vital programs running while we negotiate an agreement to cut the deficit without hurting our fragile economic recovery. Why? Because a government shutdown would profoundly hurt all Americans, and we need time to work together to avoid that.

Fifteen years ago, a hyperpartisan Congress shut down our national government for ideological reasons and furloughed over 8,500 jobs in my hometown of St. Louis. And just this morning, the St. Louis Post Dispatch reported that a shutdown could put as many as 38,000 people out of work in our region.

Let's have a serious and spirited debate about cutting redtape and duplication and finding common sense solutions. Let's focus on the priorities of the American people: creating jobs and cutting the deficit. We should do so by looking at three principles. Will it create jobs? Will it help the middle class and working Americans and our retirees? And finally, will it lower the deficit?

I hope my colleagues will join me in passing a funding resolution that meets these essential goals. Our constituents deserve no less.

REPEAL THE 1099 REPORTING REQUIREMENT

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

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to fight for the job creators in my district. Small businesses and family farms in upstate New York are already struggling to survive in these tough economic times. We in the Congress can help by attacking the impediments to their profitability: high taxes, onerous regulations, and spiraling health care and energy costs.

Today I rise in support of the repeal of the 1099 reporting requirement that was included in the government-centric health care bill passed last year. This new government mandate is set to require our small businesses to issue detailed tax information for each vendor with whom they do business beyond $600. Some of our small business owners have hundreds of these vendors, and this new onerous requirement is absolutely unnecessary and would add more burden to an already stressed bottom line.

I look forward to standing with the small businesses and farms in my district tomorrow by casting a vote to repeal the 1099 provision.

□ 1210

SUPPORT PUBLIC WORKERS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this 1-minute is from the heart, and it disturbs me and baffles me for a country that I love. I don't believe there is anything more precious than for Members to stand up and pledge allegiance to this great Nation and to be taught as children about the American Dream.

That's why Democrats have focused their life journey on creating jobs for Americans. That's why we don't want to engage in frivolous budgeting that causes us to lose jobs.

But why are Governor Walker of Wisconsin, Governor Kasich of Ohio and Governor Daniels of Indiana demonizing the American Dream, demonizing workers, teachers, transit workers, police and firefighters? Does anyone know that Wisconsin public workers offered $100 million last year to be able to help the State and have already committed to helping them this year? But, no, union busting is not union busting. It is quashing the American Dream, making it a crime to organize workers.

What is America? I beg of them to stand against this kind of dastardly act. Democrats are fighting for jobs. Where is the American Dream?

NATIONAL FRAGILE X FOUNDATION ADVOCACY DAY

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

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled today to welcome over 125 advocates from 40 States with the National Fragile X Foundation to Capitol Hill.

Today the fragile X community will visit their Members to promote awareness, improved research and more efficient treatments for fragile X-associated disorders. This disorder is linked to a mutation on the X chromosome and is the most commonly inherited form of intellectual disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, as you may know, this is a very personal and emotional issue for my family, as my 21-year-old son, Livingston, has fragile X syndrome. I am honored to have Livingston with me today in Washington to help me share our family's story about this condition.

While we understand the challenges facing Congress, we ask you to continue to support Federal investments in fragile X-specific research, discovery and public health priorities.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION AND JOB LOSS

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, Republicans have been in charge for 8 weeks, and this Chamber has taken 154 votes, yet we still see no signs of job creation or a jobs plan.

With 14 million Americans still looking for work, I ask my colleagues on the other side, Where are the jobs? Where is the plan? In this House we have talked about repealing health care reform and instructing committees, but nothing about a jobs plan.

And, now, as we approach the deadline for government funding and the looming threat of a crippling government shutdown, House Republicans are focusing on irresponsible budget plans than actually threaten job creation. In fact, the Republicans' proposed long-term CR not only fails to create jobs or spur the economy, it would actually cause more job losses and depress economic growth.

Economists have discovered that their plan would destroy around 700,000 jobs through 2012. Mr. Speaker, as the impending funding deadline approaches, my Republican colleagues should negotiate in good faith and fund the government in ways to support job creation and economic growth, not cause greater job loss or economic damage.

RED TAPE

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk today about red tape, specifically the 1099 form.

It's a relatively short, seemingly harmless form. Yet when we require every business in this country to file a 1099 form for every business transaction over $600, it is far from harmless. In reality, this requirement is an enormous burden that takes time, energy, resources away from growing their businesses.

The 1099 provision is one of the many backbreaking regulations included in the Democrat's health care overhaul that I opposed when it passed the House in 2010. Repealing this requirement would be a victory for America's small businesses, families, and individuals.

Florida's businesses deserve economic solutions that will let them keep more of what they earn so that they can innovate and grow. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4 and repeal this 1099 provision.

BREATHE CLEAN AIR

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, one thing we share on a bipartisan basis is Republicans and Democrats like to breathe clean air. We don't want to see our kids exposed to aggravated asthma problems.

That's why it's very disappointing that the Republicans are trying to threaten a government shutdown if they don't get to pass their dirty air act. Now, their dirty air act is a bill that they want to pass, and I am not making this up. They want to pass a bill that would make it illegal for the Environmental Protection Agency to enforce the provisions of the Clean Air Act that will reduce air pollution.

This is amazing to me. You want to shut down government, if you don't shut down government in enforcing pollution. Now, I always thought that the American people thought that that was a really bad idea.

I want to share my colleagues' proof of this. In polls done in 19 congressional districts recently, including the Speaker's own district in Ohio, 68 percent of Americans said that we should move forward with the EPA in this; 6 out of 10 said the Republicans' dirty air act is a really bad idea.

We need to keep the government to keep this clean air. Reject the Republicans' threat of a government shutdown.

HONORING THE MEADOWS OF NORTH SMITHFIELD, RHODE ISLAND

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor The Meadows, an affordable senior housing community in my congressional district located in North Smithfield, Rhode Island.

The Meadows excels as an elderly community by providing individual living with enhanced social services and high-quality care to approximately 100 Rhode Island seniors. The Meadows was built using a smart combination of Federal, State, local, and private funding. It has a green design which includes geothermal heating, Energy Star appliances, and energy-efficient lighting.

For the commitment to providing our seniors a quality standard of living, I congratulate the Meadows. I proudly join the National Affordable Housing Management Association in honoring The Meadows as a ''community of quality'' for exemplary development for our seniors.

Thank you for your work. Congratulations on your achievements, and thank you for your commitment to Rhode Island's seniors.

TAX HIKES FOR WORKING MIDDLE CLASS AMERICANS

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, in 2010 the Republicans promised smaller government and fewer taxes. They even signed a pledge, a pledge not to raise taxes. Yet here we are, 56 days after assuming control of the Congress, and Republicans are proposing to do exactly that, tax hikes for working middle class Americans.

Their bill, H.R. 4, would repeal the onerous reporting provisions on small businesses, but on the backs of hard-working middle class American families. Those watching the debate are probably thinking ''say it ain't so, Joe,'' but despite Republicans' claims that it isn't a tax increase, it is a tax increase.

If it isn't, why did the Joint Committee on Taxation say it is? If it isn't, why do Republicans block a vote on my amendment that would prohibit any section of H.R. 4 from kicking in if it did, indeed, raise taxes on middle-class families?

It took only 56 days to break their pledge. Republicans are raising taxes on working people. Say it ain't so, GOP. Say it ain't so.

BLAME FOR OUR NATION'S FISCAL PROBLEMS

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it's hard not to get angry when watching the news or reading the newspaper about Wisconsin.

We are trying to recover from the biggest financial crisis since the Depression, and who is getting the blame for our Nation's fiscal problems? Teachers. Teachers certainly aren't the people who caused the Great Recession. It was a group of Wall Street executives who brought about the financial crisis which led to the budget shortfalls in the States.

Blaming teachers or cutting their pay is wrong. Working to strip them of the basic American right to collectively bargain because some greedy Wall Street executives made huge mistakes and went too far, well, that's absolutely also wrong. Of course, Wall Street executives have gone back to collecting big bonuses while teachers and public workers are collecting the ridicule.

It's time to quit blaming hard-working and dedicated teachers and let them get back to focusing on their students.

□ 1220

OUR NATIONAL DEBT

(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, our national debt, as we all know, is approaching $14 trillion, with a capital ''T.'' It's clear that we can no longer afford to continue the partisan bickering and short-term thinking that too long has consumed our Nation's capital. While kicking this can down the road may have been in vogue at one time, it can no longer be afforded by our Nation.

The staggering debt was not created in a day, and we can't dig ourselves out of this hole overnight, but we must stop digging. In order to tackle our

debt, we must cut spending, agree to a stable source of revenue, and hold these commitments over the long term on a bipartisan basis. Partisan rhetoric will not get the job done. The Congress now has to deal with the reality of this budget mess.

The longer-term continuing resolution the House passed 2 weeks ago, though, won't grow our economy and it won't create jobs in the San Joaquin Valley. And, in fact, two reports by respected economists have indicated that it will provide careless cuts and mean hundreds of thousands of jobs lost throughout the Nation.

We can cut spending and we can grow our economy, but it will require shared sacrifice across the Nation by Democrats and Republicans coming together. Our Nation's fiscal health depends on it.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. POLIS. One of the most critical issues to my constituents and Americans across the country, there is crying out for Congress to take action with regard to illegal immigration.

This Nation has over 15 million people who are here illegally, and yet I don't hear one word about comprehensive immigration reform. Comprehensive immigration reform has strong majority support in polls from Republican voters, from Independent voters, and from Democratic voters. Comprehensive immigration reform would finally establish real border security, real employment verification, and require that people that are here illegally register, pay a fine and get right with the law. It is common sense for America, and it's time for Congress to take action on this critical issue.

Lately I've heard that we might be discussing mandatory E-Verify. That would make the problem worse. E-Verify encourages a black market in Social Security numbers. We need real employment verification with fingerprints or eye IDs so we can identify who's there and don't simply contribute to a black market in Social Security numbers which can be bought and sold, only increasing crime in this country.

My constituents are calling on Congress to take action on comprehensive immigration reform. I urge my colleagues to bring this important issue forward.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, SMALL BUSINESS PAPERWORK MANDATE ELIMINATION ACT OF 2011

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 129 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 129

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4) to repeal the expansion of information reporting requirements for payments of $600 or more to corporations, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in H.R. 705 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours and 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 129 provides for consideration of H.R. 4, the Small Business Paperwork Mandate Elimination Act of 2011.

If you are looking for a prime example of government regulation which, first, is an unnecessary intrusion on small businesses, second, enlarges government bureaucracy at the expense of taxpayers and entrepreneurs, and, finally, creates a mountain of mind-numbing paperwork which has the net effect of killing jobs, then look no further.

Section 9006 of the health reform bill does all of that by requiring businesses to report every expense that they incur over $600; not just wages to their employees, but even for payments to other businesses and for merchandise.

Imagine, if you will, a small business that picks up a couple of dozen doughnuts from Krispy Kreme on a weekly basis. At the end of the year, they must send a 1099 to Krispy Kreme. Think about a small business owner, as I have been for the last 14 years, who buys stamps from the post office, and now you have to send a 1099 to the U.S. Post Office. What about if you buy a printer for your office or blinds for your office? Here comes more, another mountain of new paperwork. So now you're spending tax time preparing 1099s for Krispy Kreme, Office Depot, Walmart, Costco, Starbucks, and the list goes on and on.

It's one thing for a large corporation with an in-house tax department. It's another thing completely for a small business which spends an average of $74 an hour—that's $74 an hour—on tax compliance, the most expensive paperwork burden that the Federal Government imposes on all small businesses.

Then, to make matters worse, last year the President signed the Small Business Jobs Act, which expanded this onerous 1099 requirement to anyone who rents out property. How did this happen? Well, after the bill has been passed, we are learning more about it. We had a Congress that passed a bill through backroom deals shielded from the public view without reading them.

The American people have seen what's in this bill, and they don't like it. They don't like it one bit. That's why they sent all of us to Congress, to repeal, to defund, and to dismantle the health care reform. My Republican colleagues voted to repeal this bill 245–189, with a 49-vote greater margin than the original vote to pass it. That is also why two Federal judges have already ruled that national health care reform is unconstitutional.

And I am proud to be handling this rule on the House floor. H.R. 4 will remove an unnecessary burden from small businesses, so that instead of creating 1099s for their expenditures, they can create W–4s when they hire new employees.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, today the Republicans are breaking a promise that they made to the American people, a promise not to raise taxes. The new majority came in promising a growth agenda. Instead, under the guise of giving administrative relief to small businesses—relief that we all agree is necessary and the majority of this body last session voted to provide with a different way of paying for it—the Republicans are now increasing taxes on middle class Americans and punishing workers.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have also broken their promise to this body. The people's House was promised an open legislative process. Over and over, the leadership has told the American people they want to create an open process, create jobs, and lower taxes. Yet here we are debating the second closed rule of the week on a bill that calls out for new and better ideas, a bill that in its current form will increase taxes and punish employees.

We all agree that the 1099 reporting provision of the Affordable Care Act needs to be fixed. Just last Congress, we brought a bill to the floor to do that. H.R. 5982 would have repealed the 1099 requirements. But the measure failed because our Republican friends did not believe that ending incentives

for companies to outsource jobs overseas, which is the way we paid for fixing this administrative burden at the time, would protect American jobs and wouldn't raise taxes on individuals. They didn't believe that that was the correct way to offset the legislation. Instead, in this Congress, they are seeking a tax increase on middle class families as somehow preferable as a way of paying for something we all agree is important rather than ending incentives to shift American jobs overseas.

Now, we won't get into an argument about semantics. There will be those who somehow argue that this is not a tax increase. Well, if it looks and smells like a tax increase, it is a tax increase. A tax increase by any other name would smell as bitter.

Indeed, under this bill, hundreds of thousands of American families will receive an extra bill from the IRS to the tune of $3,000, $5,000, particularly middle class families, families earning $80,000 a year and $90,000 a year. The heart of what makes up the American middle class face the largest tax increases under this bill.

□ 1230

This bill would raise taxes, harming workers that should be protected. As the Joint Committee on Taxation points out, the Republican proposal would increase taxes for a family of four by an average of $3,000 a year. And, yes, that is a bill from the IRS. That is taxes. T-A-X-E-S is what the Republicans are seeking to increase under this bill.

Let me give another real-life example. One of the issues we want to correct with regard to the 1099 bill and work with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to find a good way to pay for, is that currently people who have rental property are going to be classified as being in the business of renting property, and being subject to additional paperwork under the 1099 provision. So this could be a family of four earning maybe $60,000 a year in salary; they earn another $20,000, $25,000 from a rental property. They work hard. They keep up that property. Maybe it was formerly a family home, or maybe they saved up over 10 or 15 years to buy it.

With the 1099 paperwork problem, we are saying hey, you put a new refrigerator for $600 in that rental home, you have to fill out additional government paperwork that makes you responsible for taxes on that, okay? That's what we want to save people from, Republicans and Democrats. We're saying: You know what, we don't want to burden that family. You make $60,000 a year, you're getting $20,000 from a rental property, we don't want you to jump through hoops to put a new refrigerator in your rental property.

But you know what? To that family, they say we don't want to do that extra paperwork, but if it's between that paperwork and paying a $5,000 bill to the IRS, I'll do the darn paperwork. I'll do the darn paperwork.

Who are we trying to help here? Who are we talking about helping? If they don't want the help, if this is actually harmful, who are we talking about helping?

According to Families USA, House Republicans wish to decimate what remains of the safe harbor that protects individuals and families from substantial tax penalties. The Affordable Care Act provides built-in flexibility to consumers and protects them by capping the tax penalty if the monthly premium credit received during the year exceeds the amount of credit due based on unexpected income or family status.

So again, how can unexpected or unplanned for income or family status change? It could be a bonus, it could be a raise at work, it could be a divorce, or it could be a marriage. There are a number of ways these things change and put people in a higher category where the IRS will be sending them, because of this bill, $3,000 to pay, $5,000 to pay. That's what American families are going to be on the line for.

These provisions of the Affordable Care Act recognize that forcing middle income individuals to repay the entire amount would dampen their willingness to sign up for insurance in the first place. It would penalize them if they found a new job, or penalize them if they received a raise. This process of reconciling the actual income versus tax credits is often called a true up.

Now, last December, as part our bill to prevent the SGR payment cuts from going into effect, we changed the true-up policy for the better. We converted it to a graduated income approach to protect those with middle income levels and enable us to ease away from the cliff that people face when they reach the 400 percent level.

Now, let's talk briefly about health care reform. I know there is a lot in health care reform that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't agree with, but I like to think there is some they do agree with as well.

One of the most important provisions of health care reform from a market perspective is the incentive it gave middle class families to work and get off of government health care. Let me explain.

Before this House and the country took up health care reform, there were many families that were right at the cutoff point for Medicaid, okay. Let's say they are earning $10 an hour. If they got a raise to $10.50 an hour, they might lose thousands of dollars in government benefits. And I've met constituents who've said this. They've said: Look, I'm earning $9.50 an hour. I can't even take a raise at my job. I can't work another 20 hours a week at a side job because I actually lose money. So the government was telling them they couldn't work harder. The government was telling them we're going to trap you into a cycle of dependency. The government was telling them if you earn any more money, we're cutting off your health care.

We replace that in the Affordable Care Act with something that I like to think has support from both sides of the aisles, and that is a sliding scale of reductions. So there is an actual incentive to get off of government health care, to get off of Medicaid, to better yourself and take that 50 cent raise, realizing you may not keep all 50 cents, you might lose a little bit. But, you know what, we're going to let you keep 30 cents of that, and 20 cents will go to decreasing your government benefits. And eventually you've weaned yourself off of government aid entirely and you're able to support health care. That is another misconception. It's not that people want to receive Medicaid or government health care; what they want is to be able to afford, to earn enough money to afford to have private insurance. That's the goal here. The Affordable Care Act helps them get there.

This would strip that provision back and provide a disincentive for families making $75,000, $80,000 a year, depending on the size of the family, to work harder.

America was built on a strong work ethic. We all, on both sides of the aisle, have a strong awareness of the market-based system we live in and the power of incentives. We should provide an incentive for middle class families to earn more, not earn less. Why do we penalize those who succeed? Why are the Republicans seeking to raise taxes on middle class families who are seeking to do a little bit better? We should encourage them to get that second home and make some rental income, to work another 10- or 20-hour-a-week job so they can send their kids to a good college. That's what this body should be discussing. Yet instead, we're about to present to the middle class in this country an enormous tax hike. Now to fund something we all agree, and that is why if this was an open process, as Republican leadership has repeatedly promised, we could come together around better ways to pay for it. Okay, you didn't like the way the Democrats proposed paying for it last year. And you know what, by the way, a lot of those pay-fors wound up in statute anyway paying for other bills, but let's work together to do that. Consistent with the cut-go proposal, let's make cuts in government expenditures somewhere to pay for closing this 1099 loophole. Let's not put it on the backs of middle class families earning $80,000, $90,000 a year, those who are least able to pay for a tax increase.

You know, I was proud to support the continuation for 2 years of the Bush tax cuts at the end of last year, and let me tell you why. I think it would be unthinkable to raise taxes on families making under $250,000 a year. Now, I supported letting them expire for families making over $250,000 a year. You don't take pleasure in that, but it was because I felt we needed to do that to

close the deficit. We couldn't leave that revenue on the table. But I felt it was so important to make sure that families making $80,000, $90,000, $100,000 a year didn't get a tax increase that I was willing to support no tax increase for millionaires as well as part of the package.

And yet here we are in the third month of the Republican Congress with an enormous tax increase on those Americans who can least afford it, the very families who are making $80,000, $90,000 a year who form the backbone of the American middle class, facing a $3,000, $4,000, $5,000 tax increase because of the way the Republican majority has chosen to pay for what we all agree is a worthy cause: reducing paperwork for small businesses and home renters.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 129 and the underlying legislation, H.R. 4.

Last year's health care law was rammed through without the opportunity for the American public to let their voices be heard. At the time, then-Speaker PELOSI said Congress had to pass the bill to know what is in it. Now we know. Even Democrats are realizing how many problems there are in this bill.

One such example is the 1099 reporting requirement. This requirement forces businesses to report nearly all expenses exceeding $600 to the IRS. This results in a new, onerous burden on small businesses. The requirement means 10 to 20 times more paperwork for small businesses. The U.S. Small Business Administration estimates the 1099 tax compliance will cost small businesses $800 per employee annually.

Small businesses are the economic backbone, and the 1099 requirement is breaking their back. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will tell you H.R. 4 is a Republican tax increase on middle America. That couldn't be further from the truth.

The offset we are using here today prevents individuals from receiving health care subsidies that they aren't entitled to. We are preventing people from defrauding the Federal Government. We aren't taking money away from people; we are protecting taxpayer dollars by ensuring they're being used the way they're meant to be used.

Moreover, the subsidies we're talking about today don't even take place until 2014, which gives taxpayers ample time to know the facts. The 1099 requirement is affecting small businesses today. Anybody who calls this rule an attack on the middle class isn't telling you the truth, Mr. Speaker.

We are here today because the Republican majority is committed to jobs and protecting and creating jobs for the American people.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NUGENT. The Democrat-passed 1099 reporting requirement is a job killer. We want to make sure that small businesses can use their hard-earned profits to expand their businesses, open new storefronts, and bring on new employees, not spend their time reporting to the IRS.

If we're going to create jobs, we need to create an environment where small businesses can succeed. H.R. 4 is an important step in fostering that environment. With that, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this rule and support H.R. 4.

□ 1240

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

This is not, as my colleague from Florida indicated, about fraud. The law has strong penalties for fraud already.

Now, there's agreement to close this extra paperwork on the 1099. What we are supporting is an open process that would allow the majority to work with the minority to find a way to pay for solving this increased administrative overhead without raising taxes on American families.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Florida who just spoke said that the Democrats were going to attack this proposal or the pay-for for this proposal by saying that it's an assault on the middle class, and that's exactly what I intend to say.

Unless I misunderstood my colleague from Florida, he seemed to suggest that the health care subsidies, that people who are in this $80,000 or $90,000 income bracket was something that they were not entitled to; I suppose because he thinks that somehow they're too rich. Well, let me tell you, if you have a family of four and you're making $80,000 to $90,000 a year or something like that, certainly in my State of New Jersey but in a lot of parts of the country, it's very difficult for you with a family of four to be able to buy health insurance, to pay your premium, without some help. And that's exactly what we're talking about when we talk about people who are middle class. People who are middle class could be making $25,000 a year, $40,000, $50,000, $80,000, $90,000, $100,000 a year. It's not easy to be able to afford your health premiums if you have a family of four and you're in that income bracket.

I regret what's happening here today, because the bottom line is there was bipartisan agreement on the main goal of repealing this 1099 reporting. Doing away with it is something that the Democrats actually put on the House floor and voted on last session. But what we had during the 111th Congress is a repeal bill that basically was paid for by closing tax loopholes for companies that ship jobs overseas, and we weren't able to get that passed because it was on suspension and only two Republicans joined with us. It was actually endorsed, the pay-for and the bill, by the National Federation of Independent Business, but the Republicans wouldn't support it. There's no question here that we want to repeal the 1099 reporting requirement, but we don't want to pay for it on the backs of the middle class. We should pay for it by closing these loopholes for taxes for companies that take jobs overseas so that we can create more jobs here at home.

I just can't believe what the Republicans are saying. They have this offset that would essentially eliminate protections for middle class families and cost them about $6,000 or more in payments to the IRS. So the average middle class family is either going to have to pay more to the IRS in order to get some kind of benefit on their premium or just decide to go uninsured. The whole point of the Affordable Care Act was to try to deal with those middle class families that can't afford health insurance. If you're very poor now, you get Medicaid. If you're over 65, you get Medicare. But if you're a working person, you can't afford your health insurance a lot of times because what happens is you have to go and buy it on the individual market because your employer simply doesn't provide it. That's these middle class people that we're trying to help with the Affordable Care Act, those that need a little help so that they can afford their premium. And these are the very ones that you're saying, ''No, it's too bad now. We're not going to help you.''

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are bringing H.R. 4 to the floor. This is a bill that I introduced in its original form last April 26 when we looked at the health care bill that had passed and saw that this, which has absolutely nothing to do with health care, this new burden on businesses, this double-edged sword against small business, was put in that bill supposedly to pay for part of the health care bill.

Now, we have our Democratic friends talking about the pay-for here. I happen to think that we don't even need a pay-for because I think there is a game that is played in this place, which is we will put something in the health care bill that virtually nobody knows is in there. I bet you 99 percent of the Members of the House and the Senate who voted on that bill didn't even know this provision was in there. We then have it scored as somehow gaining $19 billion for the Federal Government over the next 10 years, which I happen to think is made out of whole cloth because you have to assume that virtually everybody cheats in order for you to come to that conclusion. And

then if we say we now want to get rid of this unnecessary burden, which, by the way, when I introduced this last April, I couldn't get a single Democrat to join me on. I was told by Democrats that the leadership had said, Don't get on that bill; don't dare do anything like that because that will be the first repeal of the health care bill. After a while I finally got some to join me and now there are 38 Members, I believe, on the other side that have joined so that we now have a total of 278 Members, I believe, that have cosponsored my bill, H.R. 4.

But the point is, we bring this new obligation in, this new paperwork obligation, we claim it's going to gain us $19 billion, and then what's the joke on the American people? If we dare repeal it, we're responsible for somehow coming up with $19 billion in additional taxes.

Now I know what the Ways and Means Committee has done. They've added this to the bill, a pay-for, and I understand the justification for it. But frankly the rules are such that they're gamed against the average American citizen. You come up out of whole cloth to create this new obligation in your bill, and then once you do and see what the actual implication is and small business said this is a job killer, you say, ''Okay, we'll allow you to bring it to the floor but only if you pay for it with new taxes in some way.''

Well, our side has looked at it and said, instead of that, why not say those things that are not to be given to folks under this bill ought not to be given to folks under this bill? That is, overpayments ought not to be allowed. As Secretary Sebelius said when your side brought up a very similar provision last year, she said, basically, this is a way to recapture funds.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. And so I would just like to get away from the confusion that is being displayed on the floor today and just get back to the essence of this bill. It is to repeal a provision that was put in the health care bill that virtually no one knew about, that is a job killer, that is recognized as being a job killer, that the other side with the majority could have at any time last year gotten rid of, which finally the President recognized in his State of the Union address is an excess in this health care bill, and let's not make it a political football now and say, well, now it's a tax, or now it's this, or now it's that. Frankly it is an attempt to try and repeal a section of the health care bill that never should have been there in the first place, that has erroneous premises on which it was developed, a suggestion that somehow most Americans involved in business cheat. That's the only way you can justify $19 billion coming back to the Federal Treasury. If you believe that the average American businessman and businesswoman, particularly small businessmen and small businesswomen, are cheaters, I never have accepted that. I won't accept that today. And, frankly, we ought not to allow this kind of debate to stop the repeal of this provision of the health care bill.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself a minute to respond to my good friend, the gentleman from California.

I agree with much of what you said, particularly when you said we don't need a pay-for. I agree with you that to a certain extent the gains are illusory. Yes, they're used as a pay-for; yes, there's a shell game; yes, on paper it looks like so much money. There's times that you and I might both disagree with the CBO, for instance, and this might very well be one of those. But the answer, and I hope my friend from California agrees, is not instead of doing no pay-for or perhaps allowing an amendment under this rule that would allow us to eliminate the pay-for, the answer is not to raise taxes on the middle class.

With that, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule, because hidden deep in this bill is language that indeed will increase income taxes on middle class American families by thousands of dollars a year.

□ 1250

My Republican colleagues claim the bill is not a tax increase on the middle class. They argue that Grover Norquist says it's not a tax increase. They say Democrats have, and I quote, ''decided to dance the Washington two-step,'' claiming this bill contains a new income tax on working families.

In hearing all that, I have one simple question:

If the Republican plan is not that of a massive, new income tax increase, then why did the Republican majority refuse to allow a vote on the amendment which I offered?

My amendment simply said that no section of this bill would take effect if it raised taxes on any American family of four earning less than $110,250 a year. That's all it said. It just makes it clear you can't raise taxes on the middle class. That's all it said. It is a straightforward and simple amendment. If the Republicans actually believed their own rhetoric of cutting taxes, they would have accepted my amendment and allowed a vote on that amendment on the floor.

We took JOE CROWLEY's amendment and accepted it because we believe this bill will not raise taxes on the middle class.

That's what my colleagues could have said.

The Republicans refuse to allow a vote on my amendment. They refuse to debate it. They refuse to even discuss it. Why? Because they know their bill raises taxes on the middle class by thousands of dollars. It's not just me saying it. The Committee on Joint Tax states that this bill will raise $25 billion in new revenue, which is shorthand for taxes. It doesn't come out of the sky. You just can't take that $25 billion out of the air. Somebody has to pay that, and that entity is the middle class of our country.

Even Grover Norquist at Americans for Tax Reform has written, and I quote, ''Americans for Tax Reform has always followed the Committee on Joint Tax's methodology.''

He follows the Joint Tax methodology. So, if Joint Tax says it's a tax, Grover Norquist has to agree it is a tax. The best example, though, is a real-life example on how this bill will raise taxes on middle class families. By the ''middle class,'' I mean families with children, earning no more than $110,250 a year, not the millionaires the Republicans were trying to protect when they held these same taxpayers hostage in December while demanding tax cuts for the richest 1 percent of Americans, those earning over $1 million a year.

Here is how this bill will raise taxes on middle class families:

If you're a family of four, earning $88,000 a year, which is approximately 398 percent of the Federal poverty line, the Democratic health care law caps the amount of health care premiums you will be forced to pay annually at no more than 9.5 percent of one's income. In this example, that is $8,360 a year on a typical family policy valued at $13,000.

So the family receiving private health care insurance would pay $8,360 in annual premiums, and the Federal Government would provide a tax credit valued at $4,640, with these funds going directly to the insurance carrier, from Treasury to the insurance carrier. The money does not go to the family. The family doesn't touch it. The husband and wife, they don't touch that money. It goes right to the Treasury.

If this family were to get a $250 bonus at the end of the year, say in December, and if the boss asks the husband or the wife or whoever the bread earner in the family is—maybe it's both—to come in and he says, ''You know what? You're doing such a great job that we think you have management potential, and we want to give you a bonus''—and you're like thinking ''a bonus''—''We're going to give you a $250 bonus. Go out and buy the family a little dinner for the holidays,'' that $250 bonus will bounce up that family to 401 percent of the Federal poverty level.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Under the Republican bill being debated now, this family would be required to refund the government the entire $4,640. Talk about

making work pay. Talk about getting a bonus for doing hard work and making work pay: Oh, here's 250 bucks. Please give us 4,640 bucks back.

Let's remember that the $4,640 in tax credits never actually goes to the family. The Treasury cuts a check to the insurance companies, so the insurance companies are fine. They keep the money. It's the poor schlep—the middle class man or woman—who has to pay that money back.

So in essence, this bill, H.R. 4, is charging families, families who play by the rules—not tax cheats, not people who are trying to scam the system but those who play by the rules—thousands of dollars in new taxes. These are not families getting so-called new taxes. These are not families getting so-called ''overpayment checks'' or cash from the government. These are honest, hardworking families who are just trying to get ahead.

The adoption of my amendment would have stopped the Republican tax increase on middle class families. It would still allow for the repeal of the onerous 1099 reporting requirements on owners of small businesses.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Democrats want to enact the repeal of the 1099 reporting requirements. We passed a bill in July of 2010 that didn't raise taxes on anyone. Instead, it closed loopholes that allowed for the exporting of U.S. jobs overseas.

Guess what happened to that bill? Your side blocked it. The Republicans blocked it.

That wasn't the only time Democrats did this responsibly. Recently, the Senate passed a bipartisan, deficit-neutral repeal of the onerous 1099 business reporting requirements. Let me make it clear: Democrats are ready to repeal 1099 reporting requirements, but we will not do it on the backs of hardworking middle class Americans.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

Mr. GUINTA. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding this time.

I rise to add my voice to those calling for the repeal of the 1099 provision.

H.R. 4, very simply put, Mr. Speaker, is about protecting small business owners, job creators in New Hampshire and across our Nation, from onerous paperwork burdens. Simple as that. Nothing more. Nothing less.

Currently, this piece of legislation, a component of the health care legislation, requires those small business owners to comply with the Federal Government every time they spend $600 with an individual vendor over the course of a calendar year. I've talked to many small business owners in my home State of New Hampshire, who have told me specifically how this would hurt their small businesses.

We should be here to encourage small business owners to innovate, to expand. We should make sure that we give them the predictability of this House through public policy that will allow them to create jobs. The heart of New Hampshire's economy is the small business owner as 80 percent of our economy is reliant on them.

I ask that my colleagues join me in repealing the 1099 provision.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have always looked for opportunities and ways to support our Nation's small businesses. We all know that they are the real job creators in our country.

Today, I strongly support repealing the enhanced 1099 tax reporting requirement established under the Affordable Care Act. Businesses across my home State of Rhode Island and the country have made it crystal clear that this is a highly problematic requirement that will result in serious logistical and financial burdens if it is not addressed before next year's implementation.

We passed the Affordable Care Act, in part, to ease the burdens of health care costs on small businesses, not to replace them with onerous tax provisions. This is an opportunity for lawmakers, regardless of party affiliation, to come together and fix a problem in the health care reform act that will protect businesses of all sizes.

Now, I was proud to vote for the repeal of this provision last year, and was equally disappointed that it did not garner enough votes to pass in either the House or the Senate. It is my sincere hope that Democrats and Republicans will take this opportunity to set aside their differences and agree to repeal this provision in both a fiscally and socially responsible way.

As currently drafted, this repeal would be paid for by raising taxes on middle class families, making it harder for them to afford private health insurance when the Affordable Care Act goes into effect in 2014. This is unacceptable. Surely, we can find a better way to pay for a bill that lessens the tax burden on businesses than by increasing the tax burden on middle class and low-income families.

□ 1300

To that end, I ask my colleagues to support this measure, but to consider an alternative way to pay for this bill when the House resolves its differences with the Senate. Businesses everywhere are counting on us to come through for them, as is the middle class; and we can't afford to let them down.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, my cousin, Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. I would like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina. I'm looking forward to visiting the family at Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of this House and this great country, as I traveled to cities like Covington, Warner Robins and Tifton, Georgia this past week, the main issue I heard from constituents was their growing fear of the size of government's regulatory burden on their business and their way of life.

Now, I find it laughable that today Democrats say that they didn't know this 1099 provision was in this bill. The fact is this 1099 provision was part of a continuous assault by the Democratic Party on small businesses across this country. Now, eliminating this provision will further reduce the government's burden placed on these businesses.

As a small business owner myself, I know from personal experience that passing this resolution will allow employers the time necessary to focus on creating jobs rather than dealing with the burden of government paperwork.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my fellow colleagues to vote in favor of repealing this overbearing, burdensome, job-killing 1099 provision that the Democrats put into that bill. And as Thomas Jefferson once said: ''When the people fear their government, there is tyranny; when the government fears the people there is liberty.''

Mr. Speaker, it is time to liberate our people, our small businesses from the burdens of this 1099 provision.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Does section 4 of H.R. 4 violate the rules of the House by proposing a tax increase?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman asking about the underlying bill or the pending resolution?

Mr. POLIS. The inquiry is regarding the underlying bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill is not yet pending. In any case, the gentleman is asking for an advisory opinion. The Chair will not issue such an opinion.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a question of how cleverly—or perhaps deviously—the majority party constructed the rules of the House with regard to a test as to whether presenting a family earning $80,000 a year with a bill for $3,000 from the IRS is a tax increase or not. It would take some pretty fancy tap dancing to say that a $3,000 or $4,000 bill from the IRS to a middle class family is not a tax increase. If it

looks like a tax increase, if it smells like a tax increase, it is a tax increase. And it is contrary to the rules of the House to allow a tax increase in this kind of bill.

Now, I understand there's some fancy dancing and semantics around it, but I think the American people and the voters of this country have a great deal of common sense with regard to this matter. When you get a $3,000 bill from the IRS that you have to pay—and if you don't pay, as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle liked to point out during the debate on the health care bill, you could face going to prison—that's a tax increase. That's a tax increase.

What this bill does is tell hundreds of thousands of middle class families, particularly right on that cusp—we talk about this 400 percent of poverty rate, again, that's an arbitrary level, but it's a real level for families; it's X dollars. Now it depends on the size of the family and it depends on the State, but we're talking $80,000, $90,000 a year, right in that range. You earn, as my friend from New York pointed out, 250 bucks more, the IRS sends you a bill, $3,000, $4,000, $5,000; and if you don't pay it, you face going to prison.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman.

I was attempting to ask the gentleman from Georgia to yield so I could ask him a question: What part of what I said about the family of four earning $88,000 and getting a bonus of $250, and their exposure then to $4,460 in taxes was untrue? He was on a diatribe of his talking points about small businesses.

We understand small businesses, the burden that was placed there. We are trying to remove that from them, but not to place it on the backs of the middle class. I understand he wanted to remove the burden from small business, but to place it on the backs of the middle class, that was the question I've asked.

And by the way, I haven't heard one colleague from the other side of the aisle refute what I said about that family of four. Not one person has stood up and said, you're wrong, Mr. CROWLEY. That will not take place; that potential will not take place if this bill passes. The silence is deafening from the other side. They know it's a tax increase on the middle class, Mr. POLIS.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I thank my colleague from South Carolina for yielding.

This is great. You know, it's very interesting to listen to this concern. When I was actually out on the campaign trail, I talked to a lot of small business owners. These small business owners were fired up. This is exactly what they're saying is wrong with Washington—more and more government regulation, more and more paperwork—and this is exactly what we have to clean up now after 4 years of what we've been dealing with.

Mr. Speaker, as a new Member I was not in the body when the previous Democrat majority passed this job-destroying regulation, taxes on every sector of our economy. But as I did go around, I heard from businesses like Mussman's Back Acres in Kankakee County in my district, and I heard about the illogical burden that this would place on them, the people they would have to hire just to take care of this requirement—one of the most illogical requirements I can say of the health care bill. It doesn't make a heck of a lot of sense.

The 1099 requirement impacts small businesses disproportionately by requiring them to file and collect 1099 tax forms for any business transaction—any one—over $600 or more per year, these new requirements at a time when businesses can't afford it.

Mr. CROWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Actually, if you would allow me to keep speaking, I would appreciate that.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation to strip the 1099 requirement on business. This body will continue to remove the undue burden on small businesses, the undue burden on society in general that was placed out of this body for the last 4 years.

It is high time that the Republican majority, and, frankly, with many colleagues on the other side that have said it's time to make small business work again—it's time to give them the freedom to hire people back. It's time to take our country back, get people back to work, rein in government spending, and put government where it should be: limited, effective and efficient.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 seconds to my friend from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Once again I asked the gentleman to yield. He refused to yield because he has no answer. But I'm correct. The example that I gave of a family of four making $88,000 would have a huge tax increase because of this bill of $4,460.

You refused to yield because you know you cannot refute what I'm stating here on the floor.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. I thank the gentleman.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 4. This bill will repeal one of the most egregious and anti-jobs, anti-growth provisions contained in last year's health care law. This 1099 provision threatens our small business owners with an avalanche of paperwork and bureaucracy when Congress should instead be doing everything in our power to help employers create jobs.

My constituents have told me loud and clear what this means to them. One small business owner in my district told me that just last year alone she had more than 500 transactions that she would have had to report under this provision, the expense and enormous regulatory burden on her and her employees. She called it ridiculous, and I think she is understating things.

I hope Congress will overwhelmingly pass this bill. Let's liberate our small business owners from the mountain of paperwork and instead let them get back to work, creating jobs and moving our economy forward.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada, Dr. HECK.

□ 1310

Mr. HECK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, today I also rise in support of H.R. 4, the Small Business Paperwork Mandate Elimination Act of 2011. There is no doubt this job-killing 1099 hidden tax deserves repeal.

Nevada's unemployment rate is a Nation-high 14.5 percent. We need to create jobs. Eighty percent of Nevada's employees work for small businesses. So I asked small business owners what the government should do to create jobs.

