United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 31, 2011 No. 76

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 31, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TIM GRIFFIN 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 1:50 p.m.

ALFALIT: EMPOWERING INDIVIDUALS THROUGH LITERACY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize an amazing organization headquartered in my south Florida district, Alfalit International.

Alfalit is a faith-based nonprofit organization that provides education for the world's poorest people. Alfalit offers many programs—basic education, preschool, nutrition, microcredit, and community development—but its core mission is to eliminate the human suffering caused by illiteracy. Alfalit is active in 24 countries, in Latin America, the Caribbean, Africa, and in Portugal. As you would see from these posters here, Mr. Speaker, these are the volunteers and the many participants in Alfalit literacy programs throughout the world.

Since its founding in 1961, 7 million individuals have had their lives transformed by Alfalit because it also provides comprehensive health programs that focus on HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, and cholera prevention. This year marks its 50th year of service to the world's most vulnerable population, 50 years of empowering individuals through literacy. It is an impressive achievement, and yet Alfalit knows that there is still much more to be done.

Worldwide, 774 million adults lack the ability to read and write. Think of that staggering number—774 million adults. That is one in five adults throughout the world who are illiterate, with two-thirds of them being women. In addition, 75 million children have never had the opportunity to go to school, and many attend infrequently or they decide to drop out.

As a former Florida certified teacher, I know the importance of a quality education. It is one of the best ways to ensure that a child will have a stable and productive future. Literacy helps bring communities together, and it helps prevent violence and poverty. Last year, Alfalit had over 120,000 students enrolled in its programs, students like the ones that we see here in these posters.

Alfalit is always striving to reach more people, and that is why it has started an adult and youth education program in Liberia. They have opened facilities in 10 of Liberia's 15 counties, quite an impressive achievement. Liberia's President, Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, has become involved with Alfalit's program. Program participants in Liberia say that Alfalit has taken them from darkness to light. They say that before, they could not read a simple street sign or know what a danger sign meant. But now they truly see everything.

The Women in Peace Building of Liberia have been active participants in the program that Alfalit offers them. It is a group of Christian women activists that formed during the Liberian civil war. They come together to pray and discuss issues of concern for their fellow Liberians. Alfalit has provided them with the know-how and with the confidence to continue their work.

After 50 years of service and dedication, Alfalit has built a legacy that is truly impressive.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Alfalit for all that it has done to fight illiteracy and ignorance throughout our world. Let's hear it for Alfalit and 50 years more of service.

THE McGOVERN-JONES AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, like most of my colleagues, I had the opportunity to speak to a number of veteran groups on Memorial Day in my district. As always, I was very humbled when I stand before those who have fought for this Nation and the families whose loved ones did not come back from wars.

I would like the House to know that when I talked about the McGovern-Jones amendment to get our troops out of Afghanistan, the statement received very strong applause, showing the very strong support of the veterans of the Third District for getting our troops home from Afghanistan. After my comments, I had many of these veterans come up individually who wanted to

Printed on recycled paper.

talk to me, expressing their support and telling me that they agree with MCGOVERN and myself.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the 26 Republicans who voted in favor of the McGovern-Jones amendment last week. I believe we came within 11 votes of passage. Mr. MCGOVERN and I will continue to fight until there's a definite plan to bring our troops home before 2015.

Bin Laden is gone, and there is zero al Qaeda presence in Afghanistan. We have done our job.

In closing, I would like to quote Leslie Gelb from his May 9 article in The Wall Street Journal: ''Afghanistan is no longer a war about vital American security interests. It is about the failure of America's political elites to face two plain facts: The al Qaeda terrorist threat is no longer centered in that ancient battleground, and the battle against the Taliban is mainly for Afghans themselves.''

Mr. Speaker, I have with me, as I have many times—the true cost of war is those who die, and those who lose their arms and legs, and those who are paralyzed and blind for the rest of their life. Beside me is a very, very frank picture of war. It is an Air Force honor guard at Dover Air Force Base with the officer in charge saluting the transfer case that is covered with the American flag.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, to both parties, how many more have to die in the next 4 or 5 years before we as a Nation and we as a Congress wake up to the fact that Karzai is a corrupt leader? He has a corrupt government. We are spending $8.2 billion a month to prop him up. And yet, Mr. Speaker, on this floor of this House, I've been part of many, many debates where people are saying, well, we've got to cut the senior citizens, we can't keep their programs going; we've got to cut the children so they can't get milk in the morning at school.

We make sure that Karzai gets his $8.2 billion every month in Afghanistan for what we can't even account for.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. MCGOVERN and I will again this summer have an amendment on the floor to bring our troops home from Afghanistan. And I will say to the moms, the dads, the wives, and the husbands who have lost loved ones in Afghanistan, you have won the war. The war is over. Bin Laden is dead, and al Qaeda does not exist in Afghanistan anymore.

So, Mr. Speaker, before I close, as I do always on the floor, as I look at this poster with the flag-draped coffin, I will ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I will ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I will ask God, in His loving arms, to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I will ask God to please bless the House and Senate, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for His people and this great Nation. I will ask God to please give wisdom, strength, and courage to President Obama, that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for this Nation.

And I will say three times, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Almighty God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pray in thanksgiving for the thousands of men and women our Nation honored this past weekend who have given so much of themselves to the service of our Nation. Grant them, living and dead, the peace of Your presence.

We ask Your blessing as well upon the men and women of this, the people's House. May they strive with all their energy and good will to serve our Nation, to work on legislative solutions to the challenges we face in this time, always mindful that they are entrusted especially with the well-being of so many who are powerless. We know, O God, these little ones are of special interest and concern for You.

Bless us this day and every day. And may all that is done within these hallowed Halls be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. CRAVAACK 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.

REPORT ON H.R. 2055, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012

Mr. CULBERSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–94) on the bill (H.R. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

HOUSTON POLICE OFFICER KEVIN WILL

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, peace officers are the last strand of wire in the fence between the law and the lawless. They go forward each day to protect the people and risk their own lives doing so.

Very early Sunday morning, one of Houston's finest, Officer Kevin Will, was investigating a hit-and-run accident when he was run over and killed by a speeding vehicle that had blazed past police barriers. Immediately before being struck, Officer Will yelled for an accident witness to jump out of the way, thus saving the citizen's life just before the officer's life was stolen from him.

Officer Will was 38 years of age and had been a Houston police officer 2 years. He leaves behind a pregnant wife and two step-children.

The driver of the speeding vehicle ignored the safety lights of police cruisers at the accident scene. He was drunk, charged with intoxication, manslaughter of a police officer, evading arrest, and possession of cocaine. The accused killer was in the United States illegally, having been deported at least once before returning to become one of the lawless.

And that's just the way it is.

OUR PRESENT MONETARY SYSTEM: WORKING FOR A FEW AT THE EXPENSE OF THE MANY

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Why are we in debt? We borrow trillions for wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, trillions for tax cuts for the rich. We borrow billions from China and Japan.

We have plenty of money for war, Wall Street, and welfare for the wealthy; but when millions of honest Americans need jobs, need wage increases, need health care, need education, need retirement security, they're told no, we don't have the money.

How is it that the Fed can create trillions of dollars to give to the banks but the U.S. can't meet its needs without going into debt to banks? The financial system works for a few at the expense of the many.

The Founders did not intend for America to be run by big banks and Wall Street. The Constitution put the ability to create money in the hands of Congress. The Fed took away that power in 1913. We need to get that power back to invest in our economy, to create jobs, to put America back to work, to rebuild America without going into debt. We must reclaim our destiny by reclaiming control over the money system.

THE FUTURE OF MEDICARE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Many people didn't notice that a little over 3 weeks ago, the Medicare Trustees Report came out and advised that the Medicare program would in be serious difficulty in the year 2023.

Now you might ask, What is Congress doing about this? We have well over 10 years to react. The Republican budget that was passed a few weeks ago did indeed lay out a pathway for dealing with the problems in the future. Unfortunately, the Democratic leadership in the other body has decided not to take up any type of roadmap or pathway that may lead to a resolution of this problem.

So we are left with the program that was essentially laid out by the President in the Affordable Care Act, and this program relies heavily upon a group called the Independent Payment Advisory Board: 15 people, not elected but appointed by the President, well paid to sit on a board and to deliver to Congress every year a menu of cuts in the amount of money that Medicare may spend.

Now, Congress, true enough, has the ability to accept or reject this menu of cuts, but if Congress rejects it, it must come up with its own plan. If Congress does not agree—and when has that ever happened?—the Secretary of Health and Human Services will have the ability to institute those cuts as planned.

RECOGNIZING CONNOR GUNSBURY

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

Mr. CRAVAACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to give recognition to an extraordinary young man from my district, Connor Gunsbury, an eighth grader from Forestview Middle School in Brainerd, Minnesota.

Connor has advanced to compete this week in the Scripps National Spelling Bee here in Washington, D.C., after passing an extensive writing exam and winning two spelling bees. He will join 257 students from around the country to vie for the honor of being named the country's greatest young speller.

Connor spends 4 hours a day studying his spelling while still remaining active at his church, various sports, playing the trombone in the All-Minnesota Honors Band, and serving his community participating in the Builders Club with his Kiwanis.

Madam Speaker, Connor Gunsbury is a shining example of what young people today can accomplish, and I wish the best as he moves forward in the competition.

MEDICARE

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

Mr. BENISHEK. Madam Speaker, over the past couple weeks, we've seen an increase in the false attacks on this House's plan to save Medicare for future generations and prevent America from falling into an abyss of debt and deficits. These falsehoods represent a new low in political attacks. And to those of you who are trying to scare this country's seniors, I say, Shame on you. America deserves better.

Before coming to Congress this year, I spent 25 years as a physician treating patients in northern Michigan, many of whom were on Medicare. I find it ridiculous that some on the other side of the aisle accuse us of wanting to hurt seniors. The fact is we put forth a plan that ensures our children and grandchildren will have access to Medicare and doesn't change benefits for those at or near retirement. These false attacks are nothing more than a smoke screen from the other side.

The Democrats' plan, ObamaCare, calls for bankruptcy and rationing.

I ask my colleagues on the other side to stop playing politics and do what the American people sent us here to do, work together and face reality.

□ 1410

BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, the Federal Government's highest obligation is to provide for the physical and financial security of the people of the United States. Physical security begins with border security. And the people of Houston have just suffered the loss and tragic death of another Houston police officer, Officer Kevin Will, the sixth Houston police officer to lose his life at the hands of an illegal alien.