Paul Beehler, a small business owner, operates Midas shops throughout southern Nevada, buys multiple auto parts from multiple venders, said regulations and hidden taxes, like the 1099 hidden tax, keep him from hiring new workers.

You know what? More than 170 small business organizations Nationwide agree with Paul and have called for the 1099 hidden tax's repeal.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECK. No, Mr. Speaker, I shall not yield.

Washington said it wants to hear job-creating ideas from the business community. Here is one that they are screaming about.

Nevada's families are hurting. American families are hurting. It's time to end the job-killing 1099 hidden tax and get Nevadans back to work.

Mr. POLIS. Since the gentleman from New York has been unable to enter into a colloquy with the several gentlemen he has sought to, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. I appreciate the time from the gentleman from Colorado.

I've attempted so far again to ask two more gentlemen from the other side of the aisle to yield for the purposes of answering a question. I've noticed that not a single one as of yet has refuted the example that I gave of a family of four earning $88,000 a year getting a $250 bonus being pumped up over the 401 percentile of the Federal poverty level and being exposed to a $4,460 tax.

I wonder when the gentlemen were out campaigning last year and talking to small businesses, did you talk to the middle class about the increase in the tax that you would propose when you came to the floor of the House? One of the first bills, number four, the fourth bill to increase taxes on the middle class. Did you talk to those folks? Did you let them know what you were doing to them? I suspect not. You have two more speakers to refute what I've said. I'm waiting.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL).

Mr. RIGELL. I thank my friend and the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as a business owner for more than 20 years, I know firsthand that excessive tax paperwork and compliance matters are already major expenses to our small businesses. And the new reporting requirements included in the health care law will substantially increase those costs. These new requirements impose yet another burden on small businesses forcing them to devote more resources to filing taxes instead of going out and doing what they do best, which is to create jobs.

You know, in Virginia alone, small businesses make up nearly 98 percent of all business establishments and account for——

Mr. CROWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGELL. No, I will not. The gentleman's question that he is persistent with is not germane.

And account for more than 75 percent of new job growth. And according to a study by the Small Business Administration, the cost of complying with the Tax Code is 66 percent higher for small businesses as compared to large businesses.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia controls his time. The gentleman apparently refuses to yield.

Mr. RIGELL. You know, these reporting requirements are a classic example of laws that are passed by people who have no clue what it means to go out and create a job and that put precious capital at risk. They're created, these laws, by people who have never met with a banker and have been told by a banker, ''No, I can't help you.''

So this bill, H.R. 4, is a step in the right direction to help our small business owners. I strongly urge my colleagues to stand with me in voting in favor of it.

Mr. POLIS. After continuing to be amazed that the gentleman from Virginia somehow said that a tax increase is not a tax increase and is not germane, I am happy to yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Not germane. That's the answer. A $4,460 tax increase is not germane to this debate we're having right now. What is? The $25 billion doesn't fall out of the sky, out of the air. It has to come from somewhere. It is a tax increase on the middle class.

You know it. We all know it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, Dr. ANDY HARRIS.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, as if businesses weren't struggling enough with the worst recession since the Great Depression, some Washington bureaucrat decided it was a good idea to distract the real job creators of our country from doing what they do best—create jobs.

To the gentleman from New York, that's what this debate is about, whether that hypothetical family actually has a job. But whether they should be distracted from creating jobs by requiring them to fill out mountains of 1099 paperwork. Obviously, the individual who came up with this brilliant idea has never had to meet a payroll or deal with the day-to-day operations of a small business.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland controls the time. The gentleman, by his silence, is not willing to yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Small business owners all over my district have told me that the 1099 provision would hurt their business. Trish Date, who co-owns Rittenhouse Fuel Services with her husband and Perry Hall, said it would be ''an administrative nightmare that would cost me thousands of dollars to implement.''

Last year, she used over 250 individual vendors that will now require 1099 forms to be printed, copied, mailed, completed, and sent to the venders and the IRS. Her small family-owned business simply does not have the resources or capacity to handle this onerous regulation.

Another business owner, Karen Oertel, whose family owns and operates the Harris Crab House on the eastern shore, said this 1099 mandate would be ''overwhelmingly burdensome on my family business.''

Mr. Speaker, the 1099 provision is simply a job-destroying regulation that wastes precious time, labor, and money. If we want to create jobs tomorrow, I urge my colleagues to join me in repealing this awful provision now by supporting H.R. 4.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me first say that we all know why we're here. There is a bipartisan consensus that the 1099 provision in this bill is flawed. It's a mistake. And what it says to me is that the health care bill is badly flawed.

And we all recall the very famous statement that was made, ''We have to pass this bill before we can understand what's in it.'' I'm trying to remember who said that. Somebody said that. Somebody very prominent said that.

So here we have a measure that is badly flawed. There is bipartisan consensus—278 cosponsors of Mr. LUNGREN's bill. And as Mr. LUNGREN said at the outset, Democrats were discouraged from cosponsoring it because by cosponsoring the measure they admitted that this outrageous health care bill was flawed.

Well, it got to the point where the President of the United States in his news conference right after the election said the bill needs to be fixed, the 1099 provision needs to be fixed. So he was acknowledging right there that it was flawed. Now, we have this big debate on CutGo and how we're paying for this.

And I would be happy to yield to my friend who has been requesting time to ask the question that I know he's going to ask me because I've heard it a million times over the last few minutes.

I yield to my friend from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. No. The last time, Mr. Speaker, was for the purpose of a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DREIER. I'm yielding to my friend. The Speaker doesn't need to yield.

Mr. CROWLEY. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for my asking for my colleagues to yield was to inquire as to the procedures of the House.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I yielded to the gentleman to ask me a question.

Mr. CROWLEY. I will ask that as well.

What of the example I gave you of a family of four earning $88,000 a year who gets a bonus—how many here have heard of a bonus of $250? They get a bonus because they worked hard. They get that bonus and they are in the 401 percentile of the Federal poverty level. They get a bill from the IRS for $4,460. What part of that is not a tax increase?

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I will answer my friend by saying the following: It is a subsidy that has provided that opportunity for that taxpayer. It is a subsidy.

This is scored by the Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. CROWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Could I finish the answer to the question? Because I know the gentleman has been interrupting, repeatedly, Members, and I, usually, as I ask people to yield, try not to do it more than three times. And the gentleman has asked three, four, five times. Some of our Members yield when they're doing 1-minute speeches.

So let me just say that this is scored by the Congressional Budget Office, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1320

It is scored not as a tax increase; it is scored as a spending cut. And I know what the Joint Committee on Taxation has said, but they rely on the Congressional Budget Office as they look to this. And so the fact is what this comes down to is returning an improper government subsidy. And that is not a tax increase.

So if I could complete my statement, Mr. Speaker, now that I have answered the question posed by the gentleman, this bill itself is in fact a badly flawed measure, the Obama health care bill. And for that reason, it is absolutely essential that we provide the kind of relief that every small business in this country deserves. And so we are in a position where we have done this in, I believe, the most proper way.

The gentleman's amendment doesn't comply with the CutGo provision that we have. So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am going to encourage my colleagues to support this rule.

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

Look, in a climate of a fragile economic recovery, the last thing we want do is punish people for getting a raise or earning a few extra dollars by working an extra job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to help small businesses, and that's something we all agree with. I ran a small business before I was elected to Congress, and there is great support from both sides of the aisle to making sure that we reduce the 1099 reporting requirements for small businesses and people who happen to have a rental home.

But this is a situation of thanks, but no thanks. Thanks for saying I don't have to fill out an extra form because I bought a $600 refrigerator for my rental property, but no thanks because you are giving me a $5,000 bill from the IRS.

This Republican proposal undoes a bipartisan agreement that passed overwhelmingly last Congress. Under this Republican pay-for, an average middle class family could find out in January that they have to come up with $12,000 by April to send to the IRS with their tax return, or they could face going to prison. An extra $100 in overtime here and a $500 holiday bonus there could send a working family towards tax court.

During the last Congress, the Republican Party complained of being left out of the process; and while we didn't always have an open rule, every major piece of legislation came to the floor under a structured rule. Members of both parties come to the Rules Committee and have their amendments vetted. Now, why aren't we through this rule offering the good idea that the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) offered? He said why don't we remove the pay-for from this bill and simply disagree with CBO and see if we can pass it on that ground? Why are we not allowing the amendment from my friend from New York, who offered an amendment that would repeal the middle class tax increase proposed in this Republican bill? The Crowley amendment would protect the middle class and maintain the bipartisan agreement that we had last year.

Mr. Speaker, we all agree that the 1099 provisions in the Affordable Care Act need to be addressed. There has been excellent points made in that regard from Members from both sides of the aisle, but this is not the way to do it, not on the backs of the middle class, not with a tax hike during a recession.

Republicans are proposing a substantial tax hike for the middle class. Not only is that bad policy, but it's also a violation of the pledge that many of them signed committing to oppose all tax increases. A tax increase is a tax increase. When you get a $3,000, or $4,000, or $5,000 bill from the IRS that you have to pay the IRS, it's called a tax increase. A tax increase. There is nothing else to call it.

No fancy dancing, no fancy words can change the fact that a bill from the IRS is a tax increase. And families making $80,000, $90,000 a year will receive substantial tax increases under the Republican version of paying for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order Mr. CROWLEY's amendment to the bill. That amendment simply says that nothing in the bill will apply if it would result in a tax increase on anyone whose income is less than 500 percent of the Federal poverty line.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot today about the cost and about taxes, about tax increases. We must be working from very different mathematical systems. They keep saying that we are raising taxes, and there is nothing further from the truth than the statements I have heard from the left.

You have consistently posed a question that all of America needs an answer to: Is this in fact a tax increase? Well, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation, this is in fact a net tax cut of over $20 billion over the next 10 years, and it will reduce the deficit by $166 million over the same period of time. Let's also keep in mind that these cost savings come from the government recouping money that the recipients should not have gotten in the first place.

That is not a tax increase. Let me say it one more time: that is not a tax increase. If we were looking for the way to actually get rid of this problem, there is a simple way to do that: let's repeal the entire health care law. Because the problem that we see today comes in the package of the health care law itself. So consistent with reality is the fact that the Democrats have put us in this position. So we are working in a bipartisan fashion through the 1099 repeal to eliminate this problem.

Finally, we should all bear in mind that while this resolution is a closed rule, the opposition was offered an opportunity to submit a substitute bill. They declined. We have also expanded debate to 2½ hours.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 129 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

(1) Strike ''the previous question'' and all that follows and insert the following:

The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours and 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the amendment printed in section 2, if offered by Representative Crowley of New York or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

(2) At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. ___PROHIBITION OF TAX INCREASE ON AMERICA'S MIDDLE CLASS.

Any amendment made by this Act shall not apply to any taxable year beginning during any calendar year if such application of such amendment would result in an increase in the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for any taxpayer whose household income is less than 500 percent of the poverty line for the size of the family involved for a taxable year of the taxpayer beginning in such calendar year (compared to the tax which would be imposed under such chapter for such taxable year determined without regard to such amendment).

___

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To

defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

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

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. 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. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 662, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2011

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 128 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 128

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 662) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto 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 Transportation and Infrastructure; (2) the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Mica of Florida or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1330

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 128 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 662. This rule provides for ample debate and opportunities for Members on both sides of the aisle, the majority and minority, to make sure that they have ample time to participate, come to the floor, and express their ideas, which is what this new Republican majority is enabling Members to do.

I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. The underlying legislation is a simple extension of service transportation programs through September 30 of this year.

This legislation was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Chairman MICA, on February 11, 2011, with Ranking Member RAHALL as an original cosponsor. It was reported out of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure by a voice vote on February 28, 2011. This legislation went through regular order with bipartisan support.

This is a clean, straight extension of current law, providing a hard freeze at 2009 spending levels through the end of this fiscal year. Without this legislation, the spending levels would expire on Friday, March 4, 2011.

In an effort to provide more transparency and accountability of how this body has been run, which is different than how this body has been run for the past 4 years, the Republican Conference adopted a policy that would no longer permit extensions of programs on a continuing resolution or any other appropriations bills. This allows Members a straight up or down vote on an issue at hand and, in this case, it is surface transportation.

The Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011 continues the authorization of Federal highway, transit, and highway safety programs through the end of this fiscal year at the same program funding levels established for fiscal year 2009. This authorization is essential to allow funds that had been included in transportation appropriations legislation to flow to States and local transit agencies. We are not trying to get in the way of decisions that need to be made locally; we are simply trying to make sure that they are legally executed.

Should this straight extension of transportation funding not be signed into law before the March 4 deadline, the impact would be severe and immediate. A shutdown would result in immediate furloughs and suspension of payments to States, which would hamper the Federal Highway Administration's ability to pay contractors. This would jeopardize the States' transportation funding to a tune of $154 million a day, killing ongoing projects, things which had been agreed on and are being done locally.

This level of funding was extended by the previous Congress six times starting in October of 2009. Continuing this funding at 2009 levels allows for the appropriate funding for States to complete and manage their transportation projects. With an extension through the fiscal year, it will allow the new chairman of the Transportation Committee, my dear friend, the favorite son and gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) the appropriate time to hold necessary hearings to review and re-estimate the funding essential for States to carry on their transportation projects.

The Congressional Budget Office, which is also known as the CBO, has concluded that the underlying bill today does not affect direct spending or revenues. Further, the CBO determined

that, ''the nontax provisions of H.R. 662 contain no intergovernmental or private sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on State, local, or tribal governments.''

Additionally, according to the Department of Transportation, surface transportation allows for international trade, which helps sustain and create jobs that support our national economy.

The data reported in the past 10 years says that U.S. surface transportation trade between the United States, Canada, and Mexico, has increased 48.6 percent, a 13.8 percent increase in the past year alone. In December 2010, imports were up 41.9 percent compared to December 2000, while exports were up 57.7 percent.

Currently, this trade is valued at $66.5 billion annually. In an ever increasing global market, the United States needs to ensure that our surface infrastructure can sustain the tremendous growth rate of trade so that we can maintain international competitiveness, create jobs and encourage economic growth in the United States of America.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. I applaud the Republican leadership for following regular order for the bipartisan nature of this bill, for Republicans and Democrats working together through the entire process, and up to and including the gentleman, Mr. DREIER, the chairman of the Rules Committee, extending an unusual amount of time so that every single Member has an opportunity to come to this body and not only voice what they believe is important to them but also the time where they can come down and speak to important matters of this Congress.

The chairman and ranking member continue to work together to provide a necessary extension that will get us through the rest of the year, and I look forward to an open and transparent process for the reauthorization for next year's funding also. I have confidence in not only Chairman MICA, but also JOHN BOEHNER and ERIC CANTOR, as they lead this House of Representatives on transportation issues, to do what's right for a beautiful country that expects Congress to have an open and transparent process that is good for all Members.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

DECEMBER 2010 SURFACE TRADE WITH CANADA AND MEXICO ROSE 13.8 PERCENT FROM DECEMBER 2009 (STATE RANKINGS IN TABLES 5 AND 7)

Trade using surface transportation between the United States and its North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) partners Canada and Mexico was 13.8 percent higher in December 2010 than in December 2009, reaching $66.5 billion, according to the Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS) of the U.S. Department of Transportation (Table 1).

BTS, a part of the Research and Innovative Technology Administration, reported that the value of U.S. surface transportation trade with Canada and Mexico fell 2.2 percent in December 2010 from November 2010 (Table 2). Month-to-month changes can be affected by seasonal variations and other factors.

Surface transportation consists largely of freight movements by truck, rail and pipeline. In December, 84.8 percent of U.S. trade by value with Canada and Mexico moved on land.

The value of U.S. surface transportation trade with Canada and Mexico in December was up 12.6 percent compared to December 2005, and up 48.6 percent compared to December 2000, a period of 10 years. Imports in December were up 41.9 percent compared to December 2000, while exports were up 57.7 percent (Table 3).

U.S. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION TRADE WITH CANADA

U.S.-Canada surface transportation trade totaled $39.8 billion in December, up 12.2 percent compared to December 2009. The value of imports carried by truck was 17.7 percent higher in December 2010 compared to December 2009, while the value of exports carried by truck was 10.4 percent higher during this period (Table 4).

Michigan led all states in surface trade with Canada in December with $4.7 billion (Table 5).

U.S. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION TRADE WITH MEXICO

U.S.-Mexico surface transportation trade totaled $26.8 billion in December, up 16.3 percent compared to December 2009. The value of imports carried by truck was 16.3 percent higher in December 2010 than December 2009 while the value of exports carried by truck was 18.7 percent higher (Table 6).

Texas led all states in surface trade with Mexico in December with $9.5 billion (Table 7).

The TransBorder Freight Data are a unique subset of official U.S. foreign trade statistics released by the U.S. Census Bureau. New data are tabulated monthly and historical data are not adjusted for inflation. December TransBorder numbers include data received by BTS as of Feb. 16.

The news release and summary tables can be found at http://www.bts.gov. More information on TransBorder Freight Data and data from previous months are posted on the BTS website at http://www.bts.gov/programs/international/transborder/. BTS will release January TransBorder numbers on March 29.

TABLE 1—VALUE OF MONTHLY U.S. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION TRADE WITH CANADA AND MEXICO

[In millions of dollars]

Month	2008	2009	2010	Percent change 2008–2009	Percent change 2009–2010
January	65,160	47,459	56,697	−27.2	19.5
February	69,406	47,938	59,492	−30.9	24.1
March	70,787	51,055	69,943	−27.9	37.0
April	74,317	49,729	65,831	−33.1	32.4
May	74,128	47,881	66,805	−35.4	39.5
June	74,139	50,753	69,859	−31.5	37.6
July	71,628	51,545	61,260	−28.0	18.8
August	72,254	54,254	67,964	−24.9	25.3
September	71,801	57,294	68,324	−20.2	19.3
October	72,683	61,400	70,565	−15.5	14.9
November	60,661	58,922	68,060	−2.9	15.5
December	52,910	58,465	66,530	10.5	13.8
Annual	829,875	636,695	791,329	−23.3	24.3

Note: Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding. Percent changes based on numbers prior to rounding.
Source: BTS TransBorder Freight Data, http://www.bts.aov/programs/international/transborder/.

TABLE 2.—U.S. SURFACE TRADE WITH CANADA AND MEXICO BY MODE OF TRANSPORTATION

[In millions of dollars]

Mode	December 2009	November 2010	December 2010	Percent change November December 2010	Percent change December 2009–2010
All Surface Modes:					
Imports	32,030	36,544	36,345	−0.5	13.5
Exports	26,435	31,516	30,185	−4.2	14.2
Total	58,465	68,060	66,530	−2.2	13.8
Truck:					
Imports	19,223	23,761	22,480	−5.4	16.9
Exports	20,600	24,660	23,390	−5.1	13.5
Rail:					
Imports	6,451	7,222	7,106	−1.6	10.2
Exports	3,317	3,912	3,785	−3.2	14.1
Pipeline:					
Imports	5,125	4,413	5,157	16.9	0.6

TABLE 2.—U.S. SURFACE TRADE WITH CANADA AND MEXICO BY MODE OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Mode	December 2009	November 2010	December 2010	Percent change November December 2010	Percent change December 2009–2010
Exports	373	482	549	13.9	47.2

Notes: Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding. Percent changes based on numbers prior to rounding. The value of trade for all surface modes is not equal to the sum of truck, rail and pipeline modes, it also includes shipments made by mail, foreign trade zones, and other transportation. For additional detail refer to the ''Data Fields'' Section of the TransBorder web page: http://www.bts.gov/programs/international/transborder/TBDR__DataFields.html.

Source: BTS TransBorder Freight Data, http://www.bts.gov/programs/international/transborder/.

TABLE 3.—DECEMBER 2010 SURFACE TRADE WITH CANADA AND MEXICO COMPARED WITH DECEMBER OF PRIOR YEARS

Compared to December in . . .	Percent change		
	Imports	Exports	Total surface trade
2009	13.5	14.2	13.8
2008	25.7	25.8	25.7
2007	5.4	14.3	9.2
2006	7.2	20.1	12.7
2005	5.3	22.8	12.6
2004	22.5	34.8	27.8
2003	40.1	54.9	46.5
2002	54.0	75.6	63.1
2001	66.7	83.5	74.0
2000	41.9	57.7	48.6

Source: BTS TransBorder Freight Data, http://www.bts.gov/programs/international/transborder/.

TABLE 4.—U.S. MERCHANDISE TRADE WITH CANADA BY SURFACE MODES OF TRANSPORTATION

[In millions of dollars]

Mode		December 2009	November 2010	December 2010	Percent change November–December 2010	Percent change December 2009–2010
All Surface Modes	Imports	18,926	20,461	21,432	4.7	13.2
	Exports	16,521	19,012	18,330	−3.6	10.9
	Total	35,447	39,472	39,762	0.7	12.2
Truck	Imports	8,836	10,373	10,399	0.3	17.7
	Exports	12,776	14,667	14,106	−3.8	10.4
Rail	Imports	4,121	4,893	4,707	−3.8	14.2
	Exports	1,825	2,133	2,095	−1.8	14.8
Pipeline	Imports	5,107	4,398	5,142	16.9	0.7
	Exports	251	306	227	−26.0	−9.8

Notes: Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding. Percent changes based on numbers prior to rounding. The value of trade for all surface modes is not equal to the sum of truck, rail and pipeline modes, it also includes shipments made by mail, foreign trade zones, and other transportation. For additional detail refer to the ''Data Fields'' Section of the TransBorder web page: http://www.bts.gov/programs/international/transborder/TBDR__DataFields.html.

Source: BTS TransBorder Freight Data, http://www.bts.gov/programs/international/transborder/.

TABLE 5.—TOP 10 STATES TRADING WITH CANADA BY SURFACE MODES OF TRANSPORTATION, RANKED BY DECEMBER 2010 SURFACE TRADE VALUE

[In millions of dollars]

Rank	State	December 2010
1	Michigan	4,672
2	Illinois	3,824
3	New York	3,276
4	California	2,462
5	Ohio	2,394
6	Texas	2,300
7	Washington	1,551
8	Pennsylvania	1,486
9	Minnesota	1,288
10	Indiana	1,202

Source: BTS TransBorder Freight Data, http://www.bts.gov/programs/international/transborder/.

TABLE 6.—U.S. MERCHANDISE TRADE WITH MEXICO BY SURFACE MODES OF TRANSPORTATION

[In millions of dollars]

Mode		December 2009	November 2010	December 2010	Percent change November–December 2010	Percent change December 2009–2010
All Surface Modes	Imports	13,104	16,083	14,913	−7.3	13.8
	Exports	9,914	12,504	11,855	−5.2	19.6
	Total	23,018	28,587	26,768	−6.4	16.3
Truck	Imports	10,387	13,389	12,081	−9.8	16.3
	Exports	7,824	9,993	9,284	−7.1	18.7
Rail	Imports	2,330	2,328	2,399	3.0	2.9
	Exports	1,491	1,780	1,690	−5.0	13.3
Pipeline	Imports	18	15	15	4.0	−13.1
	Exports	122	175	322	83.8	165.0

Notes: Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding. Percent changes based on numbers prior to rounding. The value of trade for all surface modes is not equal to the sum of truck, rail and pipeline modes, it also includes shipments made by mail, foreign trade zones, and other transportation. For additional detail refer to the ''Data Fields'' Section of the TransBorder web page: http://www.bts.gov/programs/international/transborder/TBDR__DataFields.html

Source: BTS TransBorder Freight Data, http://www.bts.gov/programs/international/transborder/.

TABLE 7.—TOP 10 STATES TRADING WITH MEXICO BY SURFACE MODES OF TRANSPORTATION RANKED BY DECEMBER 2010 SURFACE TRADE VALUE

[In millions of dollars]

Rank	State	December 2010
1	Texas	9,459
2	California	4,073

TABLE 7.—TOP 10 STATES TRADING WITH MEXICO BY SURFACE MODES OF TRANSPORTATION RANKED BY DECEMBER 2010 SURFACE TRADE VALUE—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Rank	State	December 2010
3	Michigan	2,922
4	Arizona	979
5	Illinois	915
6	Ohio	686
7	Tennessee	497
8	Indiana	445
9	Georgia	414
10	North Carolina	399

Source: BTS TransBorder Freight Data, http://www.bts.gov/programs/international/transborder/.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my good friend from Texas for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 662, the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, prevents our Nation's highway, transit, and safety programs from expiring ahead of the upcoming construction season by extending them at fiscal year 2010 funding levels through September 30 of this year.

My friend from Texas referenced the fact that it would be bad if we did not do this before March 4, and I agree with him thoroughly. I am hopeful that he has the same attitude with reference to the overall aspect of any kind of shutdown of the government. A shutdown would be bad in any of its particulars, and not just as he referenced it, that I agree with, in the area of transportation and infrastructure.

This extension allows States to continue signing contracts, managing planning and construction, and paying for vital transportation and infrastructure projects while we finalize a multiyear authorization to update our network. As all of us know, our interstate highways, roads, and bridges are in desperate need of repairs and improvements. All you have to do is drive around Washington to prove that.

According to the American Society of Civil Engineers in their 2009 report card, which rates the operational condition and future capacity of dams, levees, railways, roads, bridges, and transit by letter grade, our Nation's surface infrastructure is rated at a ''D.''

□ 1340

This is deplorable and, frankly, it's embarrassing—embarrassing for several reasons. I came here in 1992. We were advocating on both sides of the aisle that we should be about the business of repairing bridges in this country, and the multiples are enormous from that time. We were talking 14,000 bridges.

More than 26 percent of our Nation's bridges today are either ''structurally deficient or functionally obsolete,'' with the number of such bridges in urban areas on the rise. And we have seen what disasters can occur when a bridge collapses.

Existing rail capacity is inadequate to handle future freight and passenger rail growth without significant investment. Last year, I took the Amtrak to New York, and when returning to Washington, I looked at the rail underbed. I grew up near a railroad in Altamonte Springs, Florida. And the railbed in that time where I grew up in the 40s was 100 percent better than the railbed just outside of this city on the Amtrak line. That's ridiculous.

Our interstate highway program has changed little since it was created in the 1950s by the distinguished President, Dwight Eisenhower's vision. With ever-increasing congestion—and we see it right around here—and improvement costs, our Nation's roads were even poorer at a D-minus in 2009. One-third of America's roads are in poor or mediocre condition, and 45 percent of major urban highways are congested.

Just last January, the main road in and out of one of the cities that I'm privileged to represent, the city of Pahokee, was closed for 17 days because of sunken asphalt. Now, that may not sound like much, a little old town like Pahokee being cut off. But a collapsed culvert had created a 2-inch dip measuring 252 square feet in size on the northbound lane of State Road 715. This resulted in hours-long detours for commuters and trucks, stymied local and regional business, and regrettably reduced access to Glades General Hospital and Pahokee Airport.

Similar stories can be found throughout my home State of Florida and indeed in communities across this Nation. We can, and we must, do better.

Just as routine and preventive health care costs much less than a trip to the emergency room, regular maintenance and improvements cost less than major overhauls and replacement. According to Transportation for America, for every dollar that we spend today on maintenance, we avoid $14 in future costs.

H.R. 662 obligates up to $42.5 billion for Federal-aid highway programs and $639 million for the equity bonus programs to ensure that States receive in Federal highway funds a certain portion of the gasoline taxes that they contribute.

Investing in our Nation's roads is about more than getting from point A to point B faster, which would be, in many respects, reason enough for many commuters. It's about having more time, about having more money, and about having more opportunities to work, play, live, and enjoy life. Americans spend 4.2 billion hours a year stuck in traffic at a cost to the economy of $78.2 billion. That averages to $710 per motorist. Furthermore, poor conditions cost motorists $67 billion a year in repairs and operating costs.

One way to ease congestion is getting more people to use public transit. In fact, transit use increased 25 percent between 1995 and 2005, faster than any other mode of transportation. However, nearly half of American households do not have access to bus or rail transit, and only 25 percent have what they consider to be a good alternative.

On that note, increasing the capacity of our transportation and infrastructure network means nothing if our roads are not safe. Each year, thousands of people die in road crashes in the United States, and millions more are injured or disabled. As cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Global Road Safety, I recognize that road crash fatalities and disabilities represent a serious public health concern. This extension authorizes $742 billion in highway-safety programs administered by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, as well as $597 million for truck-safety activities of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, in order to help save lives and minimize crash-related injuries.

Safe, dependable, and efficient transportation is essential to our economic recovery and our Nation's competitiveness. At a time when unemployment in the construction industry is double the national rate, this extension provides much-needed market stability to create and sustain thousands of jobs.

The transportation sector has played a crucial role in rebuilding the U.S. economy, most recently through the Recovery Act, which provided $27.5 billion in new funding for surface transportation programs through the existing Federal-aid highway program and $8.4 billion for transit. In addition, $1.5 billion and $600 million were made available in two rounds, respectively, by the discretionary grant program known as TIGER, the Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery.

Extending these highway, transit, and other surface transportation programs is not only essential to our Nation's continued economic recovery, but also to our long-term prosperity and future. Today, we find ourselves on the cusp of a great opportunity, the opportunity to make meaningful investments in the future of this country, improve our quality of life and cut future debt. We need a truly interconnected, multi-modal system that effectively utilizes high-speed rail, light rail, streetcars, van pools, motor carriers by water, efficient buses, cars and

bikes. We need a system that helps ensure that lower-income workers can also get to and hold down jobs, a system that gets people where they need to go, increases our energy independence through new sources and innovative technologies, improves air quality, reduces traffic deaths and injuries, and creates jobs by supporting America's hard-hit construction and manufacturing sectors.

It is imperative that we not only extend the surface transportation programs through the end of the current fiscal year, but also pass a multi-year—yes, multi-year, as many as a 6-year—reauthorization as soon as possible. A new multi-year surface transportation authorization will create even more jobs and ensure that we can meet our growing transportation needs in the 21st century in a way that is affordable, efficient, innovative, resilient, sustainable, and accountable.

In this country, highways, roads, bridges and transit are neither Democratic nor Republican. They serve all Americans and help bring us closer together, literally.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Carlsbad, California (Mr. BILBRAY), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

□ 1350

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, and I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, I think this is an opportunity for all of us, both Democrats and Republicans, to talk openly and frankly about the fact that we are at a point in our history where we need to not only spend money, but we have to be smarter, too. I think too often in Washington we are thinking that our degree of efficiency or compassion is based on how much we spend and not how well we accomplish our goals.

I would only ask my colleague who just addressed us to join with some of us who say that we need to be smarter. As a former member of the Air Resources Board in California, I can show you studies that have been done by very noted research people that point out—one study alone that says we could reduce fuel and emission problems by 22.6 percent. But to do that, we not only have to address what is the private sector doing in Detroit in building cars, but what is the government sector doing in controlling those cars when they are on the road.

One of the biggest problems we have is Washington sends money out for projects, but we do not hold those projects to a standard that has been upgraded to 21st century standards. An example: There are studies that have shown that 97 percent of all stop signs that you and I stop for every day, Mr. Speaker, don't have to be stop signs. Those could be yield signs. Now granted, there are those sites with sight-distance problems where you have to have stops. But when you and I go drive down out of our home tomorrow morning, think about when you stop, why are you stopping? It's not for safety. Lord forbid, it's not for fuel consumption or for environmental conservation; it is because the law says you have to stop, even though there is a cost in environmental and economic impact. The safety factor is not the factor being determined. It is easier for a local government to give you a ticket on a stop sign, or at least that perception is there, when a yield sign is just as enforceable.

A good example is why is a four-way stop always the easiest and the cheapest way for a government to be able to control an intersection when everybody knows that a roundabout has been proven to be a major source of safety and environmental and economic benefit.

The fact is that communities that have been brave enough to try new traffic control, like the new computer-engineered roundabouts and traffic circles, have not only proven that it reduces congestion by a huge amount because it stops the queuing approach; it also eliminates that pollution that stop signs cause by five times more polluting than allowing somebody to drive through an intersection at low speed, that roundabouts do. But it also eliminates, as the gentleman who just spoke brought up, the safety factor. A roundabout eliminates the T-boning where fatalities occur. Actually, by going to the next generation of traffic control, we can not only address fuel consumption and pollution, but we can make our roads safer.

So I really call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let's look at making sure that when we send this money over to the States and the cities and the counties—and I was a mayor. I ran a transit system, the San Diego trolley system. We helped build that system. We need to make sure that we are doing the right thing in government. And one of the things that we are not doing in government that we can do and lead through example, if we truly care about public safety, environmental protection and fuel efficiency, if we really want to lead, let's not mandate on the private sector that they have to do something if we're not willing to look at our colleagues here in government and say: We have to reform ourselves.

I call on my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, let's work together. Let's start saying, look, local governments, counties and cities; the environmental, economic, and safety impacts of you not upgrading your traffic control to an efficient system is costing our economy 22.6 percent more than it should. It is costing our environment 22.6 percent that it shouldn't. And the fact is, we don't know how many lives we can save until we are willing to do that.

I call on both sides, let's get together and work on this and set an example for the rest of the world.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I say to my colleague and my friend from California, sign me up.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN), the ranking member of the Railroad Subcommittee and my classmate. We came here together.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I thank my classmate for giving me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the rule. I would like to begin by discussing the importance of reauthorizing the surface transportation bill. It has been a long time since we had a bill; since 2005, in fact. I cannot overemphasize the importance of completing this bill as soon as possible, not only to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure but for the desperately needed jobs it will create.

Transportation projects are a natural economic development tool. The Department of Transportation has indicated for every $1 billion invested in transportation, it creates 42,000 permanent jobs and $2.1 billion in economic activity. It also saves the lives of 1,400 people. You can't argue with those numbers.

Transportation funding is a win/win for everyone involved. States get to improve their transportation infrastructure, which creates economic development, puts people back to work, enhances safety, and improves local communities.

Yet in delaying the passage of this much-needed legislation any further, we are doing a disservice to the driving population, and the Nation as a whole. The States who are battling red ink want to see this bill passed. The construction companies who are laying off employees want to see this bill passed. And the citizens waiting in traffic jams, like my constituents on the I–4 corridor in central Florida, want to see this bill passed. If this Congress fails to pass a real transportation funding bill, our Nation's transportation infrastructure, and the citizens who use it, will suffer for years to come.

There are numerous studies that have come out in the last few months documenting the current state of affairs. The American Society of Civil Engineers has found that this country's infrastructure ranked ''D''—barely passing, certainly not acceptable for a superpower like the United States.

So we need to really pass this bill and really pass a full 6-year reauthorization bill so the States can plan and the communities can plan for their transportation needs.

I have to take a moment to talk about high-speed rail because come Friday—it is a very sad state of affairs for the people of Florida. The Governor of Florida, Rick Scott, has indicated that he is going to turn down $2.5 billion for Federal high-speed rail funding. That is very sad for the people of Florida because we have worked for a number of years across the aisle. Mr. MICA and I have worked. And, in fact,

when I was first elected, for every dollar we sent to Washington, we were receiving 77 cents in Florida transportation dollars. I worked to change that formula, and now we get 92 cents, and that is $5 billion.

Well, for once Florida has an opportunity to get some of their gasoline tax dollars back and to put Floridians to work. We have 12 percent unemployment. With the 90 percent funding from the Federal Government and the 10 percent private, that would generate over 60,000 jobs. But it is so sad, and it is really a no-brainer for the Governor. He indicated he spent over $100 million to be the Governor of the State of Florida, and he indicated that he wanted to put Floridians to work.

Well, Mr. Governor, how are you going to put them to work? What are you going to work them on besides talk? What really puts people to work is transportation and infrastructure, and it is a no-brainer, the high-speed rail project. The communities have worked on it. In fact, in 1980 Bob Graham, being the Governor, appointed me to a committee to work on high-speed rail. Let me just say, when there is no vision, the people perish.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

And I would also take this opportunity, if she would yield to me, to ask her a question.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. The previous SAFETEA-LU measure provided some funding for a high-speed rail corridor. This particular provision does not. Am I correct that if we were to do the high-speed rail project, that the lowest estimate is it would provide 30,000 jobs?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Sir, that is the lowest; but it would provide 60,000 jobs because you're not just looking at the construction, but everywhere you build a station is economic development, and it is jobs.

Let me say, this is public-private. In other words, we would be contracting the jobs out. Companies, private companies, would be building these stations. In fact, over eight different companies have indicated that they want to be partners with this. It is sort of the way we build airports. The Federal Government goes in and puts the major infrastructure down, and then there are private operators.

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

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

□ 1400

Ms. BROWN of Florida. All I've got to say is that I have been elected for 30 years and this is in my opinion the worst politics I have ever seen. The Bible says, ''Without vision, the people perish.'' The people of Florida are going to suffer. We have a roughly 12 percent unemployment rate. That's over 2 million people that's unemployed. This is an opportunity to put 60,000 people to work. That translates not just in jobs, but if you have a job, you can pay your mortgage until the foreclosure goes down. It goes on and on. I want to thank the President, the Vice President, the mayors and all of the communities who have worked together for this project.

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

Madam Speaker, I enjoy my colleagues coming to the floor and talking about us being without a vision and that the people will perish. People are perishing all across our country because of the excessive spending that this administration and the previous two Congresses have placed upon the people. Excessive debt. This year, the President has estimated we will have a $1.650 trillion debt. And as best I can tell you, some sense of reality and dose of discipline must be invoked upon this Congress. That's what we're attempting to do not only by this bill today but by also following regular order, by allowing Members of Congress to come and speak very clearly on the floor, by allowing an open process, things which were never allowed in the previous two Congresses.

I appreciate Members coming to the floor and talking about what's in the best interests of the country. Madam Speaker, the bottom line is that the Republican majority is going to do something about jobs. We're going to do something about spending. We will bring discipline, authority, responsibility and actions directly to the floor of the House of Representatives as opposed to spending which was out of control, ideas which ran amok, and a lack of vision and clarity for our future. I'm very proud of what we're doing here today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, when the gentlewoman from Florida was speaking about the light rail program that may expire on Friday, and I am hopeful that our Governor will understand that, a retort came from my friend from Texas about her saying about a lack of vision is what causes these kinds of matters. The gentlewoman from Florida was talking about light rail. I don't recall my friend from Texas being upset when we did light rail in Houston, and I was for that. I might add all of us know that we need to move people as best we can in other methodologies, as I have described earlier.

Madam Speaker, Democrats and Republicans must work together to invest more in our Nation's aging transportation infrastructure network; invest more, not less. We have a vision for America's future transportation infrastructure. Now we need the leadership to make it a reality. I shudder to think what would have happened to this Nation's overall national security had Dwight Eisenhower not had the vision and those Congresspersons who were here and the American people did not agree that we would have an interstate highway system. I understand that it takes money to do these things.

Let's look at Minnesota as an example. When the bridge collapsed in Minneapolis, tragically, lives were lost and a system that was a city's lifeblood had to be repaired. It has been repaired. But wouldn't it have been so much better, not just to avoid the tragedy, that's obvious, but could we not have as we do see in some of these situations, that these bridges need repair, these levees need repair. The Congresspersons from Louisiana were talking about the levees that were blown away during Katrina 10 years before that happened. I stand here today and talk about a levee in the Everglades that unless it's repaired, it is going to cause a disaster. You either pay me now on these things or you pay a whole lot later. We're not talking about not spending, not investing. We're talking about doing it wisely and with accountability.

While I support the underlying bill, I would like to express my disappointment at the closed process. My colleague comes down here and talks about all the Members are going to get a chance to come down here and they're going to get a chance to express their ideas. Well, there may be some Members that may have had an amendment that might innovate something or might improve our transportation system. My friend from Texas will claim that this is technically not a closed rule, and it's true that the rule did allow one—one—amendment by Chairman MICA, who wrote the underlying bill that I support. You heard that correctly. The only Member who is allowed to offer an amendment is the same Member who wrote the bill.

On January 5, the distinguished Speaker of this House for whom I have great respect, and he is a friend of mine, stated the following:

''Above all else, we will welcome the battle of ideas, encourage it, and engage in it—openly, honestly, and respectfully. As the Chamber closest to the people, the House works best when it is allowed to work its will.''

My colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) offered a motion for an open rule, so these important matters could be debated openly on the House floor. But this amendment was defeated last night, or yesterday, in a party-line vote. In addition, I also made a motion to amend the rule and make in order an amendment by Delegate HOLMES NORTON of Washington, D.C. and cosponsored by Mr. MORAN of Virginia which would simply have permitted the District of Columbia to spend its own money after March 4—in other words, this coming Friday—in the event of a government shutdown. That was defeated on a party-line vote.

I ask you, Madam Speaker, does this sound like an open process to you? I

urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule and instead pass this much-needed extension through a truly open process that allows all Members to offer amendments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I will say that this process that we have had as opposed to having it just mixed in a resolution allows for a motion to recommit for the gentleman and his party, and it is my hope that they will take up that open process that we talked about where we'll see what their ideas are. In a few minutes we'll find out when they make that choice.

Madam Speaker, we've heard a lot of things during this debate, up to and including about thoughts and ideas about shutting down the government, that that looms ahead of us. Not one Republican, not one Republican, is talking about shutting down the government. It is an issue that Republican leadership, including the gentleman Mr. BOEHNER, the Speaker of this House, has openly talked about that we will do every single thing that we can do to avoid a government shutdown.

So it's my hope that this body would recognize, we're not offering that as a threat to the American people. We're open for doing business. We're trying to make sure we not only address this issue weeks ahead of time but that we're forthright about how we would go about giving options, opportunities, how we would work with the President and the Senate to make sure that we avoid this from happening.

Secondly, we heard about a vision statement, a vision statement that evidently is lacking now from Republicans. Well, the facts of the case are very simple and, that is, the vision that our country sees ahead right now is diminishment of jobs, of a free enterprise system that is overburdened by rules and regulations, a policy that comes from this administration that is about destroying jobs, whether it be from the Environmental Protection Agency, the Securities and Exchange Commission or, government-wide, an assault on the free enterprise system and upon employers.

□ 1410

So what we are trying to do is to offer some reassurance today that we will go ahead and reauthorize the Surface Transportation bill and that there will be the understanding that the gentleman—the fabulous chairman of the committee, JOHN MICA from Florida—will, in fact, lead in a bipartisan effort with Ranking Member RAHALL to provide the opportunity to make sure that there is public involvement, that open hearings are held, that we in committee talk about this, and that every Member is given a chance to participate.

That is what Republicans are now willing to do: regular order, open processes, and a chance to make sure, as they find their way here to the floor, that every single bill we want, where possible, allows for a Democrat motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, you heard me say earlier today that my Republican colleagues and I are committed to an open process and to far, far more accountability, transparency, and an open process than what our friends have ever allowed us for the last 4 years.

Today's legislation is a step in the right direction. The underlying bill has bipartisan support, even up at the Rules Committee, where Republicans and Democrats support this underlying legislation. It went through regular order, which is a structure which worked, and open debate on the floor. This is just the first step in the necessary transportation funding—an open dialogue with the American people, cities, States, counties—and it is essential that the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee takes the time to review where it is and to come up with the recommendations in allowing for a future that will be even brighter and better.

Allowing this funding gives the States the tools that they need. We are working, as Chairman MICA is, with counties, cities, States, and with elected officials all across the country. The hard work that he is doing pays off again today. I will predict that we will pass this rule and this bill on a bipartisan basis because of the way our Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, our majority leader, ERIC CANTOR, and also the great chairman, JOHN MICA, insist on making sure that the floor is run with openness for the body. I look forward to working with Chairman MICA and the rest of the committee on that endeavor.

Madam Speaker, 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 (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 128 will be followed by 5-minute votes on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 129; and adopting House Resolution 129, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 256, nays 169, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

YEAS—256

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

NAYS—169

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez

Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Carney
Giffords
Hanna
Hinojosa
Honda
Pelosi
Simpson

□ 1437

Messrs. OWENS, FRANK of Massachusetts, and GUTIERREZ changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. DEFAZIO changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CARNEY. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 155, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, on March 2, 2011, I inadvertently voted "yea" on rollcall No. 155. I intended to vote "no."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, SMALL BUSINESS PAPERWORK MANDATE ELIMINATION ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 129) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to repeal the expansion of information reporting requirements for payments of $600 or more to corporations, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 185, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

YEAS—243

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

NAYS—185

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords
Hanna
Hinojosa
Wilson (FL)

□ 1445

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 156, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 175, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

YEAS—252

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)

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

NAYS—175

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Giffords
Hall
Hanna
Hinojosa
Pastor (AZ)

□ 1451

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.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, March 2, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On February 16, 2011, pursuant to the provisions of 40 U.S.C. 3307, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure met in open session to consider a resolution related to the General Services Administration's (GSA) FY2011 Capital Investment and Leasing Program. The resolution authorizes the consolidation of the operations of the National Gallery of Art and the Federal Trade Commission that will result in savings to the federal government. The Committee adopted the resolution by voice vote with a quorum present.

Enclosed is a copy of the resolution adopted by the Committee on February 16, 2011.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,
Chairman.

Enclosure.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION/NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART CONSOLIDATION

Whereas, the General Services Administration proposed in Lease Prospectus PDC–14–WA11 to the U.S. House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure a request to lease up to 427,000 square feet for the Federal Trade Commission in addition to the 306,000 square feet of space in the Apex building currently housing part of the Federal Trade Commission operations;

Whereas, a proposed alternate plan to consolidate space currently leased or occupied by the Federal Trade Commission and National Gallery of Art can save taxpayers nearly 1/3 billion dollars and meet both agencies' current and future space requirements;

Whereas, the National Gallery of Art currently leases 60,000 square feet of space and will require an additional 150,000 square feet of space for future use;

Whereas, the Federal Trade Commission currently uses only 160,000 square feet of the 306,000 gross square foot building located at 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, to house approximately 450 federal employees, resulting in an inefficient use of the building, creating waste and costing the taxpayer;

Whereas, only 3% of the space in the building located at 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW is designated as actual hearing space for Federal Trade Commission operations;

Whereas, the Federal Trade Commission also leases two additional locations in the District of Columbia totaling 220,000 square feet and 56,000 square feet, respectively;

Whereas, on May 13, 2010, the General Services Administration submitted a prospectus number PDC–14–WA11 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for an additional 150,000 square feet of leased space for the Federal Trade Commission;

Whereas, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in laying the cornerstone for the building at 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, did so to consolidate government operations out of scattered space into consolidated space ''to save the taxpayers' money'';

Whereas, President Barack Obama's Presidential Memorandum of June 10, 2010, in accordance with Executive Order 13327 issued by President George W. Bush, requires federal agencies to maximize the utilization and efficiency of space;

Whereas, the management of federal real property was placed on the Government Accountability Office's ''High Risk'' list in 2003 where it remains today;

Whereas, the Government Accountability Office concluded, regarding the use of aging buildings that ''[m]any of these assets and organizational structures are no longer needed; others are not effectively aligned with, or responsive to, agencies' changing missions. At the same time, technological advances have changed workplace needs, and many of the older buildings are not configured to accommodate new technologies'';

Whereas, it is in the national interest to maximize use of federal space and save taxpayer dollars through the more efficient use of space consistent with federal policies;

Whereas, the National Gallery of Art was created in 1937 for the people of the United States by Congress as an independent ''bureau'' of the Smithsonian Institution as codified in 20 United States Code §72;

Whereas, the National Gallery of Art is a federal government-owned organization;

Whereas, Congress provides funds to maintain the National Gallery of Art to ensure it remains open to the general public free of charge as codified in 20 United States Code §74;

Whereas, the National Gallery of Art receives 80% of its funding through Federal appropriations;

Whereas, 75% of National Gallery of Art employees are federal employees;

Whereas, the 30-year net present value of the savings to the taxpayer realized from consolidating the National Gallery of Art's leased space into government owned space is $145 million;

Whereas, the building located at 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW would require more than $137 million in taxpayer funded renovations for continued use by the Federal Trade Commission as office space;

Whereas, the National Gallery of Art has authority to and shall raise and use private funds to renovate the building at 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW for the benefit of the American people;

Whereas, renovating the building at 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW will preserve a historic building and maximize its use by the American people;

Whereas, the space in the building located at 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW would be optimally located and adjacent to the National Gallery of Art West and East wings providing additional space consistent with the mission of the National Gallery of Art as codified in law;

Whereas, such use of the 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW building would complete the cultural triangle in the District of Columbia;

Whereas, relocating the Federal Trade Commission into lower maintenance and more energy efficient space will further save taxpayer dollars;

Whereas, there are significant savings in consolidations of operations—employee shuttle, child care, communications and operational efficiencies.

Therefore, be it resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that, pursuant to title 40 U.S.C. §3307(a), the Administrator of General Services shall transfer administrative jurisdiction and custody and control of the building located at 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. to the National Gallery of Art and relocate the Federal Trade Commission, currently located at 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. to (1) up to 200,000 usable square feet of space located in Federal Office Building Number 8, Southwest, District of Columbia; (2) 1800 F Street, NW, District of Columbia; or (3) such other building in the District of Columbia owned by the Government that the Administrator of General Services considers appropriate.

It is further resolved, that the Administrator of General Services is authorized to consolidate Federal Trade Commission operations in the District of Columbia into efficient, modern government-owned space.

Provided, that no appropriated funds shall be used for the initial renovation, remodeling, or reconstruction of the building at 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C.

Provided further, that terms and conditions, including rental rate, applied to the Federal Trade Commission by the Administrator of General Services, for use of the building located at 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. shall apply to replacement space provided by the Administrator of General Services pursuant to this resolution for no more than ten (10) years after the relocation of the Federal Trade Commission.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

Adopted: February 16, 2011.

JOHN L. MICA, M.C.,
Chairman.

There was no objection.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2011

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 128, I call up the bill (H.R. 662) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 128, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 662

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011''.

(b) RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Transportation shall reduce the amount apportioned or allocated for a program, project, or activity under this Act in fiscal year 2011 by amounts apportioned or allocated pursuant to the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2010 and the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2010, Part II for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title; reconciliation of funds.

TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

Sec. 101. Extension of Federal-aid highway programs.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS

Sec. 201. Extension of National Highway Traffic Safety Administration highway safety programs.
Sec. 202. Extension of Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration programs.
Sec. 203. Additional programs.

TITLE III—PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 301. Allocation of funds for planning programs.
Sec. 302. Special rule for urbanized area formula grants.
Sec. 303. Allocating amounts for capital investment grants.
Sec. 304. Apportionment of formula grants for other than urbanized areas.
Sec. 305. Apportionment based on fixed guideway factors.
Sec. 306. Authorizations for public transportation.
Sec. 307. Amendments to SAFETEA–LU.
Sec. 308. Level of obligation limitations.

TITLE IV—EXTENSION OF EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY

Sec. 401. Extension of expenditure authority.

TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 411 of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–147; 124 Stat. 78) is amended—

(1) by striking ''the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011'' each place it appears (except in subsection (c)(2)) and inserting ''fiscal year 2011''; and

(2) in subsection (a) by striking ''March 4, 2011'' and inserting ''September 30, 2011''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 411(b)(2) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2010 (124 Stat. 79) is amended by striking ''155/365 of''.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Section 411(c) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2010 (124 Stat. 79) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''155/365 of''; and

(B) by striking ''the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2011'';

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii) by striking '', except that during such period obligations subject to such limitation shall not exceed 155/365 of the limitation on obligations included in an Act making appropriations for fiscal year 2011''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii)(II) by striking ''$271,356,164'' and inserting ''$639,000,000''; and

(3) by striking paragraph (5);

(d) EXTENSION AND FLEXIBILITY FOR CERTAIN ALLOCATED PROGRAMS.—Section 411(d) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2010 (124 Stat. 80) is amended—

(1) by striking ''155/365 of'' each place it appears; and

(2) in paragraph (4)(A) by striking ''2009'' and inserting ''2010''.

(e) EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS UNDER TITLE V OF SAFETEA–LU.—Section 411(e) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2010 (124 Stat. 82) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B) by striking ''155/365''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(A) by striking ''2009'' and inserting ''2010''.

(f) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 412(a)(2) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–147; 124 Stat. 83) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) $422,425,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.

(a) CHAPTER 4 HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 2001(a)(1) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''and $99,795,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011.'' and inserting ''and $235,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

(b) HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 2001(a)(2) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''and $45,967,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011.'' and inserting ''and $108,244,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

(c) OCCUPANT PROTECTION INCENTIVE GRANTS.—Section 2001(a)(3) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''and $10,616,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011.'' and inserting ''and $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

(d) SAFETY BELT PERFORMANCE GRANTS.—Section 2001(a)(4) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''and $52,870,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011.'' and inserting ''and $124,500,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

(e) STATE TRAFFIC SAFETY INFORMATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS.—Section 2001(a)(5) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''and $14,651,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011.'' and inserting ''and $34,500,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

(f) ALCOHOL-IMPAIRED DRIVING COUNTERMEASURES INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 2001(a)(6) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''and $59,027,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011.'' and inserting ''and $139,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

(g) NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.—Section 2001(a)(7) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''and $1,748,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011.'' and inserting ''and $4,116,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

(h) HIGH VISIBILITY ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM.—Section 2001(a)(8) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''and $12,315,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011.'' and inserting ''and $29,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

(i) MOTORCYCLIST SAFETY.—Section 2001(a)(9) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''and $2,973,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011.'' and inserting ''and $7,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

(j) CHILD SAFETY AND CHILD BOOSTER SEAT SAFETY INCENTIVE GRANTS.—Section 2001(a)(10) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''and $2,973,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011.'' and inserting ''and $7,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

(k) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 2001(a)(11) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''and $10,756,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011.'' and inserting ''and $25,328,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS.

(a) MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS.—Section 31104(a)(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(7) $209,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31104(i)(1)(G) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(G) $244,144,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

(c) GRANT PROGRAMS.—Section 4101(c) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''2009'' and all that follows before the period and inserting ''2011'';

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking '', 2007'' and all that follows before the period and inserting ''through 2011'';

(3) in paragraph (3) by striking '', 2007'' and all that follows before the period and inserting ''through 2011'';

(4) in paragraph (4) by striking ''2009'' and all that follows before the period and inserting ''2011''; and

(5) in paragraph (5) by striking ''2009'' and all that follows before the period and inserting ''2011''.

(d) HIGH-PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—Section 31104(k)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''through 2010 and $6,370,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011'' and inserting ''through 2011''.

(e) NEW ENTRANT AUDITS.—Section 31144(g)(5)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''(and up to $12,315,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011)''.

(f) COMMERCIAL DRIVER'S LICENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM MODERNIZATION.—Section 4123(d)(6) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1736) is amended to read as follows:

''(6) $8,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

(g) OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.—Section 4127(e) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1741) is amended by striking ''2010,'' and all that follows before ''to carry out'' and inserting ''2010, and 2011''.

(h) GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS.—Section 4134(c) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1744) is amended by striking ''2009'' and all that follows before ''to carry out'' and inserting ''2011''.

(i) MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 4144(d) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1748) is amended by striking ''March 4, 2011'' and inserting ''September 30, 2011''.

(j) WORKING GROUP FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES TO ENHANCE FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS.—Section 4213(d) of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 14710 note; 119 Stat. 1759) is amended by striking ''March 4, 2011'' and inserting ''September 30, 2011''.

SEC. 203. ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS.

(a) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS RESEARCH PROJECTS.—Section 7131(c) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1910) is amended by striking ''through 2010 and $531,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011'' and inserting ''through 2011''.

(b) DINGELL-JOHNSON SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT.—Section 4 of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking ''through 2010, and for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''through 2011,''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A) by striking ''through 2010, and for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''through 2011''.

TITLE III—PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 301. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR PLANNING PROGRAMS.

Section 5305(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2010, and for the period beginning October 1, 2010, and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''2011''.

SEC. 302. SPECIAL RULE FOR URBANIZED AREA FORMULA GRANTS.

Section 5307(b)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting ''SPECIAL RULE FOR FISCAL YEARS 2005 THROUGH 2011.—'';

(2) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''2010, and the period beginning October 1, 2010, and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''2011,''; and

(3) in subparagraph (E)—

(A) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting ''MAXIMUM AMOUNTS IN FISCAL YEARS 2008 THROUGH 2011.—''; and

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking ''In fiscal years 2008 through 2010, and during the period beginning October 1, 2010, and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''In each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011''.

SEC. 303. ALLOCATING AMOUNTS FOR CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS.

Section 5309(m) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting ''FISCAL YEARS 2006 THROUGH 2011.—'';

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''2010, and during the period beginning October 1, 2010, and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''2011''; and

(C) in subparagraph (A)(i) by striking ''2010, and $84,931,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''2011'';

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''2010, and $6,369,000 shall be available for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''2011''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''2010, and $2,123,000 shall be available for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''2011''; and

(3) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''(A) FERRY BOAT SYSTEMS.—'' and all that follows through ''(i) FISCAL YEARS 2006 THROUGH 2010.—$10,000,000 shall be available in each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010'' and inserting the following:

''(A) FERRY BOAT SYSTEMS.—$10,000,000 shall be available in each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011'';

(ii) by striking clause (ii);

(iii) by redesignating subclauses (I) through (VIII) as clauses (i) through (viii), respectively, and moving the text of such clauses 2 ems to the left; and

(iv) by inserting a period at the end of clause (iv) (as so redesignated);

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011''; and

(ii) by adding after clause (v) the following:

''(vi) $13,500,000 for fiscal year 2011.'';

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking '', and during the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'';

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking '', and not less than $14,863,000 shall be available for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,''; and

(E) in subparagraph (E) by striking '', and $1,273,000 shall be available for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,''.

SEC. 304. APPORTIONMENT OF FORMULA GRANTS FOR OTHER THAN URBANIZED AREAS.

Section 5311(c)(1)(F) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(F) $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

SEC. 305. APPORTIONMENT BASED ON FIXED GUIDEWAY FACTORS.

Section 5337 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2010'' and inserting ''2011''; and

(2) by striking subsection (g).

SEC. 306. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.

(a) FORMULA AND BUS GRANTS.—Section 5338(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1)(F) and inserting the following:

''(F) $8,360,565,000 for fiscal year 2011.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''$48,198,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''$113,500,000 for fiscal year 2011'';

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''$1,766,730,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010, and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''$4,160,365,000 for fiscal year 2011'';

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''$21,869,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''$51,500,000 for fiscal year 2011'';

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking ''$707,691,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''$1,666,500,000 for fiscal year 2011'';

(E) in subparagraph (E) by striking ''$417,863,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''$984,000,000 for fiscal year 2011'';

(F) in subparagraph (F) by striking ''$56,691,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''$133,500,000 for fiscal year 2011'';

(G) in subparagraph (G) by striking ''$197,465,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''$465,000,000 for fiscal year 2011'';

(H) in subparagraph (H) by striking ''$69,856,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''$164,500,000 for fiscal year 2011'';

(I) in subparagraph (I) by striking ''$39,280,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''$92,500,000 for fiscal year 2011'';

(J) in subparagraph (J) by striking ''$11,423,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''$26,900,000 for fiscal year 2011'';

(K) in subparagraph (K) by striking ''$1,486,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''$3,500,000 for fiscal year 2011'';

(L) in subparagraph (L) by striking ''$10,616,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2011'';

(M) in subparagraph (M) by striking ''$197,465,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''$465,000,000 for fiscal year 2011''; and

(N) in subparagraph (N) by striking ''$3,736,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''$8,800,000 for fiscal year 2011''.

(b) CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS.—Section 5338(c)(6) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(6) $2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

(c) RESEARCH AND UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CENTERS.—Section 5338(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''$29,619,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''$69,750,000 for fiscal year 2011''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''fiscal year 2009'' and inserting ''each of fiscal years 2009, 2010, and 2011'';

(2) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(A) in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) by striking ''2009'' and inserting ''2011''; and

(B) in clauses (v), (vi), (vii), and (viii) by striking ''and 2009'' and inserting ''through 2011''; and

(3) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) FUNDING.—If the Secretary determines that a project or activity described in paragraph (2) received sufficient funds in fiscal year 2010, or a previous fiscal year, to carry out the purpose for which the project or activity was authorized, the Secretary may not allocate any amounts under paragraph (2) for the project or activity for fiscal year 2011, or any subsequent fiscal year.''.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 5338(e)(6) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(6) $98,911,000 for fiscal year 2011.''.

SEC. 307. AMENDMENTS TO SAFETEA–LU.

(a) CONTRACTED PARATRANSIT PILOT.—Section 3009(i)(1) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1572) is amended by striking ''2010, and for the period beginning October 1, 2010, and ending March 4, 2011'' and inserting ''2011''.

(b) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 3011 of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 5309 note; 119 Stat. 1588) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(5) by striking ''2010 and the period beginning October 1, 2010, and ending March 4, 2011'' and inserting ''2011''; and

(2) in subsection (d) by striking ''2010, and for the period beginning October 1, 2010, and ending March 4, 2011'' and inserting ''2011''.

(c) ELDERLY INDIVIDUALS AND INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 3012(b)(8) of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 5310 note; 119 Stat. 1593) is amended by striking ''March 4, 2011'' and inserting ''September 30, 2011''.

(d) OBLIGATION CEILING.—Section 3040(7) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1639) is amended to read as follows:

''(7) $10,507,752,000 for fiscal year 2011, of which not more than $8,360,565,000 shall be from the Mass Transit Account.''.

(e) PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS FOR NEW FIXED GUIDEWAY CAPITAL PROJECTS.—Section 3043 of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1640) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2010, and for the period beginning October 1, 2010, and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''2011''; and

(2) in subsection (c), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2010, and for the period beginning October 1, 2010, and ending March 4, 2011,'' and inserting ''2011''.

(f) ALLOCATIONS FOR NATIONAL RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS.—Section 3046 of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 5338 note; 119 Stat. 1706) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by striking ''or period''; and

(2) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS.—The Secretary shall allocate amounts appropriated pursuant to section 5338(d) of title 49, United States Code, for national research and technology programs under sections 5312, 5314, and 5322 of such title for fiscal years 2010 and 2011, in amounts equal to the amounts allocated for fiscal year 2009 under each of paragraphs (2), (3), (5), and (8) through (25) of subsection (a).''.

SEC. 308. LEVEL OF OBLIGATION LIMITATIONS.

(a) HIGHWAY CATEGORY.—Section 8003(a) of SAFETEA–LU (2 U.S.C. 901 note; 119 Stat. 1917) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (5);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

''(7) for fiscal year 2011, $42,469,970,178.''.

(b) MASS TRANSIT CATEGORY.—Section 8003(b) of SAFETEA–LU (2 U.S.C. 901 note; 119 Stat. 1917) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (5);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

''(7) for fiscal year 2011, $10,338,065,000.''.

TITLE IV—EXTENSION OF EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY

SEC. 401. EXTENSION OF EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''March 5, 2011'' in subsections (b)(6)(B) and (c)(1) and inserting ''October 1, 2011'',

(2) by striking ''the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2010, Part II'' in subsections (c)(1) and (e)(3) and inserting ''the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011'', and

(3) by striking ''March 5, 2011'' in subsection (e)(3) and inserting ''October 1, 2011''.

(b) SPORT FISH RESTORATION AND BOATING TRUST FUND.—Section 9504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2010, Part II'' each place it appears in subsection (b)(2) and inserting ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011'', and

(2) by striking ''March 5, 2011'' in subsection (d)(2) and inserting ''October 1, 2011''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on March 4, 2011.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in House Report 112–20, if offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) or his designee, which shall be considered read, and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 662.

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

There was no objection.

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

I come to the floor today to pass the extension of our major surface transportation legislation, that's H.R. 662.

I would like to first lead off by informing Members and the Speaker that this extension is a spending freeze at 2010 levels through September 30.

We find ourself in a situation where the major transportation legislation that authorizes all of the policies, the various projects, all the funding levels and all of the activities that are so important to job creation, to building the Nation's infrastructure, that legislation expired September 30, 2009.

In the past Congress, since that time, we have passed a number of short-term extensions. We are now on the sixth extension of that legislation.

What happens when the Congress does this is we end up sending the worst message and the worst policy possible across the Nation, across the land, to our States and our localities that are trying to build the Nation's infrastructure and trying to determine what Federal policy, what their partnership and funding relationship will be with the Federal Government.

Right now, in a time in which across this Nation we are experiencing some of the worst unemployment, in my district I have some areas with 17 percent unemployment. And where is that unemployment? That's in the construction industry.

So it's critical that we pass an extension of the current legislation and extension that we are on, the sixth extension that we are on, and we do that before Friday. Friday is when the current extension expires.

Again, this is important for jobs. Why? Our State transportation departments have only been able to do small

projects. Now, they have done some sidewalks, and they have done some repaving, and they have done some minor construction projects. But because they don't have a dependable Federal partner and the hiccup manner in which we have provided policy judgment funding direction as far as our Federal law for major transportation projects, because it's been done in such a helter-skelter fashion, people are not employed. Projects do not move forward. This is the worst time that this could happen. I am determined that that won't happen again.

Now, I might like to do a short-term extension, and some people have said we should do that. But the responsible thing for us to do now is to pass through the fiscal year—and this extension takes us to September 30—so States can plan, so people can get back to work, so we have some semblance of policy regarding building the Nation's infrastructure in place now. People are crying out for jobs across this country, and we may not pass any other piece of legislation this year but our transportation and infrastructure legislation.

This, and the FAA reauthorization, in addition to highway and surface and all the other modes, our FAA extensions have become almost the saddest commentary you could have on building, again, the Nation's important infrastructure. We have done 17 extensions of the FAA legislation, so our airports and others can't plan. Now, we are not going to let that happen under our watch. We are going to set policy today and extend until the end of this fiscal year in a responsible manner.

Some people on the conservative side of the aisle, and I will match my credentials with any of them, want to know about the money that's being spent.

□ 1500

This is not money that's general revenue. This is entirely within the trust fund, the Federal Highway and Transit Trust Fund.

When we came here, we also said we were going to force the Congress to spend more money in general revenue than we had in that fund, and this extension adheres to the policy that we won't be reckless in spending and we won't spend beyond what we have in the fund. This extension only expends funds from within that trust fund. So I want my conservative friends—and I consider myself in the conservative fiscal corner, the responsible corner in spending—to know that that is the way this is crafted. So, again, I think we have an obligation to move forward. We are doing it on a sound basis. We are freezing at the 2010 levels. And we will be able, at least until September, to get people to work.

Now, I know sometimes I can move legislation along in this body, and I work hard sometimes to do that. But I can tell you I cannot pass a full authorization bill by this Friday. We just took over, again, some of these responsibilities a few weeks ago. We've had six extensions. I don't want to get to, again, into a situation where we are doing these short-term, job-killing extensions.

So that's the reason that we're here. That's the responsibility that we have as a Congress in moving forward and again setting that policy and setting a timeframe in which our States and others who actually do these projects can operate. And again, it's being done within the responsible parameters that this new Congress and the House of Representatives has set forward.

I do want to say, finally, that I thank my colleague, Mr. RAHALL, who is the ranking member, for his interest in moving forward with a long-term bill. In reaching out, we held the first of our hearings, and we're doing these around the country. We've done more than a dozen from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We started in Beckley, West Virginia, a little over a week ago, in the hometown of the ranking member because we want our permanent legislation to be long term, a 6-year bill, to have in place sound policy. We want it done on a bipartisan basis. And to ensure also that it was done on a bicameral basis, we did almost an unprecedented hearing with Senator BOXER, the gentlelady from California, who chairs the Environment and Public Works Committee of the United States Senate. We did a joint bicameral, bipartisan hearing in Los Angeles last week to kick off our larger effort to, again, have in place the very best policy regarding our infrastructure for the Nation.

So with those comments, again, I want to thank folks that we have an agreement here to move forward. We need to do that. We need to get people working in this country and do it in a responsible fashion. And I believe that H.R. 662 will do that.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2011.

Hon. JOHN MICA,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MICA: I am writing concerning H.R. 662, the ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011,'' which is scheduled for floor consideration this week.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Code. Title IV of this bill amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and thus falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 662, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2011.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 662, the ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011.'' The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure recognizes that the Committee on Ways and Means has a jurisdictional interest in H.R. 662, and I appreciate your effort to facilitate consideration of this bill.

I also concur with you that forgoing action on this bill does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include our letters on H.R. 662 in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Again, I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I look forward to working with the Committee on Ways and Means as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,
Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 662, the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011. As my chairman has said, this legislation extends the Federal-aid highway, public transit, and highway and motor carrier safety programs through the end of the fiscal year September 30, 2011.

I commend the chairman of the committee, Mr. MICA, for his bringing this bill before us today. I also associate myself with the remarks that he has just said in support thereof. I commend him for the listening tour that he has embarked around the country, as well as a few formal hearings thrown in his listening tour. This gives the country and new Members of this body an opportunity to learn a great deal about what reauthorization of our surface transportation programs really means when it comes to jobs and when it comes to infrastructure, particularly within each Member of Congress' congressional district.

Extending these programs is absolutely critical to keep our economy on the road to recovery, and I strongly support this bill—as did my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—when we passed it out of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee 2 weeks ago by unanimous consent. I also want to support and commend our ranking member on the Highways and Transit Subcommittee, Mr. DEFAZIO, for his tremendous work in previous years and on bringing the current bill before us as well, and we will hear from him in a moment.

While I do strongly support this bill, Madam Speaker, what I cannot support are Republican attempts to gut investments that grow our economy. The Republican spending bill that passed 2

weeks ago will destroy over 300,000 good-paying transportation jobs—jobs lost in every State of this great country. What I cannot support is dangerous and draconian cuts across the board to investments in America's future. And these cuts are coming just at a time that our economy is turning the corner. And what I cannot support is cutting the job-creating muscle of our budget, which investment in our infrastructure is, when we should be focusing on trimming the fat. In order to keep pace with India, China, and other international competitors, we need to invest more, not less, in America's infrastructure. If we stop investing in the future, there's simply no way we can retire the debt of the past.

The bill before us today is identical to legislation that the House passed last fall. Regrettably, at that time, Republicans objected to it, and the Senate Republican leadership insisted that the surface transportation programs expire on March 4, 2011. I'm glad that my Republican colleagues have now come around and recognized the need to extend these vital programs through the fiscal year. I hope all Members will vote for this bipartisan extension to keep America's economy moving.

If Congress does not extend the surface transportation programs, the U.S. Department of Transportation will stop reimbursing States for expenditures on approved projects, and thousands of construction projects across the Nation could come to a screeching halt. According to DOT, a delay in enactment of this bill will shut down more than $800 million next week in highway reimbursements and transit grants to States and urban areas, endangering more than 28,000 jobs and multimillion dollar construction projects across the country.

This bill provides a certainty that the construction industry needs to continue the slow climb back from the greatest recession since World War II. It also enables Congress the necessary time to work toward passage of a long-term surface transportation authorization bill later this year. Enactment of this extension act will enable us to redirect our focus to developing a long-term bill that begins to address the Nation's enormous infrastructure needs and will create millions of family-wage jobs.

I also today call upon the administration to join us in this effort to get behind this reauthorization bill and give it the necessary support from the executive branch that it needs. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 662.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, who is one of the primary leaders in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the chair of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee, Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 662, the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, extends the highway, transit, and highway safety programs through the end of the fiscal year at the 2010 funding levels. It does not make any programmatic or policy changes but instead only continues what is currently in law.

I'm proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill with the chairman, my subcommittee vice chair, Mr. HANNA, Ranking Member RAHALL, and Subcommittee Ranking Member DEFAZIO. I want to commend Chairman MICA for his hearings and listening sessions that he's done all over this country. I had the privilege of attending several of those, and we heard from local and State officials all over this Nation about their needs.

Without this extension, these programs are set to expire on Friday. This extension will allow the highway and transit programs to continue to operate as the spring construction season kicks off. With unemployment in the construction industry at an all-time high, it is imperative that we extend the surface transportation programs through the end of the fiscal year.

A front page story in USA Today last week said that gas would soon go to $5 a gallon or higher. We need more domestic oil production in this country. We simply cannot allow or let environmental radicals drive the price of gas to $5 or higher. This will hurt many poor and lower income and working people and stop our recovery in its tracks.

□ 1510

This bill is important to our economy. Additionally, this extension will provide a level of predictability for State DOTs and local transit agencies to embark on major construction projects that will create jobs; and as I said, it will certainly stimulate the economy.

I support the passage of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the ranking member and the chairman of the full committee and subcommittee and others who support this essential legislation.

It is kind of sad that we are actually in this position. We are looking at the seventh extension of the surface transportation reauthorization. Because of events in the last Congress, lack of support from the administration, opposition from others, and basically no action to the Senate side, we ground to a halt in reauthorizing this vital legislation. That is too bad.

Had we taken a fraction of the money spent on the so-called stimulus and instead invested it in fully funding a 6-year surface transportation authorization, we could have created millions of jobs, and not just construction jobs—engineering jobs, manufacturing jobs, high-tech jobs—because we have the most effective buy America requirements on our transportation acquisitions in this country.

So, for instance, Oregon Iron Works is building the first made in America streetcar in 70 years. All of the components that go into that are being made here in the United States of America. They are very skilled workers, a very sophisticated product. You buy a bus made in America, the tires, everything has to be made in America. You build a bridge, the steel has to come from America except for a few loopholes in the law that we have to plug.

If we begin to deal honestly with our backlog, 150,000 bridges on the national highway system are substandard and in need of either significant repair or replacement. That is a lot of steel. That is a lot of work. That is also a lot of detours for trucks and others trying to use the national highway system.

Then you can look at the surface of our national highway system itself, not just the bridges; 40 percent of the pavement is in fair to poor condition. You've all experienced that—potholes blowing out tires, breaking axles, causing higher fuel consumption, accidents, all sorts of problems. That needs to be taken care of.

And then we have our transit systems. Actually right here in Washington, D.C., they are killing people on Metro because they haven't the money to make the capital investments they need to have a modern light rail system in this country, and they are running cars that shouldn't be on the tracks any more.

So we are really at a crisis point. I had taken to giving speeches when I chaired the committee about how we were falling to Third World status for infrastructure. And my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), came up to me after a speech once and said that is insulting and it's wrong.

I said, not really, EARL. You know the problems.

He said, no, to say that we're Third World. Most Third World countries are investing a much greater percentage in their gross domestic product in transportation and infrastructure than we are in the United States of America.

So I have taken to calling us fourth world; formerly First World, vaulting over to the back of the line to have the worst infrastructure of any modern nation on Earth. It's not right. It doesn't serve our businesses or our communities well.

The Obama administration did not take up this campaign adequately in the last Congress. I tried valiantly. They got hung up on the idea that we need to invest more money. We do need to invest more money. We had two commissions that were constituted when the Republicans controlled the House, the Senate and the White

House. Both commissions came to the same conclusion: we are spending somewhere around 30–40 percent of what we need on an annual basis to have a 21st-century transportation system. We are spending about 30 percent less than we need to maintain the current deteriorated rate of infrastructure in this country. We're not even maintaining the Eisenhower legacy. Come on, let's get real.

Now, unfortunately, on the Republican side of the aisle, they have adopted an arbitrary rule: no new revenues for anything. Now, they ought to rethink that. Let's think about capital budgets. If you build a bridge, it lasts 100 years. We could justify borrowing money for that. Maybe we could justify raising some revenues to pay for that—perhaps from the oil companies, who knows, and put a lot of people to work and improve our infrastructure; but that is a nonstarter so far. I hope that changes.

If we look at this as a way to put America back to work to make us more competitive in the international economy, we should be talking about rebuilding our infrastructure. It is the last place we should cut. And, unfortunately, some cuts have already been proposed and made in transportation. That's not where we should be cutting, and those who would advocate further cuts are wrong. This is a trust funded program. The program itself, 96 percent of the funding in this extension comes from the gas taxes every American has paid, the diesel taxes every trucker has paid, and the money paid in other miscellaneous taxes.

We need this bill today. It is a starting point for a robust reauthorization later this year. I look forward to working with the chairman and the new chairman of the subcommittee on that robust reauthorization.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), another leader of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the chair of the Rail Subcommittee.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Here we are again, a seventh time for an extension. I agree with my friend from Oregon who pointed out that this administration stopped us from passing a transportation bill under Chairman Oberstar. Mr. MICA was the ranking member. So here we are again, a seventh extension on the highway bill.

As the chairman pointed out, this freezes the authorizing funds at FY 2010 levels, and it will go until September 30 to give us the time necessary to craft a new transportation bill.

I want to point out that this is a clean extension. It is what is in current law. There are no policy or program changes, and this does not continue any stimulus funding. This extension, coupled with the CR, is going to reduce spending by about a billion dollars. We are going to make a reduction in transit new starts by over $400 million, discontinue highway appropriation earmarks by $900 million, eliminate unauthorized transit programs by over $200 million, and unauthorized TIGER grants by $600 million. So there are some significant reductions; and, again, this current extension has to be passed by Friday.

If we don't move this forward, we will feel this throughout the economy, throughout this Nation. Today, this week, in the past couple of weeks, State DOTs have been letting contracts, putting bids out to get contractors in place to be able to start the spring, summer, and fall contracting season. If we shut down this program, there will be immediate furloughs and suspension of payments to States.

Again, I would like to remind my colleagues, especially on my side of the aisle, this is money that is being reimbursed to the States for work that has already been completed to the tune of about $150 million a day, is going out to States to be able to pay those contractors to keep them working and building bridges and roads around this country.

So we are in an extremely difficult time to put these payments in jeopardy. Again, this gives us the time to craft a transportation bill by September 30, to put out there.

When we do that, we are going to go through this transportation bill and cut and reform and change. Some of you may have seen the GAO report. I haven't looked at it completely, but I know there are many, many programs in the Department of Transportation across the government that duplicate effort that, quite frankly, we don't know where the money is going. And some of these programs, we are not even sure who is watching the spending of it. They can't account for it.

So this transportation bill we'll move in September is going to do all of those types of things to improve what we do here in Washington and be a good partner to the States when it comes to building and maintaining a national transportation system.

So I urge all of my colleagues to support this extension.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor to support this extension. I appreciated the comments from Chair MICA talking about the involvement with the Senate and the House working together and the listening sessions that are taking place around the country. I am absolutely convinced that my friend, Mr. MICA, is sincere in his interest in infrastructure. I have had the pleasure of working with Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DEFAZIO. There is a team in place, people who are interested in moving this forward.

□ 1520

It's absolutely imperative that we extend the reauthorization through this construction cycle. And making the decision now, setting it to work, so people can plan and act. It's not as good as a reauthorization by any stretch of the imagination, but it gets us through this construction cycle and it avoids another unfortunate situation.

We are 7½ years into a 6-year reauthorization. No one is happy about that. It's sort of the tenor of the times, however, because I was on the committee when we were struggling with 12 extensions in the last reauthorization. We need to do better. I am all for looking at squeezing out any inefficiency, examining programs to focus them, make them work better. But the simple fact is we need to spend more on infrastructure, not less.

Those commissions, the nonpartisan independent commissions that my friend from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) referenced with business leaders, environmentalists, government leaders at other levels, organized labor, are very focused on this. They documented the need to do more.

The fact is that the American public is already paying a huge cost in addition to their road fees by wasting their time in damage to their vehicles and interrupting the flow of commerce. We're already paying the price. My personal goal as a member of the Budget and Ways and Means Committees is to work with the authorizing committee so they have the resources. We have people from the Chamber of Commerce, organized labor, local governments, AAA, truckers, bicyclists, the Women's Federated Garden Club of America, all coming together to provide support for the resources. We need to work this dance out between the House, the Senate and the administration to be able to have the resources so that the committee can put forth a robust bill for our future.

It's true we're not going to reauthorize this bill in this week. We're not going to reauthorize it this spring. It will be a stretch to reauthorize it before this extension expires. But the time to get busy is now. I appreciate the approach that's being taken by the committee, bringing people together.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you.

I am hopeful that instead of cutting transportation, which is envisioned in the CR, that would cost us 200,000 or 300,000 jobs at precisely the time that we need economic activity, that we can have a truce on the budget wars. Let's acknowledge that we will have a tight and focused reauthorization meeting the wide range of transportation needs, deal with how we build and renew America, get the economy started again, strengthen the quality of life in our communities, and make our families safer, healthier and more economically secure. It starts by approving this extension today.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to another

outstanding member and a new member of our committee who has great local government experience as a former mayor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA).