I will not rest, the Texas delegation will not rest until the southern border is secure to protect the people of Texas, the people of this Nation, from the drugs, the violence, the gangs, the guns. The criminal element coming across the border has got to be stopped. This is not complicated. It begins with enforcing existing law, with using the resources we have at our disposal to open up sufficient beds to lock up every illegal alien that crosses the border. With the full support of the people that live along the border, with zero tolerance, we can do this. It's being done in Del Rio. It needs to be done up and down the river.

This Congress, this Appropriations Committee, and the new Republican conservative majority in the House is staying focused on this vital mission of national security, beginning with border security, to ensure that no more law officers like Officer Will, no more Americans lose their lives at the hands of illegal aliens.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1645

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

INCREASING STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1954) to implement the President's request to increase the statutory limit on the public debt.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1954

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

SECTION 1. FINDING.

The Congress finds that the President's budget proposal, Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2012, necessitates an increase in the statutory debt limit of $2,406,000,000,000.

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Subsection (b) of section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking

out the dollar limitation contained in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof ''$16,700,000,000,000''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

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

Mr. Speaker, last December, the President's own Fiscal Commission offered a plan to rein in our budget deficits and debt. While I did not support the final package—especially the tax increases it proposed—it did contain several meaningful suggestions for ways to get our Federal spending under control. Yet last February, when the President submitted his budget for 2012, he ignored their advice and provided no plan to rein in deficits and debt. Last month, Standard and Poor's downgraded the outlook for the U.S. credit rating because Washington appeared to have no plan to rein in our budget deficits and debt.

In recent weeks, many congressional Democrats were proving them right when over 100 of them called for an unconditional increase in the U.S. debt limit. They signed a letter calling on their colleagues to establish ''the Democratic position in favor of a clean extension of the debt ceiling,'' something Secretary Geithner has also repeatedly called for.

It's time to come clean with the American people about our deficits and debt. At over $14 trillion, our debt is as large as the entire U.S. economy and is putting the American Dream at risk for future generations. It has become an anchor on economic growth, costing us 1 million jobs at a time when the unemployment rate has not been this high for this long since the Great Depression.

Erskine Bowles, who chaired President Obama's Fiscal Commission and served as Chief of Staff to President Clinton, has said that the era of debt denial is over. While it doesn't appear that all of his Democrat colleagues have gotten the message, with today's vote this House will declare to the American people and to the credit rating agencies that business as usual in Washington is over. Not only is the era of debt denial over, but so is Washington's out-of-control spending.

Today, we are making clear that Republicans will not accept an increase in our Nation's debt limit without substantial spending cuts and real budgetary reforms. This vote, a vote based on legislation I have introduced, will and must fail. Now, most Members aren't happy when they bring a bill to the floor and it fails, but I consider defeating an unconditional increase to be a success because it sends a clear and critical message that the Congress has finally recognized we must immediately begin to rein in America's affection for deficit spending.

Research by international experts clearly demonstrates that spending reforms, not tax increases, are the most effective path to fiscal consolidation. That means that together we must look for responsible ways to tackle our runaway spending. And though it's difficult and not always popular, it requires us to deal with entitlement reforms that are the largest driver of America's deficits, including health care spending programs like Medicare.

We all know that failing to act and address our debt head-on would be very similar to defaulting on our debt. In both cases, we would experience a significant downgrade in our credit rating, which increases interest rates, making payments for things like a car and home loans more expensive. It would also increase the cost of imports, meaning higher gas prices. And it would make an already shaky economy even worse, leading to less job creation.

□ 1650

The greatest threat to the U.S. economy and to international financial markets would be simply increasing the debt limit without cutting a penny of spending. This vote makes clear that deficit reduction will be part of any bill to increase the debt limit and is a necessary part of this process.

A ''no'' vote today is a vote to put us on the path toward exactly what the markets and the American people are demanding, an America that is a strong, reliable, and secure financial investment for the future. I urge all my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this unconditional increase.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Bringing up this bill in this fashion is a ploy so egregious the Republicans have had to spend the last week pleading with Wall Street not to take it seriously and risk our economic recovery.

If Republicans were being truthful, they'd admit they're looking for political cover. But in their doing so, they risk blowing a hole in our Nation's economy. They'd acknowledged that their timing is an effort to change the subject less than a week after their plan to end Medicare was dealt a major setback by voters in a New York special election whose democratic winner will be sworn in tomorrow.

To act in good faith to solve our Nation's fiscal problems, the Republicans should focus not on this ploy but on the budget negotiations being led by the Vice President. Our Nation's debt is indeed a problem that requires serious solutions—not ploys that risk another global financial crisis.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, we better not forget how we got here in the first place. The President, when he raised his hand in January of 2009, inherited a $10.6 trillion debt. Let us not forget history. I know this is like a Kabuki dance today.

You're not only not sincere about this, but this is all process. The American people, the folks in my district, are not interested in process. They're interested in results. What are the results? How does this help the guy or gal on Main Street? That's what we should be talking about.

This bill we know is going to fail. You already told your Wall Street friends, ''Don't worry about it. Don't take it serious.'' That's just like a reality show. The Republicans have warned their Wall Street friends, and as The Wall Street Journal said today, they are in on this ''joke.'' But as in poker, they're not all in.

Alexander Hamilton, who founded my city of Paterson, New Jersey, understood that good credit is integral to being a world power. It is by no means a joke.

Failure to act will have immediate and dire consequences. Now, the world is not going to collapse this afternoon or tomorrow when this legislation goes down in a few hours. The majority is willing to risk all of that in order to play political games to force their failed economic policies. It didn't work in the last 10 years. It's not going to work now.

Mr. Speaker, this is serious business. This is not a joke.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1½ minutes to another member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. There's no more important agenda item currently facing Congress than ensuring America pays its bills and honors its obligations. The accumulated choices of Congresses and administrations, past and present, have created the debt and the need to honor the obligations—like an unfunded war in Iraq that's going to cost trillions of dollars, or an unfunded Medicare prescription drug program both from our Republican friends.

We're not going to default on our debt. With over a hundred of my colleagues, I signed a letter calling for a clean extension and offering to work with the Republican leadership so they wouldn't be held hostage to the most extreme members of their party in order to push through draconian proposals that have no chance of being passed, which would unsettle the markets and do damage to things that Americans care about, like the reckless proposal for ending the Medicaid guarantee to seniors and additional tax cuts that are unaffordable.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership decided not to treat this seriously. They're bringing a bill to the floor which they're not supporting.

They put it on the suspension calendar so it had no chance of passage, and they think somehow this is constructive. Well, it's not.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for us to be serious, to avoid taking legislative hostages. Maybe the Chamber of Commerce thinks that Wall Street is in on the joke that is represented by their legislative ploy here today, but I'm not certain the American public is. It's time to stop the games.

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

I would just say during the 8 years of the Bush administration, the debt limit was raised seven times for a total of $5.365 trillion. According to the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan CBO, the scorer of President's Obama's fiscal year 2012 budget, the debt limit will have to be raised a total of $5.385 trillion during the 4 years he's President. So 8 years versus 4 years. That means that President Obama will have raised the debt limit at twice the pace that President Bush did.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 10 seconds.

I think, Mr. CAMP, Standard and Poor's did not downgrade. They threatened. Let's be accurate.

I now yield 1½ minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. I think those of us who are Members of Congress or within the Beltway understand that this is a political thing that's going on at one of the most serious financial times that our Nation is facing.

I only wonder whether or not our friends and creditors abroad, or those that respect the United States and even try to follow our fiscal ways in thinking that this is the strongest country in the entire world—for them to follow what we are doing, it is an embarrassment to the House, as well as the Senate, that the President of the United States of America would ask that our country be safe from a fiscal point of view by allowing the traditional increase in the debt ceiling. Notwithstanding the political differences we had, we come together as a Nation, not to play games on each other for political reasons, but we come together as a symbol for the free world to understand that if it's the United States of America, you can depend on us.

But now on the suspension calendar—which is an insult to those people who have studied the Constitution—in the House of Representatives, which is reserved for noncontroversial issues, when the whole world knows that this is controversial and is certainly not a subject that should be on a calendar called the suspension calendar.

So we still have some time to rehabilitate ourselves. I don't know how more ridiculous we can get, but I do hope that we avoid this in the future.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, Mr. BRADY from Texas.

□ 1700

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Members, America is undergoing a terribly subpar recovery, one of the worst we've seen; three times worse of an economic recovery than under President Reagan, a worse recovery than even what President Obama promised us when he spent all those hundreds of billions of dollars of the stimulus money. We have 13 million Americans out of work. Our unemployment rate is sky high. And the only reason it's come down a little is that we have fewer people working in the workforce than we have had for a quarter of a century.

One of the strongest signals we can send to consumers and families and to businesses to restore their confidence is to make sure they understand America is going to get its financial house in order. Republicans in Congress are going to send a statement today that America will get its house in order. This vote today basically says we're not going to grant the President an unconditional increase in how much America can borrow. Here is a good reason why.

We took a look at who ran up the debt for America over the years. This chart shows we basically said, Who controls the purse strings? Congress. We took a look at all the debt that's been incurred since World War II, and what it shows is that the debt held by the public, that's by people, by countries like China, like firms in the Federal Reserve Board, 90 percent of the debt that's been run up since World War II has been accrued by Democrats, 10 percent by Republicans.

Now, that doesn't leave us, as Republicans, off the hook. As a matter of fact, we're committed to lowering this debt and getting control of spending. But there is a special obligation by our Democrat friends and the President to get this spending under control, to put discipline on the size of government, to restore some financial soundness, to, in effect, cut up the credit cards. That's what Republicans are committed to do. That's what Americans, poll after poll, say we need to do as a Nation. That's why a ''no'' vote on this unconditional debt increase is the right vote, not just for the country but for our future.

Mr. LEVIN. How much time is there on each side, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 14½ minutes. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 13 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, the ranking member on the Budget Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a political stunt. I just heard my friend from Texas on the Republican side say Republicans wanted to tear up the credit card. It was just a few weeks ago when the Republican budget passed this House. All but four Republicans voted for it. Let me show you what that did to our credit card.

Here it is. We are at about $14 trillion in debt. The budget all but four Republicans voted for takes us up toward $23 trillion, $24 trillion in debt. An $8 trillion increase in the national debt by passing the Republican budget, so that clearly this isn't about tearing up the credit card.

What is this about? This is about threatening to default on the full faith and credit of the United States unless we put into place the Republican budget, including their plan to end the Medicare guarantee and to slash Medicare benefits. That's what this is all about. They've said, Whoa, we're going to hold this whole thing up until we get our way.

Let me tell you what their way would do to seniors. And we've seen it before on the floor of the House. What it means is that seniors will be paying thousands and thousands of dollars more for Medicare or getting their benefits slashed beginning in 2012. And it gets worse and worse and worse, so that by the year 2030 you're talking about seniors having to pay $12,000 more for their Medicare because the support they're getting is going down, while the costs in the private market, which the Republican plan forces them to go into, go up and up and up. So while the costs they face go up and up and up, the help they get under Medicare goes down, down, down, and they're left holding the bill.