Mr. BARLETTA. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge the passage of H.R. 662, the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011.

As I heard from my friends and neighbors back home, job creation and rebuilding our economy is the most important issue facing us. Transportation funding means not only construction jobs but also for surveyors, heavy machinists, asphalt companies, grocers, hotels and restaurants.

Historically, studies have shown that for every dollar spent on investments in transportation and infrastructure, the gross domestic product grows by $1.59, and for every $1 million spent on highways, 47 jobs are created.

Poor roads and congestion are costing my constituents. The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials estimates that poor road conditions cost this country $355 billion annually. H.R. 662 is a clean extension that would fund ongoing operations through September 30, 2011.

Failing to extend this bill would hurt my district in terms of jobs, safety and costs to my constituents in wasted fuel and lost productivity.

The 2011 construction season is just getting under way. Any disruption in funding will delay the construction industry's ability to create jobs and complete much-needed improvement projects. With unemployment in the construction sector at a staggering 22.5 percent, we must pass the extension and put more hardworking Americans back to work.

As a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass long-term legislation that will meet our future transportation needs. This extension gives Congress the time and ability to produce a smart, fiscally responsible bill.

I urge support of H.R. 662.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I want to thank Ranking Member RAHALL for the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 662, the Surface Transportation Authorization Act of 2011. Last Friday, I was in Millington, Tennessee and I joined with Chairman MICA and Mr. FINCHER on a transportation bill listening session. Chairman MICA went all across the country listening to folks on the needs of transportation. We heard from all kinds of folks saying how important this is for the future of our country, getting goods to market, and improving our infrastructure. The listening session focused on those needs of a new surface transportation authorization. And while this legislation is just another extension of SAFETEA–LU, it is important that we act quickly and extend the surface transportation authorization before it expires on Friday.

My hope is that H.R. 662 will be the final short-term extension Congress uses to extend SAFETEA–LU because this country needs a comprehensive, long-term surface transportation authorization. Chairman MICA has promised everybody on the tour that we're not going to have more extensions, that we're going to pass a bill just like we did with the FAA reauthorization. Seven extensions was enough. We need to move this country forward and get those programs started.

By continuing to extend SAFETEA–LU and not passing a new authorization, Congress has created uncertainty in the transportation sector which has limited the ability to invest in a crumbling infrastructure network. The importance of immediate passage cannot be emphasized enough. Not only will reauthorization create millions of quality jobs—jobs that are needed by Americans now and that have been neglected thus far in Congress—and provide States and MPOs a known, dedicated funding stream, but it will also address the dire need for investment in the Nation's transportation system.

In the 2012 Department of Transportation budget proposal, President Obama lays out a bold vision for a surface transportation authorization. The President understands the United States will not maintain its mantle as the greatest Nation in the world without an intermodal transportation system that enables America to compete in the 21st century global economy.

To that end, the President has called for a $556 billion, 6-year surface transportation authorization that includes a $50 billion ''up front'' economic boost to jump-start job creation. Jobs.

As the President said in his State of the Union, now is not the time to stand pat. This is why I believe we need to pass a surface transportation bill that increases revenue, makes a significant investment in maintaining existing infrastructure, and spurs development of innovative infrastructure networks such as high-speed rail and aerotropolis transportation systems.

I appreciate Chairman MICA including aerotropolis language in the FAA reauthorization bill and look forward to seeing that same language included in the surface transportation reauthorization act which was discussed in Memphis.

As New York Times columnist Paul Krugman said, ''We must win the future, not eat it.'' I look forward to working with Chairman MICA, Subcommittee Chairman DUNCAN, and Ranking Members RAHALL and DEFAZIO in seeing that we pass a comprehensive surface transportation authorization that strengthens our infrastructure, spurs innovation, creates jobs, ensures safety and wins the future. We are winners.

□ 1530

Mr. MICA. I would like to inquire as to the balance of time on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 15 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from West Virginia has 14 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to a valued member of our committee, the distinguished gentlelady from California (Ms. RICHARDSON).

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 662, the Surface Transportation Extension Act. I am hopeful that passing this extension will give us the adequate time we all need on the committee to pass a full 6-year reauthorization.

Last year, the committee initiated a very good start. In fact, we suggested spending a minimum of $500 billion of investment, and the administration recently released budget calls for approximately that same amount, of $556 billion, over the next 6 years. This includes an extra $50 billion boost next year to provide for an immediate economic stimulus, which we all know we need.

I heard one of my colleagues on the other side reference unemployment in construction. In my district, it's over 40 percent, so this has got to be done, and it has got to be done now.

While the President's budget calls for a significant increase in our spending, we should all remember that it still falls well short of the $225 billion per year investment that is really required from all sources, recommended by the Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission, a bipartisan commission that was created by Congress to study this very issue.

Our infrastructure is in a state of disrepair, and congestion costs us more than $78 billion per year. The quality of our transportation system is deteriorating. Almost 61,000 miles—37 percent—of our roads are in poor or fair condition. More than 152,000 bridges—25 percent—are structurally deficient. So, when we talk about cutting, we are all mindful of the need to make adjustments and to be good stewards of these dollars, but we shouldn't cut just for the sake of cutting. That is the wrong approach and the wrong thing to do.

In my district—home to four major highways, a transit system, three airports, and more than 40 percent of our entire Nation's cargo going through it—these congested roads and crumbling bridges are in dire need, and we need help now. A robust surface transportation bill will help the people in my district and across this country get where they need to go; it will improve safety; and it will help put people back to work.

I was talking to some of my colleagues, and they were telling me that Mr. SHUSTER, when he was the chair of this committee, worked on both sides of the aisle. I was told, when we had that very difficult vote, he worked with this side, and we moved forward a very successful bill. In that spirit,

when Mr. MICA mentioned that he was going to have his listening tours, I took him at his word. I've attended two, and I intend upon attending one more.

Out of those listening tours, we've heard a lot of things from people. One of the things I'd like to suggest we continue is really that of open discussion—an open discussion about HMT, an open discussion about TIFIA, an open discussion about really implementing a true national goods movement strategy—all of which my staff and I have worked on in order to bring forward very thoughtful legislation that I hope will be sincerely considered. The gas tax alone will not work, so I urge Mr. MICA to please work with us as we are working with you today.

Many people asked me today, You're going to vote for this rule? I said, Yes, because I'm willing to work across the aisle with Mr. MICA to get this done and with Mr. SHUSTER as well. We are going to have to consider new ideas to be able to help institute this public-private partnership that we all know needs to be a part of this discussion.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 662, which should really be the building block of our 6-year reauthorization. It deserves the bipartisan support of this Congress and of the American people.

Mr. RAHALL, I appreciate all of the efforts that you have made so far. I know you are very committed to getting this done. There is hard work ahead, and I look forward to working with your new leadership as well as with our ranking member, Mr. DEFAZIO.

Mr. MICA. I have no further requests for time, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, once again, I do appreciate the work of Chairman MICA in his bringing this extension to the floor of the House—as he has already noted, the sixth extension of SAFETEA–LU. This will take us to the end of the fiscal year. It will give us the spring and the summer to continue to work together in the bipartisan spirit with which Chairman MICA has started his tenure as chairman of our committee, and I do look forward to continuing to work with him.

I, once again, call upon the administration to work with us as well under the very capable leadership of Secretary LaHood. I am sure that the administration will work with us if it will just give us some proposals and will put some concrete ideas upon the table with which we can work in a bipartisan and bicameral measure.

This is a job-saving piece of legislation. Although a permanent reauthorization would provide a much greater degree of certainty, it helps provide some degree of certainty to our construction industry so that it can plan and invest in what are not short-term jobs but, rather, good, long paying, family wage jobs for our people. That's what we're talking about when we talk about investments in infrastructure. That's what we're talking about in this legislation; so I urge my colleagues, as I conclude, to support this in a bipartisan fashion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Each of us who is sent to Congress, Madam Speaker, has certain responsibilities. First, we have responsibilities to our constituents in our districts. Then we are sent here, and by the grace of the good Lord, on our side the steering committee, the approval of leadership and our colleagues, we get to do certain tasks.

Mine is now to try to shepherd forward transportation policy for our country. That's an important responsibility, again, because we have millions of Americans who don't have jobs. Probably the hardest thing that I face when I go home or when I talk to folks across the country and in my district are the people who have lost their homes, who can't make their mortgage payments or who are struggling. They want to go to work, most of them I've talked to, and they don't have the opportunity.

Now, I know a new Congress has come, and that new Congress has been sent a very clear message about spending, about conserving assets and resources here. I think that Congress gets it and that the American people have mandated that approach. We can also many times be here, doing things that might prove a political point; but from time to time, we have to step back, and we have to do something for the very good of the country. I think this is one of those times that we have an important obligation.

What will happen on Friday, if we don't act accordingly today and pass H.R. 662, is literally a disaster because we will shut down all of the transportation projects across the land, those projects that have any connection to the Federal Government.

Now, we have also said that we can't pass in continuing resolutions the authorization for legislation, so that's the situation we find ourselves in today. We have a bipartisan agreement to move forward. We have an opportunity to actually expand and define the time in which we can accomplish the important work of government.

Some people say, oh, these are just transportation projects. Yet, if you go back to the very beginning of the Nation, they came together first for national security; but then the Founding Fathers—Washington, Jefferson—were pretty smart. They also wanted to be able to do infrastructure projects that transcended arbitrary political boundaries. I love to read about Washington and his vision to open the canals and the post roads. Some of the first work of the Congress was to authorize transportation and infrastructure projects for the Nation, through the vision of people like Lincoln, to connect the continent. So that kind of leadership has come from people in the past, and we have that responsibility today to move forward.

So I think that people can go home after they vote for this and say, I did something positive. We acted in a fiscally responsible way. We're dealing with the trust fund money that people have paid in. When they put gallons of gasoline in their cars, they paid 18.4 cents, which went into the trust fund.

□ 1640

We didn't spend recklessly, but we did act responsibly and we're getting people working again. And we did it in a period of time, not the hiccup and the sporadic six passed extensions, in a timeframe in which we can actually get major infrastructure projects, people working again. So I think we can all take heart in a bipartisan effort that we've had here that Congress can work and the people's work can get done by people coming together.

I know we still have disagreements on policy, and I've pledged to work on both sides. I even offered to buy the beer and pizza when we finish the listening tours. And with Senator BOXER, she wanted, I think, fruit drinks, and I'll even throw those in, too, if we can come together and establish sound policy for the Nation so infrastructure can move forward. And we can do it. I really think we can do it.

So we have 6 months of definition. We have 6 months to get the rest of the job done. But I'm confident that everybody here today can join and we can make a difference, a difference for those people wanting us to be responsible and do what they sent us here for.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 662 the Surface Transportation Extension Act. This legislation would provide a necessary short term extension of surface transportation programs through September 20, 2011. I strongly prefer more comprehensive, multi-year appropriations legislation that more adequately funds the transportation and infrastructure projects that we as Members have identified in our districts as crucial to our economic recovery. The bridges, highways, rail systems necessary to our economic recovery and sustained economic growth and global competitiveness are not built in a year.

However, I cannot support letting the sun set on necessary funding of critical surface transportation and infrastructure projects while we pursue longer term solutions in the face of a misplaced focus on spending cuts. I will not allow this on my watch. My colleagues here in Congress must not allow this to occur either. We must work together to forge a bipartisan long-term solution to our nation's transportation and infrastructure needs.

Economic experts universally agree that funding the critical and necessary infrastructure projects nationwide creates jobs for America and increases our level of global competitiveness. There is an intense competition between fiscal responsibility and investment in job growth and infrastructure. We must make investments in job creating infrastructure projects in order to grow the U.S. economy.

We must be winners in contest for economic change now and for our children's future. We cannot be the losers. We must catch the wave of economic growth or be crushed by it. China, India and Europe understand this because they have committed to greater investments in their infrastructure.

As I think of my home District, the 18th Congressional District in Houston, Texas and its busy port, much like the other ports around this great nation, I am compelled to urge my colleagues to consider the pressing national necessity of decongesting the surface transportation, both rail and highway, that moves the goods in and out of those ports. We must improve this surface transportation system in order to accommodate national economic health, global competitiveness, and to avoid harm to agriculture industry, maritime jobs and manufacturing jobs. Maritime jobs and construction jobs for infrastructure provide a good middle class wage, allow workers to get educations at night, and lower crime rates in our cities.

We must invest in High Speed Rail. We have about 500 miles of high speed rail in process, but China has about 10,000 miles being built. We need to have a domestic talent pool with the required knowledge, skills and trained workers to do projects like high speed rail or we will be paying for skilled Chinese companies to do it for us.

Infrastructure Investment is a Non-Partisan Issue: If the AFL–CIO and U.S. Chamber of Commerce have teamed up to promote infrastructure investment, then surely the Democrats and Republicans in this Congress can do the same. Moreover, now is the time for us to consider the creation of a long overdue National Infrastructure Bank and Public-Private partnerships to shift our infrastructure improvement into full gear. We should not shy away from this issue when a nation is waiting for us to do our part to restore our economy through fortification of our infrastructure. It is time for another large, bold, national forward thinking infrastructure project like interstate highway system.

Governors and Mayors at ground level around this nation will quickly confirm that Infrastructure investments create jobs, help balance budgets, and grow both state and national economies. We must listen to our local elected officials who must fix the potholes, repair the crumbling bridges and tunnels or be held directly accountable by their constituents on every street corner. Our local elected officials will quickly tell us that infrastructure investment creates jobs, because it attracts business.

The American Association of Civil Engineers (ASCE) gives U.S. Infrastructure the Grade of "D" in its 2009 Report Card. Infrastructure Investment equals Jobs. But, the U.S. is falling behind its competitors in infrastructure development (especially China, India and Europe). The bottom line is that Transportation and Infrastructure Investment is needed for a Strong Economy.

So, I say to my colleagues that we must pass H.R. 662. A delay in enactment of this extension will shut down more than $800 million next week in highway reimbursements and transit grants to States and urban areas, endangering more than 28,000 jobs and multimillion dollar construction projects across the country.

I must say that I am very disturbed that we cannot get our colleagues to cooperate in a bipartisan manner to pass essential appropriations bills and must instead resort to short-term measures. However, for the good people of the 18th Congressional District of Texas, the State of Texas, and our national well being, I cannot let time expire on critical transportation and infrastructure funding. It is imperative that we pass H.R. 662 to continue to fund transportation and infrastructure programs without interruption. We must keep this nation moving forward toward progress.

I would also urge my colleagues in the House and the Senate chambers to reconsider the local transportation and infrastructure expenditures that Members have identified in the 111th Congress and in the 112th Congress for inclusion in appropriations measures. Members of Congress are in a front line position to identify useful and necessary projects in their districts that require funding. These projects create jobs, rebuild our infrastructure and benefit our districts, our states and our country, as well. Though, I recommended funding for critical transportation and infrastructure projects in Houston, Texas, during the 111th Congress, this funding was excluded from the Continuing Resolution passed in December 2010 and an opportunity to improve our national economy was lost.

As we move forward, it is my hope that both chambers in the House and Senate will take a bipartisan approach to moving vitally important appropriations legislation which includes useful, necessary, job creating and economy-building projects from our districts. This is the fiscally responsibly course and grows and strengthens our economy in the long run.

In summation, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this H.R. 662 as we continue the work of funding our nation's critical transportation and infrastructure projects.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of extending surface transportation funding for the remainder of the 2011 fiscal year before the authorization expires at the end of this week, on March 4th. I support the highway program; it is a critical part of an efficient and effective 21st century transportation infrastructure in the United States. However, I want to highlight a concern I have with an extraneous provision that is included in the language of this extension.

Section 308 of this bill attempts to extend the budget "firewalls" in Section 8003 of SAFETEA–LU for highway and transit categories to protect those programs from having to compete for funding against all other discretionary programs should Congress put in place overall discretionary spending caps. More specifically, Section 8003 amends Section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 that expired on September 30, 2002—a law that is squarely within the jurisdiction of the House Budget Committee.

Section 308 of this extension has no substantive effect not only because there are no overall spending caps for FY 2011, but because Clause 3 of Rule XXI in the new House Rules for the 112th Congress eliminated the requirement to uphold such firewalls.

However, if the intention is that this provision should have a substantive effect, it is premature.

There are many tough choices ahead given the fiscal realities we face. We clearly need to set caps on spending. Funding guarantees that protect a certain category of spending prevent lawmakers from having the flexibility to balance other needs within an overall discretionary spending cap. Given the nation's trillion dollar deficits and $14 trillion in debt, Congress should be working to remove, not continue, spending floors in statute.

Furthermore, these highway and transit firewalls were originally established to protect the user-pays/user benefits principle. Unfortunately, the opposite has happened. The Highway Trust Fund is insolvent and has required $35 billion in bailouts since 2008. The Congressional Budget Office projects shortfalls of $140 billion over the next ten years.

These spending guarantees have pushed the Highway Trust Fund deeper into insolvency and have forced it to rely more and more on borrowed money. I am concerned that continuing even the appearance of firewalls for these categories in this extension suggests that spending on these programs is a higher priority than getting deficits under control. It also suggests that surface transportation should get first claim on the Treasury over other priorities for discretionary spending such as Veterans medical care or funding for our troops.

Congress may decide that ultimately highways and transit have such a high priority that we should continue to run high deficits to pay for them, but we should do that as part of the budget process and not part of a short-term highway extension that must be passed quickly or the entire program shuts down.

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICA

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 12, line 4, strike ''through 2011'' and insert ''through 2011,''.

Page 15, line 4, strike ''for the period'' and insert ''$5,732,000 for the period''.

Page 15, line 12, strike ''October 1, 2010'' and insert ''October 1, 2010,''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 128, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, again, this is a purely technical amendment and reviewed by both sides of the aisle in both bodies. We found three technical changes to correct drafting errors in H.R. 662. We want this to go to the President. We want it signed, and we want to make certain that it has all the technical provisions necessary and clear language.

So the amendment adds two commas to the bill on page 12 and also another on 15. And on page 15, it also strikes an authorization in the current extension that H.R. 662 failed to strike. So it's purely technical in nature, but we do want it correct.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition, though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the manager's amendment. The chairman has adequately explained it, and I fully concur and urge its adoption.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

YEAS—422

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Blackburn
Blumenauer
Cooper
Costa
DesJarlais
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Hanna
Hinojosa
Kaptur

□ 1609

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 158, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ). Pursuant to House Resolution 128, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. POLIS. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Polis moves to recommit the bill H.R. 662 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE V—GRAVINA ISLAND BRIDGE AND KNIK ARM BRIDGE RESCISSIONS

SEC. 501. RESCISSION OF GRAVINA ISLAND AND KNIK ARM BRIDGE EARMARKS.

There are hereby rescinded all unobligated balances, remaining available as of March 2, 2011, of contract authority provided or reserved for planning, design, or construction of the Gravina Island bridge, Alaska, or the Knik Arm bridge, Alaska, under the following provisions of law:

(1) Section 144(f)(1)(A)(ii) of title 23, United States Code.

(2) Item number 14 of the table contained in section 1302(e) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1205).

(3) Item numbers 406, 2465, 3323, and 3677 of the table contained in section 1702 of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1256).

(4) Item numbers 2 and 10 of the table contained in section 1934(c) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1485).

SEC. 502. PROHIBITION ON FUNDING OF GRAVINA ISLAND AND KNIK ARM BRIDGES.

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to plan, design, or construct the Gravina Island bridge, Alaska, or the Knik Arm bridge, Alaska.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, usually when something is killed, it stays dead. But just like in a bad zombie movie, some bad earmarks refuse to die and return to life time and time again as wasteful spending. That's what's happened with this bill and what this amendment corrects.

There isn't an American taxpayer out there who hasn't heard of the Bridge to Nowhere. The Bridge to Nowhere has become synonymous with government waste.

What Americans may be shocked to find out is a significant portion of the $454 million that Congress provided through eight separate earmarks in SAFETEA–LU is still available in Alaska to build these bridges. We fix that with this amendment and eliminate these return-from-the-dead earmarks

with this amendment to save taxpayers money and restore credibility to Congress.

Although Congress has tried to stop these bridges to nowhere by giving Alaska the authority to use its earmarked funds on other transportation projects, Alaska has still used $71 million of Federal funds provided under SAFETEA–LU to continue work on two bridges to nowhere. Sadly, Alaska's earmarked bridges to nowhere, like zombies eating the brains of taxpayers, refuse to die.

Frankly, like most Americans I thought Federal funding for the bridges to nowhere was a thing of the past. ABC News reported in 2007 the Bridge to Nowhere is gone. This bridge had collapsed even before it was built after an onslaught of angry editorials, furious anti-pork citizen groups, and caustic jokes on late-night TV.

But, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this zombie has climbed from its grave and is terrorizing American taxpayers to the tune of $180 million in deficit spending to build two bridges, one of which is a bridge that from an engineering perspective is comparable to the Golden Gate Bridge to an island with 50 people.

Now, but wait, we are not calling it an earmark because we have abolished earmarks in this Congress. So, instead, we are taking Republican earmarks from previous sessions of Congress and calling them something else.

Is that the new spending plan? Is that how we are going to balance the budget? Now, many Republicans in this body have used the bridges to nowhere as an example of wasteful spending.

My colleague and friend from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) stated that ''while some earmarks fund worthy projects, there are some, such as the infamous 'Bridge to Nowhere' that are wasteful uses of taxpayer money.''

My friend from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) said, ''All spending bills passed in 2007 included some 11,000 earmarks. Those earmarks included wasteful spending for items such as a $20 million ferry are in Alaska benefiting just 40 people. That, of course, followed the infamous Bridge to Nowhere earmark from the 2005 highway bill.''

So here we have a wasteful expenditure that not only had its origin as an earmark but has been used by fiscal hawks from both sides of the aisle as the very example of a wasteful earmark.

If Alaska wants to build a bridge to nowhere or a road to nowhere or a road to somewhere, bridge to somewhere, go ahead and do it, just do it without Federal tax dollars.

My colleague from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) said: ''Taxpayers are tired of their hard-earned money paying for things like a Bridge to Nowhere in Alaska, fruit fly research in France and a hippie museum in New York.''

Well, this bill doesn't fund a fruit fly museum in France or a hippie museum; but unless we act by passing this amendment, it will allow $183 million of taxpayer money to be spent for bridges for nowhere, wasteful spending we can't afford.

Despite claims that the Bridge to Nowhere earmarks were eliminated, Alaska spent over $71 million of Federal money. You know, in 2006, when the Republicans lost their majority and entered the minority, Mr. CANTOR, the leader, said Republicans have become ''a party of the Bridge to Nowhere.'' Well, Mr. Speaker, it looks like too little has changed.

Unless this amendment passes, the Republicans once again will become a party lost on the Bridge to Nowhere. This motion rescinds all remaining funds, about $183 million provided for the planning, design and construction of the two bridges under SAFETEA–LU. In addition, the amendment prohibits the use of funds to finance these bridge projects.

This is a very simple choice. There is no politics in this. We are not changing other parts of the bill, trying to catch people up. We are not putting up a vote to trap people for 30-second spots to say they are for pornography, like has been done in previous sessions while the bill is gutted elsewhere. What we are simply providing is a clean vote on the Bridge to Nowhere.

According to the CBO, this motion will reduce the deficit by $160 million by eliminating funding for these two bridges, nothing else. Listen, for us to have the credibility as a Congress to make the tough cuts we need to balance the budget, to work together to pass a CR that cuts spending, to reduce spending in future years, Congress must have moral standing. Continuing to provide funding to be used for these bridges, the infamous Alaska bridges to nowhere, which most Americans like me thought were already dead, is not the way for Congress to build trust with the American people.

So we have a choice today. We can vote to continue these most egregious earmarks; or we can stand by our words, our vows, and our values and vote for this amendment and finally put an end to wasteful spending and pet projects.

Let me close with some words of wisdom from my colleague from West Virginia, Congresswoman SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO: ''The days of members slipping in 'the bridge to nowhere' in the dead of night are over.'' I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to shine the light of day on this insidious example of pork, remove it from the bill and pass the House amendment.

SUMMARY

In 2005, the Safe, Accountable, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA–LU) (P.L. 109–59) provided a total of $454 million for the construction of two bridges in Alaska—the Gravina Island bridge and the Knik Arm bridge—through eight separate earmarks in the law. Since 2005, the public, media, and Members of Congress have questioned the merits of these projects and condemned the use of scarce Federal surface transportation funds to finance these projects, commonly referred to as the ''Bridges to Nowhere.''

SAFETEA–LU provides $223 million of Federal-aid highway funds for the Gravina Island bridge. The $304 million bridge under consideration, which rivals the Golden Gate Bridge in size and scope, would serve an island of 50 people, who can access Ketchikan, Alaska, via a five-minute ferry ride.

In addition, the act provides $231 million of Federal-aid highway funds for the Knik Arm Crossing project. The Knik Arm bridge is a project to build a 1.6-mile long bridge, 790-foot tunnel, and 18 miles of connecting roads at a cost of approximately $1.6 billion, including approximately $740 million for phase 1 of the project.

Despite claims that the ''Bridges to Nowhere'' earmarks were eliminated, Alaska has spent more than $71 million of Federal SAFETEA–LU funds to proceed with these bridge projects and accompanying access roads over the past six years.

The Motion to Recommit rescinds all remaining funds—approximately $183 million—provided for planning, design, and construction of the Gravina Island and Knik Arm bridges under SAFETEA–LU. In addition, the motion prohibits the use of any funds provided under the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011 to finance these bridge projects.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Motion to Recommit will reduce the Federal deficit by approximately $160 million over the next 10 years.

These earmarks also contribute to Alaska's high rate of return for its gas tax contributions. Over the six-year period of SAFETEA–LU (FY 2004 through FY 2009), Alaska received an average $5.20 for each dollar that the State contributed to the Highway Trust Fund.

GRAVINA ISLAND BRIDGE

Gravina Island is a small land mass (21 miles long and 9.5 miles wide) located in Ketchikan Gateway, Alaska. According to the latest Census data, the island has a population of 50 people. Ketchikan International Airport is located on the island. The island can be accessed by a five-minute ferry ride across Tongass Narrows from Ketchikan, and an average of 10,000 vehicles per month use the ferry crossing. A ferry arrives and departs every 15 to 30 minutes.

Alaska received a total of $223 million in SAFETEA–LU to finance the construction of the Gravina Island bridge and accompanying access roads. Although Congress expanded the eligible uses of the earmarked funds in legislation subsequent to SAFETEA–LU, Alaska continues to be able to use these funds on the bridge and access road projects. In 2008, Alaska completed construction of the Gravina Island Highway to provide access to the proposed bridge. Alaska used $37.6 million of Federal funds provided under SAFETEA–LU for the project. Given that the bridge does not exist at this point, the road currently leads nowhere.

According to the Alaska State Legislature Budget and Audit Committee, Alaska has specifically reserved $75.9 million of the remaining SAFETEA–LU funds to improve access to Gravina Island and is currently conducting a supplemental environmental impact statement that includes construction of a $304 million bridge as an alternative.

According to the Federal Highway Administration, $125.8 million remains available for expenditure from the amounts provided in SAFETEA–LU for the Gravina Island bridge.

KNIK ARM BRIDGE

The Knik Arm Bridge project proposes the construction of a 1.6-mile bridge across Knik Arm connecting Anchorage with the borough of Mat-Su, along with 18 miles of access

roads to the bridge, at a cost of approximately $1.6 billion, including $740 million for construction of the bridge in phase 1 of the project. In 2003, Alaska established the Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority to construct the bridge. On December 15, 2010, the Federal Highway Administration approved the Environmental Impact Statement Record of Decision to construct the 8,200-foot bridge, 790-foot tunnel, and 18 miles of access roads.

Alaska received a total of $231 million in SAFETEA–LU to finance the planning, design, and construction of the Knik Arm bridge and accompanying access roads. Although Congress expanded the eligible uses of the earmarked funds in legislation subsequent to SAFETEA–LU, Alaska has used $45.4 million of Federal funds provided under SAFETEA–LU for the project.

According to the Federal Highway Administration, $57.4 million remains available for expenditure from the amounts provided in SAFETEA–LU for the Knik Arm bridge.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. MICA. Well, congratulations my colleagues. Welcome to the era of smoke and mirrors, and that's exactly what this motion to recommit is; and I urge its defeat.

You heard the gentleman describing bridges. He, again, is trying to mislead the entire House on this particular motion to recommit. It is smoke and mirrors.

I urge the defeat of the motion to recommit.

□ 1620

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 246, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

AYES—181

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—246

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

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

DeFazio
Schrader

NOT VOTING—3

Giffords
Hanna
Hinojosa

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). One minute is remaining in this vote.

□ 1637

Ms. BROWN of Florida changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 421, noes 4, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

AYES—421

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)

Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—4

Amash
Flake
Polis
Stearns

NOT VOTING—7

Berg
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Hanna
Hinojosa
Paul
Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1643

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BERG. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 160 I was inadvertently detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

CONGRATULATING WOMEN OF TOMORROW ON ITS 10TH ANNIVERSARY GALA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a great South Florida organization: Women of Tomorrow. This month, Women of Tomorrow will hold its annual gala, celebrating 10 years of making a difference in the lives of young women.

Women of Tomorrow was founded in 1997 by South Florida journalist Jennifer Valoppi and Telemundo President Don Browne. Their goal was to help at-risk young women live up to their full potential. The result has been a truly unique organization that pairs accomplished professional women with small groups of at-risk teenage girls in high schools. The mentors come from varied backgrounds: lawyers, doctors, entrepreneurs and public servants. They show their mentees that anything is possible and nothing is out of their reach.

Congratulations, Women of Tomorrow, on 10 amazing years, and I know that the next 10 will be even better.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of rhetoric one hears in the House about what the American public wants or what the American public thinks.

Well, this week survey research came out commissioned by the Public Broadcasting System and conducted by a bipartisan survey research team from Hart Research and American Viewpoint that is powerful evidence that while Americans are concerned about the budget and budget deficits, public broadcasting is a higher priority.

Support for public broadcasting transcends party affiliation. More than two-thirds of all voters oppose elimination of Federal funding for public broadcasting as approved by my Republican friends. What is most interesting, nearly eight in 10 voters believe that PBS should receive the same amount of government funding or more than it currently receives.

It's not just Democrats. Ninety-two percent favor the same amount or more. It's not just Independents. Seventy-five percent favor the same amount or more. Two-thirds of Republicans favor the same or more money for public broadcasting.

There's still time to climb off the ledge. The Senate should stand tall and the House should reverse itself.

THE DEBT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. My constituents are perplexed with Washington, Mr. Speaker. Economists have warned and the public demands Washington tighten its belt. Despite this year's $1.6 trillion deficit, the President still refuses to change course and reduce spending.

President Obama created the bipartisan National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform by executive order. The commission's mission, according to the executive order was, quote, to identify policies to improve the fiscal situation in the medium term and to achieve fiscal sustainability over the long run.

Unfortunately, the President's FY 2012 budget ignores every essential observation and proposal advanced by the commission and doubles debt held by the public by the end of his term while adding on $13 trillion in new debt.

Erskine Bowles, the Democratic chairman of the fiscal commission stated: the White House budget request goes ''nowhere near where they will have to go to resolve our fiscal nightmare.''

Mr. Speaker, my constituents and I agree. Despite the need to rein in our runaway debt, the President's budget is more of the same. It's time we take the economists and our constituents seriously and get serious on the debt. I ask

my colleagues to join me in heeding their call.

RISING GAS PRICES

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to shed light on a very serious problem—skyrocketing gasoline prices.

In the capital district of New York, prices at the pump today average about $3.50 per gallon. Nationally, the average price is $3.38 per gallon, and it continues to rise. Due to the continued conflict in North Africa and the Middle East, oil is over $100 per barrel. There appears to be no end in sight.

For every $10 per barrel rise in the price of oil, America sends an additional $40 billion overseas, yearly. How can we expect to turn around our economy and create jobs when we are sending this much money to our enemies?

Plain and simple, we must start thinking outside the barrel—to create jobs and protect our national security. We as Americans are better than the ancient fuel that we put into our vehicles.

Using 19th and 20th century oil subsidies in this 21st century is outdated and foolish. We are literally giving away hard-earned taxpayer money to big oil companies that are setting record profits. What do we get in return? Sticker shock at the pump.

Mr. Speaker, this is unfair to hard-working Americans that play by the rules. We deserve better. Let's stop this sticker shock.

□ 1650

BABY KILLER FLEES

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday was just a normal day in Houston, Texas. Seven families left their babies at Jackie's Childcare, and went along to work just as they did every day.

A daycare is supposed to be a place where parents trust caregivers with the safety of their kids. After all, that is what they are supposed to do—keep children safe. The owner, however, Jessica Tata, left the children by themselves and carelessly drove off to Target. Meanwhile, the pot of oil she had left on the electric stove caught fire, and those seven babies burned in a massive fire.

Elizabeth Kojah, Kendyll Stradford, Elias Castillo, and Shomari Dickerson all burned to death. They were all under the age of 3.

It took several days for the authorities to get their act together to file charges. Meanwhile, Tata was able to flee to Nigeria. As the Good Book says: ''The guilty fleeth when no one pursueth.''

There should be no question in any person's mind that Jessica Tata should be held responsible for this crime. So the long arm of the law needs to capture her and return her to Texas and let a jury decide what to do with that baby killer—because justice is what we do.

And that's just the way it is.

LOSING THE WAR OF COMMON SENSE

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, last week, while most of us were working from our districts, a newspaper article entitled, ''Combat Troops To Get Gay Sensitivity Training,'' was published. The article explains how our combat forces on the front lines in Afghanistan will soon be required to take a time-out from their mission and be forced to participate in the Pentagon's homosexual sensitivity training regimen.

I still maintain the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell will harm recruitment, retention and readiness; but regardless of your opinion on that issue, it is remarkable that the courageous men and women who have voluntarily put themselves in harm's way are being subjected to such insane distractions while the war wages on around them.

Our Nation is at war against an enemy that wants nothing more than the complete destruction of our way of life. For the President and the Pentagon to dangerously distract the attention of our troops in forward operating bases away from the enemy and toward homosexual sensitivity training is outrageous.

To the men and women in the U.S. Armed Forces, I pray to God that you all return home safe and sound to your families. I, for one, believe in your mission and want to win the war on terror because we have certainly lost the war of common sense.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad my colleague came up to talk about high energy prices. We have consistently tried on this side of the aisle to talk about an all-of-the-above energy strategy. We are independent on electricity generation, but we are held captive to imported crude oil.

So what does that mean?

That means we are stuck with a one-fuel technology. In an all-of-the-above energy strategy, we envision a world where you go to a filling station, and you have fuel competing. You have coal-to-liquid technologies; you have liquid fuel by natural gas; you have renewable fuel by biomass. You have all of these issues to help decrease our reliance on imported crude oil. We have the operability for an oil-sand pipeline from Canada.

We really can be independent on our energy needs based upon North American energy resources. We have to be about that. For the administration to celebrate opening up one permit on the gulf coast is a joke. We ought to get our drilling rigs back and operating.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUINTA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank the Democratic leadership for giving the Congressional Black Caucus this time to stand in solidarity with our sisters and brothers in Wisconsin, in Ohio, as well as those in Indiana, and anywhere the rights of workers are being trampled upon. The similarities in what is going on here in the Nation's Capital and in the Wisconsin capital are not only striking, but it's the kind of coordinated attack against working men and women that we have become accustomed to seeing from Republican legislators and Governors.

I don't understand why Governor Walker can't take ''yes'' for an answer. The unions have agreed to most, if not all, of the concessions he asked for; but rightly, they will not—and should not—give up their right to collective bargaining.

No one knows better than the African American community what unions have done to lift people out of poverty, to ensure them decent jobs with decent wages and protections in the workplace. Not only African Americans, but all Americans have benefited from the work of our labor unions.

What Governor Walker is doing is not about balancing a budget or reducing a deficit any more than the cuts in spending are up here. It's about busting unions, thus making it possible for companies to run roughshod over workers' rights—a place no one in this country should ever allow us to go back to.

For the life of me, I can't understand what Republicans have against children—or is it just poor and middle class children? The Governor and his allies in the State legislature would rather take teachers out of the classroom—killing jobs—and jeopardize the education of Wisconsin's children than raise property taxes just a little bit to help cover the cost of providing a quality education even after the teachers

have agreed to give up some of their health and pension benefits negotiated in their contracts.

In fact, it is my understanding that, just like the Republicans here insisted on tax cuts for the wealthy, who did not need them, before anything could be done to help struggling families, Governor Walker also enacted tax cuts as soon as he came into office. The spending cuts, as I understand it, would not have been necessary in Wisconsin if those tax cuts had not been enacted, just as the devastating cuts in health care, education, community economic development, and job creation programs in homeland security and public safety would not have been needed here if we had not given the wealthy a tax giveaway in December.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she might consume to the former chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, who is always here, standing for the rights of workers, for the rights of children, for the rights of people everywhere, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE of California.

Ms. LEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Let me thank the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands for, once again, coming to the floor and organizing us to make sure that we sound the alarm, to make sure that we put out the facts about what is taking place. Tonight, of course, we are talking about the union-busting efforts of Governor Walker in Wisconsin.

So thank you, Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN, for your leadership and for your tireless work.

I am pleased to participate in this Special Order tonight as we provide some perspective about the importance of preserving and respecting the process of collective bargaining and of supporting the rights of public employees to protect union benefits won by virtue of the blood, sweat, and tears of unionized workers.

We are talking about the implications of the union-busting efforts undertaken by Wisconsin Governor Walker; but the reality is there is a sweeping antiunion sentiment overtaking our Nation, and public employees who are union workers are being used as scapegoats to balance State budgets. This practice is not only wrong; it is cruel and is calculated. Let's take a look at the facts.

In Wisconsin, for example, Governor Walker is attempting to ram through legislation that cuts State employee benefits and strips unions of their collective bargaining rights by allowing them to bargain only on wages, keeping benefits and other issues off the table, severely limiting union say on hiring, firing, assignments, and other work rules. The Governor appears ready to rush through radical changes that would take away rights from workers without making any effort—any effort—to talk to those workers, much less negotiate a fair agreement with them.

Governor Walker is calling employee unions unreasonable, but his administration has made absolutely no effort to work with or to even contact any of the unions he is attacking. He is demonizing public employees who are protesting at the capital. That's why 74 percent of Wisconsin residents oppose this and the Republicans' bill to take away these rights from the struggling middle-income/middle class residents of Wisconsin.

His proposals are an affront to all workers. When he says that State employees should contribute more, all he is really saying is that they should accept massive cuts in salary without being offered a seat at the negotiating table.

□ 1700

And we're not talking about huge salaries here.

This is not about budgeting; this is about union busting. And it is the kind of policy that will only hurt workers in the State and across the country, but it only leads to stalled economic growth and the slashing of jobs.

The process of collective bargaining has led to the rise of the middle class. It is a fair process that allows employers to sit at the table and craft an agreement that serves both parties. It's a fundamentally American process. It's a democratic process. Yet Governor Walker is bent on undermining decades of hard-earned concessions won by organized labor and its membership. If the Governor is successful in his union-busting efforts, we will see further assaults around the country on union workers and in other States that are really experiencing budgetary woes.

So in response to Governor Walker's action, elected officials—and we are very proud of and stand in solidarity with the elected officials in Wisconsin—decided to protest against his actions.

Public employees have shown that they are serious about balancing the budget by agreeing to Governor Walker's pension and health care requests, concessions that the Governor himself says will solve the budget challenge, but still it seems like this is not enough. The Governor's efforts are denying the rights of tax-paying nurses, educators, emergency response workers—all people who probably are our next-door neighbors. We all know public employees who this will hurt. These are union workers who need and should have a voice.

At the same time, he is pressing for a bill that will do nothing to fix the budget. This bill will shatter relationships among educators and school leaders, undermining current innovations around teacher compensation, evaluation and improvement. It will really have a chilling effect on teacher recruitment and sends a terrible message about the value of public service.