What's been interesting in the last couple weeks in connection with this debt ceiling debate is to hear these Republican proposals that say, Hey, don't worry about it. You know what? We'll pay China. We'll pay our overseas foreign creditors on our bonds. We'll take care of them. But guess what? We don't have to pay our full faith and credit on our obligations to America's seniors. We don't have to pay Medicare. We don't have to pay Social Security. Pay off the bond holders. Take care of them. But let's follow through on this plan to decimate Medicare. And at the end of the day, that's what this is all about.

Because we all understand that we've got to get the deficit under control. We're having negotiations with the Vice President to come up with a responsible, balanced plan. But you're trying to force the Republican plan, which Newt Gingrich just the other day acknowledges was a radical right-wing piece of social engineering, until of course he was bludgeoned by the right wing to withdraw his statement. He was calling the shots as they were. He was saying, You know what? This isn't such a good idea.

And what's really outrageous about this charade is you are now threatening the entire U.S. economy in order

to get your way on a radical right-wing Medicare plan that's bad for America's seniors.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1½ minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I came to Washington because I knew that we had a debt problem. But you know what? Once I got here and I started getting all the facts, I realized that we didn't have a debt problem. We have a debt crisis. We are $14.2 trillion in debt. And you know what? That number is even hard to comprehend, it's so large.

Over and over we hear from economists, both conservative and liberal, that we've got less than 5 years to turn things around or the United States is going to sink under all this debt. We've seen what has happened in Greece and Ireland, and I reject that future for the United States.

The time is now to fix this, because we're out of time and we have an opportunity to change for the good the way Washington is spending. But it doesn't seem the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue thinks that we should change anything. They're happy to keep kicking the can down the road. But you know what? The road has run out. In fact, the administration and over 100 Democrats in this Congress want a straight up or down vote on the debt ceiling. Well, that's what we're going to get today.

And when this measure to raise the Nation's debt limit fails on the House floor tonight, we will be sending the White House a message loud and clear: You will not get another blank check from us, Mr. President. That's because I and 87 of my freshman colleagues were sent here to Washington with strict marching orders to change the borrow-and-spend cycle that is bringing our country down.

Tonight, the people back home can see that we listened to them and that we are acting for them.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. BLACK. The American people reject the idea of a clean debt limit vote and so will the House tonight. Enough is enough.

The gig is up, Mr. President. So now is the time to get serious: Get serious about ending this debt; get serious about ending Washington's spending addiction; and get serious about getting this country back on track.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to address their comments to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), a member of our leadership and a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the last thing that we need right now is for our Republican colleagues to play Russian roulette with a recovering economy by threatening to default on America's bills and triggering an escalation of interest rates and mortgage rates that will have repercussions on every single American family, and certainly on every sector of our economy. Yet that's what we have today.

Republicans have presented a bill that they've said they're going to vote against. So this whole charade, which is costing taxpayers money because we have to pay for the lights, for the printing, for all the Members of Congress and our staffs who are working, we have to pay for this so we can simply send a message that we're going to vote ''no.''

□ 1710

The New York Times further tells us today that Republican leaders have ''privately assured Wall Street executives that this [vote] is a show.'' Furthermore, they cite that an executive from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce tells us that ''Wall Street is in on the joke.''

The reality is that what our colleagues on the Republican side are trying to do is furiously try to deflect the public's attention from what they recklessly tried to do to Medicare by ending it, because that is in their proposal in their budget. They are doing everything they can to try to get people to stop focusing on the fact that seniors are being asked to pay for this debt by getting less when it comes to Medicare and certainly every single American as they age into seniority as well.

Mr. Speaker, every family in America has to balance its checkbook. They have to do so responsibly. They have to pay the mortgage and pay the credit card bills. This Congress should do the same. This is not the time to play jokes. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this resolution.

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

I would say that the Medicare trustees have said that Medicare goes broke in 2024.

So if you support an unconditional debt limit increase, as 100 Democrats wrote to their leaders and asked to be made a position of the Democrat Caucus, that does nothing about preserving and protecting Medicare for the future.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. No, I will not yield.

So I would say that by supporting an unconditional increase in the debt limit, as more than 100 wrote in a letter to their leaders, again, it would do nothing about preserving that program for the future.

At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In my district people ask, what is this vote about, this debt ceiling vote, and so I have created a simple chart that just says it as plainly as we can. We are spending $3.5 trillion in the country each year, and we are bringing in 2.2 trillion.

It doesn't work for your family, it doesn't work for your business, and it's not working for the country. In order to make up the difference, we have to borrow that money except that our bankers are saying no more, just as your bankers would say no more. So we are printing the money to make this system work. It's a scheme that's not working.

This chart in the upper right-hand corner says that the whole economy collapses about 2038 so OMB and CBO both are saying that we must take care of the spending problem that we have in this country; that's what the debt ceiling is about. We have a law that says we can't borrow more than a certain amount of money.

If we just extend with no provisions for reform, then we are going to continue to spend this much money every year that we don't have. So let's take care of the problems; let's do structural reforms in the way that we are spending our money. Let's do structural reforms on our budget; let's get it under control so that we don't give our kids a failed economy.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to a member of our committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. Thank you very much, Mr. LEVIN.

The gentleman just raised the issue in question. He said, let me tell you what this is about. Well, let me tell you what this is about. I just came from the Holyoke Soldiers Home this morning; 287 veterans. I represent the North Hampton veterans hospital. That's what this vote is about.

The gentlelady from Tennessee, I wish she was here on January 20 of 2001 when that political party spent their day and night saying, yes, Mr. President, to George Bush. They went along with everything he said. They never even bothered to read article I of the Constitution.

This vote is about one thing and one thing only: paying your bills. They ran up the debt, and now they don't want to pay their bills.

January 19, 2001, Bill Clinton said goodbye to the country, a $5.7 trillion surplus on hand, $2.3 trillion in tax cuts, a war in Iraq over weapons of mass destruction, a drug prescription benefit called part D, and they are talking about who owes the bill? This is about responsibility. This is about those VA centers. This is about those men and women in Iraq that need to be equipped with the best possible weaponry. This is about paying the credit card bill that has come in from what they did for all of those years.

I would debate any member of the Republican Party—you choose the

forum—in the House or the Senate, and we will go through what those 8 years were about. Count me in.

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

I am certainly concerned about the last 8 years, but I am more concerned about the last 2. I think we have got the third year in a row of trillion dollar deficits, a Presidential budget that doubled the debt in 5, tripled it in 10.

I quote from the Standard and Poor's report on the United States debt:

''Because very large deficits and rising government indebtedness and the path to addressing these is not clear to us, we have revised our outlook on the long-term rating to negative from stable.''

The path to addressing these is not clear. We think it absolutely essential that we not have an unconditional increase in the debt limit, that we have the spending reductions, that we have the structural reforms that we so desperately need in this country.

We have 110 Members of the other party who wrote a letter saying we want an unconditional increase in the debt; just keep spending. Don't bring in any spending reductions, don't bring any long-term reforms; just keep going the way we have been going.

Well, Standard and Poor's says that if we don't address this issue—and what does that mean that ''we have revised our outlook on the long-term rating to negative from stable''? It means buying a house is more expensive; buying a car is more expensive. Certainly our ability to sell our bonds around the world will be very difficult to do and make it that much more expensive.

A downgrade in our debt limit would have the same impact as not increasing the debt limit at all. Financial markets would be disrupted, borrowing costs would skyrocket, the dollar would plunge, driving up the cost of imports like gasoline and causing higher inflation. It would wreak havoc on our economy.

RESEARCH UPDATE: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ''AAA/A–1+'' RATING AFFIRMED; OUTLOOK REVISED TO NEGATIVE

OVERVIEW

We have affirmed our ''AAA/A–1+'' sovereign credit rating on the United States of America.

The economy of the U.S. is flexible and highly diversified, the country's effective monetary policies have supported output growth while containing inflationary pressures, and a consistent global preference for the U.S. dollar over all other currencies gives the country unique external liquidity.

Because the U.S. has, relative to its ''AAA'' peers, what we consider to be very large budget deficits and rising government indebtedness and the path to addressing these is not clear to us, we have revised our outlook on the long-term rating to negative from stable.

We believe there is a material risk that U.S. policymakers might not reach an agreement on how to address medium- and long-term budgetary challenges by 2013; if an agreement is not reached and meaningful implementation does not begin by then, this would in our view render the U.S. fiscal profile meaningfully weaker than that of peer ''AAA'' sovereigns.

RATING ACTION

On April 18, 2011, Standard & Poor's Ratings Services affirmed its ''AAA'' long-term and ''A–1+'' short-term sovereign credit ratings on the United States of America and revised its outlook on the long-term rating to negative from stable.

RATIONALE

Our ratings on the U.S. rest on its high-income, highly diversified, and flexible economy, backed by a strong track record of prudent and credible monetary policy. The ratings also reflect our view of the unique advantages stemming from the dollar's preeminent place among world currencies. Although we believe these strengths currently outweigh what we consider to be the U.S.'s meaningful economic and fiscal risks and large external debtor position, we now believe that they might not fully offset the credit risks over the next two years at the ''AAA'' level.

The U.S. is among the most flexible high-income nations, with both adaptable labor markets and a long track record of openness to capital flows. In addition, its public sector uses a smaller share of national income than those of most ''AAA'' rated countries—including its closest peers, the U.K., France, Germany, and Canada (all AAA/Stable/A–1+)—which implies greater revenue flexibility.

Furthermore, the U.S. dollar is the world's most used currency, which provides the U.S. with unique external flexibility; the vast majority of U.S. trade flows and external liabilities are denominated in its own dollars. Recent depreciation of the currency has not materially affected this position, and we do not expect this to change in the medium term (see ''Après Le Déluge, The U.S. Dollar Remains The Key International Currency,'' March 10, 2010, RatingsDirect).

Despite these exceptional strengths, we note the U.S.'s fiscal profile has deteriorated steadily during the past decade and, in our view, has worsened further as a result of the recent financial crisis and ensuing recession. Moreover, more than two years after the beginning of the recent crisis, U.S. policymakers have still not agreed on a strategy to reverse recent fiscal deterioration or address longer-term fiscal pressures.

In 2003–2008, the U.S.'s general (total) government deficit fluctuated between 2% and 5% of GDP. Already noticeably larger than that of most ''AAA'' rated sovereigns, it ballooned to more than 11% in 2009 and has yet to recover.