Mr. Speaker, there are ominous signs on the horizon that reflect a growing sentiment by Governors who seem bent on union-busting, anti-democratic initiatives to really undo longstanding collective bargaining agreements. Union workers and public employees are being used as scapegoats to balance the budget. Teachers, nurses, police, firemen and others who perform their jobs dutifully are being treated shabbily by this Governor and those who share his union-busting and anti-collective bargaining philosophy. I hope that cooler heads prevail, and I urge the Governor to pull the State back from this radical governmental overreach.

I see my colleague from Wisconsin, Congresswoman GWEN MOORE, will be with us. And I just want to say to Congresswoman MOORE that my constituents in the Ninth Congressional District stand in solidarity with you and with all of those bold and brave leaders who have left the State, and also on behalf of all of the union workers and all of those who have come to the Capitol to say enough is enough. So thank you, Congresswoman MOORE, for your leadership.

Thank you, Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Congresswoman LEE, and thank you for your leadership.

We have a number of women leaders here, and I would like to now yield to the gentlelady from Maryland who has been a leader on many issues, including during the health care reform debate to make sure that those who were insured were protected, Congresswoman DONNA EDWARDS.

Ms. EDWARDS. Thank you, Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN.

I'm here today because I look at the fight and the struggle of the workers in Wisconsin, the public sector workers, as connected, the dots connected to the struggles of workers across this country.

For 20 years we've seen an erosion of the organized labor force, the organized workforce. And it isn't just the private sector workers who have lost over these 20 years. It's also our public sector workers. And this is the fight in which we're engaged now, Mr. Speaker.

The union movement and collective bargaining have brought us minimum wages, not for our organized workers, but for those of us who are not organized, have brought us decent workplaces, safe working conditions, health care insurance, disability, vacation, family and medical leave, and the list goes on and on.

And so I want to step back in our history a little bit, Mr. Speaker, and take a look at what has happened to the organized workforce—jobs shipped outside this country for private sector workers, a depletion of the organized workforce. We've also seen a circumstance where our State and municipal employees have done everything that we've asked them to do even in a tough economy in saying that they will make concessions, as all workers have in this economy, because they believe

in holding the line for all of their workers so that people will not have to lose jobs. But they've taken furloughs, they've taken pay freezes, they've taken cuts in benefits. And even in Wisconsin, we know that the workforce there, the public sector workers have given on all of those money issues.

And so we have to ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker, what is at the bottom of this. And what's at the bottom of this, in my view, Mr. Speaker, is that this is about busting up unions. We started with the private sector workers. We've put a kibosh on the ability of all of our workers to organize and to bargain for themselves, and now we're with public sector workers.

So I think that this is a race to the bottom, Mr. Speaker. It's a race to the bottom for the American worker, and so the struggle for workers in Wisconsin is a struggle for all workers.

When a worker is asked to give up $50 a month in contributions to a pension plan or $100 a month, let's think about what that means for that family. That $50 or $100 is the difference between having oatmeal and cereal and milk and eggs and paying the utilities every month. That's what $50 or $100 means. It's not something that's just thrown away.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I stand here with my colleagues in deep solidarity with the workers, the public sector workers of Wisconsin, because I know that as sure as their struggle goes, the struggle with all workers goes across the country. And we have to link those fights. We have to end this decades-long race to the bottom, Mr. Speaker.

We're being asked to look at trade agreements where we trade away private sector jobs, our public sector workers, our teachers, our firefighters, our law enforcement, people who take care of our children on a day-to-day basis. We're saying to them, you're not valued; you're not worth enough even in this economy. I don't think that that is the message that the American people want to send.

And, Mr. Speaker, clearly the polls show that across this country a vast majority, an overwhelming majority—upwards of 60 percent—of the American public believes in the right to bargain collectively. And what is collective bargaining? Collective bargaining is sitting around a table, having a fair shake, getting a fair deal, and dealing as equal partners.

Let's look at what's happened in Wisconsin and across this country. Contracts were struck. Now, if a contract were made in the private sector and one of the parties wanted to renege on that contract, the other party would probably take them to court. They would be in litigation.

Yet here in Wisconsin and across this country, workers are being asked every day, they're being told every day that the person who is on the other side of an equal-bargaining table is going to renege on a contract. There is something deeply anti-democratic about that.

So I'm here, Mr. Speaker, because public sector workers in Wisconsin deserve our solidarity. As a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, we know deeply of the struggle for freedom and for justice, and we know an injustice when we see it; And we are witnessing what looks to be an injustice in Wisconsin and Ohio and Indiana and perpetrated all across this country when it comes to the rights of workers and the ability to organize and the ability to bargain collectively for a decent workplace, for decent wages, and for the ability to take care of one's family and oneself.

□ 1710

We stand toe-to-toe, shoulder-to-shoulder, and union card-to-union card with our public sector workers and with all workers across this country who deserve not a race to the bottom, Mr. Speaker, but a race to the top.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Congresswoman EDWARDS, and thank you for those really strong words to encourage our union members in Wisconsin and Ohio and Indiana and wherever else unions are under attack. We appreciate your being here with us this evening and for reassuring those workers that you and the Congressional Black Caucus are standing firmly with them.

At this time I would like to yield such time as she might consume to the gentlelady from Ohio, a former mayor, also a strong fighter for children, for the poor, and for the underserved, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you so very much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to attempts by the Republican Governor of Wisconsin and the Republican Governor of the State of Ohio, from which I hail, to undermine collective bargaining for public employees.

In my State, Ohio Senate Bill 5 is a measure currently under consideration by the Ohio General Assembly that would strip State workers of their collective bargaining rights. Today, this bill was approved by the Senate's Insurance, Commerce and Labor Committee. It now moves to the State Senate floor for a final vote, which could begin as early as today.

This vote comes after Ohio State and local union workers gathered in protest yesterday at the statehouse. Just yesterday, more than 8,500 people surrounded the statehouse to express their disapproval.

I firmly support the right of public employees to collectively negotiate. Who are we as a Nation when we tell our firefighters, our police officers, and other public protectors that they don't deserve a say in their working conditions? Does a teacher's experience or education have no economic value?

Ohio's proposed legislation is less about fiscal responsibility than it is an overt political attack on public workers who speak with a collective voice.

As labor battles erupt in State capitals across this country, a majority of Americans say they oppose efforts to weaken the collective bargaining rights of public employees.

I want to join with my colleagues today to just talk a bit about what is happening not just in Wisconsin—although we are here today because of all that has gone on in Wisconsin.

And I would now yield back to our chair so that we may discuss this in another form.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Certainly.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. And before we begin that, I'd like to just ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to enter extraneous material on the matter under discussion this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. And to begin this dialogue, I'd like to turn now to the gentlelady from Wisconsin who feels it and who knows it, GWEN MOORE.

Ms. MOORE. Well, thank you so much for yielding, and thank you, Mr. Speaker, during this hour.

I want to thank the Congressional Black Caucus members and the women of the Congressional Black Caucus for joining me here today. The Congressional Black Caucus has always been known as the conscience of the Congress because we understand budgets, and these initiatives to break the collective bargaining agreements are being presented to us in the context of a budget. And we all know that budgets are not about numbers, and this is proof of that. It's about values. And where you place your money is where you place your heart.

And so I'd like to talk about the situation in Wisconsin.

You know, there are a few things that have been misinformation, just let me say that, around this budget. And I appreciate the fact that we have a physician here with us this evening who is an expert on the Medicaid program. We have an attorney here with the gentlelady from Ohio. And we have the gentlelady from Maryland who is an expert on all kinds of programs that deal with family issues.

So I need you to help me sort out some of the things that have been misinformation and disinformation in this campaign.

Let me say that I once served on the Joint Committee on Finance and put the budget together as a State senator in the Wisconsin Legislature. So I know that the opening balance to the budget was a $121 million surplus. Now, that's not a lot of money when you consider that $65 million is required for a statutory minimum balance in the account. But it left a cushion of $54 million in those accounts. Nothing like the $3.6 billion deficit that the Governor likes to present as his raison-

d'etre for these draconian cuts in collective bargaining.

Now, what is a structural deficit? A structural deficit simply is the difference between what the agencies of the government request and what the Governor provides. And so when is the last time the agencies have gotten every dime that they've asked for? Never. So it's a phony structural deficit. But given the fact that our Governor, just like any Governor, has budget challenges, I respect the fact that, you know, sometimes you have to make unpleasant cuts.

So what the Governor proposed to do was to realize savings by requiring that State employees, except for the police and fire and State troopers, pay 5.8 percent of their pension funds and a little over 12 percent of their health care funds, and to make those contributions, generating $725 million in savings. Miraculously, the unions agreed to do that.

But the Governor said, No. No, I do not want to negotiate with you. I want to strip you of your rights to collective bargain. And the exact words of the bill were that they were prohibited from bargaining about anything related to their conditions of employment.

So I was wondering if I could yield to the gentlelady from Ohio and talk about that kind of legal jargon, that they are unable to negotiate on any conditions of employment except for the 1 percent wage within the consumer price index.

Ms. FUDGE. Let me just say to you—and I thank you for yielding and allowing me this time—as mayor of a city, I balanced budgets for 9 years. I understand what it takes to balance a budget.

But let me just suggest to you that Wisconsin, being very similar to Ohio, when you look at the fact that wages and benefits for public employees in the State of Ohio account for only 9 percent of the budget, so Ohio is saying, as you are, that they've got this huge, huge deficit. They're saying we've got an $8 billion deficit. Well, just like in Ohio, if we were to fire every single public employee in the State of Ohio, we would save about $2 billion this year. They would still have a $6 billion deficit. So public employees are not the problem.

And for them to suggest that the only thing they can talk about is wages is ridiculous. It is nothing more than a smokescreen. They are basically saying: We are taking all of your rights. And that is what it boils down to legally is that they really have no rights at all. There is no collective voice. There is nothing that they can do to protect themselves. They have taken away their seniority, their security. It is just, to me, the most barbaric thing I've seen in a long time.

Ms. MOORE. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. FUDGE. I will yield.

Ms. MOORE. There are some things that I don't understand.

Now, another myth and an untruth that has abounded in this debate is that somehow these public sector employees who are very well educated—I mean, some of them are nurses, school teachers, career executives in State government. Well-educated people make less, it is true, they make less than their peers in the private sector because as part of their compensation they have accepted less in wages so that they could have a pension, so that they could have health care benefits.

□ 1720

And so the misinformation, the effort to gin up antagonism against public employees is totally faulty. Because the pensions, and I want you to share this with me as a lawyer and as a former chief executive, the pensions are obligations because people have already earned that money in lieu of the salary they may have received in the private sector.

Ms. FUDGE. My colleague, who also is a lawyer, was talking about that earlier in her remarks today.

Ms. EDWARDS. If the gentlewoman would yield, I think that we have to be really clear here that this is not a valid substantive debate. I think that we tend to want to address substantive arguments to refute the misinformation that you describe. This is an ideological debate that is about one thing only, and it is about busting up the union. It's an ideological debate. It's about privatizing a pension system. It's an ideological debate that says that services can be provided better in the private sector. So I think we have to be very clear here that if this were a valid substantive debate, then I think that the workers of Wisconsin would win on that. This is an ideological battle.

It's an ideological battle that's rooted in tearing apart, slashing and burning public sector workers under the ruse, under the guise of balancing a budget.

Ms. MOORE. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. EDWARDS. I will.

Ms. MOORE. It is very interesting that you should raise that, because in fact the governor of our State, in his previous capacity as the Milwaukee county executive, hired private security guards for the county jail. And a court just this past January ordered Milwaukee County to restore those public servants to their jobs. And in fact, they are required to do that. And it was all presented as a budgetary crisis. The Court found that the county exec, now our governor, had overstated the savings that would be realized by privatizing those county prison guards. And it's been the same tactic.

Indeed, the police and firefighters and State troopers were excluded from the collective bargaining prohibitions and the prison guards were not. And as a State legislator, and I served with our current governor, he did introduce a bill to privatize our prison system. So that's a very important insight.

Ms. FUDGE. I would say just to take a step further what my colleague has said, there is an assault on working people all over this country and in this House as well. As these communities and these States have become Republican controlled, we now hear as we talk about our own budget and our own CR that we have to deal with entitlement programs. And they continue to throw in there Social Security. It is not an entitlement program. It is funded by payroll taxes and taxes on employers. It is not an entitlement program. But we still today hear them talking about wanting to privatize it.

They want to take away the rights of workers across this country. It's not going to stop in Wisconsin, or Ohio, or in Indiana, or in Florida. It is a plan. And we need to realize it now, because all workers, and those as you talked about who are retired, are going to feel the effects of this as we go forward. So this is just the tip of the iceberg. This is a battle we have to win.

Ms. EDWARDS. If the gentlewoman would yield, we have just gone through an exercise and continue to go through a budget exercise here in this Congress with respect to Federal workers. So I have said to some Federal workers your struggle as a Federal worker is connected to the struggles of private sector workers, is connected to the struggles of public sector workers at the State and municipal level. And let me tell you about that.

First, we have Federal workers who are facing a 2-year pay freeze. And they have accepted that because they are good public servants. Then they face the mythology of people who say that Federal workers are greatly overpaid when it comes to the private sector. But just as in Wisconsin, when you examine deeply the work that the workers do, you examine their job skills compared to the private sector job skills, and what you find is in fact they are greatly underpaid in the same job categories requiring the same skills and education as their private sector counterparts.

Now, I don't want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in fact private sector workers have made out like bandits over the last 20 years, because what we know is that private sector workers, including the organized workforce, have faced stagnant wages and benefits over the course of the last two decades. And that's why I think it's really important for us to connect the dots with workers, because I think that opponents out there who would like to privatize the public workforce, opponents out there who would like to delegitimize and disaggregate unions, who would like to bust them up, also want to suggest that in fact it's the public sector workers fighting against the private sector workers fighting against the Federal workers.

No, this is an entire workforce, as my colleague from Ohio has pointed out, across the board, across this country that has suffered massive, massive assaults on working people, on middle

class people when it comes to wages and benefits. And Wisconsin serves the purpose of highlighting for us the transparency and the meanness of what it takes to go after working families.

Ms. MOORE. Reclaiming my time, you know, I will tell you there are a couple of other myths I want to bust before I turn to the gentlelady, the doctor, physician in our caucus, to talk about Medicaid a little bit, because that links in with this union-busting effort. You know, Congresswoman from Maryland, you talk about trying to pit private sector workers against public workers, I am happy to say that those unions in the private sector in Wisconsin have stood firm with the public sector employees.

I am happy to report to you that the firefighters and the police, those unions that were exempted from this collective bargaining fiasco, stand firm with public employees. Why? Because they get it. They get it that the gains made by organized labor inure to all workers.

In Wisconsin in the 19th century, May 5, 1886, five people in my district, in Bay View in Wisconsin, were killed, and four were wounded, attacked by troops called on, sicced on them by the then-Governor Jeremiah Rusk, fighting for the 8-hour workday.

Workers in unions have won the weekend, safety conditions in the workplace. Workers have won these benefits, and they have inured to the private sector. And those people who are in the private sector need to respect the sacrifice, the blood and the tears.

You know, Wisconsin was a State where the first workers comp law passed, the first State to have unemployment compensation. It was the birthplace of AFSCME. This has been a progressive State.

We have 14 very brave State Senators who have left the State so that they would not have to vote on these draconian union provisions. And the governor has said that because they are leaving that there are going to be massive layoffs and firings, and it will be their fault.

□ 1730

Well, I just wanted to point one thing out. He revealed his budget just yesterday afternoon, and he has reduced State aid. He has reduced shared revenue to all of the counties, villages, cities, and municipalities to the tune of $6.9 million. He has reduced aid to schools, kindergarten through 12th grade and technical colleges, to the tune of a billion dollars.

So these local communities, school districts, will have to lay off snow shovelers and teachers. Teachers will find themselves in classrooms with, they predicted, as many as 60 kids in them.

They are cutting Medicaid in this State, and I will get back to that later, because they are draconian cuts.

In the meantime, we are providing $7.6 billion for roads. That's local money and Federal money together. We are providing a total, 100 percent tax relief for capital gains taxes for businesses that locate in the community for up to 5 years. We are providing, his special sessions bill provided at least $200 million worth of tax breaks at the same time we are reducing school aid by a billion dollars.

I see that the gentlewoman from Washington D.C., also a very esteemed attorney, has come to join us here. We are talking about the loss of the collective bargaining agreements in Wisconsin, something that has no fiscal impact, but that the governor insists must be a part of his budget.

I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I am in solidarity with the gentlewoman from Wisconsin and with my friend from the Virgin Islands as well, those who have come down, and in special solidarity with the workers in Wisconsin, in Ohio, in Indiana, who are fighting for their collective bargaining rights. Now, unlike the gentlewoman from Wisconsin, I don't know whether paying 5.8 percent into their retirement benefit is good or not, or whether paying 12 percent of their health care costs, I know it's double or triple the amount. I don't know about any of that.

I do know that when you have health care and retirement systems, there is usually a quid pro quo. You take less pay.

But I don't know the answer to that. All I know is that in a democratic society, where people have won collective bargaining rights, those matters are bargained at the table.

I am here to reinforce the importance of collective bargaining rights that are now on the table of the country, beginning in Wisconsin, spreading rapidly and, watch out, they could come, this insidious movement against collective bargaining could even come to the Congress of the United States. We have to stop it in its tracks in the Midwest.

In any free society, there are four or five rights that everybody will cite, the right to free speech, the right to religion and, guess what, the right to bargain collectively. Once you have established that the workers have elected a union, it is one of those fundamental rights.

I want to say to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin, if one of the developing countries that we always complain are not democratic enough, were to take away the collective bargaining rights of some of its workers, well, you would have to fight people at the well in order to quell the stampede of people saying you have violated a fundamental right of a free society.

I have just come from a hearing on the Postal Service. It was amazing to hear management and the private sector say that the reason you have a post office today and that it hasn't gone down the drain is because the workers across the table from management have helped them to manage the downsizing of the Postal Service.

The best thing that you can have when there is downsizing to be done is, indeed, to have a union. Because when people know that the downsizing, that the rights they hope they had that they don't have have been bargained for, they will accept those rights in a way they would not if management came in and just pulled them himself. That is what Governor Walker is trying to do right now.

Ms. MOORE. You know, you have made a very good point. If you going to downsize and if you are going to make those sacrifices, number one, our workers have said we will negotiate that. We will try to help our State.

But if you are going to downsize at least you ought to think that you are doing it for the public good. You don't want to think that you are doing it so that could give $200 million in tax cuts so that you could privatize the nuclear power plants in the State. You would think that if you are going to pay 12.8 percent of your own health care that that would mean that at least the Governor was going to protect the most vulnerable who are on Medicaid.

But I am sorry, it's sad to be able to share with you, Dr. CHRISTENSEN, that in his budget he is limiting a family care program, it's a Medicaid program to pay for in-home services for seniors and people with disabilities, to only those who are currently enrolled; all the 2,000 people on the waiting list, no services. He is going to seek permission from the Federal Government to cut eligibility standards, to cut off certain categories of nonpregnant or nondisabled adults or lower eligibility, and he is not a fan of Planned Parenthood. He wants to cut off family planning services for men.

He is expecting—right now, they are forced to continue their maintenance effort, at least until July, when the enhanced FMAP runs out. But he is again seeking those waivers so that he can cut off categories of people.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. If I could just say for a moment it sounds very much like what's happening here.

As the gentlewoman has said and our other colleagues have said, this is not just an issue for Wisconsin, Ohio, and Indiana; this is an issue for our country. And the same thing that's being done in Wisconsin is what is being done here.

Tax giveaways to the wealthy and to business while we cut health care programs, education programs, community, economic development programs for people across America who need them.

And that's why we have decided today, as a caucus, to come here and to voice our support and to give encouragement to the workers and to your legislators who have had to leave Wisconsin to prevent these devastating cuts that will further damage the health of—and I am sure your State is no different from other States, where the poor people of color, women, are not getting the kind of health care that they need.

What we need is to make sure that the benefits that we passed last year in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act are implemented in Wisconsin and everywhere. What your governor is doing is going backwards instead of forward.

Ms. MOORE. Backwards instead of forward, $900 million from our school system, $250 million in State aid for the University of Wisconsin system, $71.6 million from the technical college system, low-income children and families requiring women who receive TANF, temporary assistance, they are cutting them by $20 a month, 3 percent of the TANF check.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. And the check is not that big to begin with.

Ms. MOORE. The check is small.

□ 1740

There is some talk of requiring them to move from 28 hours of work a week to 30 hours of work a week and reducing the amount of child care that they can get.

Again, the theme for this budget, our Governor's budget, is that Wisconsin is open for business. Well, no State can be open for business by slamming the doors of educational opportunity and denying babies, poor people, and seniors health care. It is more a case that we're selling our State to business interests.

I would yield to the gentlelady from D.C.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlelady for yielding because I want to bring this right home to what is happening on the floor of this Congress as we speak. There is too little recognition of what you have indicated that when you cut agencies, you strangle services. That goes for the Federal sector as well. And I think we have to be very wary that this could come to the Federal sector. Federal workers have been targeted. They've got a great big bull's eye on their backs. They are among the best educated workers in the United States.

Bear in mind, I say to the gentlelady, because this will particularly be important in your State, the deadly deficit commission warned that no cutting should be done in this year, 2011, small cuts perhaps in 2012 and no real programmatic cuts until 2013. And they gave as a reason—this is the deficit commission—they gave as a reason that you would strangle the recovery. It's a fragile recovery. Mr. Bernanke spoke. I don't know if anyone mentioned that.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. We haven't mentioned it yet.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Bernanke spoke. I'm not on that committee, but I heard what he said. He has said, as well, don't harm the recovery. You don't, in the midst of a bear recovery, start acting as though you had a full-fledged economy. Everybody has been talking about a double dip. They are going to find out what a double dip is. If we had what independent observers say, 700,000 jobs gone because of these cuts, gone in Wisconsin, gone from the Federal Government, there is no way for us to recover. We cannot kick workers to the curb without having an effect on the recovery itself.

Watch out, Wisconsin. And particularly I say to my Republican colleagues, watch out that you don't bring it here and don't mess with collective bargaining of our Federal employees the way you're doing in Wisconsin. This is not Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. In January, our economy nationwide gained 36,000 jobs, hardly anything to brag about. But I can tell you this: this Wisconsin State budget fires 21,600 State employees alone. And when you consider the cuts to municipalities, cities, villages and counties, there are thousands more that are going to lose their jobs. So you talk about hurting the recovery, how can you recover when people don't have jobs to consume and those who do have jobs find their income cut by 6 and 7 percent because of these givebacks in their pensions and for their health care?

Not only that, they're balancing the budget on the backs of children and on the backs of seniors, but they're also penny wise and pound foolish. I live on a Great Lake. Twenty percent of the Earth's fresh water is in those Great Lakes. And what does this budget do? It reduces the ''burden'' that municipalities have in cleaning the water. It reduces standards for water cleanliness. It ends the recycling program. So it is penny wise and is probably going to destroy the environment, reduce educational opportunity and reduce health care to the most indigent and vulnerable in our population.

But we're giving tax breaks to the wealthiest Wisconsinites to encourage them to invest, 100 percent forgiveness of capital gains taxes, $7.6 billion for roads, and we are going to privatize the nuclear power plant. One of the great contributors to the Governor's campaign happens to be in the nuclear power plant business. And we're all doing this in the name of balancing a budget.

I hope that the people in Wisconsin don't fall for this trick.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I'm sure they're not because people across America are not falling for it. The New York Times/CBS did a poll. They showed that the majority of Americans—and I'm sure in the States that are facing these issues—oppose efforts to weaken collective bargaining rights of public employee unions and are against cutting the pay or benefits of public workers to reduce State budget deficits. They oppose weakening collective bargaining by 60 percent, including large numbers, and not just Democrats but independents, they oppose cutting pay and benefits. The majority of Americans, over 56 percent, oppose cutting pay and benefits. And most of those who were surveyed are not union members and don't have union members in their family. So the American people get it. They don't like what they are seeing.

Ms. NORTON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Surely.

Ms. NORTON. This is very important because it means that Americans understand a fundamental right when they see one. And they are saying, and they know best of all, we're willing to take these cuts, don't go into people's fundamental rights, in fact, don't cut as much as you were doing.

Look, this majority rode into town on the promise of jobs. Where is the jobs bill? Instead, they proceeded forthwith to cut jobs. They cut jobs first in the health care bill. Now they are cutting hundreds of thousands of jobs on the floor with their own version of deficit reduction. All we're asking for is balance.

The workers in Wisconsin are willing to take cuts. They said so. Look, we'll take your cuts, Governor. Don't take away our collective bargaining. Everybody is willing to share. The Governor wants it all. Collective bargaining is about sharing. They need collective bargaining to get a fair deal for all concerned in Wisconsin.

And I compliment the gentlelady from Wisconsin for reinforcing her workers and reinforcing what the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands has told you is the view of the majority of the American people.

Ms. MOORE. I thank you so much, gentlelady from the Virgin Islands, for pulling this hour together.

As my aunt used to always say, the truth will set you free. And I hope that those who have watched this debate will try to see through some of the partisan bickering that has gone on.

Just to reinforce a few points that we've made, the effort to take away the ability for union members to not only collective bargain for themselves, but when they win those rights, so-called freeloaders, the people who are not in the union, benefit from those gains. That has nothing to do with budget issues. It has nothing to do with money. Those rights are things that have something to do with your conditions of employment, your ability to relate to your employer and to negotiate with him on non-economic issues as well economic issues.

This budget crisis is a creation of this Governor. We started out with a surplus budget in Wisconsin, and the first thing he did when he came into office was to provide at least $300 million in tax benefits to the very wealthiest and then declare that we now have an emergency.

I would yield back to the gentlelady for closing.

□ 1750

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. So you did say that the emergency was sort of created?

Ms. MOORE. Exactly. That is the same reason that the Governor, then-

county executive, lost his case by firing those 26 guards because he is creating, once again, the same pattern, creating a false emergency.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Do you see the same thing happening here in this Congress?

Ms. MOORE. Exactly.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you.

I want to thank all of my colleagues for joining us this evening to talk about this issue. Again, this is not about budgeting. It is about union busting, and it is the kind of policy that will not only hurt workers in the State and across the country, but it only leads to stalled economic growth and the slashing of jobs. It is the kind of policy that hurts our Nation.

We want to make sure that our workers in Ohio and Wisconsin and Indiana and everywhere know that the Congressional Black Caucus stands with you. We want to let our country's labor leaders, the union leadership know that we stand with them and support them, and that we have the highest respect and support for the Democratic legislators who have drawn the line and did what had to be done to stop the egregious attacks on the middle class and the poor.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO ZIMBABWE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112–12)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2011.

The crisis constituted by the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions has not been resolved. While some advances have been made in Zimbabwe, particularly on economic stabilization, since the signing of the power-sharing agreement, the absence of progress on the most fundamental reforms needed to ensure rule of law and democratic governance leaves Zimbabweans vulnerable to ongoing repression and presents a continuing threat to peace and security in the region and the foreign policy of the United States. Politically motivated violence and intimidation, and the undermining of the power-sharing agreement by elements of the Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front party, continue to be of grave concern. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue this national emergency and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

The United States welcomes the opportunity to modify the targeted sanctions regime when blocked persons demonstrate a clear commitment to respect the rule of law, democracy, and human rights. The United States has committed to continue its review of the targeted sanctions list for Zimbabwe to ensure it remains current and addresses the concerns for which it was created. We hope that events on the ground will allow us to take additional action to recognize progress in Zimbabwe in the future. The goal of a peaceful, democratic Zimbabwe remains foremost in our consideration of any action.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 2, 2011.*

CRISIS FACING AMERICA

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

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a treat to be able to join you tonight, my colleagues and friends, and to talk about a great crisis that our Nation is facing. It is becoming increasingly apparent to Americans not only that we have a problem with unemployment and jobs, but we have a problem with the Federal budget and the deficit and the spending and the taxing—all of those things that go into an economy.

These problems are far more significant than I think many Americans are aware. I would like to talk about that tonight and to keep it fairly simple, and to let people know, as President Reagan said, while the solution is simple, it is not easy. It requires a great deal of courage.

I am going to start tonight in perhaps an odd way. I am going to ask you, please, to picture that you are either a Senator or a Congressman in 1850 in America. In 1850, you would have noted that there was increasing discussion as the new territories became available, whether they would be allowed to come into our Nation either as a free State or a slave State. It created a lot of political tension between the different Representatives representing different points of view on that subject.

By 1852, the book ''Uncle Tom's Cabin'' was written. It became a very popular book, and it tended to further inflame the issue, the great question of the day. The question was slavery; what would America do with that question.

By 1857, the Supreme Court, deciding to legislate from the bench, which has always turned out to be a bad idea and beyond their constitutional authority, came up with a decision that came from my State, the State of Missouri. It was called the Dred Scott decision. It said essentially that black people were not people; they were property. But beyond that, it also said to the Congress and to the Senate that they could not make any kinds of deals as to which State would be slave or free because each State could do whatever they wanted.

And so the stage was set as the tensions grew for Abraham Lincoln to be elected to be President. And as he was on the train approaching the capital, leaving Illinois, a number of Southern States seceded from the Union. And almost as though in slow motion, a great locomotive drove off the edge of the cliff pulling the train with it, and America was immersed in a terrible, terrible Civil War. It was a war that was ultimately to claim 600,000 lives. That is more than all the people who are Americans who have been killed in all of the rest of the wars we have fought in our Nation's history. Of course, a statistic like 600,000 may seem to make your eyes glaze over, but then you start to hear the individual and personal stories of people who were horribly touched and families that were destroyed by the horror of the war, and you recall the words of the second inaugural address of Abraham Lincoln and he talked about the fact that the war had been far, far worse than anybody had ever imagined was possible.

That great tragedy, that terrible cost that was paid by our Nation, was a result of a failure of leadership, a failure to deal with a massive fundamental question that everybody knew was there all through the 1850s—the question of slavery. And the failure was not just in the Congress, in the Senate, but it was in the people of the States for being too disengaged and unwilling to take that question head on.

The parallel today, I think, is a little bit frighteningly similar. Today, just as there was in 1850, there is a gorilla in our tent, and that is the problem with the Federal Government spending too much money. So what I want to do is put that in very simple terms not so your eyes will glaze over, but so we get some sort of a sense of balance as to what is going on; because my proposition is that we are spending too much money, the government is spending too much money, and it is unsustainable.

Now, this is something that many thoughtful liberals, as well as conservatives, agree is true. There is disagreement as to what to do about it. But the numbers are the numbers. There is something about mathematics that is

that way. And that is what we are going to talk about: the simple view of what the numbers are today and why. This is a crisis that we must address. We cannot ignore the gorilla in the tent. This is something that all Americans must become aware of and must be participants in solving the problem.

As we do that, the jobs will return. America will hold her head high again; and almost, as a ship with a big wave breaking across the deck, the ship will shake loose the water that threatens to push it to the bottom and lift its bow in pride and sail further on.

So what I am going to do is just take a look at some stuff that sometimes politicians talk about in gobbledygookspeak and try to make it simple.

□ 1800

We have here a picture of all the things that the Federal Government is spending money on. It's your old classic pie chart. And I have over here Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. You can see that's a pretty big piece of the chart. These things are called entitlements by politicians. An entitlement—I'm an unfortunate engineer that ended up in politics—is sort of like a little machine that's created by law. The machine might have been created 30 years ago and it's a little bit like the machine in the bathroom which you put your hand in front of it and it spits out paper towels, except this machine spits out dollar bills. The entitlement is like a little machine. It's put on a track and off it goes spitting out dollar bills. So anybody who qualifies gets money. These programs—Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid—if you qualify, you just get money.

There are other entitlements as well. In addition to other entitlements, there is something that acts an awful lot like an entitlement and that's the interest on our debt. When we sell a Treasury bill, the person that bought it expects to be paid interest, and so the Treasury bill acts like a little machine. It spits out dollar bills at the appropriate intervals.

The point is that if you add these entitlements here, the other entitlements, and you take the net interest on our debt and you put that together, it comes up to $2.2 trillion. What does that mean, anyway? $2.2 trillion is bigger than I can understand, but we can compare it to something else, and that is the revenue of the Federal Government. That is, when everybody in America pays their taxes, the money comes into Washington, D.C., that's our revenue. The revenue is $2.2 trillion. So the entitlements and debt service at $2.2 trillion is the same thing as our revenue.

Well, what's left over to pay for national defense? And what's left over to pay for the rest of the running of the government? This other non-defense discretionary would be things like the Congress and the Senate buildings, would be the Federal prisons, the Federal parks, Departments of Energy and Commerce and Justice and Education, all those different things. Those are this non-defense.

In other words, what I'm saying is this. If you zero out defense, so there's not a soldier left, not a rifle, not a ship, not a plane left and zero out everything else in the Federal Government, when you zero those out, you now have a balanced budget. Because entitlements and debt service are taking every last penny we get in revenue. That is a serious problem.

I am joined by a very good friend of mine from Louisiana, a man who is growing in stature and feared, loved and respected, my good friend STEVE SCALISE from the great State of Louisiana.

Please join us, STEVE.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my good friend from Missouri. When we talk about feared and loved, I'm not sure where we fit in, but I do think it's important——

Mr. AKIN. The feared is because of the people who want to whitewash what was going on with that big oil spill and the fact that you got on it and told people the truth; and I respect that. Thank you, sir.

Mr. SCALISE. Thank you.

That's the beauty of the people's House. I think what you're doing, you hold this weekly town hall forum, as we call it, to talk to the American people about what really is happening here in the people's House, in the Congress, and how it affects people all across this country. Of course, I had three town hall meetings last week when I was back in my district, when Congress had finished dealing with one part of this budget problem.

I think when you talk about what's wrong with the spending, how out of control spending is in Washington, we had taken some action 2 weeks ago to say it's finally time to start righting the ship. Speaker PELOSI had the reins of the House of Representatives for 4 years. Of course during that 4 years that Speaker PELOSI was running the House, we saw unbridled runaway spending and record deficits, to the point where we now have a $1.5 trillion deficit.

One thing that she left behind that we're dealing with is the fact that Speaker PELOSI didn't even bring a budget to the House floor last year so there was not even a budget, when families across this country had their own family budgets and families and small businesses are dealing with their crises and shortfalls by cutting spending.

Mr. AKIN. Let me interrupt for just a second, gentleman, because you're bringing up a whole lot of additional facts and things. Let me try and put this in perspective.

In 1974, we came up with a budget act, and every year since 1974, there was a budget here in this House. You might have liked it, you might not have liked it, but there was a budget, anyway, for what's going to go on in terms of Federal spending. Last year, under Speaker PELOSI, there was just no budget. None. And so what a lot of people see us dealing with now, and I think you're getting to this point, and that is the fact that we're doing what you do in the Federal Government when you don't have a budget and it's called a continuing resolution. I think maybe you were going down that direction.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. SCALISE. You're exactly right, because when we're talking about where we are today, it's important to look at how we got into this mess and the mess that we're trying to clean up, but the fact that historically last year Speaker PELOSI failed to even bring a budget to the floor when she was Speaker and so there was no budget that was passed.

What that means is, like I said, while families are putting together their own budgets and families and businesses are dealing with the problems in the economy and shortfalls and they're cutting back and doing more with less, the Congress didn't even pass a budget. And so under Speaker BOEHNER now as we've got this new Republican majority here, we came up with a plan to fund the government for the rest of the year, but to fund it in a way that actually started cutting spending. I think one of the big problems that's been out there for a long time, things that you and I want to deal with, we want to cut spending and start putting our country back on a path to a balanced budget.

And so we had this debate 2 weeks ago in the House where we said, okay, we want to be responsible about funding government, but that means we've got to start making real cuts. You can't just keep spending at the rate you're spending with the deficits that go along with it. We've got to start cutting so that this pie that you showed actually starts getting addressed and shrunk in a way that the Federal spending starts getting closer to matching the amount of revenue that's coming in.

Mr. AKIN. If I could piggy-back in and jump to what you're saying.

A couple of weeks ago, we had basically a budget on the floor of the House. But the budget, interestingly enough, is what's called the discretionary side. So the budget was for this green, the defense, and this—what is that?—tomato soup. Maybe it's Campbell's tomato soup. This is the non-defense discretionary. So the budget only dealt with this section and we were making cuts to that section.

What, of course, you have to ask yourself is, how about all this other stuff? Of course, this wasn't touched.

So proceed, please, because I think it's a good story. People need to understand what we're working on was the first thing we had to work on which was the fact there wasn't any budget that we're running on, and so we're trying to put a budget together for between now and October 1, if I recall, sir.

Mr. SCALISE. And so finally, to address the real problem in the country with this runaway spending, what we said under both Speaker BOEHNER and then chairman of Appropriations Committee Hal Rogers is that we've got to stop the bleeding. We've got to start cutting spending. And we brought a bill to the floor that allowed for $100 billion in cuts. That's billion with a B. Real cuts to spending at the Federal level to finally start that process. By no means is this the finished product, but it was the first start of the process of finally getting spending under control.

That bill came to the floor. We had a lot of debate. An open process. Any Member could bring an amendment to that bill. I brought an amendment to get rid of a bunch of these czars, these czars that are killing jobs in our country, that are getting paid millions of dollars to go out there and try to implement radical policies that run jobs to China and India and other places. That amendment passed. A lot of good amendments passed to cut spending, but ultimately we set a new tone. We said, number one, we're going to put our money where our mouth is. We promised that if we get the reins of power in the House, that we would actually really start cutting spending. So we cut $100 billion. We sent that to the Senate. And we're almost at 2 weeks past the point where we sent that bill over to the Senate. They still haven't had one ounce, one minute, of hearings or debate on our bill that we sent to them to cut $100 billion in spending.

Mr. AKIN. Why do you think it was that they didn't want to take a look at the bill? They could have brought a bill up the same way. They could have gone through it and said, Well, we don't think they should have cut this much. They should have done this or this or this. They could have made changes on it and gone back and forth, and then we would have a budget for between now and October 1 and we could get on with what should be done this year instead of what should have been done last fall, or actually last year before the fall.

Proceed, please.

Mr. SCALISE. I think it became very clear very quickly just what is at stake here. There was a battle line that was drawn. In fact, as we were debating that bill to cut $100 billion and, as I said, with a $1.5 trillion deficit this year, $100 billion is just a start. Well, President Obama comes out and actually starts criticizing us for cutting $100 billion. He said $100 billion is too much. Senate majority leader, HARRY REID, said $100 billion is too much to cut. Again, we're saying $100 billion is just the beginning. We've got to cut more than $100 billion. And so you quickly saw a divide. There is a divide right now in Washington. I don't think there's a divide in this country. I think most people, people I talk to when I go back home to south Louisiana, my colleagues that I talk to that are going back home and having town hall meetings, meeting with their constituents, families and small businesses are saying, it's about time that we're finally seeing real cuts coming out of Washington, but yet the President and the Senate leader that were saying $100 billion is too much to cut. And so we've sent them $100 billion, but what's at stake here, it's not just getting spending under control, it's getting jobs created again in America.

□ 1810

One of the reasons we are seeing such stagnant job growth in this country is due to the uncertainty that is created by the runaway spending. These are interlinked issues—the spending problem in Washington and the problem with the slow economic recovery—because people are afraid to create jobs. Our job creators are under attack by Federal bureaucrats, who are bringing out all these regulations every single day to kill jobs.

We are seeing in my home State, in south Louisiana, where the administration doesn't even want to explore for energy in America. They've only issued one permit in 10 months to drill. In fact, now we're looking at the Middle East. We're putting more dependence in this country on Middle Eastern oil, under the Obama administration, at a time when the Middle East has never been in more disarray, which is why people are seeing over $3.20 or so a gallon at the pump. It's because of the President's own policies. This is killing jobs. It's not only running more jobs overseas, but it's also raising the prices of energy and gasoline for families.

Mr. AKIN. You're getting this down to the place where we really need to be talking this evening, and that's about jobs, because Americans are wanting to know: Hey, where are the jobs? So let's take this thing straight head on.

The fact of the matter is, first of all, if you allow this monkey business to go on here, this is just silly. There is no way you can excuse kicking the can down the street and ignoring this huge problem, and this huge problem really is connected to jobs. Specifically, there are things you do to kill jobs. We had a forum back in my district of St. Charles, Missouri. We had a whole bunch of businessmen come in, and we asked them: What do you have to do to create jobs, and what do you have to do to kill jobs? The thing that you do to kill jobs is exactly what we're doing.

So what are those things?

First of all, we're going to tax the owners of businesses—that's the first thing—because if you tax the owners of businesses, they can't expand their businesses, and they can't invest in their businesses, so the businesses just sit there. In fact, as you tax them more, they take money out of the businesses to pay the taxes, and they start laying people off because they can't run their businesses. So the first thing is: If you want to kill jobs, raise the taxes on the people who own businesses.

The second thing you do is bury the business in redtape. Now, we've got an EPA that feels like they can run redtape without Congress even passing a bill, so they're going to try and pass cap-and-tax and all these kinds of ridiculous regulations that cost a whole lot of money. It's not like a tax, but it ends up costing people business.

One of those very interesting actions on the part of the EPA, just to illustrate redtape, is the idea of requiring cleanup in case you spill milk. Usually, on farms, the cats lick up the milk.

We have with us a genuine hero in the U.S. Congress, Congresswoman BLACK from Tennessee, who won a coveted award just earlier this day. It's the Golden Turkey Award. It's for the silliest, dumbest regulation that you could find. Now, I know the competition is going to be fierce in this category, but Congresswoman BLACK won it by plenty of extra as she got her award. We're going to recognize her tonight for this award that she got, which ties right into our subject of jobs, and that is: If you want to kill jobs, raise taxes on business owners, and bury them in redtape.

Congresswoman BLACK from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. Thank you. I am so honored to unveil this new initiative from our Republican Study Committee.

This right here is the Golden Turkey Award. Each month, the RSC will be bestowing this dubious award to highlight the most absurd, the most ridiculous and obscure regulation that taxpayers foot the bill to enforce and have to live by. This month's Golden Turkey Award goes to a regulation that I have been talking about in my district and here also in Congress for the past month. The March 2011 Golden Turkey Award goes to the Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. AKIN. The EPA.

Mrs. BLACK. The EPA. The EPA recently discovered that milk contains fat. Can you believe that? It's also considered an oil. So what did the EPA do? It decided to regulate milk spills.

Well, the EPA is currently developing a rule that will subject dairy farmers to the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Program—that's sort of a long name—which was created for oil contamination in waterways, and now they're applying it to dairy farmers. So, when Nellie kicks over the bucket, our farmers will have to build berms around the area where they milk. They will have to have an emergency responder's plan so, in case milk is spilled, all of their employees will be trained in the containment of this spilled milk.

Mr. AKIN. Now, if you had some cats around in a cage and could open the cage, do you think that would work or do you think the EPA is going to want something more expensive than that?

Mrs. BLACK. That's an excellent question because, when I talked to the dairy farmers back in my district and when I told them about this great idea the EPA has for them, one of my farmers told me he already has this plan in

place. When asked, he said he has a barn with about 15 stray cats, and he's going to open the doors and yell, ''Here, kitty, kitty,'' and that will take care of the emergency spill.

Mr. AKIN. How many millions of dollars do you think it's going to take to get this tremendous hazard of spilled milk under control? I'm glad that our Federal Government is really dealing with tough issues like this.

Mrs. BLACK. It's good that you asked, because the rule requires that these emergency protocols be in place by November 10 of this year. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has already initiated a $3 million pilot program through the Natural Resources Conservation Service to help the farmers and the ranchers comply with the on-farm oil spill regulation. So already we see $3 million that's going to be wasted in just getting the farmers up to speed on how they have to do these plans.

When I was in my district last week and spoke to people about this, they were absolutely speechless. It has been told to me by many of the businesses in my district that what they really want is just for the government to get out of their way, to let them do their jobs, to stop overtaxing them, and to stop overregulating them so that they can actually grow their businesses. They have the capital to do so, and if we would just leave them alone, they could grow their businesses.

So that's why the inaugural Golden Turkey Award is being presented to the EPA and to its proposed overregulation of dairy farmers with spilled milk. I am going to work as hard as I possibly can to make sure that this does not get initiated and that our farmers will be freed from this onerous regulation.

Mr. AKIN. I have to wonder, particularly of the people out in my State of Missouri, what they'll be thinking when they find out that $3 million of their money is being used to come up with a program to take care of spilled milk.

I don't know how you found this treasure out. I heard there was another one that was similar. I think it was an EPA requirement that you couldn't have rogue dust. So, if you're a farmer, you can't farm with rogue dust, which is dust that comes off your property and goes over onto somebody else's property.

It makes me think that whoever is writing these regulations lives in one of these office buildings downtown here. If there happens to be anybody who is working on the rogue dust program, I'm sure that's another $3 million wonder—or maybe worse—just to go out on a combine in the good old State of Missouri and just run down a couple of rows of corn and see what happens when that old, dusty corn hits the combine and how they're supposed to keep all that dust right over their own properties. So that's another one of these examples.

I think Ronald Reagan talked about the fact that we're buying too much government, and that's what we've been doing these last number of months.

The point of the matter is, when you start cutting a lot of this government trash, you're going to create jobs in a couple of ways. The first thing is: You don't put us in debt so much, but you start cutting that redtape, which is overhead that our businesspeople have; and if they're not having to pay for all that overhead, they can hire people and get the economy going.

Hats off to Congresswoman BLACK from Tennessee for winning this prestigious Golden Turkey Award. Actually, I suppose the one who technically won it was the EPA; is that right?

Mrs. BLACK. That's right. The EPA has won.

Mr. AKIN. Isn't there actually like a bowling trophy with a big golden turkey on the top of it or something?

Mrs. BLACK. You're so right, and it's proudly displayed on my desk. It is a trophy that stands about 12-inches high, and it is golden and has a golden turkey on the top of it. I'm challenging all of my colleagues to find places that we're having overregulation, killing our businesses, stifling the growth of our economy, and stifling job growth.

Mr. AKIN. Who says we can't have fun in cutting the wasteful spending out of the government and at least do it with a little twinkle in our eyes?

It is noteworthy that a freshman Congresswoman could walk away with this kind of a prize. Certainly, there will be competition to have that Golden Turkey passed around.

□ 1820

I appreciate you joining us tonight.

We have some other distinguished guests. My good friend, Congressman WALBERG, I'm going to ask if you'd like to join us. We're talking a little bit, first of all, a big picture about how much money there is in the entitlements, the trouble with trying to balance a budget. And also we've talked about jobs and how much jobs relate to a government that's out of control, has forgotten they're supposed to be servants and are just running mad, making redtape, which again is excess overhead for the businesses and kills jobs. But please join us with your unique perspective.

Mr. WALBERG. Well, I appreciate my colleague from Missouri. I appreciate you holding this time this evening as we can talk about those things that impact our whole way of life in the United States.

We, I'm sure, understand here on the floor this evening the impact of what our Framers and Founders had in mind of a limited government, a government that believed very clearly that free people, with the opportunity to be creative and use the resources that they have, could indeed make a life that was filled with happiness in their pursuit that involved property and all that went with it.

As the subcommittee chairman for Workforce Protection, I had the opportunity to look at some things that are coming up right now that are being proposed as workplace safety standards. And this goes into cost issues that are huge regulatory costs, but also costs that ultimately reduce jobs and opportunity. One such regulatory issue is related to the noise regulation being proposed by OSHA. Now fortunately that has been pulled for the time being. It was pulled a couple days after we introduced the fact that we're going to hold hearings on it, continue to hold hearings. We found out in the process that noise standards—and all of us here would say that a worker ought to be safe, reasonably speaking, in their workplace.

I worked at U.S. Steel South Works shortly after high school, worked in the furnace division. I worked on a mole platform. I worked in a hooker shaft, which was lifting and holding pig iron and a number of other things. And I had reasonable expectation to be safe, including using hearing protection that involved either earmuffs or earplugs. What this new standard would have required would not have been simply putting earplugs into employees that would meet the standard, or earmuffs, but would require businesses to purchase machines that weren't only guarded or shrouded safely for hearing protection, but machines that would be reduced in the noise standard to a point that, as we looked at it more carefully, most likely weren't even machines made yet. They hadn't been produced. So we're talking about businesses that want to employ people that increase the economy—because you and I both know that the economy is produced in the private sector, not in the public sector, that the private sector entrepreneur, the taker of risk, produces an idea, comes up with it, ultimately hires employees to carry out the job, and then we put reasonable regulations to make sure that those employees are safe, that the hearing is protected as well. But we don't say to the employer you must buy a machine that isn't even produced yet, that isn't made yet in order to protect—

Mr. AKIN. You know, I really appreciate your example. And that's the trouble with these things. It's not that maybe there shouldn't be some workplace safety rules, but these things have just gone beyond the realm of what even makes sense.

I have even greater respect for you now. I also worked in a steel mill. And the noisy place at our steel mill was the pipe shop where they're loading the pipe. And you take a whole big bundle of pipe and drop it or hit it against something, and boy does it make a racket. So they always had ear protection and things in the pipe mill there. And certainly businesses know that that's necessary to do that. But when you start loading that kind of extreme redtape and regulations on a business, the business has to use their money to pay for all that, and they can't hire employees. So taxes, redtape, those are job killers.

As I recall, I think there was a gentleman last week that shared, somebody that had a drycleaning facility, and they found something like a spoonful of some water underneath a concrete slab that had a small amount of cleaning fluid—I guess carbon tetrachloride—in the water or something. They had to do like a $60,000 remediation, which for a simple dry cleaner just about took every penny that the owners had out of their bank, because of one teaspoonful of some water that had a little bit of the cleaning fluid they use on people's clothes. And that's what we're talking about. This is just bizarre kinds of stuff.

We have Dr. BOUSTANY from Louisiana here, and I think he was going to share with us for a minute. And Congressman WALBERG, we'll come back to you. Congressman WALBERG is from Michigan and a great Member of the caucus. And doctor, please.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my friend from Missouri for giving me time to speak here.

As we talk about American competitiveness and growing jobs, private sector jobs in this country, coming off the heels of this recession where we still have high unemployment, there are two aspects to it: One is cutting back on government spending, as you've already suggested with the pie chart you have there. We have to get our debt under control. This is imperative because it's going to strangle private investment in the form of higher taxes on the American people.

But the other side of this is the growth side of the equation, stimulating economic growth. And if you look at how to do that, we want economic growth in the private sector which will help spur job growth. The way we have to do that is we have to look at an energy strategy for the United States because so much of what we do depends on cheap, affordable energy to fuel our plants, our factories, transportation, you name it. So it's critical that we have an energy strategy for the country, which we don't have, and we never have had one. In fact, what you're seeing now, instead of the lack of an energy strategy, we're actually seeing energy proposals that are detrimental to the country that are being proposed by this administration. Let me list what's going on.

First of all, the moratorium on drilling for American energy in the Gulf of Mexico has been in place since May. This is killing jobs back home in Louisiana, along the gulf coast, but it's also hurting our energy security in this country. As we lose these jobs—these are highly skilled workers, as they leave this industry and go find other jobs and move, you cannot turn that light switch back on and get that kind of skill back on these platforms. That's number one.

Mr. AKIN. Now wait just a minute. Just on the surface of what you're saying, if somebody were really to listen to what you're saying, it sounds like insanity. Because here's what my thinking would be: You're saying that we've got all this unrest in the Middle East, which threatens the oil production there, which increases the cost of Middle Eastern oil. So we pay even more to countries that don't like us and use the money for advancing terrorist kinds of causes——

Mr. BOUSTANY. That's exactly right.

Mr. AKIN. And we have oil right under our feet and we're saying no, you can't drill for that stuff. And gasoline is $3-something a gallon, and we're not even drilling for the silly oil that we've got.

Now let me add one thing that gets me even more fired up, and that is, you go north, north of Louisiana where it's cold—we're talking out in the ocean outside Alaska. You've got foreign countries that are drilling on what is basically our coastal plain and they're drilling for oil. And here we are paying $3-something, and we're not drilling for any of this stuff. I mean, isn't this weird?

Mr. BOUSTANY. We have basically shut down our production in the Gulf of Mexico, and it's a boneheaded policy to do that. But not only that, the administration in its budget proposal is now proposing nearly $50 billion in new taxes on small, independent oil- and gas-producing companies. Now that's going to put a lot of these guys out of business; they can't cash flow. And they do a lot of the work on the Continental Shelf in shallow water areas, and also our onshore production in oil and gas. And there's a distinction between oil and gas——

Mr. AKIN. So here we are again. Because I started just a little while ago, we talked about if you want to kill jobs, first of all tax small businesses, tax them so much they can't run their business, or at least chase people out of them so there goes the jobs. The second thing you do is bury them in redtape. Now we're coming back to what you're saying—the very people we should want to be working and drilling for oil for us, we're going to tax them out of existence. Isn't that ridiculous?

Mr. BOUSTANY. It's ridiculous. And these taxes are indiscriminate; they hit oil companies, those drilling for oil, but also natural gas.

□ 1830

And there are many—even our friends on the other side of the aisle will admit that natural gas usage is a very important transition strategy as we look at our energy needs going into the future whether for transportation fuel, electricity generation. Those taxes proposed by the administration will put a lot of these gas companies out of business. And keep in mind, 97 percent of the natural gas used in this country is produced here in this country by these small companies.

A given rig will employ 65 people on one rig. So, if a company that has—let's say they have to cut back 50 rigs. Do the math. You're talking 3,000-plus jobs.

Mr. AKIN. The very jobs that we should be encouraging because we're so dependent on foreign oil.

Mr. BOUSTANY. These are private-sector jobs. They're good-paying jobs, and they help promote U.S. energy security. It's critical.

So what we have is an administration that is proposing policies counter to what American interests are with regard to our energy security, and I would submit to you it hurts our national security as well.

And I'm really worried about the situation in the country of Oman, for instance. It's right across the Strait of Hormuz from Iran. That strait is very narrow. Forty percent of the world's oil crosses through that strait, and if it were to shut down because of unrest in Oman and Iranian mischief, we would see oil prices spike up to $400 a barrel, and we'll pay a lot at the pump.

It will hurt our farmers. Rice farmers back home are trying to export rice and grow rice for domestic consumption. It will hurt our chemical manufacturing.

And speaking of the natural gas piece——

Mr. AKIN. Maybe I could just stop. I want to hit you with a ''gee-whiz'' statistic because I'm kind of an old geezer. I've been here for a while, and I've watched voting patterns, and here's something that might be interesting to you. And I tell this to some of my constituents back home.

If I were to say that the Republicans and Democrats in the House are divided on the abortion issue, people would go, Well, no big surprise. What I think's interesting is if you look back over the years, at least the 10 years I've been here, the two parties are more divided on developing American energy than they are on the abortion subject. And I find that just amazing to me because it seems so obvious that we're still using gasoline in cars. Until we get away from that, we need to be trying to produce our own gasoline.

We have very large reserves of oil that we could be drilling. And my understanding is on many, many of those locations where we could drill and hope to find oil, there are environmental lawsuits blocking drilling in all of these different locations where we could legally drill—not mentioning ANWR, which is off bounds to us right now—and now the regulations in the gulf which, again, I don't have any problem with people wanting to say, hey, we need to see what went wrong with the oil spill. How do we make sure that we get a very deep high-pressure situation, that we've got the proper devices to stop that up if we need to. But just to basically shut down and then tax everybody, this is just bizarre.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Well, it is bizarre.

And again, Americans want to compete. And we know, if given the opportunity to compete, we can win in the global economy. And we've got to have

energy production in this country to allow our companies to compete.

Now, let me point out something. One of the biggest areas of exports for the United States is chemicals, petrochemicals and other chemicals, fertilizer, that are produced here, manufactured here in the United States.

Mr. AKIN. Manufactured with?

Mr. BOUSTANY. Natural gas and petroleum products.

And if you shut down our natural gas production, then our companies, which have a price—on a basis of price, we can compete because we have cheap natural gas here in this country compared to around the world. Our companies are competitive.

Mr. AKIN. Now, you haven't even mentioned the massive new supplies of natural gas they're finding, particularly under Pennsylvania. That's an incredible find.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Yes.

We know we have the world's largest reserves in coal. We have potentially the largest reserves in the world in natural gas here in the United States. And some argue that the estimates of oil are vastly underestimated because of two things: one, the shale oil that's available that currently is off limits because of administration policy and environmental policies; and, secondly, on the east coast and west coast, Outer Continental Shelf area, we don't have accurate seismic information. So when they say we only have 3 percent of the world's reserves, that's an inaccurate figure. That's not been thoroughly looked at with modern seismic activity.

But our companies that manufacture these chemicals and fertilizer have a competitive advantage because of the low price of natural gas in this country. If we tax it, as this administration is proposing, it will actually make us less competitive. Our exports will go down, and it will be counter to what the President wants to do by expanding exports. It makes no sense whatsoever.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I think what you're getting into, Doctor, is something that I wanted to talk to a little bit tonight. And that is the assumption that you can just go taxing and taxing and always talk about the rich guy and, oh, we're going to talk about the rich guy and think you can get away with that without consequences.

Because it seems to me that there is a disconnect with the current administration and the Democrats as well policywise because they talk about the fact they want jobs, but then they destroy the companies that create the jobs. And you can't kill the company if you want jobs because the company is the one that hires people. And they seem to miss that connection there.

I'd like to go back to my good friend from Michigan—I had to check to make sure, Congressman WALBERG—and I wanted to give you a chance to jump in to our discussion.

But I'd like to start going—talk a little bit in the direction about taxes, what happens with taxes and how it is that we can deal with some of the tough problems budgetwise here, and at least one piece of that is the proper tax policy.

Mr. WALBERG. I appreciate my good friend from Missouri again holding this conversation tonight.

And I think you're leading into the key point here. Because bottom line, when you talk about entitlement spending, those entitlement programs that we've come to expect in the United States, whether it be Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security—and most of us, at least in this room tonight, have paid into Social Security a long time.

Mr. AKIN. Now, let's not get personal about age here now.

Mr. WALBERG. It's not a voluntary tax. And in just a couple of short years, I will be capable of receiving that myself. I've not had a choice to do that.

And yet the only way that we can see those entitlement programs continue, at least if we did it right, is have an economy that's growing, have people that are employed, that are paying into the entitlement programs, the taxes that are there. Even if we don't talk about any alternative way for younger employees coming down the road in the future, we still have to have the ability to put dollars in. That comes from having a job.

So when we go back to what Dr. BOUSTANY was talking about on the issue of energy, when we talk about the regulatory concerns that I expressed that are destroying jobs, I go back to my own home State of Michigan, my own district, Seventh District. Michigan, who led the Nation for 4 straight years on unemployment. A State that was known for its manufacturing, its auto industry, always having jobs, high standard of living.

And yet, as a result of government growing too large, too strong, too intrusive, and spending too much and taxing too much, we've destroyed the economy in Michigan. And now the new administration comes in and has to go through almost insurmountable odds to try to restore an economy that has jobs so they can pay in to this.

Mr. AKIN. Let me just ask you whether this gets under your skin, because I'm on the Budget Committee. But I hear all the time that my Democrat colleagues are saying the recovery is fragile; therefore, don't you go cutting any of this government spending. And I'm just thinking, wow. I totally don't see it that way at all.

When you have a government that's busy spending money trying to regulate a milk spill in a barn, you have a government that's wanting to talk about rogue dust that comes off of a farm when you're basically running a combine through a row of corn, and you've got a government with duplication after duplication—and we're talking about let's cut just some of the edge of this stuff—and they're saying, careful, don't destroy a fragile economy, hey, the economy is fragile because they're doing everything wrong to it.

Mr. WALBERG. Everything wrong. Everything to destroy it.

Mr. AKIN. And the main thing that's wrong is, as Ronald Reagan said, we're buying too much government.

Mr. WALBERG. Right.

Mr. AKIN. Please, go ahead.

Mr. WALBERG. I assumed I would get you into a rant on that because I know you're passionate about that. It's absolutely true.

I can show you from experience in Michigan as we went through this type of downturn back in the 1980s: too-large government, increased taxation, increased spending for all sorts of programs.

□ 1840

We ran businesses out of the State. We turned that around in the nineties, and we cut taxes 26 times. We right-sized government. We put Workfare and Edufare in in place of welfare. We encouraged businesses to thrive and grow. What happened? By reducing taxes, cutting spending, the economy grew. More revenue came in, and then government had to control itself from spending those revenues from less taxes, but still increased revenue because people were working, they were spending, they were saving, they were investing, they were taking care of themselves.

Lo and behold, the American people with their own intellect, their own intelligence, their own creativity began to grow an economy that made things right for themselves. And then they had choice. They had opportunity. They could be creative. They could build new machines. They could build machines that met the noise standards that were presently available, as opposed to saying we're going to create jobs by saying you can't have this noise standard here and you can't take care of it with an ear plug or an ear muff; you are going to have to produce a machine that isn't there. So look what we're doing.

And my good colleague, I have a letter from OSHA that says that was part of an economic development plan, to encourage the development of new machines that would meet these noise standards so that then you would have new jobs. Well, wait a second. The people that would produce those, and more importantly the people that would buy those machines, could not do that because they couldn't afford it. So here's Big Government again with its own ideas that ultimately destroys an economy.

Mr. AKIN. Let's take a look at you just talked about an example from the great State of Michigan. And just hearing you talk about it just made me feel good. It's America on the move again. It's individual citizens taking risks, going out there working hard, making a good living; and then because of the things they've done, other people get better jobs and they make a better living, and everybody does better.

I mean, you cannot ignore the fact that the standard of living that we enjoy in America is because a whole lot of people could be free, free to succeed or free to fail.

Mr. WALBERG. Right.

Mr. AKIN. But it's called free enterprise. Now, let me give you another example that occurred when I was a Congressman here, and I think the beginning of when you were, and that was that the second Bush, G.W. Bush, copied the example of JFK and Ronald Reagan. And both of those Presidents understood that when the government cuts taxes in the right way, it actually gets the economy going. In fact, what happens when you cut taxes the right way, the government actually gets more revenue.

Now, that sounds weird. Let me just try and explain. I have done this a couple times before, but tell me if you think it makes sense. How is it that the government can cut taxes and get more revenue in? Well, think about it. Let's say you're king for a whole year. And the only thing you can tax is a loaf of bread, and so you start thinking if I put a penny tax on that loaf of bread, I can figure out how much bread people are eating and figure out how much to get for tax revenue. Then you think, hey, how about I put $10 tax on every loaf of bread. Then you think maybe people wouldn't buy any bread. So you start to think there is probably an optimum point where you can put some tax on the bread, people will still be eating bread, but you will get your most revenue. That's what goes on.

Here is an example. May of 2003, were you here then, Congressman?

Mr. WALBERG. I was not.

Mr. AKIN. Okay. You were thinking about it, though, perhaps.

Mr. WALBERG. I was thinking about it.

Mr. AKIN. Good for you. Anyway, May of 2003 we cut three taxes, not popular, because everybody, oh, the Democrats, that's all rich-guy stuff. It was capital gains, dividends, and death tax. Now, I don't know if you're a rich guy if you're dead, but anyway we're going to tax death. We tax everything else, so why not that.

So we cut capital gains, dividends, and death taxes at this time right here. Now, I have got three charts that show what happened. This is job creation before and after the tax relief. This is some of the taxes we extended into this year. Okay. The lines that go down are job loss by month and the lines that go up are job gain.

And so what you have right here is that's the tax relief goes into effect. And take a look at the jobs, the more lines coming up over here. I mean, that's really pretty substantial and pretty interesting, whereas these you are losing. So this tax appears to have had a good effect. Let's check it on not just job creation, let's check it against——

Mr. WALBERG. You meant the tax cuts, the tax relief.

Mr. AKIN. The tax cuts, yeah.

Mr. WALBERG. It gave incentive.

Mr. AKIN. So the tax cuts go into effect same place here, this line, this is the GDP, this is actually losing GDP or gaining; you can see the average here is about 1.1 percent; but after those tax cuts, it jumps to 3.5. You can see these are a lot stronger economy. So the economy seems to do better when you allow business people to take the money, put it in their business, create jobs. There is more people working, more tax revenue comes in.

Well, wait a minute. You cut taxes, that means your revenue's going to go down? Well, let's see what happened to revenue. Here's the story. Here's the tax cut right here. The revenue has been going down. They cut the taxes, and 4 straight years of increase in revenue. So what's happening there is that actually if you do the right kind of tax cut, just as you say you get the free enterprise system working, and you can turn the economy around. JFK understood that. He did it. It worked for him. Ronald Reagan did it. They said, oh, trickle down economics and all this kind of stuff, but it worked.

In fact, here is another chart. This is the tax rate on the most wealthy people. This is this red line. It started at 90 percent; it's come down. You notice as the tax on the wealthy people comes down, the amount of Federal revenues goes up. Now, that's weird. Why would that be? It's the same principle. You can overtax and basically run the economy into the dirt.

Mr. WALBERG. Isn't it the simple principle that what you give incentive you get more of, and what you discourage you get less of?

Mr. AKIN. Yeah, you are absolutely right.

Mr. WALBERG. You give incentive to people to use their own resources with American exceptionalism and let the market forces work, everybody benefits.

Mr. AKIN. And we started out tonight talking about the overall fiscal problem we have in America, and the fact that it's really unique. This is a pretty scary situation that America's in. And the solution, as Ronald Reagan said, the solution is simple, but it's not easy. And the solution really comes in two sides. The first is we have to be cutting all of what the government is spending. We have to do some cuts. But on the other hand, what we have to do is to selectively do the tax cuts to allow the economy to really get back in a strong recovery.

The one thing I agree with that the Democrats are saying is that the recovery is fragile. I think they picked that up from Bernanke, the Secretary. But I think it is. I think it's fragile because of the fact we've still got the problem of excessive taxes, excessive red tape, and a whole lot of uncertainty in the markets.

Mr. WALBERG. And a lot of spending.

Mr. AKIN. If we can do those, that's going to help. So the first thing is we've got to cut taxes, but we tremendously have to cut the overhead. And the thing here, and I think the public is becoming aware of this fact, we can't make it by cutting defense and non-defense discretionary. That was the budget we were doing 2 weeks ago on the floor. We cut $100 billion out of that. If you know what the real problem is, as we talked about earlier, the total of these entitlements plus debt service is $2.2 trillion. The Federal revenue is $2.2 trillion. You can zero this and this out, and you just barely have a balanced budget; and that's not talking about the out-years, when it gets worse.

So these areas must be dealt with. Now, supposedly if you talk about changing anything with Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid, lightning will fall and you'll be struck dead politically. But the fact of the matter is we must deal with these. How we deal with them is one of those things that we need to have a conversation on it.

But to do what the President did and submit the 2012 budget and not deal with these at all is being disingenuous. It's kicking the can down the road and ignoring this massive problem, which is a little bit like that gorilla in the tent.

I started, my dear friend from Michigan, I started by talking about—and it's sort of sometimes I think about this: What would it be like to be in the year 1850 and be a Congressman or Senator and you have this huge issue of slavery and we didn't deal with it? We just ignored it, and then we got slammed by the Civil War.

And my question is, are we as Americans going to deal with the fact that our entitlements and debt service is using up the entire revenue of the country? I mean, that's not just a little bit of a budget problem; that says we have a fiscal crisis on our hands and we're responsible. And our American citizens that elected us here expect us to deal with this problem. And the first way to deal with it is to at least acknowledge that we got the problem.

Mr. WALBERG. And I believe that more and more people, even those that are using the entitlements, the Social Security, Medicare, understand that and are growing in their fear that unless we do something, they indeed will be hurt. But I think that you and I together, and many who are of like mind, understand that we must do something, but we can do something that's better.

□ 1850

We can do something that assures people that they will have what they expect.

Mr. AKIN. That's exactly the point.

Mr. WALBERG. And we can do it the right way without the Big Government issues and getting down to that American exceptionalism that says we can trust people to do for themselves, if given the incentive and opportunity, better than what Big Government can do.

Mr. AKIN. You see the point of the matter is is there are people who are dependent upon these programs, older people. They are going to be in trouble if the wheels fall off this thing. So what we need to do is craft a solution that allows the older people that are on these programs to stay there, and as people become younger, give them alternatives and to have a transition so that you can get these costs under control.

That is the way to manage a solution. Everybody has got to suffer a little bit. But at least we are not allowing the whole thing literally to crash like some sort of a train off the edge of a cliff.

Mr. WALBERG. Well, I think, not necessarily the suffering idea, I think in doing something that's credible and the right thing to do, it gives people optimism that the answer is here. It will take some tough decisions but ultimately the people who are in need will be taken care of.

The other people with the great creativity, the American exceptionalism that's there will find ways to do it and do it better, and ultimately a greater opportunity for the future, and that's optimism.

Mr. AKIN. You know, and I think that is a thing that's so exciting, because I don't think you are being a Pollyanna by saying what you just said.

Mr. WALBERG. Not at all.

Mr. AKIN. The reason I say that is because we have been through, as Americans, a lot of dicey situations.

Our own parents, known as the Greatest Generation, as they would say it, did their bit. My father was with Patton in Europe, and they fought World War II. And then there were the days when Ronald Reagan came to a discouraged Nation, and he said America's got brighter days ahead. With that twinkle in his eye, and he had such a way of putting it, you know the solution is simple but it's not easy.

We have come to another one of those pivotal times in history where it is our responsibility to deal with a massive problem and not to ignore and try to pretend it doesn't exist and just try to lie to people and let the government run a little longer until we are gone, and then everything comes down in a big heap. That's not what the American public wanted of their leadership.

As long as you and I are kicking, my friend, we are going to stay here. We are going to talk about this. We are going to talk about the great days ahead for America and some of the things that could possibly be.

You know, we take a look at some of these medical costs. They are really, really busting the budget. Maybe one of the things we need to do is to say, hey—I think it was 1950, somebody calculated the cost of polio that had cost us a trillion dollars a year in America today, the polio costs.

They forgot something. We figured out a cure for polio. Maybe it's time for us to target the most expensive diseases, things like diabetes or Alzheimer's, things that are very, very big-ticket items. Maybe that's part of that American exceptionalism to leave the world a better place, to leave our kids freer, not taxed into the dirt, to leave our economy the strongest of any in the world, that America could be a shining city on the hill, a light to the people around the world.

That was the vision of our forefathers. Why don't we grab ahold of that have and say, hey, we have got way too much government that we could afford. Let's turn loose the American people and let's not trust so much in government. I think that's the big question coming up. Do we really want more government, more taxes, more spending, more debt, and less freedom, or do we want more freedom and a whole lot less government, and the government that's there to really be a servant to the people and not have the attitude that they know better than everybody else. Don't you think that's where we are?

Mr. WALBERG. And I think the people spoke in November. I think that speech they gave to us, my good friend, is that we must take this opportunity. This is our point in time. This is our date with destiny, as it were. If we back off from tackling the big things, we will not only lose there, but all of those little special things will be taken away as well.

Mr. AKIN. Congressman WALBERG, with you and the other great people at work down here and the American public, I believe we can do it. It's time for us to roll up our sleeves. Let's get busy cutting, let's do things the right way. Design programs that work and not threaten people, and let's move forward, because there are brighter days ahead.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Let me express my appreciation to you and to the leadership of this Congress for allowing me 30 minutes to speak to my constituents, but also to speak to the American people about the central issue that confronts our Nation and this economic crisis.

Mr. Speaker, the central issue that has confronted every Congress that remains unaddressed, for which I want to talk about tonight, is unemployment.

The unemployment rate in our country is too high. The Democratic message, job creation and create jobs, I respect that message.

Republicans believe in tax cuts and tax breaks and pro-business perspective, which many Democrats support as well, and I believe that, clearly, economic growth is the path to job creation. But for the unemployed in our Nation, a very, very different category, the debate, led by Democrats and led by Republicans in the Congress of the United States, all too often ignores people who are unemployed.

Unemployment is a very special category. Every Member of Congress knows the numbers, but it's the American people who are feeling them. About 9 percent of the country is ''unemployed'' based on the definition of unemployed that the Bureau of Labor Statistics uses.

But in communities like mine, it's around 15 percent, and that's conservative. Some communities have as high as 30 percent unemployment.

So when Democrats come to the floor of the Congress and talk about job creation, for African Americans, for minorities and for women, when we hear that language, because we are usually the last hired and the first fired, job creation isn't a message that touches my constituents. It's not a message that touches the long-term unemployed who find themselves in the barrios, the ghettos, and the trailer parks of our Nation.

So the question is why Democrats and Republicans in Congress, both promoting growth, Republicans promoting tax breaks and tax cuts and limited government as a way to stimulate the economy, Democrats focusing on job creation as a way to separate the economy, which might include reasonable spending and deficit reduction measures, why, in the midst of our conversation, led by Republicans in the majority and Democrats, unemployed Americans continue to grow. There is this huge category that Democrats are not speaking to and Republicans are not speaking to but needs to be addressed in order to strengthen our economy and change the present direction.

You see, Mr. Speaker, if we can provide a job for every American, if we can eliminate unemployment just like we eliminated slavery, if we can eliminate unemployment just like as a Nation we are trying to eliminate discrimination against women and against the disabled and against the gays and lesbians of our Nation, if we can eliminate unemployment—the way our system is actually set up, if every American is working they pay into the system. And if they are paying into the system, it pays for future generations of Americans to take advantage of the entitlement programs that my colleagues who just left the floor were talking about. But if there is high unemployment in any given generation, it profoundly impacts the kinds of resources that are available for the Federal Government and local governments to handle basic programs that keep our Nation strong in every succeeding generation for every American.

Mr. Speaker, many Americans have been out of work. For many months they have stopped looking for work. So even though they have no jobs, they are not counted as unemployed.

Over the last few months, I have called on unemployed, underemployed, and economically insecure Americans to send me their resumes and their stories so that I can keep unemployment front and center before our government.

Unemployment. I did not say job creation. I did not say deficit reduction or tax reductions to corporations. I said unemployment, that thing that President Roosevelt talked about when he said, ''We have nothing to fear but fear itself.''

President Roosevelt wasn't talking about the Russian bear. He wasn't talking about Nazis in Germany. He wasn't talking about fascism in Italy under Mussolini. He was talking about the deterioration of our national fiber and fabric from within, unemployment.

□ 1900

And at the time that he was delivering that speech, Mr. Speaker—I know that my chart here is probably inadequate for the C–SPAN cameras—but the largest spike in our Nation's history for unemployment, between 1930 and 1945, was during President Roosevelt's administration. Now one would think that the goal would be in order to keep men content and women content in their homes, in their jobs, and actually believing in our country, that we would be working collectively as Democrats and Republicans to eliminate the idea of unemployment as a potential factor in the life of the American people.

But no. We're talking about job creation, we're talking about deficit reduction, and somehow we believe that by moving the interest rates and the levers of our economy that somehow corporations that have chosen to leave the United States and locate in foreign countries abroad, that somehow they're going to come back to America and provide us with enough work for millions of Americans who find themselves unemployed, underemployed, and out of work.

So, Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate this shameful condition, I have called on unemployed, underemployed, and economically insecure Americans to send me their resumes so that I can tell their story and so that I can keep unemployment front and center. Thousands of people responded and sent their resumes to me at ResumesforAmerica@mail.house.gov.

And so tonight, I want to share a few of the emails that I received. And Mr. Speaker, I hope these stories will compel this Congress to make ending unemployment once and for all a national priority. If we can end unemployment once and for all, we can save Social Security without any cuts to Social Security. If we can end unemployment once and for all, we can take the entitlement programs off of the table.

But there is very little focus on ending unemployment. Congress is focused on job creation. However, Congress' efforts, historically, at job creation have gotten it probably at least about a C-minus in terms of what most economists actually believe Congress has the power to create jobs. Congress doesn't create jobs. The private sector creates jobs. Congress can offer incentives for the private sector to create jobs, but Congress cannot create jobs unless Congress is going to hire everybody, which, Mr. Speaker, is not necessarily a bad idea of Congress hiring everybody. But that's another Special Order.

I want to talk tonight, Mr. Speaker, about these Americans who have been left behind, and at the conclusion of my remarks hopefully offer some insight in what I think could serve as a constructive part of a conversation about ending long-term unemployment for all Americans.

First, I want to start with Linda Stabile. Linda wrote a letter to Speaker BOEHNER. She said, ''I'm a 63-year-old woman who has been laid off from my job I loved in mid-June of 2009.'' She got laid off from her job she loved. ''Since then, I have spent every day looking for work unsuccessfully. I am a four-time breast cancer survivor and in December underwent my second mastectomy in 3 years. I have a small condo with a modest mortgage, but sold my car last August to help me make ends meet. Unless I'm able to find even a part-time job, in a few months I will join the ranks of the 99ers with an uncertain future. Should I lose my home, I have nowhere to go.

''There are many Americans who face the same frightening prospect, I know, and I'm sure you receive many communications such as mine. But I do hope that you will lend your support to extending benefits for the long-term unemployed.

''The emotional, physical, and psychological stress of day-to-day job hunting is painful, and it's damaging beyond words. I begin each day with a hopeful outlook, but at the end of the day, restorative sleep is beyond my reach. I am talented. I have good skills. But time is running out. Please, won't you make jobs a priority? Respectfully, Linda Stabile.''

Linda, I believe that we should make jobs a priority, and ending the shameful condition of unemployment ought to be a priority of this Congress.

LINDA M. STABILE

SKILLS SUMMARY

Highly organized and energetic administrative professional with wide experience in managing multi-faceted projects, along with day-to-day support of an office or executive, with emphasis on sales.

Proven skills in writing, editing, interpersonal communication, and attention to detail.

Excellent computer skills—Microsoft Office Suite: Word, Outlook, PowerPoint and Excel.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

WTTW Channel 11/98.7 WFMT–FM, Chicago, IL 1999–2009

Sales and Marketing Support

Supported Television and Radio Advertising Sales Executive Level staff by creating color one-sheets and PowerPoint bound and on-screen presentations to attract potential advertisers.

Consulted with Research Director and Director of Business Affairs/Sales Planning to extract ratings, demographics, and pricing details.

Developed and maintained first-ever Program Fact Book to provide Sales Department with detailed programming information in a single, comprehensive reference source. Interfaced with various PBS stations and their public relations firms to obtain information vital to the sales process, often under tight deadline pressure.

Updated media kits on quarterly or as-needed basis, enabling Sales Staffs to keep up-to-date on regularly or frequently changing specifics.

Designed invitations for Sales events and coordinated arrangements with other departments.

Recruited American Indian volunteers to work themed WTTW Pledge night, resulting in $30,000 Pledge total.

WTTW Channel 11, Chicago IL 1992–1998

General Administrative

Provided phone support to Vice President, Sales and Marketing—WTTW, scheduled meetings, processed travel and entertainment expenses, tracked invoices, generated contracts and high quality reports.

OTHER EXPERIENCE

Fairmont Hotel, Chicago, IL [temporary position]

General Administrative

Provided secretarial and extensive client service support to the Executive Assistant Manager and Front Office Manager.

Inter-Continental Hotels Corporation Chicago and Houston

Sales and Marketing Support—Assistant to National Director, Incentive Sales, Chicago

Edited copy for incentive travel programs and finalized with head office.

Compiled incentive sales training manual for U.S. Sales Force.

Inside Sales Manager, Houston National Group Sales Center

Solicited and managed corporate, association, tour and travel accounts for worldwide hotel chain.

EDUCATION

Northwestern University, Downtown Chicago campus—Communications/Advertising coursework.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Chicago Women in Hospitality—Founded and promoted professional women's organization.

Lincoln Park Zoo—Former docent and staff volunteer assistant.

Tree House Humane Society—Development Office volunteer (heavy phone contact, database input).

Mitchell Museum of the American Indian—Volunteer and docent-in-training.

From Michael B. Alexander, master of science in real estate management, master of urban planning, design, and development,

''Hello. I willingly left my job as a city planner with the city of Largo, Florida, to pursue an MSc degree in Sweden in August of 2008. I have been looking for work all over the United States actively since August 2010, when I received my degree. While I had four interviews, I've easily applied for over 250 jobs between August and February. It is worth noting that I have accrued a sizeable amount of debt from all of

my education over the years, and I'm currently unable to make my payments. The loans are continuing to accrue interest and are currently in economic hardship deferment.