On April 13, President Barack Obama laid out his Administration's medium-term fiscal consolidation plan, aimed at reducing the cumulative unified federal deficit by US$4 trillion in 12 years or less. A key component of the Administration's strategy is to work with Congressional leaders over the next two months to develop a commonly agreed upon program to reach this target. The President's proposals envision reducing the deficit via both spending cuts and revenue increases, and the adoption of a ''debt failsafe'' legislative mechanism that would trigger an across-the-board spending reduction if, by 2014, budget projections show that federal debt to GDP has not yet stabilized and is not expected to decline in the second half of the current decade.

The Obama Administration's proposed spending cuts include reducing non-security discretionary spending to levels similar to those proposed by the Fiscal Commission in December 2010, holding growth in base security (excluding war expenditure) spending below inflation, and further cost-control measures related to health care programs. Revenue would be increased via both tax reform and allowing the 2001 and 2003 income and estate tax cuts to expire in 2012 as currently scheduled—though only for high-income households. We note that the President advocated the latter proposal last year before agreeing with Republicans to extend the cuts beyond their previously scheduled 2011 expiration. The compromise agreed upon in December likely provides short-term support for the economic recovery, but we believe it also weakens the U.S.'s fiscal outlook and, in our view, reduces the likelihood that Congress will allow these tax cuts to expire in the near future. We also note that previously enacted legislative mechanisms meant to enforce budgetary discipline on future Congresses have not always succeeded.

Key members in the U.S. House of Representatives have also advocated fiscal tightening of a similar magnitude, US$4.4 trillion, during the coming 10 years, but via different methods. House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan's plan seeks to balance the federal budget by 2040, in part by cutting non-defense spending. The plan also includes significantly reducing the scope of Medicare and Medicaid, while bringing top individual and corporate tax rates lower than those under the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts.

We view President Obama's and Congressman Ryan's proposals as the starting point of a process aimed at broader engagement, which could result in substantial and lasting U.S. government fiscal consolidation. That said, we see the path to agreement as challenging because the gap between the parties remains wide. We believe there is a significant risk that Congressional negotiations could result in no agreement on a medium-term fiscal strategy until after the fall 2012 Congressional and Presidential elections. If so, the first budget proposal that could include related measures would be Budget 2014 (for the fiscal year beginning Oct. 1, 2013), and we believe a delay beyond that time is possible.

Standard & Poor's takes no position on the mix of spending and revenue measures the Congress and the Administration might conclude are appropriate. But for any plan to be credible, we believe that it would need to secure support from a cross-section of leaders in both political parties.

If U.S. policymakers do agree on a fiscal consolidation strategy, we believe the experience of other countries highlights that implementation could take time. It could also generate significant political controversy, not just within Congress or between Congress and the Administration, but throughout the country. We therefore think that, assuming an agreement between Congress and the President, there is a reasonable chance that it would still take a number of years before the government reaches a fiscal position that stabilizes its debt burden. In addition, even if such measures are eventually put in place, the initiating policymakers or subsequently elected ones could decide to at least partially reverse fiscal consolidation.

In our baseline macroeconomic scenario of near 3% annual real growth, we expect the general government deficit to decline gradually but remain slightly higher than 6% of GDP in 2013. As a result, net general government debt would reach 84% of GDP by 2013. In our macroeconomic forecast's optimistic scenario (assuming near 4% annual real growth), the fiscal deficit would fall to 4.6% of GDP by 2013, but the U.S.'s net general government debt would still rise to almost 80% of GDP by 2013. In our pessimistic scenario (a mild, one-year double-dip recession in 2012), the deficit would be 9.1%, while net debt would surpass 90% by 2013. Even in our optimistic scenario, we believe the U.S.'s fiscal profile would be less robust than those of

other ''AAA'' rated sovereigns by 2013. (For all of the assumptions underpinning our three forecast scenarios, see ''U.S. Risks To The Forecast: Oil We Have to Fear Is . . .,'' March 15, 2011, RatingsDirect.

Additional fiscal risks we see for the U.S. include the potential for further extraordinary official assistance to large players in the U.S. financial or other sectors, along with outlays related to various federal credit programs. We estimate that it could cost the U.S. government as much as 3.5% of GDP to, appropriately capitalize and relaunch Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, two financial institutions now under federal control, in addition to the 1% of GDP already invested (see ''U.S. Government Cost To Resolve And Relaunch Fannie Mae And Freddie Mac Could Approach $700 Billion,'' Nov. 4, 2010, RatingsDirect). The potential for losses on federal direct and guaranteed loans (such as student loans) is another material fiscal risk, in our view. Most importantly, we believe the risks from the U.S. financial sector are higher than we considered them to be before 2008, as our downward revisions of our Banking Industry Country Risk Assessment (BICRA) on the U.S. to Group 3 from Group 2 in December 2009 and to Group 2 from Group 1 in December 2008 reflect (see ''Banking Industry Country Risk Assessments,'' March 8, 2011, and ''Banking Industry Country Risk Assessment: United States of America,'' Feb. 1, 2010, both on RatingsDirect). In line with these views, we now estimate the maximum aggregate, up-front fiscal cost to the U.S. government of resolving potential financial sector asset impairment in a stress scenario at 34% of GDP compared with our estimate of 26% in 2007.

Beyond the short- and medium-term fiscal challenges, we view the U.S.'s unfunded entitlement programs (such as Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid) to be the main source of long-term fiscal pressure. These, entitlements already account for almost half of federal spending (an estimated 42% in fiscal-year 2011), and we project that percentage to continue increasing as long as these entitlement programs remain as they currently exist (see ''Global Aging 2010: In The U.S., Going Gray Will Cost A Lot More Green,'' Oct. 25, 2010, RatingsDirect). In addition, the U.S.'s net external debt level (as we narrowly define it), approaching 300% of current account receipts in 2011, demonstrates a high reliance on foreign financing. The U.S.'s external indebtedness by this measure is one of the highest of all the sovereigns we rate.

While thus far U.S. policymakers have been unable to agree on a fiscal consolidation strategy, the U.S.'s closest ''AAA'' rated peers have already begun implementing theirs. The U.K., for example, suffered a recession almost twice as severe as that in the U.S. (U.K. GDP declined 4.9% in real terms in 2009, while the U.S.'s dropped 2.6%). In addition, the U.K.'s net general government indebtedness has risen in tandem with that of the U.S. since 2007. In June 2010, the U.K. began to implement a fiscal consolidation plan that we believe credibly sets the country's general government deficit on a medium-term downward path, retreating below 5% of GDP by 2013.

We also expect that by 2013, France's austerity program, which it is already implementing, will reduce that country's deficit, which never rose to the levels of the U.S. or U.K. during the recent recession, to slightly below the U.K. deficit. Germany, which suffered a recession of similar magnitude to that in the U.K. (but has enjoyed a much stronger recovery), enacted a constitutional limit on fiscal deficits in 2009 and we believe its general government deficit was already at 3% of GDP last year and will likely decrease further. Meanwhile, Canada, the only sovereign of the peer group to suffer no major financial institution failures requiring direct government assistance during the crisis, enjoys by far the lowest net general government debt of the five peers (we estimate it at 34% of GDP this year), largely because of an unbroken string of balanced-or-better general government budgetary outturns from 1997 through 2008. Canada's general government deficit never exceeded 4% of GDP during the recent recession, and we believe it will likely return to less than 0.5% of GDP by 2013.

OUTLOOK

The negative outlook on our rating on the U.S. sovereign signals that we believe there is at least a one-in-three likelihood that we could lower our long-term rating on the U.S. within two years. The outlook reflects our view of the increased risk that the political negotiations over when and how to address both the medium- and long-term fiscal challenges will persist until at least after national elections in 2012.

Some compromise that achieves agreement on a comprehensive budgetary consolidation program—containing deficit reduction measures in amounts near those recently proposed, and combined with meaningful steps toward implementation by 2013—is our baseline assumption and could lead us to revise the outlook back to stable. Alternatively, the lack of such an agreement or a significant further fiscal deterioration for any reason could lead us to lower the rating.

Standard & Poor's will hold a global teleconference call and Web cast today—April 18, 2011—at 11:30 a.m. New York time (4:30 p.m. London time). For dial-in and streaming audio details, please go to www.standardandpoors.com/cmlive.

RELATED CRITERIA AND RESEARCH

Sovereign Credit Ratings: A Primer, May 29, 2008.

RATINGS LIST

Ratings Affirmed; Outlook Action

United States of America (Unsolicited Ratings) (To—From) Sovereign Credit Rating (AAA/Negative/A–1+) (AAA/Stable/A–1+)

Ratings Affirmed

United States of America (Unsolicited Ratings) Senior Unsecured (AAA)

United States of America (Unsolicited Ratings) Transfer & Convertibility Assessment (AAA)

This unsolicited rating(s) was initiated by Standard & Poor's. It may be based solely on publicly available information and may or may not involve the participation of the issuer. Standard & Poor's has used information from sources believed to be reliable based on standards established in our Credit Ratings Information and Data Policy but does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, or completeness of any information used.

Complete ratings information is available to subscribers of RatingsDirect on the Global Credit Portal at www.globalcreditportal.com. All ratings affected by this rating action can be found on Standard & Poor's public Web site at www.standardandpoors.com. Use the Ratings search box located in the left column.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 5 seconds.

Mr. CAMP, you were the ones who said just keep spending. We don't say that.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Today's vote represents just one more step in the Republican effort to dismantle Medicare. This contrived procedure, demanding an extraordinary two-thirds vote, right after the Republican majority announces they won't vote for it, is just a gimmick. You don't have to be much of a math whiz to know if you don't have half the votes in this body, you probably are not going to get two-thirds of the vote.

But it's not about the vote. It's about Republicans, who are withholding their support of an eventual necessary increase in the limit, by demanding that any agreement on that include a weakening of Medicare by imposing something like the Ryan Republican Medicare voucher plan that they all voted for, or some other scheme, to just let Medicare wither on the vine.

Republicans are willing to jeopardize the full faith and credit of the United States of America, exposing us to great potential economic harm. They think the President will once again yield to their ransom demands, as he did last December, by yielding on more tax breaks for billionaires.

Don't yield to this maneuver, Mr. President. Say ''no'' to gimmicks and say ''yes'' to Medicare, one of the best programs ever initiated by this Congress to ensure a little retirement security.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today, not talking about something as the other side would contend is a joke. This is a very serious issue, and I rise in opposition to an increase in the debt ceiling that would just give the President another couple of trillion dollars to keep spending the way he has been spending for the last 2 years.