''Please let me know what I have in the future. I have had a pretty good life for some time now. When I was working a few years ago, times were okay, but when I returned to the U.S.A. after graduate school late last year, I was disappointed that I tried to make life better by going back to school only to regret leaving my previous stable job in Florida. I know that my life is not bad as some Americans, but I'm now starting to feel hopeless. Please keep me posted on the status of this campaign'' to collect resumes at ResumesforAmerica@mail.house.gov.

MICHAEL B. ALEXANDER II

OBJECTIVE

Seeking employment in financial analysis and land use management through which I can demonstrate my analytical, organizational and problem solving skills.

SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS

Proficient in Excel, GIS and SPSS software for the purpose of real estate analysis

Skilled in performing all aspects of market and financial analysis to determine project feasibility

Possesses excellent technical writing and public presentation skills

Experienced in analyzing and interpreting state and municipal laws regulating land use and development

Communicates and collaborates well with a diverse group of staff, citizens and stakeholders

EDUCATION

School of Architecture and the Built Environment—

The Royal Institute of Technology (KTH), Stockholm, Sweden

Master of Science in Real Estate Management, November 2010

Maxine Goodman-Levin College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio—

Master of Urban Planning, Design, and Development, May 2006

Paul J. Everson Real Estate Scholarship Award

Graduate Certificate in Real Estate Development and Finance, May 2005

Bachelor of Arts in Urban Studies, Cum Laude, GPA: 3.49, August 2004

RELATED COURSEWORK

Contract Theory
Real Estate Investment Analysis
Real Estate Valuation
Facility Management
Public Finance and Economics
Leadership and Management Skills
Real Estate Market Analysis
Urban and Regional Economics

COMPUTER/LANGUAGE SKILLS

Computer Skills: Microsoft Excel, Word, PowerPoint, SPSS (STATA), Mapinfo 7.0 (GIS)

Language Skills: Mandarin Chinese, Novice

PROJECTS/RESEARCH

The Royal Institute of Technology (KTH), Stockholm, Sweden—

MSc Real Estate Management Student, August 2008–November 2010

Created discounted cash-flow models for commercial projects and analyzed factors such as public subsidies, financing options, net present value, and rate of return to determine project feasibility

Researched public policies such as tax incentives, grants and Brownfield redevelopment funds that impact real estate investor decision making in Cleveland, Ohio

Prepared property appraisal reports on mixed-use commercial property located in Stockholm using different appraisal methods to determine value

Assumed a leadership role to employ analytical and cooperative skills to complete reports and projects on or before deadlines

Analyzed the design of commercial property sale and lease contracts to determine hidden characteristics or hidden action problems for acquisition and tenant occupancy purposes

RELATED EXPERIENCE

City of Largo, Community Development Department-Planning Division, Largo, Florida—

City Planner, August 2006–August 2008

Performed all aspects of site plan review from conducting pre-development meetings with applicants and city staff to final inspection and issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy

Worked closely with elected and appointed officials, investors, property owners, engineers, architects, contractors and lawyers to complete projects on schedule and in accordance with City regulations

Prepared and publicly presented technical land use reports and city ordinances to City Commission and Planning Board including, but not limited to, vacation of easements and right-of-ways, land use amendments and variances

Mr. Speaker, what about all of the men and women who valiantly and bravely serve our Nation in Afghanistan and Iraq? Many of them came from communities where the jobless rate was high and sought not only an opportunity to serve their Nation, which they have done valiantly, but after having served their Nation, are returning to the United States to find unprecedented unemployment in our country. After having served our Nation, after having risked their lives and after having put the last full measure of their devotion on the line to protect our freedom, can this Congress, will this Congress not stop for a moment to guarantee them remunerable work worthy of the sacrifice that they made for our Nation, or are they, too, to join the long list of unemployed Americans? Are they, too, to join the long list of Americans who find themselves and their homes in foreclosure, who find themselves without health care or without the necessary benefits to provide for their future, for their families and their loved ones? Mr. Speaker, this Congress can do better.

''I have been unemployed,'' Representative JACKSON, according to Sharon Inglima, ''since December of 2008, with AIG 10 years. I read on the Unemployment Examiner that you were looking for resumes from the 99ers. I've been on 20 interviews over the last 2-plus years, and I have not found a job.''

This is not someone lazy, Mr. Speaker. Sharon Inglima is looking.

''I've looked online, attended job fairs and meetings, I've contacted businesses and personal contacts who are constantly looking for positions for me. I want and need to get back to work and have health care benefits. Right now, I'm on Medicaid. I'm extremely professional and a hard worker. And like so many, I can't believe this economy.

''Our Government needs to take us seriously and feel our pain. They also need to extend our unemployment benefits. If we can print money for every country who needs money from us, why does our government leave us out in the dust? I am sure I feel as other 99ers do, humiliated and depressed. It's tough for us to keep going, but we must.

''Please stand up for us. I wrote Senators SCHUMER and GILLIBRAND to support the new 99er unemployment bill 589. We need to pass this, and if Republicans want it paid for, please find the money. My resume is attached. Thank you.'' Sharon Inglima, who is writing concerning her job and the absence thereof in our economy.

SHARON M. INGLIMA

97 Keiber Court

Staten Island, New York 10314

(718) 447–2450

(917) 327–4612

singlima@verizon.net

EXPERIENCE

American International Group—(2002–2008)
American International Realty Group, Inc.
Executive Administrative Assistant
Administrative Services

Executive Administrative support for AI Realty Group President, as well as supervising administrative staff.

Responsibilities include:

Expense documentation and management, including supervising departmental bill/invoice processing

Supervising overall office services for the department, including ordering and managing supplies, general telephone coverage, correspondence, travel arrangements, filing, and external and internal presentations

All senior level confidential communications, including managerial payroll, scheduling

Reporting directly to company President with direct management of all travel arrangements, meetings, communications, and general administrative support to the President

Assist in facilitating special operations reporting to the department. This includes, Business Continuity, Emergency Critical Contact procedures

American International Group—(1999–2002)

Executive Department of the Greater New York Region

Executive Administrative Supervisor

Executive Administrative support for Company President.

Responsibilities include coordinating travel arrangements, tracking expense and vendor requisitions, as well as coordinating executive's overall schedule, including departmental, internal and external client meetings. Additional responsibilities include: coordinated, formatted, and proofed technical and senior management reports, internal and external presentations and correspondence, through the use of various systems and programs.

American International Group

Commercial Accounts & Middle Market Divisions

Executive Administrative Assistant

Executive Administrative support for Company President.

Responsibilities included coordinating travel arrangements, overall scheduling, tracking and reporting on expenses and vendor requisitions. Also, I was directly responsible for the coordination of all senior level, internal and external client meetings. Formatted and proofed technical reports, presentations and correspondence.

Oppenheimer Funds, Inc.—(1995–1999)

Corporate Marketing/Business Development

Executive Assistant

Executive Assistant to Senior Director of Corporate Marketing.

Responsibilities included coordinating all scheduling, travel arrangements, assist in preparation of all senior level reports, internal and external correspondence, as well as coordination with all direct reports to the Senior Director. Directly responsible for the coordination of all client meetings for the Senior Director.

EDUCATION

Columbia Basin College—1993–1995—Richland & Pasco, WA

Major: Business Administration

Katharine Gibbs Secretarial School Adult Training Program—1980—New York, NY

Major: Business Administration

SKILLS

IBM and Mac Computers
MS Windows
MS Outlook
MS Word
MS Excel
MS WordPerfect
MS PowerPoint
Typing 65 wpm
Internal systems include:
Huntington—attendance
WAVES—Vendor Billing/Payments
Concur—Expense (Employee) Reimbursement
ESource (Ariba)—Vendor/Supplier equipment and supply ordering

So, Mr. Speaker, we are at an impasse here. The President of the United States, a close and dear friend of mine, came before this Congress most recently, and I believe he mentioned the words ''job creation'' 31 times. He mentioned the word ''innovation'' I think 11, maybe 15 times, and never mentioned ''unemployment'' one time—not one time—as if unemployment is not a factor in the lives of the American people.

I come to the House floor and I hear Democrats in 1-minute speeches and 5-minute speeches. I hear Republicans talk about austerity measures and why they need to cut the budget and cut programs which, by the way, will only leave States to cut budgets and programs. And guess what? There are tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions of Americans who are going to wake up one of these days, and guess what? There's going to be no federal program there for them. There's going to be no State programs there for them as States pursue austerity measures.

Is there anyone concerned about that around here, that some Americans are going to wake up one morning and there won't be a government for them either at the State level or the Federal level, because a government that is of the people, by the people, and for the people is supposed to be caring for the people.

Carol Tomasetti, ''Congressman Jackson, I'm writing my story to be entered into the Congressional Record. I'm a 53-year-old, educated with a bachelor degree woman who has worked her whole life. I have 20 years of recruiting and human resources experience and have worked my whole life. I was laid off from my job at Nursefinders due to the economy tanking, and here I am 2½ years later with no job and no prospects. I have sent thousands of resumes out, and I have tried to network as much as possible to help me land something.

□ 1910

''I am at the point where I feel like my spirit is broken. I live in Rochester, New York; need I say more? The economy here is so bad that there are no opportunities. I have even started to redirect my efforts toward administrative and customer service positions. My unemployment ran out last week, and my husband and I are in a panic mode.

''My husband worked at Eastman Kodak for 30 years and I was downsized 3½ years ago because there is no manufacturing left here. He was out of work for all that time and has since gone back to work at a job he is much too overqualified for and is making half of what he was making at Kodak. I am ashamed that our standard of living has gone down to what it is. We own a home, and we do not live above our means. We pay our bills, give back to the community we live in, tried to save for our retirement, and buy what we have to and want to support our economy. We both have never not worked. Now all this is jeopardized because we have only one income and cannot meet our bills and commitments. We now have no health insurance because we cannot afford it since the unemployment ran out. The company where my husband works does not offer it because they cannot afford it. I cannot believe at our age we are in this situation, and going from bad to worse. I am not looking for any handouts. I want to get back to work and having a life. I need assistance until I can finally find a job.

''When are the politicians in this country going to finally start working for the American people and not themselves? You all are self-serving. I do not believe that you are doing what it takes to turn this country around. I have no confidence in any of you, and I don't believe anything that is said. Who are you to decide how our lives will be run and affected? Maybe you should stop sending money to every other country in the world and start worrying about our own backyard. We need help now.''

That is Carol J. Tomasetti from Rochester, New York. She sends her resume hoping, Mr. Speaker, that she won't be ignored by the Congress of the United States.

CAROL J. TOMASETTI

179 Walzford Rd., Rochester, NY 14622

(585) 544–5521 (585) 721–1727

cresso@hotmail.com

SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS

Recruiting/Human Resource/Administrative

Possess strong commitment to team environment

Developed/maintained long term relationships

Independent accountability

Excellent organizational skills

Work well with diverse populations

Three years of teaching experience

Ability to multi-task, detail orientated

Strong time management skills

Excellent written and verbal skills

Software/Technical Skills

Proficient in Word, Excel, and Internet Explorer

Working knowledge of Access and PowerPoint

Internal/proprietary database management

Excellent posting and researching skills within internet candidate/job posting sites

Professional History

Nursefinders—2007–2009

Rochester, New York

Nurse Recruiter

Source, screen, interview and perform reference checks on applicants for contract, per diem and direct hire positions

Maintain frequent contact with medical facilities via phone and on-site visits

Promotes Nursefinders at a variety of recruitment functions such as job fairs, universities, career/community events

Meet with department supervisors to develop strategies to improve staffing

Generate tracking reports

Assist in scheduling applicants for sites

Negotiate wage rates and other terms and conditions of employment with candidates

Communicate effectively with others to create a productive environment

Communicate with peers by sharing ''best practices'' and providing accurate, thorough documentation on employees in applicant tracking system

Wilson Commencement Park—2006–2006

Rochester, New York

Employment Specialist

New position created from state grant to assist organization service clients

Interviewed, advised, assessed and guided a diverse population of clients to ascertain employability

Determined client's eligibility for services, apprises clients of their rights, benefits, responsibilities and obligations under program participation

Evaluated client readiness for job referral, classroom training, on-the-job training and/or support services

Attempted to match clients with available employment, training or other opportunities/services

Assisted clients in resolving barriers to employment by identifying needs for services

Analyzed information obtained from interviews, tests and other sources to develop short/long term client goals

Developed and implemented individual employment plans

Rochester Business Institute—2003–2006

Rochester, New York

Externship Coordinator/Adjunct Faculty

Spearheaded department Medical Externship Program

Exceeded goals by placing 70% of externs in permanent positions post graduation

Coordinated, assigned, tracked, and reported activities related to the Medical Assisting Externship Program

Facilitated the student's transition from class work to externship to graduate in preparation for placement

Resolved student inquiries, issues and problems

Maintained contact with local employers, visit sites, secure signed affiliation agreements

Assisted in graduation ceremonies twice an academic year and other responsibilities as assigned

Adjunct instructor for ''Career Skills'' class Target: last quarter students/externship candidates

Bishop Kearney High School—2001–2002

Rochester, New York

Director of Admissions

Efforts resulted in raising school enrollment by 35% within first year

Conducted all phases of recruitment and promotion of the school in a newly-created position

Interviewed and advised parents and prospective students

Delivered presentations to incoming students

Managed open house, freshman orientation, registration, as well as other events such as: Rhino's Exhibition week, Honor Walk Event, school tours, and shadow visits

Worked with local parishes to promote Catholic education

Developed tracking reports, procedural guidelines

Involved in development of foreign exchange boarding program for the school

Bryant & Stratton College—1990–2001

Rochester, New York

Senior Admissions Counselor

Achieved and exceeded goals every semester for enrollment, resulting in several ''Top Gun'' awards within the Eastern Region

Recruited traditional and non-traditional students, promoted the college in a wide range of settings

Conducted the entire process of admissions, including appointments, student follow-up, admission procedural assistance and ongoing student consultation

Interviewed and trained new admissions staff as needed

Interacted regularly with community groups and municipal/state agencies

Participated in student orientation, registration, graduation, and other recruitment functions

EDUCATION

B.S., Bachelor of Science, St. John Fisher College, Rochester, New York

A.A.S., Communications/Journalism, Marymount College of Virginia, Arlington, Virginia

AFFILIATIONS

Irondequoit Youth Bureau Board, Seneca Park Zoo Zoobilation Committee (annual fundraising), Compeer Volunteer; Learning International, Professional Selling Skills Certificate, United Way Campaign Coordinator, Presidential Campaign—involved in fund raising, assisted in organizing social events in Washington, D.C., Big Sisters Organization Community Volunteer

How about Annie Mosley: ''I want to thank you so very much for stepping up and speaking on behalf of the unemployed. And not to bore you, in 2006, me and my husband moved into a home with $1,500. We were both working. And in July of 2008, my husband was arrested for domestic violence and spousal abuse that escalated on July 27. This was after my brother committed suicide and my mother had a severe stroke. I took care of my brother's funeral expenses with the help of a State assistance fund, a wonderful church family and beautiful people I've met along life's journey with a funeral home business.

''And through it all, in September of 2008 I brought my mom to live with me because I refused to allow her to be in a nursing home. I've worked in as well as visited those homes for low-income, destitute people. Then I brought my oldest granddaughter to live with me because even though we are not middle class and have no college fund, she has Spelman or Georgia State, majoring in pediatric medicine in her future. A dream she has had since the age of 4.

''I filed bankruptcy in January 2009 to save my home and lost my job in September 2009 and was forced out of bankruptcy in April of 2010. My home was saved again in July of 2010 due to the unethical practices of the Bank of America who took over Countrywide. And by right, I should lose this home because I don't have enough to pay an $1,800 mortgage, Mr. Speaker. I am divorced and unemployed. But God made a promise to me about my home and taking care of my mom. I am standing on those, but here is my resume, and I thank you again.''

ANNIE LUERENDAE MOSLEY

207 Natchez Road

Henrico VA 23223

Contact Numbers: Hm. (804) 322–1033

Cell (804) 437–9669

Email; AL 72556@yahoo.com

OBJECTIVE

Skilled and dedicated Administrative Assistant, Support Person, Office Manager, Accounting Clerk with more than 20 years coordinating, planning, and supporting daily operations and administrative, financial technology functions.

Demonstrated capacity to provide comprehensive team support for Executive level staff. Proficient in check preparation for vendor payment and weekly garnishments, semi-monthly royalties.

Instrumental in introduction of bank scanning on premises. Trained primary users on scanning system.

Online student at the Liberty University; majoring in Psychology, Bachelors of Science Degree Program.

Feb. 09–Sept. 30–09: Accounting Principals (Assignment: James River Coal Company, River Front Plaza)

Staffing Coordinator: Jennifer Green

Position: Accounts Receivable/Payable Clerk

Duties:

Prepare and cut checks for Vendor Payment, Garnishments, Royalties, Pull Royalty Letters

Check Run and Batching, Monthly Production Reports, Create Check Vouchers

Reconciliations, Month End Closings, Accounts Payables/Receivables

Research Voucher and Vendor Numbers, Run Positive Pay, Bank Deposits, Scanned Bank Deposits

Filing, Faxing, Copying

Apr. 07–Feb. 09: LandAmerica

Manager: Jerry Duffey

Position: Accounts Receivable/Payable Clerk II

Duties:

Fax Server Specialist, Processing Invoices for payment using PeopleSoft Image Now 6

Accounts Receivables/Payables

Preparing written correspondences and requests for missing information, Research Invoices and Missing Images

Creating Spreadsheets using Excel, Week & Month End Calculations, A/P Data Prep

Copying, Scanning, Faxing, Filing

Jan. 06–Apr. 07: Accounting Principals (Assignments: EverDrive, Wachovia Securities, Innsbrook)

Supervisor: Jennifer Green

Position: Technology & Finance Analyst, Accounting Clerk/Accounts Payable Specialist

Duties:

SR Approvals, Ordering Supplies using OSCAR, Filling out Mac Request, Pulling and Emailing Hyperion Reports, Re-classing and closing RCS, Research using IRIS

A/P Account/Vendor reconciliation, A/P vendor relations, A/P Data Prep, Data entry

Reconciliation, Forecasting, Month End Closing

Filing, Faxing, Fax Server, Scanner, Copying, Batching

Mar. 04–Dec. 05: Exclusive Staffing (Assignments: Bank of America, Phillip Morris, Inc., City of Richmond Zoning Department)

Supervisor: Deseria Creighton

Position: Administrative Assistant/A/P & Verification Specialist/Logistics Analyst/Docs Specialist

Duties:

Verifications (income, deposits, mortgage/rent), HUD reviewer/Closer

Printed reports, Master Card Approval (Search & Match, Fraud Detection), FedEx mailing

Docs Analyst (requested and filed all documents needed for closing loans

Researched RESPA Premier Accounts

NDS Function (mailed NDS letters (RESPA), pulled internet reports, sorted and mailed Deeds PCR (prepare General Ledger Credits and Debits), Compliance (cleaned/logged/filed Withdrawn & declined files), verification of documents for proper shipments (import & Export)

Reconciled and prepared invoices for payment, Cataloged files for storage, data entry, filing, copying, faxed, answered phones, rerouted messages

Apr. 03–Feb. 04: Sunterra Resorts, INC.

Supervisor: Cassandra Elliotte

Position: Administrative Assistant/A/P Specialist/Resolution & Courtesy Clerk

Duties:

Debit & credit memos, Reconciliation of monthly statements & reports, Updated credit card logs daily (for 3 properties), Tracked & submitted payroll, Application of charges, Recorded Minutes

Dictation, set up interviews, data entry, supplies and inventory clerk, scheduled reservations

Pulled production & TMA reports, Guest relations/customer Service (successful resolutions of customer's complaints), obtained codes for promotions, filing, copying, faxed, answered phones, recorded & rerouted of messages

Aug. 91–Jul. 02: Sixth Baptist Church

Supervisor: Pastor: Dr. Yvonne Jones Bibbs

Administrator: Ronnie West

Position: Administrative Assistant/Clerk /Accounts Receivable/Payables

Duties:

Scheduled appointments/travel arrangements, filing, answered phones, met with and secured venders for services needed, recorded and rerouted messages, faxed, copying, records/supplies and inventory clerk, purchaser, A/P (prepared check request from statements), data entry (sorted and keyed member's contributions; weekly and yearly for a 500 + membership)

Prepared quarterly and annual tax statements, updated daily & weekly message boards

Printed and designed weekly and special day's bulletins, typed and printed annual Church Yearbook (for distribution to membership), typed correspondences, dictation, recorded Minutes

EDUCATION:

Presently enrolled online at Liberty University Online

Major: Psychology—Bachelors of Science Degree

Virginia University of Lynchburg (Richmond Site)

Bachelors of Science Degree Program in Theological Studies

Commonwealth College, (now Bryant & Stratton) Richmond, Virginia

Graduate: Diploma (Medical Assistant/Office Management)

Amelia County High School, Amelia County, Virginia

Graduate: Diploma

EXPERIENCE:

ASP–400, Bank Scanner, Image Now 6, Oracle PeopleSoft, Fax Archives, Lotus Notes, Access, Excel, Word, Microsoft Outlook, Windows XP, WordPerfect 2000, MS Works, OSCAR, IRIS, Power Point

Annie Mosley represents thousands of Americans who are taking care of their families and loved ones and bringing their children back home because there are no resources available in our economy to make sure she gets home. While we are sitting around here in Congress, passing bills that aren't going anywhere, we have yet to address the fundamental issue of unemployment that confronts all Americans.

I want to deviate from the resumes for a moment and talk about something that I think is at stake here.

I have been doing a little research, Mr. Speaker, as I have been lamenting upon and reading the resumes of unemployed Americans all over our country. And it is not just enough to complain about what is going wrong here. Something has to happen. Something is profoundly wrong in our democracy, in our Republic, that needs to be fixed.

I heard the previous speakers talk about our Founding Fathers and how they ultimately outlawed slavery in the passage of the 13th Amendment to the Constitution after Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863. And it occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, that from 1619, when the first slaves arrived in our country, until 1776, the greatest capitalists in the history of our world lived. They were the colonists and the traders, those who took the greatest risks to travel across oceans to land here on the shores of America. They were capitalists. They believed in trading beans and corn and gold and natural resources, and they were seeking a new life when they came to the United States of America. Or came to these shores, more accurately stated.

After the Somerset decision of 1774 and the reaction in the colonies that led to the Declaration of Independence in 1776 and those famous words ''all men are created equal,'' the founders of this Republic, the founders of this Republic had an opportunity to say ''no'' to government; no need for government. We don't need a Federal Government. We no longer have the crown pursuing us. We are going to win, and we won the Revolutionary War. We don't need government. That was their choice.

But instead, Mr. Speaker, you know what they did? They chose government. They said that the American enterprise that we have been engaged in for a century and a half before the Declaration of Independence is an enterprise that we need to continue, that freedom system, that open system that allows bartering and trade, that allows activity, that allows potential economic growth. Now, however narrow in their thinking, there was full employment at that time for white male landowners. If you were a white woman, you couldn't vote. If you were African American, obviously you were in a condition of slavery. But for the architects of the Republic who protected the right to vote for white male landowners, clearly the white male landowners were doing just fine. They had full employment. Full employment.

So the struggle from the founding of this country all of the way to the 13th Amendment was about amending that which they established so that more Americans, Mr. Speaker, could participate in the American enterprise.

I asked the Congressional Research Service the other day how many jobs are tied to the First Amendment, that amendment added to the Constitution in 1791 by the founders of our Republic. You know what they told me? Congressman, it is impossible to calculate how many jobs are tied to the First Amendment.

I said: Impossible to calculate? I said: Why?

He said because to be an American is tied to the First Amendment. He said: Congressman, you must understand—which I did—that all corporate activity in America is First Amendment activity.

Look at the jobs that come from the First Amendment: Washington Post, Washington Times; New York Post, New York Times; Chicago Tribune, Chicago Sun Times; AM/FM, and all of the radio stations, First Amendment.

ABC, NBC, CBS, C–SPAN, all of the jobs, First Amendment.

Magazines, First Amendment.

iPods, iPhones, applications, First Amendment.

Time Square, First Amendment activity. Advertising, the Super Bowl, First Amendment activity.

All of these jobs—the original capitalists who came to the conclusion that this was worth protecting in our Constitution—established in the freedom system, the greatest jobs program in our Nation's history. They called it freedom of speech. And in that same amendment, they included freedom of religion.

Think about the jobs tied to 501(c)(3)s, 501(c)(4)s, 501(c)(5)s, all of that First Amendment activity. All charitable giving, all foundation activity, all tied to First Amendment activity.

So the greatest jobs program that the Founding Fathers bequeathed to us is the First Amendment. Now, tell me why, as we reflect upon the conclusion of African American History Month, and as someone who existentially is in Congress today as a result of the Nation's struggle to make our country better, a unique group of people in the Constitution, whose freedom came from the Constitution, why we should not, with high unemployment, look to our Constitution for the answer.

□ 1920

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the answer to long-term unemployment is actually in the Constitution of the United States.

Well, let me say that a little differently. It's not in the Constitution of the United States. It should be in the Constitution of the United States, and one of these days we're going to get there.

But I want to bring to the House's attention an important speech delivered by our President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. President Roosevelt said, on January 11, 1944, from that microphone and that platform:

''It is our duty now to begin to lay the plans and determine the strategy for the winning of a lasting peace and the establishment of an American standard of living higher than ever before known. We cannot be content, no matter how high that general standard of living may be, if some fraction of our people—whether it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth—is ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and insecure.

''This Republic had its beginning, and grew to its present strength, under the protection of certain inalienable rights—among them freedom of speech''—even Roosevelt is acknowledging that 50 percent of all jobs in 1944 come from freedom of speech—''freedom of worship, trial by jury, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures. They were our rights to life and liberty.

''As our Nation has grown in size and stature, however—as our industrial economy expanded—these political rights proved inadequate to assure us equality in the pursuit of happiness.

''We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. Necessitous men are not free men. People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.

''In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We've come to accept, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed.''

So what does Roosevelt do? On January 11, the only President who's ever

had to confront unemployment at the level that we are confronting it right now, Mr. Speaker, he turns to the Constitution of the United States and he says, These are the things we need to ask:

If the First Amendment can guarantee us 51 percent of all jobs and from it can come iPod and laptops and the Internet and unprecedented economic growth, he says, we need to add to the Constitution the right to a family to have a decent home. What would that do for home construction in this nation? What would that do for millions of unemployed people?

He says, we need to add to the Constitution the right to medical care. How many doctors would such a right create?

He says, we need to add to the Constitution of the United States the right to a decent education for every American. How many schools would such a right build from Maine to California? How many people would be put to work building roofs and designing classrooms and providing every student with an iPod and a laptop? How many ghettos and barrios will actually be touched by such an amendment?

In fact, very little that we pass in the Congress of the United States even touches the long-term unemployed. The only thing that touches them that this Congress has access to that can actually change their station in life is the Constitution of the United States.

Roosevelt concludes:

''After this war is won''—he's talking about World War II—''we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of happiness and well-being. America's own rightful place in the world depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice by our citizens.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's 50, 60, 70 years ago. And here we are today trying to pass legislation talking about austerity in government rather than taking the advice from the greatest capitalist in the history of our world who set our freedom system in motion in 1776. That freedom system is responsible for the present America.

Mr. Speaker, there is an even greater America that's in front of us. It's the America that adds to our founding document these basic rights—not at one time, but one at a time. And the way out of this economic and fiscal disaster that our country confronts isn't to cut the poor and to leave them on the streets. It isn't to ignore unemployed people. The way to change this crisis is to give the American people one more reason to believe in America again, that 308 million people can coalesce, wipe out unemployment once and for all, rebuild our union, strengthen it, and change the direction of America forever.

I thank the Speaker and I thank the American people for this time.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

A LESSON FROM THE PAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is an honor and a privilege to address you here on the floor of the House. And I would say after listening to the presentation of my colleague from Illinois, it's been a little while since I've heard that; and I'm glad to hear the delivery you gave tonight. A little more time here on the floor would be good for this whole Congress. I appreciate the reference to our Founding Fathers and the years in the earlier foundation of our country, the principles that we agree on.

I'm happy to be here. I came here to speak about some subject matter, Mr. Speaker, that I think it's important that you turn your ear to and that the Members of this Congress turn their ear to and that the people in the United States do the same thing.

We are in very dramatic times in the history of this country. They encompass quite a continuum of a ride that we've been on. To go back and capture some of that, to frame the present moment that we're in, I take us back to a time, let's say back to a time in 1995. In 1995, shortly after Republicans won the majority for the first time in 40 years in this House of Representatives. There was a real test that took place. There was a test that took place on the determination on the part of the new majority after 40 years of wandering in the wilderness, so to speak, that had determined that they wanted to bring this budget under control. They wanted to cut spending and put us on a path to balancing the budget. That was initiated in 1995 with a real determination, and also with the benefit of having a majority to work in cooperation with in the United States Senate.

That determination to balance the budget brought about a challenge from President Clinton, a number of vetoes on the part of President Clinton that brought about the shutdown in the Federal Government. I remember those years. I was not in government at the time. I was a full-time owner of the construction company that I formed in 1975 that continues to this day. As I watched this in the news and I watched the debate on C–SPAN, I was inspired by the leaders that we had, the statesmen that we had, that stood and laid out the financial circumstances that we were in and the necessity to get Federal Government spending under control and the plan to bring forth a balanced budget.

While this government was shut down because of the vetoes of President Clinton, my recollection is that it was over a $300 billion proposed cut in Medicare that was the crux of this matter, where the whole issue pivoted on it and a Nation watched as there were threats that there were parts of the Federal Government that wouldn't be providing services and others were scared that they would lose theirs; that Social Security checks wouldn't be coming in on time, et cetera, the American public began to roil and boil and rise up and push back. And over a period of time, and I don't think at the fault of the Members of the House of Representatives but by the circumstances of the life and time, the public began to have a higher level of anxiety about what would happen if the Federal Government continued with the shutdown process that they were in. At a certain point there was a request made for a unanimous consent agreement to go ahead and approve the funding in the Senate side. When that happened and the Senate passed a unanimous consent agreement, it washed over the House here and the majority in the House was compelled to accept what had been delivered from the Senate on that day.

It was a sad day for me. As a businessman and a father and a person that was working to make my little part of the world as good as I could, I was disappointed that this Congress couldn't hold the line on spending, couldn't hold the line on this growth in government, and I believed that until I understood it from this perspective of standing here on the floor, Mr. Speaker, that the House had let us down.

Today, I think it's a little bit different equation. I think they did as much as they could have done and under the circumstances because of the UC agreement in the Senate, the House didn't have much choice but to concede to the push that came from the Senate. But here is the point that I've learned on that day and I stand on at this day, Mr. Speaker, and that's this: There's not a time that the Federal Government can spend that's not agreed to by the House of Representatives. We start the spending, we start the taxes, and if we say no, it won't be spent, which means that if we hold our ground here, we can shut off the spending to anything that we choose to shut off.

□ 1930

That's the way it was designed to be by the Founding Fathers, as was referenced by the gentleman from Illinois a little earlier. That's what the Constitution says.

By the way, it's our obligation because we're the closest to the people. Every 2 years, we're up for election or reelection, and if this House is going to change hands, it can change hands within a 2-year period of time. It's a 24/24/7 campaign, meaning for 24 months, 24 hours a day, and 7 days a week, we go on in perpetual campaign mode because we are always up for reelection.

That means that the House here is more responsive and more sensitive to

the people than is the Senate, which has a 6-year election span of time. They could put up a contentious vote, one that runs against the will of their constituents in the first couple of years or 3 or 4 years of their terms and can trust that the people might forget about it by the time they're up for reelection. Not so in the House. What we do here people are not going to forget about, and they should not. I want us to be accountable all the time, and I want a public that has a long memory, one that is very astute and very well informed and very well engaged.

We've been watching a populace that has been fitting that mold more and more. We've watched, Mr. Speaker, as the tea party groups across the country have brought themselves forward and filled up the town squares and filled up the town hall meetings and surrounded this Capitol, have physically surrounded the United States Capitol, I believe, for the first time in the history of America. We couldn't put a helicopter up there and take the picture because of air security concerns; but I walked around this building, and I saw Americans here surrounding the Capitol—yes, holding hands. It wasn't just a human chain around the Capitol but a human doughnut around the Capitol. It was six- and eight-people deep all the way around the Capitol—no thin spots in it—and thousands of people in the corners who weren't part of the human doughnut but who were around this Capitol.

They came here to say, Keep your hands off of my health care. We reject ObamaCare. We want no part of it.

This went on for days and days. There were people who wouldn't leave these Capitol grounds. Finally, on that sad day last March, when ObamaCare finally passed with all of the legislative shenanigans that enabled that to happen—and they were considerable and they were unprecedented, Mr. Speaker—the people around here put up a groan, not necessarily of despair but of agony, because they'd seen American liberty ripped out by its roots and taken over—our bodies nationalized by the Federal Government, our health care; the Federal Government taking over our bodies, nationalizing our bodies and our skin and everything inside it and putting a 10 percent tax on the outside if you go to the tanning salon. That's what happened with ObamaCare—a nationalization of the second most sovereign thing we have. The first most sovereign thing we have is our soul. The second most sovereign thing we have is our body, our skin, everything inside it, our health.

In the United States of America, we must have the right to manage our health to the maximum of our ability and not have the Federal Government diminish the options or take away the numbers of insurance policies we might buy or diminish the health care providers that are out there and put this into a one-size-fits-all. That's what ObamaCare did, and it's what it does if we let it continue to exist.

The circumstances of the government shutdown in 1995 were within an economic environment that brought us to where we are today, and we should understand what that is, Mr. Speaker.

We should know that, during that period of time, there was a dot-com bubble. There was this unnatural growth in the economy that was brought about because we had learned how to store and transfer information faster and more efficiently and more effectively than ever before. So there were millions of Americans who were investing in these dot-com companies who were involved in the technological era, in this modern dot-com era. They were investing because we could store and transfer information more effectively than ever before. They were investing in our ability to store and transfer but were not adjusting it to the necessity that that information and information transfer and manipulation ability helps our economy only to the extent that we can use it to provide a good or a service more effectively than before to provide efficiencies in our economy.

We found a lot of ways over those last 15, 16 years to produce more efficiencies because of the technology that had developed, but a lot of dot-com companies went under because they didn't add that substance to add to the value of our overall economy. It isn't enough just to be able to store and transfer information better than ever before. You have to store and transfer it and help the efficiencies so that companies can provide profitability. That was the only thing other than if you could market this information for recreational purposes. That was the other component. Only two.

So this dot-com bubble grew out of an overexuberance, an unnatural exuberance, that came from an optimism that we were going to take this economy someplace it had never been before. That bubble was bound to burst. I think it would have burst on its own, but there was a lawsuit filed against Microsoft which lanced the bubble, and the dot-com bubble burst. As it burst, it was like a blister on your skin, where it settles down into the hollow place underneath it.

There was a dip in the economy, and I believe there was a concerted effort at that point to fill this hole created by the bursting of the dot-com bubble with unnaturally low interest rates and long-term mortgages that would allow people to build or buy houses that they otherwise couldn't have afforded, and it created a housing bubble. If you think of the dot-com bubble that burst, then when it collapsed, it went into a trough, Mr. Speaker, and that trough was sought to be filled by an unnatural bubble of the housing boom which was created.

It was a housing boom that was in the process of unfolding and, I should say, of stretching itself to its max while President Bush was elected in 2000. Then the 2001 September 11 attacks came on our financial centers and this assault on America. That all came with this transition of the bursting of the dot-com bubble, with the growth of the unnatural housing bubble, with the assault on the United States on September 11 of 2001 on our financial centers, and with the attack on the American economy. That was coupled with all of the spending we needed to do to go to war in Afghanistan and subsequently in Iraq. Then in the middle of all of that, we spent billions on standing up the Transportation Security Administration, the TSA, and all of the other security provisions that we put in place to make sure that America could be protected from more and more attacks from al Qaeda.

All of this was going against our economy.

Within all of that, there was also the passage of No Child Left Behind, which took more money, and there were other components of the growth in the compassionate conservatism that was driven by the Bush administration—all of this while we were at war. Now, if I add this all up, it's not a very good formula for a balanced budget, and we had that balanced budget in the late 1990s and rolling into the year 2000.

When I came here to this Congress, elected in 2002 and sworn in here in January 2003, I came down here and said to the chairman of the Budget Committee, Where is our balanced budget? He said to me, We can't balance the budget. It's not possible to balance the budget, and you'll not have a balanced budget to vote on.

I went back to my office, Mr. Speaker, and I began to put together a budget that would balance. My green staff was tasked with the job of putting together a budget that we could offer that would be balanced. We didn't get it completed. At that time, it was about a $2.7 trillion budget. To try to rewrite that in a balanced fashion as a freshman in Congress and with a staff that was at that point not yet experienced was a very, very difficult task. I got to the point where I wasn't confident enough to offer it.

I wish now, looking back on it, that I would have offered a balanced budget, and I wish every year I would have offered a balanced budget. The red ink that we had was getting bigger and bigger and bigger, and the American people have not been informed as to how difficult it is to bring this budget to a balance. One of the important components of offering a budget that balances in this year tells us how big the problem is, and it has been getting bigger and bigger and bigger.

I stood here and sat in this Chamber, and listened to the debate engaged in, and listened to the 30–Something Group. Night after night after night, they would come down here on the floor and make the argument that, if we'd just put them in charge, if they'd just have the gavels, they would fix this country.

So eventually, over time, the Republicans lost the majority. The Democrats won the majority in 2006. NANCY PELOSI came in as Speaker. Now they had what they wanted. They were going to fix this country—and they did all right. They began to take that rather minor deficit and turn it into a huge deficit. They began to make energy more expensive and to take the prospects of success in America down instead of up. They were working on their vision of America, which is the transfer of payments, to tax the rich, and to transfer those payments to other people who aren't as fortunate—or I'll just say not as productive. They may or may not be as fortunate.

□ 1940

While this was going on, the deficit was growing, the dependency class was growing, and that's what was going on.

There was a concerted effort to borrow money from the Chinese and transfer that money over into the pockets of a growing dependency class to create a bigger dependency class because that was the political base that was supporting the Democrats—and still does in this Congress. And we watched this effort to expand the dependency class in America take place during the Pelosi Congress that began in 2007 through 2008. In 2008, Barack Obama was elected President and now this Congress went on steroids because they had a President that would sign the legislation instead of veto the legislation that was sent out of this Congress. And what we saw happen was an accelerated debt, and more and more money borrowed from the Chinese and the Saudis, and that $2.7 trillion or $2.8 trillion budget raised on up another $1 trillion. We've seen an additional $3 trillion beyond our means that has been spent under this Obama administration, supported by NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID.

The American people rose up, Mr. Speaker. They knew that it was irresponsible and they filled up the town hall meetings. They saw what was happening. The summer of, I guess, two or three summers ago—and the year might come to me and I can be confident enough to speak it into the RECORD—but we had an energy crisis. We had gas at $4 a gallon. I believe that was the summer of 2008 that gas was at $4 a gallon. I went back and did town hall meetings that filled up with people. And they saw what was happening.

And there was an effort in this Congress to shut down access to energy, a belief that if energy costs went up, people would use less. And I remember the Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, saying ''I'm trying to save the planet, I'm trying to save the planet.'' Well, I think she believed that she was trying to save the planet. And what I saw happening was the actions were driving up the cost of energy. That $4 gas issue finally broke and it started to spiral back downwards by the time of the election in 2008.

But we had, in August of that year, a monthlong energy debate taking place here on the floor. When we were ready to go home for that August we had several Special Orders that were cued up for the end of business that day. Democrats offered a motion to shut the place down, which would have shut off the Special Orders about energy. Some of the Members here decided we're going to keep talking, and so we came one after another. Eventually the Speaker shut the lights down—not completely off—shut the microphones off, shut the television cameras off and turned them sideways. And still we stood here for the month of August all the way into Labor Day every day making the case that we needed all energy all the time. Now that argument diminished when gas prices went back down again. It's before us again. And we must do an all-energy-all-the-time bill. I want to compliment Congressman DEVIN NUNES from California for all the work that he's done on legislation that I believe he'll introduce tomorrow on all energy all the time.