I think Americans across the country recognize that this wild spending spree the President has been on the last 2 years has to come to an end, and it's going to start here on this House floor where we are going to finally invoke fiscal discipline. And, of course, over 100 Members of the other side have asked for a clean vote. They want another trillion to keep going along, maybe 2 trillion, to keep spending money that we don't have.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. In fact, if you look at their plan, their plan not only will double the national debt in 5 years, which I guess they are okay with, but it also allows Medicare to go bankrupt. We are not going to sit by and let Medicare go bankrupt. We are not going to sit by and let them keep spending money that we don't have.

We are finally going to say enough is enough.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. We are going to put spending controls in place. Frankly, it would be irresponsible to increase the debt ceiling without reforms that actually start cutting spending and putting our country back on a path to a balanced budget.

□ 1720

Now maybe some on the other side don't want to see us get to a balanced budget, which is why they've dramatically increased spending over the last 4 years up until when Speaker PELOSI was fired. But, frankly, the American people have said, enough is enough, stop the spending binge, enough of giving the President this uncontrolled use of the American credit card. Let's start reining in spending. Let's put those controls in place. Let's get our country back on a path of fiscal sanity so we don't have these groups like S&P saying that they will downgrade the bond rating of the United States of America. That's not something we can tolerate.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. Maybe the gentleman on the other side might want to, and I'm sure during your time you'll have the opportunity to address that, but, frankly, what we've got to do is start installing fiscal discipline back in this House, and we're going to start doing it now. It means no more blank checks and no more unbridled spending. The President is going to have an opportunity to join us in that debate. But, frankly, it starts tonight, and we say we're not going to keep giving that credit card limit to the President without real reforms.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the whip, Mr. HOYER from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Unfortunately, this is a serious issue on which serious time has not been allotted because you put this on suspension. This is a serious issue. Our country is in crisis from a fiscal standpoint.

Now I wanted the gentleman to yield because I don't think the gentleman has any idea what the facts are. Eighty-nine percent increase in the debt under Ronald Reagan. He could have vetoed every one of those bills. Under George Bush, 115 percent increase in the debt. Under Bill Clinton, less than 40.

Ladies and gentlemen, this issue is an important issue that is being treated not as an adult. This is not the adult moment of which Speaker BOEHNER spoke. And you didn't mention that the budget you voted for, I presume, I'm not sure, increased the debt by $1.9 trillion between now and October 1 of this year.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is not an honest debate. This is not an honest proposal. This is a serious issue. TARP was a serious issue, and the American public didn't want to see it passed. And had it not passed, we would have gone into depression. Who said that? George Bush, Hank Paulson, the Republican Secretary of the Treasury, and Ben Bernanke, the Republican appointed head of the Federal Reserve. It was a tough vote.

And so what did we do for America? We came together, Republicans and Democrats, more Democrats supporting the Republican President's request than his own party, to save America from depression.

We need to deal with this issue, ladies and gentlemen, of America seriously, not in 20-minute debates on each side, not as a simplistic suggestion that somehow President Obama caused this. One point three trillion in wars we haven't paid for, a drug prescription bill we haven't paid for, tax cuts that your party voted for—not mine—that we didn't pay for. Should we have tax cuts? That's fine. But we ought to pay for them, not have my great-grandson, who was just born a week ago, pay for it. That's what you're doing.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to vote ''no'' on this. We ought to vote for this. We ought to have a clean bill. And we ought to have both sides coming together and saying America needs this for debts that we have incurred. What I tell town meetings is, it's like you go to Macy's, you take out your credit card, and you charge $200 worth of goods. And then you go home that night, your husband or your wife and you sit down and say, look, we've got too much debt, we need to have a debt limit. Put a $100 debt limit on us. And then Macy's sends you a bill, and you send them back a letter and say, no, I've got a debt limit. It's 100 bucks. So you send them a check for $100. They send back a letter saying, hey, no more credit, and guess what? We're suing you.

This debt limit extension is for what we have already incurred. This debt limit extension vote is about whether or not we are going to pay our bills. But I will tell you this, we'll see how many of your folks vote for paying our bills.

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

Mr. LEVIN. The whip is so eloquent, I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. I'm looking forward to seeing how many of your folks are going to say, yes, we need to pay our bills, America. We need to be a good debtor as well as a good creditor. We're going to see how many of your folks vote. I've got just a sneaking suspicion it's not going to be very many, if any. It's a good demagogue vote, frankly, ladies and gentlemen. And if we vote for it, guess what? Oh, you're for raising the debt limit without any fiscal discipline.

Well, when we were in charge, when the President of the United States wouldn't let you do some of the things you wanted to do, Bill Clinton was there to veto things, we had a surplus for 4 years in a row, and we didn't increase the debt once.

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

Mr. HOYER. Under George Bush, we increased it seven times. I urge a ''no'' vote on this irresponsible piece of legislation that should have been handled in a bipartisan fashion.

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

One hundred fourteen members of the other party signed a letter to the leader who just spoke and asked for an unconditional increase in the debt limit. I know that's not maybe a fact they want to acknowledge now, but it is so important that we have a clear path forward on this given what the rating agencies are saying about our debt. They're saying it's not clear how we are going to deal with our indebtedness.

It is so important that we set forward that when we address this issue, there are going to be the kind of spending reductions and structural reforms we need. That is going to have to be part of this discussion. We can't continue to have it clouded with this idea that we might have a debt limit increase without any of those. That's why it is so important to send this very strong signal today.

I hope all of the members of your party join me in voting ''no'' on this bill.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I appreciate the chairman for yielding me this moment to address the American people and the students that might be watching on TV or here in the gallery.

Once again, you see the problem that we have here in Washington. We cannot have a fact-based conversation with the American people, which they desperately want. I talked to a lot of students back at home, and I said, how many of you are going to have a summer job? A lot of them raised their hands. I said, okay, we're going to say you're going to make $220 a week. But you've got a problem. We're going to take your credit card, and you're going to spend $370 a week. How long do you think you can do that as you're saving up for college, as you're saving for that car or that piece of computer equipment? Can you do that all summer? The kids look at me and say, of course not. Don't be dumb. You can't do that.

Then I say, do you know what? Add 10 zeros to it. Add 10 zeros to that, and that's exactly what we are doing here in the United States Congress, what we have been doing repeatedly, both sides of the aisle, with both administrations. It doesn't matter. We have got to get this under control. Because when you add those 10 zeros, just like my friend from New Mexico was talking about, we take in $2.2 trillion a year, we spend $3.7 trillion a year.

It's time to tear up that credit card, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LEVIN. How much time remains from our minimum 20 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 4½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. BERG).

Mr. BERG. Mr. Speaker, every time I talk to North Dakotans, one message is clear: Washington is on an unsustainable path, and it needs change. Out-of-control spending is unacceptable. A rising debt is unacceptable. And allowing this debt to grow without reform is unacceptable.

This country borrows $4 billion a day. Fixing this mess will require real reforms. It requires a serious, honest conversation about where this country stands today and how we want to leave this country for the next generation. It's irresponsible to leave our children with a Nation that has a mountain of debt.

□ 1730

It is unacceptable to increase our debt without making any attempt to reduce it. We cannot continue to do the same thing over and over and expect different results.

I've heard the North Dakota people, and I will not support any debt limit increase that does not contain significant spending cuts and budgetary reforms. It's time to stop the reckless spending. It's time to reduce the size of government. It's time to enact policies that will put America back on track.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I signed that letter, I led that letter, and I will tell you why I did. America faces two challenges. One is we must pay our bills. Whether those bills were incurred for a war that you supported or you opposed; whether those bills were incurred by a Congress you served in or you didn't; whether it was for a prescription drug program that you were for or against, a bill incurred, an obligation incurred, is an obligation that must be paid. That is the fundamental responsibility that I acknowledge as a citizen, that I acknowledge as an American, that I acknowledge as a Congressman.

Second, this question of a long-term deficit reduction plan, we need it. You are right. We understand that.

Where is it?

You have the opportunity in this legislation to present your plan that will get us on a glide path to fiscal balance. It's not here, suggesting either you don't have a plan or the plan you want to present doesn't have the support of the American people.

We are playing Russian roulette with a loaded gun in the American economy, and the deficit clock is ticking. This requires a substantial response. The approach taken, a suspension vote, trivializes both our short-term obligation to pay our bills and our long-term obligation to have a long-term deficit reduction plan.

And the fact that this is done, being sponsored by folks who immediately say they are against what they proposed and then quietly making phone calls to Wall Street saying they are for what they just voted against, is what is Washington business as usual that people are tired of and is not solving our problem.

The default clock is ticking.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I would ask the gentleman from Michigan, do you have other speakers?

Mr. CAMP. Not at this time.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, if the Treasury had a dollar for every time someone says they want to cut the deficit, we wouldn't have one. So let's stop talking about cutting the deficit and talk about how we can cut the deficit.

Let's let Medicare negotiate the price of prescription drugs, rather than pay whatever the drug companies demand, and save $300 billion over 10 years.

Let's stop occupying Iraq and Afghanistan and paying their bills, to the tune of $110 billion a year, and bring the troops home.

Let's stop giving $80 billion in tax breaks to the oil companies that made record profits last year.

Let's require people who make more than $1 million a year to pay just a little bit more to help reduce this problem.

And let's have sensible reductions in other departments of government.

This is not a time for us to be providing cover to a political party. It is a time for us to cover the obligations to our seniors, not by abolishing Medicare but by improving it, to cover obligations to our veterans, and cover obligations to the country. We will come back in a couple of weeks and do what we should be doing tonight, which is to raise this debt ceiling and protect this country.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield our final minute to our leader, who will close on our behalf, Ms. PELOSI, from the great State of California.

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you, Mr. LEVIN, for your compliment to my great State of California.

Mr. Speaker, when I first heard this legislation was coming to the floor, I anticipated with some positive thoughts of, yes, this is the right thing to do. America must pay its bills. We know how to do that. We want to go forward, assuring the American people that, when we decide not to default on our debt, we are showing our strength, even though it may be difficult for people to support that.

Then I heard that it was going to come up like this. On Sunday, they told us it would be up on Tuesday and that the bill is predicated on a false premise. It says the Congress finds that the President's budget proposal, Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2012, necessitates an increase in the statutory debt of $2.4 trillion.

Well, that is just absolutely not the case. First of all, that bill never passed the House and it never passed the United States Senate. What did pass the House, though, was the Republican budget plan, which abolishes Medicare, gives tax increases to Big Oil, gives tax breaks to corporations sending jobs overseas, weakens the middle class, and does not create jobs. And, in fact, increases the deficit by $1.9 trillion. It increases the deficit by $1.9 trillion.

So what are we doing here today? What are we doing? The Republicans have introduced a bill which they have now resoundingly said that they will oppose. So where is the good-faith effort here? We are, I believe, in a good-faith effort, in a bipartisan way, House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans, working with Vice President BIDEN to find ways to make sure we don't find ourselves in this situation again.

As a mother and as a grandmother, I have absolutely no intention of passing any bills, personal or official, on to my children or grandchildren. And let me say, the Democrats know how to clean up the debt. We have had to do it before. The Reagan-Bush debt that President Clinton inherited was a massive debt, and because we took the vote for the economic plan in 1993, we were on a path to fiscal soundness. The last four budgets of the Clinton administration were in balance or in surplus. I believe the Democratic whip, Mr. HOYER, addressed these numbers earlier, and I associate myself with his remarks and his passion on this subject.

Coming into the Bush years, President Clinton put us on a path of $5.6 trillion, a trajectory of $5.6 trillion in surplus. One of the biggest turnarounds in the fiscal situation in our country happened under President Bush. So all of this talk about deficits and their immorality and the rest, I agree. But where was everybody when President Bush was giving tax breaks to the wealthiest people in our country, which did not create jobs, giving away the store to the pharmaceutical industry in the Medicare part D bill, at a tremendous cost to the deficit, and not paying for the wars?

Again, we place our men and women in uniform in harm's way. They make us the home of the brave and the land of the free. We want them to have what they need. They want us to pay for it. We owe them an obligation to build a future worthy of their sacrifice, and that future does not contain unlimited growing debt, unlimited growing debt.

Never before in the history of our country have we lowered taxes for the rich while we were at war. This is an all-time first. So here we are. We inherit this debt of the Bush administration. That's why we are in the situation we are in.

So as our colleagues try to characterize this as we're raising the debt limit so there can be more spending, no, we're not. We're avoiding default of the massive debt accrued during the Bush administration. That's why we are here.

So to predicate this legislation, which I really, coming out of last week, thought maybe it was something I would support, unencumbered legislation so that we would pay our bills and not be a deadbeat nation, instead they predicate it again on a false premise.

The facts are these: The Republican budget did pass this House; the Republican budget. They just want to change the subject from Medicare. That's all. They just want to change the subject from Medicare, so let's just bring this up at the drop of a hat in the first hours back from Memorial Day. They want to change the subject from Medicare.

But the facts are these: In their Republican budget, which is the predicate for this legislation, they abolish Medicare. Not only that, they make prescription drugs more expensive for seniors.

□ 1740

They eliminate prevention services for seniors, services which make them healthier and lower costs to us. They do all of this while also, as far as the children are concerned, cutting education for our children, the reading teachers for our children, making college more expensive for nearly 10 million young adults—all of this a travesty in terms of our hopes and aspirations of middle-income families in our country.

Then to add insult to that injury, they come in here with a bill that they have to bring up immediately so that they can oppose it. Well, even the Chamber of Commerce has said, We're all in on the joke, but it just isn't that funny if you're a struggling family in America, hoping to keep your job, your home, to be able to send your children to college, save for the future, have some confidence about your economic security. If you're a senior or others who depend on Medicare, to have it abolished hurts your economic as well as your health security.

So this is about priorities. A budget should be a statement of our national values, what is important to us as a country: the education of our children, the respect of the dignified retirement for our seniors, job creation, in that we have a moral obligation to create jobs so we have jobs for our workers and so they can have better futures, as well as to make our country more competitive, reducing the deficit. We've done it once, the Democrats did. We can do it again, hopefully in a bipartisan way under the auspices that have been created for this purpose. We are right in the middle of it. We come in and say, Okay, let's introduce a bill based on a false premise, and then let's all oppose it. Well, I'm glad you're opposing it, because you're opposing the false premise that you have in this bill.

Let's get serious. Let's get serious about this. The American people are crying out for help.

Do you know that the tax cuts on which this deficit has grown, the tax cuts to the wealthy, did not create jobs? They increased the deficit. They did not create jobs. More jobs were created in the second year of the Obama administration in the private sector than in the 8 years of the Bush administration. So this talk that tax cuts to the high end were going to create jobs just didn't happen. We don't want to talk about the past. We want to know what we're going to do in the future, but it's important to learn from the past so we don't do it again, so we're not in this situation again.

As I said, as to the thought of an unencumbered bill that would come to the floor, if that would be the case, I looked favorably upon that until I saw what was in here, which isn't right. I'm glad that, hopefully, it will have a big, strong vote against it.

I want to commend my colleague, Congressman WELCH. In his letter, he is not demanding anything. He is saying let's get together and talk about how we can pass a bill that is a clean debt limit bill. That's what he is talking about. Why don't we follow his lead on that and get together and talk about how we can do this in a way that is clean and/or at the same time has a bipartisan plan to reduce the deficit so that we can do just that as we increase jobs and strengthen the middle class.

Thank you, Mr. WELCH, for your leadership in that regard. I know that it has been mischaracterized here, but I salute you for your leadership on that score.

So, my colleagues, you'll vote the way you'll vote, but the fact is what is happening on this floor is not serious. It's not serious, but the subject it addresses is serious. It is time for this Congress of the United States to get serious about debt reduction, job creation, and to stop this assault on Medicare, which is the basis for this legislation today.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1954.

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

There was no objection.

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

Last February, when the President submitted his budget for 2012, he did not provide any plan for reining in deficits and debt. The administration called for a clean increase in the debt limit, or an increase in the debt limit that was unconditional, one that had no spending reductions or structural reforms to try to address the problem that we face, and it assumed $2.4 trillion in borrowing authority, or an increase in the debt limit of about $2.4 trillion. One hundred fourteen Democrats have asked the leadership of their party for an unconditional vote on the debt limit.

My colleagues on the other side have been very reminiscent about the Bush years, and I would just say that, in 4 years, the debt under the Obama administration will exceed that of the Bush administration's in 8 years; or another way of putting that is the debt under this President is going up at twice the rate it did under President Bush.

So it is important that we send a clear signal that there is not going to be an unconditional increase in the debt limit and that we are serious about addressing our debt and deficit problems as a country. We've seen the signals that we've gotten from the financial markets, and we've heard what our constituents have said. It is very important that we bring the kinds of spending reductions and reforms to this debate that we need to, so I urge a ''no'' vote.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1954, the Debt Limit Extension. For weeks, Congressional Democrats and Republicans and the Obama Administration have been engaged for weeks in bipartisan deficit reduction talks. Today's vote on the debt limit extension brought to the floor despite House Republicans promotion to vote against the bill is a dangerous stunt of political theatrics that could jeopardize those serious bipartisan negotiations. Our country cannot afford to take the debt limit negotiations lightly. It is reckless for Republicans to send confusing signals to international markets that could jeopardize our own fragile economic recovery. This bill is a gimmick, by Republican leadership and something as serious as our country's debt limit should not be part of political games. I stand with my fellow Congressional Democrats and remain committed to responsible deficit reduction.

We must protect our citizens. Medicare guarantees a healthy and secure retirement for Americans who have paid into it for their entire working lives. Protecting Medicare represents the basic values of fairness and respect for our seniors that all Americans cherish. I am committed to addressing the budget deficit by putting America's working families first. We should not be cutting programs that protect the everyday lives of Americans.

An attack on Medicare and Medicaid are examples of wrong priorities and are wrong choices for seniors and middle class families.

Facts About Medicare and Medicaid:

Medicare covers a population with diverse needs and circumstances. While many beneficiaries enjoy good health, a quarter or more have serious health problems and live with multiple chronic conditions, including cognitive and functional impairments. Most people with Medicare live on modest incomes. Today, 43% of all Medicare beneficiaries are between 65 and 74 years old and 12% are 85 or older. Those who are 85 or older are the fastest-growing age group among elderly Medicare beneficiaries. With the aging and growth of the population, the number of Medicare beneficiaries more than doubled between 1966 and 2000 and is projected to grow from 45 million today to 79 million in 2030.

Medicaid is the nation's largest health coverage program measured by enrollees (53 million). Through its 40 year history, the program has transformed from a welfare-based health coverage program to a health insurance and long-term care program serving both low income individuals and families and providing long-term care services for individuals with disabilities and the low-income elderly. Because Medicaid has such a diverse set of obligations and is run jointly by federal and state governments there is much misunderstanding about facts related to the program.

Managed care is an example of an innovation that became a standard option—about 60 percent of beneficiaries are in managed care. A current innovation that several states are experimenting with is moving long-term care services towards a home and community based setting. Additionally, Medicaid's structure has allowed it to expand and readily adapt to emerging issues in the American health system like the HIV/AIDS crisis.

Sixty percent of nursing home residents are not on Medicaid at the time of their admittance into a facility. With the average annual cost of nursing home care being $60,000, the longer an individual remains in a facility, the more likely they are to deplete their financial resources and qualify for Medicaid coverage. Even after individuals deplete their assets, they are still required to apply their income, including Social Security and pension checks, towards their care costs, except for an average monthly $30 personal needs allowance.

Compared to private health programs, Medicaid has lower administrative costs per claims paid when compared to private sector plans. Medicaid per capita growth has been consistently about half the rate of growth in private insurance premiums. Both of these factors show that despite program growth, Medicaid is an efficient program.

Mr. Speaker, not only will allowing America to default on its debt wreak havoc and chaos on financial markets around the world, but it will also be damaging to the most vulnerable members of our society. In essence it takes a hatchet to the programs Americans truly care about. In my district in Houston, Texas, there are 190,035 people living under the poverty line as well as 82,272 seniors and over 58,500 seniors. If House Republicans' self destructive economic policies are allowed to play out it will threaten the viability of the programs that our Nation's seniors, children, and poor depend on for health and well being.

Despite countless warnings from economists, business leaders, and Wall Street executives about the economic consequences, House Republicans are still holding the economy hostage by threatening to default on our debt and are putting the economy at risk by suggesting America might not pay its bills.

Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke said defaulting on our debt would ''at minimum'' lead to ''an increase in interest rates, which would actually worsen our deficit and would hurt all borrowers in the economy.''

Additionally, a coalition of 62 of the nation's largest business groups urged Congress to raise the debt limit: ''With economic growth slowly picking up we cannot afford to jeopardize that growth with the massive spike in borrowing costs that would result if we defaulted on our obligations.''

But in case that isn't convincing enough, Third Way, a well respected moderate think thak, released a report outlining the consequences of not paying America's bills:

642,500 jobs lost

GDP would decrease by 1%

Every mortgage would increase by $19,175

Stocks would fall, the S&P dropping 6.3%

And every 401(k) holder would lose $8,816

The House Republican majority needs to stop threatening the American people and get to work to increase the debt ceiling so that our country can pay its bills. The real issue that we should be focusing on is that we must raise revenues while also reducing spending. They must complement each other. Congressional Republicans must accept the challenge that everything must be on the table, including ending the tax cuts to the top 2% of the wealthiest people in our country.