America needs to have cheap energy. We need to have cheap energy in a way that—everything that we do costs energy. If you move anything, it takes energy. If you have any product, it takes energy to produce it, energy to delivery it, and energy to go pick it up and bring it home. And so the cost of energy is tied into the cost of everything that we have and do. America cannot be competitive with the rest of the world if we have high energy prices. And yet, that 2008 year drove energy prices up to $4 a gallon gas. We saw crude oil prices go way over $100 a barrel, and we're looking at that happening again.

We've had the President move to shut down drilling offshore by Executive order. We've seen Democrats, in large numbers, oppose opening up ANWR for drilling, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I've been for drilling up there for a long time. I've gone up there. We drilled the North Slope in the early 1970s, and if it did anything with the environment it enhanced it, it didn't diminish it. And the strictest environmentalist we had couldn't fly over that country and point to a well and tell you how it had even defaced the landscape or broken up the scenery. The wells are submersible, they don't show up. There are not roads to each of them. They go out on ice roads in the winter time to service them. It's a good place to go and develop oil in the North Slope, and we need to go get it.

We need to drill offshore. We need to drill in the Bakken region in North Dakota and Montana, and it spills over into Canada. And we need to continue to bring Canadian oil down into the United States and refine it here and be the best trading partner for the Canadians that they could possibly ask for. If we fail to do so, they will build a pipeline to the west, and they will pump that oil and the oil stands out to tankers that will take that oil over to China, Japan, and places in Asia. They will do the logical thing. We need to make sure the logical thing is here in the United States. Mr. Speaker, that's just the energy issue.

And as this rolls forward, another summer we had the issue of health care. And as the effort came to pass ObamaCare here in the House of Representatives, the American people began to realize what was happening to their liberty, and they filled up the town hall meetings. We had town hall meetings in Iowa that got so big that they had to be moved outside because there wasn't room inside the biggest rooms we could find for all the people that came to, in a constitutional fashion, petition the government peacefully for redress and grievances. And they came, and they were well informed. Some of them had read the whole bill. And with great passion—and sometimes with little tact and sometimes with great deference—they made the case to me over and over again, they didn't want ObamaCare. They still don't want ObamaCare. And when it was passed here in the House they rejected it. And so I spent not quite a year of my life fighting the passage of ObamaCare. And since that period of time I introduced legislation to repeal ObamaCare immediately after its passage on that late night last March. We're coming up on a little past 11 months since it's been passed into law. The American people still reject it. They want their liberty, they want their freedom. They want to manage their own bodies, manage their own health care. They want a free market system. They want a doctor-patient relationship. And they sent 87 new freshmen here to the House of Representatives to ensure that ObamaCare would be repealed, that the funding to ObamaCare would be shut off, and that we would see no more implementation or enforcement of ObamaCare.

And what has it brought us, these 87 new freshmen that stand together on that one square? Here's what it brought us, Mr. Speaker: H.R. 2, presumably the second-highest priority of the new Speaker of the House—it brought us a new Speaker of the House, Speaker JOHN BOEHNER. And he sets the priorities, at least by tradition, for the first 10 bills that come out of the House, H.R. 1 through 10. And H.R. 2, the second-highest priority, was the bill that repealed ObamaCare.

The legislation that I introduced almost 1 year ago and teamed up with MICHELE BACHMANN of Minnesota and others, including CONNIE MACK of Florida and Parker Griffith of Alabama—no longer in this Congress—and a number of others that were part of this original effort to introduce legislation to repeal ObamaCare, and many others that signed on as cosponsors, and 178 that signed the discharge petition to repeal ObamaCare—the message was very clear. H.R. 2 was debated and passed the House of Representatives in the early stages here in the 112th Congress

in January, when it sent it over to the United States Senate. That's an important step.

Another important step is to do as I've said since at least the middle of last summer: At every appropriations bill introduce language in that bill that cuts off all funding that would be used to implement or enforce ObamaCare. That's an essential part of this. I had gone back and read through the history of how this Congress shut down the funding for the Vietnam War and shut off a war that had gone on for over a decade. They did so by putting language in a continuing resolution that shut off the Vietnam War. And it was language that said, in 1974—and they started some of this in 1973, but in 1974 they said, Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds in this continuing resolution for appropriations during the Vietnam War, notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds in this act and no funds heretofore appropriated shall be used to carry out offensive or defensive operations in the air over the seas adjacent to or the land of Vietnam or its adjacent countries. It's a bit of a paraphrase, but it makes the point succinctly, I believe, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1950

When I read the debate on that appropriations bill and when I read the language, that ''notwithstanding'' language that was put into the continuing resolution that shut off the funds going to Vietnam to the point where bullets that were being unloaded on the dock at Da Nang presumably were loaded back up again. None of the funds could be used to carry out offensive or defensive operations.

It cut off the supply support for South Vietnam's military. And we wondered why was it that they ran in the face of the North Vietnamese that spring in 1975? They had nothing left to fight with, Mr. Speaker. Their munitions were gone. They were played out. They didn't have heavy weapons; they didn't have light weapons that were well supplied. And it brought about the collapse of the South Vietnamese self-defense. And millions died in the aftermath—not just in Vietnam. In Cambodia and other places in Southeast Asia.

I disagreed with the decision that this Congress made, but I do agree that the language in the continuing resolution was effective in shutting off the funding to the Vietnam war; and similar language to the language that I've crafted to go into the appropriation bills from this point forward that says, essentially, notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds in this act and no funds previously appropriated shall be used to carry out the provisions of ObamaCare.

That's the language that I sought to introduce and asked the Rules Committee to grant a waiver for—unsuccessfully, I might add. That's the language that I asked be written into H.R. 1, the continuing resolution. It's the language that I tried to get offered here on the floor during H.R. 1 that was ruled out of order. And the amendments that I was able to get passed worked in compatibility with DENNY REHBERG of Montana and others—DENNY REHBERG, who did very, very good work on this appropriations bill, on H.R. 1. Without his work, we might not have had anything that was in order. Because of his work, we had eight amendments that were in order that were voted on. Each of them cut off funding to ObamaCare in some version or another. I compliment all of my colleagues who worked on that.

But now we've reached this point where we've got to draw a line. H.R. 1 took the hill. It said none of the funds in this bill are going to be used to implement ObamaCare. No funds are going to go to fund Planned Parenthood. No funds are going to be used to fund abortion anywhere in the world out of this continuing resolution.

But that language was not included in the continuing resolution that was passed night before last here in the House—or maybe it perhaps was last night. My nights blur together. That language was not included. We need better language that I'm suggesting here included in the next CR.

This government shuts down March 18 if we don't now extend its funding again. I'd like to get a solution that takes us to the end of the fiscal year.

But standing on the hill and defending the hill to shut off all funding to ObamaCare since every Republican in the House and the Senate has voted to repeal ObamaCare, everybody in the House has voted to cut off all funding to ObamaCare at every opportunity—and that's eight of them—we have this opportunity now to write a new CR and to write the language into it that does unfund ObamaCare. Not just what's in the CR, but what is automatically appropriated.

There are automatic appropriations, Mr. Speaker, that are in the ObamaCare legislation—I will say deceptively written—that appropriate funds that go forward whether or not this House acts, goes forward in perpetuity. Perpetuity. That means forever, if anybody out there is wondering what it is.

And for a 10-year period of time, there are automatic appropriations of $105.5 billion over 10 years that automatically fund the implementation and enforcement of ObamaCare. If this House doesn't act to shut it off, ObamaCare is implemented if we do nothing. Even if we pass the repeal, even if we don't authorize any new funding, $105.5 billion gets spent to implement it, which means that the roots of ObamaCare go deep. The deeper they go, the harder they are to rip out.

And I've said it must be ripped out by the roots. Let's rip it out, Mr. Speaker, in this next CR. Let's retake the hill that we took with H.R. 1. Let's hold the hill. Let's stare the President down. Let's stare HARRY REID down. If we're not willing to do that, they will get everything that they're willing to fight for.

This is the time for this new House with these new 87 Republican freshmen. Every Republican that's voted to repeal and unfund ObamaCare now needs to help us take the hill and hold the hill and stare the President down.

Let's fund the government so it functions legitimately, but let's not cave in to a President who may well shut down the entire United States Government in order to preserve his pet project, ObamaCare, which has been rejected by the American people and this Congress resoundingly.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your attention and yield back the balance of my time.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES AND BUDGETARY MATERIAL

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE 112TH CONGRESS

FEBRUARY 15, 2011.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XI, I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the rules of the Committee on Appropriations for the 112th Congress, adopted on February 8, 2011.

Sincerely,

HAROLD ROGERS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 1: POWER TO SIT AND ACT

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under Rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee and each of its subcommittees is authorized:

(1) To sit and act at such times and places within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary; and

(2) To require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, reports, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary.

(b) The Chairman, or any Member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(c) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or its subcommittees under subsection (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the Members of the Committee voting, a majority being present. The power to authorize and issue subpoenas under subsection (a)(2) may be delegated to the Chairman pursuant to such rules and under such limitations as the Committee may prescribe. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman or by any Member designated by the Committee.

(d) Compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or its subcommittees may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

SEC. 2: SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) The Majority Caucus of the Committee shall establish the number of subcommittees

and shall determine the jurisdiction of each subcommittee.

(b) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee all matters referred to it.

(c) All legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks unless, by majority vote of the Majority Members of the full Committee, consideration is to be by the full Committee.

(d) The Majority Caucus of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of Majority to Minority Members for each subcommittee. The Chairman is authorized to negotiate that ratio with the Minority; Provided, however, That party representation in each subcommittee, including ex-officio members, shall be no less favorable to the Majority than the ratio for the full Committee.

(e) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee are each authorized to sit as a member of all subcommittees and to participate, including voting, in all of the work of the subcommittees.

SEC. 3: STAFFING

(a) Committee Staff—The Chairman is authorized to appoint the staff of the Committee, and make adjustments in the job titles and compensation thereof subject to the maximum rates and conditions established in Clause 9(c) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives. In addition, he is authorized, in his discretion, to arrange for their specialized training. The Chairman is also authorized to employ additional personnel as necessary.

(b) Assistants to Members:

(1) Each Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of a Subcommittee or the Full Committee, including a Chairman Emeritus may select and designate one staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of that Member.

(2) Notwithstanding, (b)(1) The Chairman may prescribe such terms and conditions necessary to achieve a reduction in the number of Assistants to Members previously designated by a Member of the Committee prior to the adoption of the Rules of the House establishing the Committee for the 112th Congress.

(3) Staff members designated under this subsection shall be compensated at a rate, determined by the Member, not to exceed 75 per centum of the maximum established in Clause 9(c) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(4) Members designating staff members under this subsection must specifically certify by letter to the Chairman that the employees are needed and will be utilized for Committee work.

SEC. 4: COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) Regular Meeting Day—The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the first Wednesday of each month while the House is in session, unless the Committee has met within the past 30 days or the Chairman considers a specific meeting unnecessary in the light of the requirements of the Committee business schedule.

(b) Additional and Special Meetings:

(1) The Chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(2) If at least three Committee Members desire that a special meeting of the Committee be called by the Chairman, those Members may file in the Committee Offices a written request to the Chairman for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Upon the filing of the request, the Committee Clerk shall notify the Chairman.

(3) If within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the Committee Members may file in the Committee Offices their written notice that a special meeting will be held, specifying the date and hour of such meeting, and the measure or matter to be considered. The Committee shall meet on that date and hour.

(4) Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the Committee Clerk shall notify all Committee Members that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered. Only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at the special meeting.

(c) Vice Chairman To Preside in Absence of Chairman—A member of the majority party on the Committee or subcommittee thereof designated by the Chairman of the full Committee shall be vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, and shall preside at any meeting during the temporary absence of the chairman. If the chairman and vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee are not present at any meeting of the Committee or subcommittee, the ranking member of the majority party who is present shall preside at that meeting.

(d) Business Meetings:

(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the Committee and its subcommittees shall be open to the public except when the Committee or the subcommittee concerned, in open session and with a majority present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed.

(2) No person other than Committee Members and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed.

(3) The Chairman shall announce the date, place, and subject matter of each committee meeting for the transaction of business, which may not commence earlier than the third day on which members have notice thereof, unless the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the meeting sooner, in which case the Chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. An announcement shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

(4) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of a bill or resolution, or at the time an announcement is made pursuant to the preceding subparagraph within 24 hours before such meeting, the Chairman shall cause the text of such bill or resolution to be made publicly available in electronic form.

(e) Committee Records:

(1) The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee action, including a record of the votes on any question on which a roll call is demanded. The result of each roll call vote shall be available for inspection by the public during regular business hours in the Committee Offices and also made available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote. The information made available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, or other proposition, and the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against, and the names of those Members present but not voting.

(2) All hearings, records, data, charts, and files of the Committee shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Chairman of the Committee. Such records shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto.

(3) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House, except that the Committee authorizes use of any record to which Clause 3 (b)(4) of Rule VII of the Rules of the House would otherwise apply after such record has been in existence for 20 years. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to Clause 3 (b)(3) or Clause 4 (b) of Rule VII of the Rules of the House, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination upon the written request of any Member of the Committee.

(f) Availability of Amendments Adopted—Not later than 24 hours after the adoption of amendment to a bill or resolution, the Chairman shall cause the text of any amendment adopted thereto to be made publicly available in electronic form.

SEC. 5: COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

(a) Overall Budget Hearings—Overall budget hearings by the Committee, including the hearing required by Section 242 (c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 and Clause 4 (a)(1) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be conducted in open session except when the Committee in open session and with a majority present, determines by roll call vote that the testimony to be taken at that hearing on that day may be related to a matter of national security; except that the Committee may by the same procedure close one subsequent day of hearing. A transcript of all such hearings shall be printed and a copy furnished to each Member, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

(b) Other Hearings:

(1) All other hearings conducted by the Committee or its subcommittees shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee in open session and with a majority present determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or Rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present at a hearing conducted by the Committee or any of its subcommittees, there being in attendance the number required under Section 5 (c) of these Rules to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, (1) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security or violate Clause 2 (k)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or (2) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in Clause 2 (k)(5) of such Rule. No Member of the House of Representatives may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or its subcommittees unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or any of its subcommittees, for purposes of a

particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by the same procedures designated in this subsection for closing hearings to the public; Provided, however, That the Committee or its subcommittees may by the same procedure vote to close five subsequent days of hearings.

(2) Subcommittee chairmen shall coordinate the development of schedules for meetings or hearings after consultation with the Chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

(3) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or any of its subcommittees as the case may be, insofar as is practicable, shall file in advance of such appearance, a written statement of the proposed testimony and shall limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary, except that this provision shall not apply to any witness appearing before the Committee in the overall budget hearings.

(4) Each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity before the Committee, or any of its subcommittees as the case may be, shall to the greatest extent practicable, submit a written statement including a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two previous fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness. Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of witnesses, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

(c) Quorum for Taking Testimony—The number of Members of the Committee which shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence in any hearing of the Committee shall be two.

(d) Calling and Interrogation of Witnesses:

(1) The Minority Members of the Committee or its subcommittees shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, by a majority of them before completion of any hearing, to call witnesses selected by the Minority to testify with respect to the matter under consideration during at least one day of hearings thereon.

(2) The Committee and its subcommittees shall observe the five-minute rule during the interrogation of witnesses until such time as each Member of the Committee or subcommittee who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness.

(e) Broadcasting and Photographing of Committee Meetings and Hearings—Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by the full Committee or any of its subcommittees is open to the public, those proceedings shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography, as provided in Clause (4)(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Neither the full Committee Chairman or subcommittee chairman shall limit the number of television or still cameras to fewer than two representatives from each medium (except for legitimate space or safety, in which case pool coverage shall be authorized). To the maximum practicable, the Committee shall provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings and shall maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public.

(f) Subcommittee Meetings—No subcommittee shall sit while the House is reading an appropriation measure for amendment under the five-minute rule or while the Committee is in session.

(g) Public Notice of Committee Hearings—The Chairman of the Committee shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee or subcommittee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. If the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of the Committee or respective subcommittee, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee or subcommittee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairman or subcommittee chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this subsection shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

SEC. 6: PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

(a) Prompt Reporting Requirement:

(1) It shall be the duty of the Chairman to report, or cause to be reported promptly to the House any bill or resolution approved by the Committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(2) In any event, a report on a bill or resolution which the Committee has approved shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days in which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the Committee Clerk a written request, signed by a majority of Committee Members, for the reporting of such bill or resolution. Upon the filing of any such request, the Committee Clerk shall notify the Chairman immediately of the filing of the request. This subsection does not apply to the reporting of a regular appropriation bill or to the reporting of a resolution of inquiry addressed to the head of an executive department.

(b) Presence of Committee Majority—No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee was actually present.

(c) Roll Call Votes—With respect to each roll call vote on a motion to report any measure or matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered to the measure of matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those Members voting for and against, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter.

(d) Compliance With Congressional Budget Act—A Committee report on a bill or resolution which has been approved by the Committee shall include the statement required by Section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and clearly identified, if the bill or resolution provides new budget authority.

(e) Constitutional Authority Statement—Each report of the Committee on a bill or joint resolution of a public character shall include a statement citing the specific powers granted to the Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution.

(f) Changes in Existing Law—Each Committee report on a general appropriation bill shall contain a concise statement describing fully the effect of any provision of the bill which directly or indirectly changes the application of existing law.

(g) Rescissions and Transfers—Each bill or resolution reported by the Committee shall include separate headings for rescissions and transfers of unexpended balances with all proposed rescissions and transfers listed therein. The report of the Committee accompanying such a bill or resolution shall include a separate section with respect to such rescissions or transfers.

(h) Listing of Unauthorized Appropriations—Each Committee report on a general appropriation bill shall contain a list of all appropriations contained in the bill for any expenditure not currently authorized by law for the period concerned (except for classified intelligence or national security programs, projects, or activities) along with a statement of the last year for which such expenditures were authorized, the level of expenditures authorized for that year, the actual level of expenditures for that year, and the level of appropriations in the bill for such expenditures.

(i) Supplemental or Minority Views:

(1) If, at the time the Committee approves any measure or matter, any Committee Member gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, the Member shall be entitled to not less than two additional calendar days after the day of such notice (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such views in writing and signed by the Member, with the Clerk of the Committee. All such views so filed shall be included in and shall be a part of the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(2) The Committee report on that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which—

(i) shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views which have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report, and

(ii) shall have on its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views are included as part of the report.

(3) This subsection does not preclude—

(i) the immediate filing or printing of a Committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by such subsection; or

(ii) the filing by the Committee of a supplemental report on a measure or matter which may be required for correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the Committee on that measure or matter.

(4) If, at the time a subcommittee approves any measure or matter for recommendation to the full Committee, any Member of that subcommittee who gives notice of intention to offer supplemental, minority, or additional views shall be entitled, insofar as is practicable and in accordance with the printing requirements as determined by the subcommittee, to include such views in the Committee Print with respect to that measure or matter.

(j) Availability of Reports—A copy of each bill, resolution, or report shall be made available to each Member of the Committee at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in advance of the date on which the Committee is to consider each bill, resolution, or report; Provided, That this subsection may be waived by agreement between the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee.

(k) Performance Goals and Objectives—Each Committee report shall contain a statement of general performance goals and objectives, including outcome-related goals and objectives, for which the measure authorizes funding.

(l) Motion to go to Conference—The Chairman is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

SEC. 7: VOTING

(a) No vote by any Member of the Committee or any of its subcommittees with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(b) The vote on any question before the Committee shall be taken by the yeas and nays on the demand of one-fifth of the Members present.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee or the chairman of any of its subcommittees may—

(1) postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment;

(2) resume proceedings on a postponed question at any time after reasonable notice.

When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

SEC. 8: STUDIES AND EXAMINATIONS

The following procedure shall be applicable with respect to the conduct of studies and examinations of the organization and operation of Executive Agencies under authority contained in Section 202 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in Clause (3)(a) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

(a) The Chairman is authorized to appoint such staff and, in his discretion, arrange for the procurement of temporary services of consultants, as from time to time may be required.

(b) Studies and examinations will be initiated upon the written request of a subcommittee which shall be reasonably specific and definite in character, and shall be initiated only by a majority vote of the subcommittee, with the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member thereof participating as part of such majority vote. When so initiated such request shall be filed with the Clerk of the Committee for submission to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member and their approval shall be required to make the same effective. Notwithstanding any action taken on such request by the chairman and ranking minority member of the subcommittee, a request may be approved by a majority of the Committee.

(c) Any request approved as provided under subsection (b) shall be immediately turned over to the staff appointed for action.

(d) Any information obtained by such staff shall be reported to the chairman of the subcommittee requesting such study and examination and to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, shall be made available to the members of the subcommittee concerned, and shall not be released for publication until the subcommittee so determines.

(e) Any hearings or investigations which may be desired, aside from the regular hearings on appropriation items, when approved by the Committee, shall be conducted by the subcommittee having jurisdiction over the matter.

SEC. 9: TEMPORARY INVESTIGATIVE TASK FORCES

(a) The Chairman of the Full Committee, in consultation with the Ranking Member of the Full Committee, may establish and appoint members to serve on task forces of the Committee, to examine specific activities for a limited period of time in accordance with clause 5(b)2(C) of Rule X of the Rules of the House.

(b) The Chairman of the Full Committee shall issue a written directive, in consultation with the Ranking Member of the Full Committee, delineating the specific activities to be reviewed by a task force constituted pursuant to the preceding paragraph.

(c) A task force constituted under this section shall provide a written report of its findings and recommendations to the Full Committee Chairman and Ranking Member and members of the relevant subcommittees having jurisdiction over the matters reviewed. Such report shall be approved by a majority vote of the task force and shall include any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a Member of the task force or a member of a subcommittee having jurisdiction over the matter reviewed.

(d) Any information obtained during the course of such investigation, and any report produced by, a task force pursuant to this section, shall not be released until the Chairman of the Full Committee has authorized such release.

(e) The Chairman is authorized to appoint such staff, and, in his discretion, arrange for the procurement of temporary services, as from time to time may be required.

SEC. 10: OFFICIAL TRAVEL

(a) The chairman of a subcommittee shall approve requests for travel by subcommittee members and staff for official business within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee. The ranking minority member of a subcommittee shall concur in such travel requests by minority members of that subcommittee and the Ranking Minority Member shall concur in such travel requests for Minority Members of the Committee. Requests in writing covering the purpose, itinerary, and dates of proposed travel shall be submitted for final approval to the Chairman. Specific approval shall be required for each and every trip.

(b) The Chairman is authorized during the recess of the Congress to approve travel authorizations for Committee Members and staff, including travel outside the United States.

(c) As soon as practicable, the Chairman shall direct the head of each Government agency concerned not to honor requests of subcommittees, individual Members, or staff for travel, the direct or indirect expenses of which are to be defrayed from an executive appropriation, except upon request from the Chairman.

(d) In accordance with Clause 8 of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and Section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, local currencies owned by the United States shall be available to Committee Members and staff engaged in carrying out their official duties outside the United States, its territories, or possessions. No Committee Member or staff member shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in applicable Federal law.

(e) Travel Reports:

(1) Members or staff shall make a report to the Chairman on their travel, covering the purpose, results, itinerary, expenses, and other pertinent comments.

(2) With respect to travel outside the United States or its territories or possessions, the report shall include: (1) an itemized list showing the dates each country was visited, the amount of per diem furnished, the cost of transportation furnished, and any funds expended for any other official purpose; and (2) a summary in these categories of the total foreign currencies and/or appropriated funds expended. All such individual reports on foreign travel shall be filed with the Chairman no later than sixty days following completion of the travel for use in complying with reporting requirements in applicable Federal law, and shall be open for public inspection.

(3) Each Member or employee performing such travel shall be solely responsible for supporting the amounts reported by the Member or employee.

(4) No report or statement as to any trip shall be publicized making any recommendations in behalf of the Committee without the authorization of a majority of the Committee.

(f) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business pertaining to the jurisdiction of the Committee shall be governed by applicable laws or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel, and as promulgated from time to time by the Chairman.

SEC. 11. ACTIVITIES REPORTS:

(a) Not later than the 30th day after June 1 and December 1, the Committee shall submit to the House a semiannual report on the activities of the Committee.

(b) After adjournment sine die of a regular session of Congress, or after December 15, whichever occurs first, the Chairman may file the second or fourth semiannual report with the Clerk of the House at any time and without the approval of the Committee, provided that a copy of the report has been available to each Member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a Member of the Committee.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING:

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2011 BUDGET RESOLUTION RELATED TO LEGISLATION REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to sections 3(d) of H. Res. 5, the resolution adopting the rules for the One Hundred and Twelfth Congress, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the budget allocations and aggregates set forth pursuant to the budget for fiscal year 2011 as set forth under the provisions of that resolution. Aggregate levels of budget authority, outlays, and revenue are revised and the allocation to House Committee on Ways and Means is also revised, for fiscal year 2011, and the period of fiscal years 2011 through 2015. Corresponding tables are attached.

This revision represents an adjustment pursuant to sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended (Budget Act). For the purposes of the Budget Act, these revised aggregates and allocations are to be considered as an aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to section 3(d) of H. Res. 5.

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, House Budget Committee.

BUDGET AGGREGATES

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year	
	2011	2011–2015
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,964,850	(1)
Outlays	3,131,363	(1)
Revenues	1,662,481	11,420,669
Change for the Comprehensive 1099 Taxpayer Protection and Repayment of Exchange Subsidy Overpayments Act of 2011 (H.R.704):		
Budget Authority	0	(1)
Outlays	0	(1)
Revenues	0	−7,391
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,964,850	(1)
Outlays	3,131,363	(1)
Revenues	1,662,481	11,413,278

[1] Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2011 through 2015 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee on Ways & Means	2011		2011–2015 total	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Current allocation	1,156,980	1,158,913	5,587,569	5,590,239
Change for the Comprehensive 1099 Taxpayer Protection and Repayment of Exchange Subsidy Overpayments Act of 2011 (H.R. 704)	0	0	−1,880	−1,880
Revised Allocation	1,156,980	1,158,913	5,585,689	5,588,359

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 44. Joint Resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reports that on March 2, 2011 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.J. Res. 44. Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 3, 2011, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

657. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled ''Report Regarding Effect on Military Readiness Caused by Undocumented Immigrant Trespassing on Operation Ranges — Implementation Update''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

658. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report entitled ''Reforming America's Housing Finance Market''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

659. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Office of the Ombudsman (RIN: 2590-AA20) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

660. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — List of Nonconforming Vehicles Decided to Be Eligible for Importation [Docket No.: NHTSA-2007-29271] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

661. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — List of Nonconforming Vehicles Decided To Be Eligible for Importation [Docket No.: NHTSA-2006-25686] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

662. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: NUHOMS(R) HD System Revision 1 [NRC-2011-0002] (RIN: 3150-AI89) received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

663. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

664. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's report on the amount of acquisitions made from entities that manufacture the articles, materials, or supplies outside the United States in Fiscal Year 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

665. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Permits and Regulations, Division of Migratory Bird Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Permits; States Delegated Falconry Permitting Authority; Technical Corrections to the Regulations [FWS-R9-MB-2010-0064; 91200-1231-9BPP] (RIN: 1018-AX31) received February 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

666. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Permits and Regulations, Division of Migratory Bird Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Permits; Removal of Rusty Blackbird and Tamaulipas (Mexican) Crow From the Depredation Order for Blackbirds, Cowbirds, Grackles, Crows, and Magpies, and Other Changes to the Order [FWS-R9-MB-2008-0064; 91200-1231-9BPP] (RIN: 1018-AV66) received February 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

667. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revised Critical Habitat for the Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse in Colorado [Docket No.: FWS-R6-ES-2009-0013] [MO 92210-0-0009] (RIN: 1018-AW45) received February 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

668. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of Recovery, USFWS, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Populations of Endangered Whooping Cranes in Southwestern Louisiana [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2010-0057] [92220-1113-0000-C3] (RIN: 1018-AX23) received February 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

669. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Revised Critical Habitat for Brodiaea filifolia (Thread-Leaved Brodiaea) [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2009-0073] [MO 92210-0-0009] (RIN: 1018-AW54) received February 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

670. A letter from the Regulatory and Policy Specialist, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Indian Trust Management Reform — Implementation of Statutory Changes [Docket ID: BIA-2009-0001] (RIN: 1076-AF07) received February 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

671. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revised Critical Habitat for the Arroyo Toad [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2009-0069] [MO 92210-0-0009-B4] (RIN: 1018-AV89) received February 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

672. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report on the activities of the Community Relations Service, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000g-3; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

673. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30768; Amdt. 3413] received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

674. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30765; Amdt. No. 3410] received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

675. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30766; Amdt. No. 3411] received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

676. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Sturgis, KY [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0992; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-36] received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

677. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Low Altitude Area Navigation

Routes (T-281, T-283, T-285, T-286, and T-288); Nebraska and South Dakota [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0688; Airspace Docket No. 09-AGL-23] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

678. A letter from the Senoir Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company (Type Certificate Previously Held by Columbia Aircraft Manufacturing (Previously The Lancair Company)) Models LC40-550FG, LC41-550FG, and LC42-550FG Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1186; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-065-AD; Amendment 39-16588; AD 2011-03-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

679. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Model F.28 Mark 0100, 1000, 2000, 3000, and 4000 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1114; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-206-AD; Amendment 39-16591; AD 2011-03-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

680. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Operations Specifications [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0140; Amendment No. 45-27, 110-1, 119-14, 121-353, 129-49, and 135-124] (RIN: 2120-AJ45) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

681. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Short Brothers PLC Model SD3 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0225; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-203-AD; Amendment 39-16525; AD 2010-24-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

682. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 727 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0677; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-075-AD; Amendment 39-16578; AD 2011-02-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

683. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30767; Amdt. No. 3412] received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

684. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA Model TBM 700 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0948; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-041-AD; Amendment 39-16575; AD 2011-02-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

685. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aircraft Industries a.s. Model L 23 Super Blanik Sailplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0053; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-073-AD; Amendment 39-16581; AD 2011-02-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

686. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney PW4000 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0596; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-22-AD; Amendment 39-16533; AD 2010-24-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

687. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model MD-11 and MD-11F Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0228; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-252-AD; Amendment 39-16574; AD 2011-02-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

688. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 757 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0295; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-298-AD; Amendment 39-16576; AD 2011-02-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

689. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model DC-9-81 (MD-81), DC-9-82 (MD-82), DC-9-83 (MD-83), D-9-87 (MD-87), and MD-88 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0549; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-109-AD; Amendment 39-16573; AD 2011-01-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

690. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC-6, PC-6-H1, PC-6-H2, PC-6/350, PC-6/350-H1, PC-6/350-H2, PC-6/A, PC-6/A-H1, PC-6/A-H2, PC-6/B-H2, PC-6/B1-H2, PC-6/B2-H2, PC-6/B2-H4, PC-6/C-H2, and PC-6/C1-H2 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1011; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-047-AD; Amendment 39-16571; AD 2011-01-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

691. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC-6, PC-6-H1, PC-6-H2, PC-6/350, PC-6/350-H1, PC-6/350-H2, PC-6/A, PC-6/A-H1, PC-6/A-H2, PC-6/B-H2, PC-6/B1-H2, PC-6/B2-H2, PC-6/B2-H4, PC-6/C-H2, and PC-6/C1-H2 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0622; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-034-AD; Amendment 39-16570; AD 2009-18-03 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

692. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; M7 Aerospace LP (Type Certificate Previously Held by Fairchild Aircraft Incorporated) Models SA26-AT, SA26-T, SA226-AT, SA226-T, SA226-T(B), SA226-TC, SA227-AC (C-26A), SA227-AT, SA227-BC (C-26A), SA227-CC, SA227-DC (C-26B), and SA227-TT Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0014; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-066-AD; Amendment 39-16577; AD 2011-02-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

693. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D-7, -7A, -7B, -9, -9A, -11, -15, -15A, -17, -17A, -17R, and -17AR Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0593; Directorate Identifier 98-ANE-48-AD; Amendment 39-16584; AD 2011-03-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

694. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GROB-WERKE GMBH & CO KG Models G102 ASTIR CS, G102 CLUB ASTIR III, G102 CLUB ASTIR IIIb, and G102 STANDARD ASTIR III Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2007-28435; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-054-AD; Amendment 39-16556; AD 2011-01-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

695. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 727, 727C, 727-100, 727-100C, 727-200, and 727-200F Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0646; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-223-AD; Amendment 39-16558; AD 2011-01-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

696. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135BJ Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1080; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-118-AD; Amendment 39-16554; AD 2011-01-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

697. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B4-600, B4-600R, and F4-600R Series Airplanes, and Model C4-605R Variant F Airplanes (Collectively Called A300-600 Series Airplanes) [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1278; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-260-AD; Amendment 39-16567; AD 2011-01-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

698. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. (P&WC) PW305A and PW305B Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0829; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-23-AD; Amendment 39-16524; AD 2010-24-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

699. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 767-300 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0796; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-007-AD; Amendment 39-16579; AD 2011-02-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

700. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200 Series Airplanes Model; Model A330-300 Series Airplanes; Model A340-200 Series Airplanes; and Model A340-300 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0029; Directorate Identifier 2010-

NM-279-AD; Amendment 39-16583; AD 2011-02-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

701. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation and Establishment of Compulsory Reporting Points; Alaska [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1191; Airspace Docket No. 10-AAL-22] received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

702. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Show Low, AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0903; Airspace Docket No. 09-AWP-16] received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

703. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-2 and V-12; Hawaii [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1263; Airspace Docket No. 10-AWP-17] received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

704. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Jet Route J-93; CA [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1022; Airspace Docket No. 10-AWP-4] received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

705. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Lucin, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1208; Airspace Docket No. 10-ANM-16] received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

706. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Port Clarence, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0354; Airspace Docket No. 10-AAL-10] received February 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

707. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Richmond, IN [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1033; Airspace Docket No. 10-AGL-21] received February 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

708. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; New Hampton, IA [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1035; Airspace Docket No. 10-ACE-12] received February 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

709. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Greensburg, IN [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1028; Airspace Docket No. 10-AGL-16] received February 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

710. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; La Porte, IN [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1030; Airspace Docket No. 10-AGL-18] received February 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

711. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Lafayette, Purdue University Airport, IN [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1029; Airspace Docket No. 10-AGL-17] received February 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

712. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Industry Director's Directive (IDD) to Withdraw a Prior IDD on Foreign Sales Corporation (FSC) IRC Sec. 921-927 Bundle of Rights in Software Issue (IDD dated November 14, 2003) [LB&I Control No.: LB&I-4-1110-032] received February 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

713. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segments Rates [Notice 2011-13] received February 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

714. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Withholding on Wages of Nonresident Alien Employees Performing Services Within the United States [Notice 2011-12] received February 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

715. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting a consolidated report of the Administration's processing of continuing disability reviews for FY 2009; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

716. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2012 budget request, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 437d(d)(1); jointly to the Committees on House Administration, Appropriations, and Oversight and Government Reform.

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. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 525. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance and increase the number of veterinarians trained in veterinary public health (Rept. 112–22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 528. A bill to require the submission of a report to the Congress on parasitic disease among poor Americans (Rept. 112–23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 570. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance the roles of dentists and allied dental personnel in the Nation's disaster response framework, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–24). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 867. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to set the retirement benefits age for today's four-year-olds at age 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 868. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for the more accurate and complete enumeration of certain overseas Americans in the decennial census; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 869. A bill to clarify the definition of flood control operations for the purposes of the operation and maintenance of Project No. 2179 on the Lower Merced River; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 870. A bill to establish the National Full Employment Trust Fund to create employment opportunities for the unemployed; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. SHULER (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 871. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the credit for research activities permanent and to provide an increase in such credit for taxpayers whose gross receipts are predominantly from domestic production activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. BACA, Mr. MICA, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. COSTA, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. HOLDEN):

H.R. 872. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 873. A bill to improve the safety of motorcoaches and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. OWENS (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 874. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to expand eligibility for Farm Service Agency loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HALL, Mr. JONES, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 875. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit Federal court jurisdiction over questions under the Defense of Marriage Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 876. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for patient protection by establishing safe nurse staffing levels at certain Medicare providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. CLAY (for himself and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 877. A bill to express the sense of Congress that Federal job training programs that target older adults should work with nonprofit organizations that have a record of success in developing and implementing research-based technology curriculum designed specifically for older adults; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 878. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to individuals for legal expenses paid with respect to establishing guardianship of a disabled individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 879. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow refunds of Federal motor fuel excise taxes on fuels used in mobile mammography vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. DENT, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 880. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction for health insurance costs in computing self-employment taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 881. A bill to amend title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to require a plaintiff to provide a defendant with an opportunity to correct a violation of such title voluntarily before the plaintiff may commence a civil action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H.R. 882. A bill to require that any local currencies used to provide per diems to Members and employees of Congress for official foreign travel for a fiscal year be obtained by Congress and paid for using funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of Congress for the fiscal year, to enhance the disclosure of information on official foreign travel of Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, 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 Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 883. A bill to expand and enhance existing adult day programs for people with neurological diseases or conditions (such as multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, traumatic brain injury, or other similar diseases or conditions) to support and improve access to respite services for family caregivers who are taking care of such people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 884. A bill continuing appropriations of local funds of the District of Columbia during fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota):

H.R. 885. A bill to improve and expand geographic literacy among kindergarten through grade 12 students in the United States by improving professional development programs for kindergarten through grade 12 teachers offered through institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 886. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 225th anniversary of the establishment of the Nation's first Federal law enforcement agency, the United States Marshals Service; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 887. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to submit a report on Indian land fractionation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 888. A bill to amend title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies that educate alien children admitted to the United States as citizens of one of the Freely Associated States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. STARK, Mr. REYES, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WU, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 889. A bill to provide for fulfilling the potential of women in academic science and engineering, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 890. A bill to allow for the enforcement of State disclosure laws and access to courts for covered Holocaust-era insurance policy claims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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.

By Mr. CLAY:

H. Res. 136. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Minority Donor Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H. Res. 137. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should take all appropriate measures to ensure the continuation of its 6-day mail delivery service; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H. Res. 138. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. SABLAN):

H. Res. 139. A resolution expressing condolences to the people of New Zealand for the terrible loss of life and property suffered as a result of the deadly earthquake that struck on February 22, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 2. ''The actual Enumeration . . . within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct.''

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

Page 311 U.S. 426.

''In our view, it cannot properly be said that the constitutional power of the United States over its waters is limited to control for navigation. By navigation, respondent means no more than operation of boats and improvement of the waterway itself. In truth, the authority of the United States is the regulation of commerce on its waters. Navigability, in the sense just stated, is but a part of this whole. Flood protection, watershed development, recovery of the cost of improvements through utilization of power are likewise parts of commerce control.''

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SHULER:

H.R. 871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 874.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III and Amendment X.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

Legislative Powers.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2.

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. HELLER:

H.R. 879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 880.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for the ADA Notification Act is: Section 8, Clause 1 of Article I; Section 8, Clause 18 of Article I.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H.R. 882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9. ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 885.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 886.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 states ''The Congress shall have Power . . . To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.''

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article 4.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 890.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 11: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 27: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 99: Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H.R. 100: Mr. FLORES, Mr. JONES, and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 104: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 140: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 152: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 153: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 154: Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 205: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 217: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 237: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. REYES, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 283: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 284: Ms. FUDGE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 287: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 397: Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 421: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 428: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 432: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 436: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 459: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 482: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 515: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 535: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 584: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 587: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 589: Mr. SIRES, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. CHU, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. WATT.

H.R. 606: Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 658: Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 673: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. REED, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 679: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 690: Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 692: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 694: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 735: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 750: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 771: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 773: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 782: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 800: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. LONG, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 808: Mr. WU.

H.R. 816: Mr. CARDOZA.

H.R. 822: Mr. BOREN, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HELLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. COLE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 837: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 838: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 863: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SABLAN.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. PLATTS.

H. Res. 60: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. KILDEE.

H. Res. 95: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 134: Ms. BERKLEY.