We need a serious debt ceiling increase bill so that we can have deliberative discussion on how to cut spending without cutting Medicare and Medicaid. We do not need to hold the American economy hostage, and we need to begin these discussions in order to show the world that we are fiscally responsible.

If not, the failure to extend our Nation's debt limit would have harmful effects on job creation and the programs necessary to ensure the health and safety of out constituents. I support a clean bill that is not layered down with Republican Christmas tree ornaments that are made for special interests. This will raise our debt. We must pay our bills otherwise this will be detrimental to our Nation and that I will not support.

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, when the United States Congress was faced with raising the debt ceiling in 2006 Senator Barack Obama stated ''The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the U.S. Government can't pay its own bills. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our Government's reckless fiscal policies.''

I will not be party to a failure of leadership when it comes to the debt ceiling. Today, I will do what I stated when I ran for the House of Representatives, I will vote against increasing a debt ceiling absent of spending control measures to right our fiscal ship of state.

This resolution would increase the current statutory debt limit by $2.406 trillion, from $14.294 trillion $16.7 trillion. The 16.8 percent increase would be the fourth time the debt ceiling has been increased since February 2009.

Over the past two years, President Obama and congressional Democrats have overseen the largest budget deficits in the history of the United States. Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID chastised the Republicans and President George W. Bush in 2006 when he stated ''Why is it right to increase this Nation's dependence on foreign creditors? They should explain this. Maybe they can convince the public they are right. I doubt it, because most Americans know that increasing the debt is the last thing we should be doing. After all, I repeat, the baby boomers are about to retire. Under the circumstances, any credible economist would tell you we should be reducing debt, not increasing it.''

The American people have sent a Republican majority to the House of Representatives to reduce spending and put our country on a sustainable financial footing. If I were to close my eyes and abandon my principles, and vote yes to raising the debt limit I would allow Congress to continue to spend the taxpayers' money with no clear plan to reduce our long term debt. The problem in Washington is we do not have a revenue problem—the facts are clear we have a spending problem in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I will not vote for this debt increase and I will not vote for a debt limit increase unless all of the following criteria are met, or included in the final bill that would aim to raise the debt limit:

The United States Congress must pass a Balanced Budget Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

A failsafe trigger mechanism must be put in place that would automatically cut spending if we reached a set percentage limit towards hitting the debt ceiling. In other words, as Federal spending approached the debt ceiling, once a certain level was reached, automatic cuts in spending to Federal programs would be triggered, ensuring that future Congresses and Administrations would not have to consider raising the debt ceiling in the future.

Capping federal spending as part of the GDP at 18–20%.

The U.S. corporate tax rate is 35% at the federal level and 39% when the average state corporate tax is included. The average rate in the other industrial countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) is just 25%. Only Japan has as high a rate. Businesses and corporations in the United States cannot succeed in an environment where they are among the highest taxed in the entire world. It is paramount that Congress lowers the corporate tax rate for American businesses by at least 10% before any vote on raising the debt limit is considered.

On May 14, 2011, the Wall Street Journal in article entitled ''What if the U.S. Treasury Defaults?'' interviewed Mr. Stanley Druckenmiller, the onetime fund manager for George Soros, regarding whether Congress should immediately raise the federal debt. Mr. Druckenmiller pointed out the grave danger if politicians give the government authority to borrow beyond the current $14.3 trillion without any conditions to control spending. He further went on to state that he was willing to accept a temporary delay in the interest payments he is owed on his United States Treasury Bonds ''if the results in a Washington deal to restrain runaway entitlement costs.''

I cannot, and will not, be part of President Obama's, and more than 100 of my Democrat colleagues in the House of Representatives, mantra that we need to raise the debt ceiling as a ''clean'' bill without any fiscal reform. For

without making meaningful attempts to reduce on every increasing national debt, this would be a vote not on a debt ceiling but more a debt recommendation.

The Congress would find themselves voting to increase the debt ceiling again, and again, and again. Enough is enough! Washington needs to stop spending money we do not have and not make our children and grandchildren pick up the tab for our reckless financial behavior.

I am even pleased that then Senator JOE BIDEN agrees with my thoughts, for in 2006, he stated: "This is a record of utter disregard for our Nation's financial future. It is a record of indifference to the price our children and grandchildren will pay to redeem our debt when it comes due. History will not judge this record kindly. My vote against the debt limit increase cannot change the fact that we have incurred this debt already, and will no doubt incur more. It is a statement that I refuse to be associated with the policies that brought us to this point."

Vice President BIDEN, I stand with you and refuse to be associated with the policies your Administration help precipitate, by spending beyond our means, and will not vote to raise the debt ceiling.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today's debt limit vote will fail to pass because neither Republicans nor Democrats have made meaningful progress on balancing the federal budget. The Republican 2012 budget makes devastating cuts to transportation, education, ends Medicare as we know it. Despite these cuts, they fail to balance the budget for three decades. The Democratic 2012 budget would take even longer to restore balance. Neither is a serious long term plan to restore fiscal sanity.

Today's vote was necessary to conclude the debt limit theatrics and bring us closer to negotiating a comprehensive budget. Neither party has the necessary votes to extend the debt ceiling without a bi-partisan deal on the budget.

We need to pay our debts and obligations and I will be urging the Republican leadership to tie future debt ceiling legislation to a balanced budget amendment. I have long supported a balanced budget amendment and had it passed in 1995, we wouldn't be in this mess. A balanced budget amendment would force both sides to make some tough decisions on both budget cuts and raising revenue.

Balancing the budget does not need to be a partisan issue. For example, in his second term President Reagan increased taxes several times to reduce the massive deficits created by the failure of supply side trickle-down policies. Again in the late 1990s, Clinton and a Republican Congress balanced a budget from 1998 to 2001 because they compromised on both spending cuts and increased taxes.

With adoption of a balanced budget amendment Congress could balance the budget in ten years. This begins with repealing the Bush tax cuts, cutting the deficit in half. To reduce federal spending, Congress should bring our troops home from Iraq and Afghanistan, cut antiquated cold war weapons systems, and cut agriculture subsidies. Further cuts can be made by eliminating special interest tax breaks and subsidies for ethanol, big oil, and prescription drug companies. Finally, Congress should continuously scrub the rest of the budget for further reductions to ensure a balanced budget in ten years.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this legislation raising our nation's debt ceiling by $2.5 trillion without any spending cuts or attempt to balance our nation's budget.

The fact that we have reached the $14 trillion debt ceiling should concern every American. Congress has to get our fiscal house in order and everything needs to be on the table.

If we are going to have this debate, then let's bring everything to the table. Any discussion concerning raising our debt ceiling needs to include significant spending cuts, fiscal reforms to reduce the debt we are leaving our children, and a balanced budget amendment.

We can't afford to continue the same path of spending more and more taxpayer dollars and hoping our nation's debt will somehow go down. And we certainly cannot afford another blind increase in America's debt limit.

It is a fact of life. When you max out your credit card, you cut spending and pay down your debt. It is time Congress does the same.

We have the chance to do the right thing, but this measure—raising the debt ceiling without any attempt to curb spending—fell far short.

Mr. CAMP. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1954.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds not being in the affirmative, the noes have it.

Mr. CAMP. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

VETERANS APPEALS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1484) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the appeals process of the Department of Veterans Affairs and to establish a commission to study judicial review of the determination of veterans' benefits, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1484

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Veterans Appeals Improvement Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. WAIVER OF REGIONAL OFFICE JURISDICTION OVER INCORPORATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL EVIDENCE INTO PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED CLAIMS.

(a) WAIVER.—Section 7104 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) If a claimant or the claimant's representative submits new evidence in support of a case for which a substantive appeal has been filed, such evidence shall be submitted to the Board directly and not to the agency of jurisdiction, unless the claimant or the claimant's representative requests that the evidence be reviewed by the agency of jurisdiction before being submitted to the Board.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (f) of section 7104 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section, shall apply with respect to evidence submitted on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

I rise today in strong support of the manager's amendment to H.R. 1484, the Veterans Appeals Improvement Act of 2011.

This legislation is a product of the committee's continued oversight of the disability claims process. We continue to look for ways to improve this laborious process and ensure that veterans receive their disability claims, and the decisions, in a timely and accurate fashion. Now, under current law, veterans who disagree with their initial claims decisions by the VA can appeal to the VA's Board of Veterans' Appeals. But if a veteran submits additional evidence before the board in support of his claims, it automatically goes back to the very beginning of the process.

The legislation before us would stop the shuffling of veterans back to the end of the line. It would direct that evidence submitted by a veteran in support of an appeal before the Board of Veterans' Appeals be considered by the board unless the veteran, himself or herself, elects to send it back to the very beginning of the process. This provision has garnered wide support from veterans' service organizations and the Department of Veterans Affairs. I believe it will reduce the frustration that many of our veterans face when appealing a ratings decision and that it will also reduce processing times.

□ 1750

I want to thank the ranking member, Mr. FILNER, for introducing this legislation, and I do urge all Members to vote in support of the manager's amendment to H.R. 1484.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to say first that I appreciate the chairman's cooperation in bringing these bills to the floor. We're a day after Memorial Day, but these are important to honor our veterans. I thank him and also urge that his manager's amendment, which took care of a funding issue, be approved.

So I am in strong support of this bill, and I thank the members of the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs who have worked

very hard in moving this bill forward. It's been quite a long time coming to fruition, and I know that many of our stakeholders look forward to its passage today.

In the last Congress and this one, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs held a multitude of hearings on the language that is in the bill today. It was developed as a result of vigorous oversight hearings and meetings conducted in the past two Congresses. We received expert input from many of our stakeholders on the myriad systemic and vexing issues surrounding the whole process of claims appeals.

As such, section 2 of the bill would allow the Board of Veterans Appeals to review evidence submitted directly to it by the veteran or a survivor without issuing often unnecessary supplemental statements of the case that serve only to delay and to deny. I know that many stakeholders are anxious to see this provision enacted, including the VA itself.

Section 3 of the bill would have established a judicial review commission that would have been made up of 11 expert members to tackle other longstanding appellate review issues facing our veterans and survivors.

These issues have included whether to continue Federal Circuit Court review of the decisions of the Court of Appeals of Veterans Claims, whether to grant class action and associational standing to the Veterans Court, and whether to require decision on all issues raised on appeal, just to name a few.

The commission would have been required at that time to report on its findings and recommendations to Congress, and it would not sunset until 2 years after that time. However, we were not able to move this section forward because of certain de minimus costs associated with operating the commission, and I know that we all have a bit of ''commission fatigue'' anyway. But at some point, this is an unexamined area with divergent and broad concepts that are in dire need of concentrated and expert attention.

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we find a way to fund this commission in the near future, and I look forward to working with Mr. MILLER in a bipartisan manner to make this a reality. I ask all my colleagues to support the bill in its amended form.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield as much time as he may consume to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RUNYAN).

Mr. RUNYAN. I thank the chairman for the time.

I rise today in support of the manager's amendment to H.R. 1484, as amended, and the Veterans Appeals Improvement Act of 2011.

The veterans disability claims policy is very complex, and all of us on the Veterans' Affairs Committee are constantly seeking ways to improve the process for both our veterans and the VA. This bill is a good first step in accomplishing the goal by improving upon the current process. Specifically, section 2 will work to simplify the process for submitting evidence to the Board of Veterans Appeals by allowing veterans to keep their place in line at the Board of Appeals for Veterans Claims when they submit new evidence in support of their claim.

Under current law, if a veteran submitted new evidence to their case with the intention of expediting their adjudication, they may have actually made the adjudication take longer due to the VA's archaic rules that require the agency to resubmit the claim back to the regional offices. This bill corrects that problem.

While I'm hopeful that the VA's new electronic processing system, which is currently being developed, will alleviate the backlog, we must do right by our veterans by continually improving the claims process and continuing to make changes, no matter how small, to help our veterans who are currently stuck in a failed paper-based system.

This bill is one of many steps my subcommittee will take in this Congress to address the backlog of veteran disability claims. On Thursday, the subcommittee will be holding a hearing on underperforming regional offices, and my staff is currently working on ways to improve training and accountability at all VA regional offices. Every veteran has the right to have their claim adjudicated in a prompt and accurate fashion.

I am proud that many veteran service organizations, as well as the VA, have expressed support for H.R. 1484, as amended; and I urge all Members to support H.R. 1484, as amended.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to the chair of the subcommittee—and I guess the chair of the committee also—we're taking an important step today, but it is a small step. And the chair, the gentleman from New Jersey, mentioned other small steps. We aren't going to clean up this backlog, which approaches 1 million cases, without a major step, a major blowing up of the whole way we do this stuff. We just hired 10,000 new people, and the number of claims doubled. So we're not getting anywhere with this brute force kind of thing.

I have suggested many times to just cut out the red tape completely, at least in the short term, to clean up the backlog, to say to those who have submitted claims that are backed up both by the medical evidence and with help from veteran service officers—of which we have thousands certified across the Nation—that we ought to accept those claims and honor the service of our veterans. Until we get to a mindset that says blow up the bureaucracy in this thing, we're not going to solve the problem.

So all these small steps will be taking forever. Let's pass this small step today, but let us take on a much bigger honoring of our veterans as we just talked about on Memorial Day by saying, you know, some of you have died while waiting for this process to continue, some of you have lost your homes because you didn't get a disability check. Let's really honor our veterans this Memorial Day and say let's change the whole system that we have and stop trying to fool around with these small steps.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the ranking member. This issue of the disability claims backlog has haunted this Congress and this committee for many, many years; but nobody is more haunted by it than the veterans who have to go through that process. We, together, in a bipartisan way are looking for a way to try to solve this issue, and it's obvious that money and bodies are not the way to do it.

So together, Mr. FILNER and I and the members of our committees will work together and try to bring a reasonable solution to this Congress that will help resolve the million veterans that are out there right now in backlog waiting for their disability claims.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material on the manager's amendment to H.R. 1484, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Once again, I encourage all Members to support the manager's amendment to H.R. 1484, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1484, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1800

ESTABLISHING VETSTAR AWARD PROGRAM

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass

the bill (H.R. 802) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a VetStar Award Program, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 802

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

SECTION 1. VETSTAR AWARD PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 532 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Secretary may'' and inserting '' (a) ADVERTISING IN NATIONAL MEDIA.—The Secretary may''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) VETSTAR AWARD PROGRAM.—(1) The Secretary shall establish an award program, to be known as the 'VetStar Award Program', to annually recognize businesses for their contributions to veterans' employment.

''(2) The Secretary shall establish a process for the administration of the award program, including criteria for—

''(A) categories and sectors of businesses eligible for recognition each year; and

''(B) objective measures to be used in selecting businesses to receive the award.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

*(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of such section is amended by adding at the end the following: ''**; VETSTAR AWARD PROGRAM**''.*

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 532 and inserting the following new item:

''532. Authority to advertise in national media; VetStar Award Program.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 802, as amended, a bill introduced by Ranking Mr. FILNER to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a ''VetStar Award Program.''

Mr. Speaker, the VetStar Award Program would recognize private sector businesses which excel in promoting the hiring of veterans.

In the tough economy that we're in, unemployment among veterans is too high. According to the Department of Labor, 11 percent of veterans from the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan were unemployed during the month of April. I'm confident that you and all of the Members would agree that we need to use every tool at our disposal to bring that number down.

Our Nation's veterans bring a unique set of qualifications and skills to any job. And while many in the private sector understand their value, more must be done. H.R. 802, as amended, would recognize businesses who have done their part and promoted veterans for employment. This is a great no-cost way of recognizing those employers who have already stepped up to the plate and helped our veterans.

I want to thank the ranking member, Mr. FILNER, for this bill and urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 802, as amended.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Again, I want to thank the chair of our VA Committee for the incredible cooperative effort we have devoted so far in this Congress. He mentioned on the last bill that we are united to try to find a way to cut through these intolerable and inexcusable delays in the disability claims process. And we are working together as a top priority to make sure that those who have served this Nation have a job when they get back because that, of course, leads to everything else good in our society. A good job is what is needed, and we are united in saying to our veterans this is going to be our top priority.

What we have done here in H.R. 802 is again a small step which will highlight efforts and create an incentive for businesses to hire veterans by directing the VA to develop a very low-cost annual award program to recognize businesses who contribute to veterans' employment, the award to be displayed by business owners as a recognition of the business owner's commitment to the veteran community.

I think the First Lady and the Second Lady of this country are doing much to promote what our Nation is doing for families of veterans. The White House might convene a summit of those who are both helping and will pledge to help hire veterans and highlight this issue more for all Americans.

This bill would authorize the VA to advertise the program in the national media and allow the public to be educated on those businesses that support the employment of veterans.

Again, I thank the chairman for scheduling the bill. It's part of our Memorial Day tribute to our veterans. I ask that our colleagues support the legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield as much time as he may consume to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, Mr. STUTZMAN from the great State of Indiana.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 802, as amended, as this bill would require the Department of Veterans Affairs to establish an award program to recognize businesses that excel in hiring veterans.

We all know the unemployment problems facing many of our veterans. Our youngest groups of veterans have the highest unemployment rates among all the veterans, while older veterans between the ages of 35 and 64 make up two-thirds of the unemployed veteran population.

As we look for ways to increase veteran employment rates, it is absolutely appropriate that we honor those businesses that make the effort to hire veterans and to emphasize and to recognize their efforts. This award not only highlights employers who currently hire veterans, but it is my hope that it will also serve as an incentive for other employers to hire more veterans as well.

At the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity legislative hearing on the bill, some witnesses suggested that the program would be appropriately sponsored by the Veterans Employment and Training Service. While not required by the bill, I hope that the VA will consult with the Department of Labor during the selection process.

I can tell you as a small business owner and one that highly values the service of our veterans to our country, I believe that this is a wonderful measure to recognize those businesses that not only go out of their way but make it a priority to hire veterans to work at their businesses.

So, Mr. Speaker, highlighting businesses for their support of veterans seeking employment is the right thing to do, and I urge my colleagues to support Ranking Member Mr. FILNER's bill, and I appreciate him bringing the bill forward.

Mr. FILNER. I would again urge support of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Again, I thank the ranking member for bringing this bill to the floor. I would add that tomorrow morning the full committee will be having a hearing at 10 a.m. entitled: ''Putting American Veterans Back to Work.''

I would also please ask my friend, the ranking member, not to give all of the good ideas to the White House because you and I are going to be working together on a summit that will bring together those individuals who are wanting good employees to hire and highlight the veterans community to them for employment in their companies.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Once again, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend and add any extraneous material on H.R. 802, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I encourage all Members to support H.R. 802, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 802, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SMALL BUSINESS ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION ACT OF 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1082) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1082

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Business Additional Temporary Extension Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS UNDER THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT AND THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the Act entitled ''An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration'', approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109–316; 120 Stat. 1742), as most recently amended by section 1 of Public Law 112–1 (125 Stat. 3), is amended—

(1) by striking ''Any'' and inserting ''Except as provided in section 3 of the Small Business Additional Temporary Extension Act of 2011, any''; and

(2) by striking ''May 31, 2011'' each place it appears and inserting ''July 31, 2011''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on May 30, 2011.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF SBIR AND STTR TERMINATION DATES.

(a) SBIR.—Section 9(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(m)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''TERMINATION.—'' and all that follows through ''the authorization'' and inserting ''TERMINATION.—The authorization'';

(2) by striking ''2008'' and inserting ''2011''; and

(3) by striking paragraph (2).

(b) STTR.—Section 9(n)(1)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(n)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''IN GENERAL.—'' and all that follows through ''with respect'' and inserting ''IN GENERAL.—With respect'';

(2) by striking ''2009'' and inserting ''2011''; and

(3) by striking clause (ii).

(c) COMMERCIALIZATION PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 9(y)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(y)(6)) is amended by striking ''2010'' and inserting ''2011''.

SEC. 4. COMPETITIVE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR SBIR AND STTR PROGRAMS.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended by inserting after subsection (r) the following:

''(s) COMPETITIVE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR SBIR AND STTR PROGRAMS.—All funds awarded, appropriated, or otherwise made available in accordance with subsection (f) or (n) must be awarded pursuant to competitive and merit-based selection procedures.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent that all Members shall have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The legislation we have before us is a short-term extension of programs that helps our Nation's small businesses. Last week, the House passed the bill by voice vote to extend these programs for 4 months until the end of the fiscal year. Unfortunately, that bill was used as a vehicle to pass the PATRIOT Act authorization. So we have a new bill before us today.

Like the bill the House passed last week, this legislation extends the authorization of the Small Business Innovative Research and Small Business Technology Transfer programs until the end of the fiscal year. These two programs provide R&D dollars to small businesses to create jobs, spur innovative ideas to the market, and solve Federal agency problems, all at no additional cost to the government.

Secondly, the bill extends for 2 months, until July 31, 2011, the authorization of several other programs of the Small Business Administration. Among them is the pre-disaster mitigation program that provides loans to small businesses so they can implement technology that will reduce the impact of disasters on their operations.

□ 1810

With the recent devastation we have seen in the Midwest, including in my home State of Missouri, and with the hurricane season right around the corner, it's imperative that this program continue for small firms who wish to bolster their disaster plans.

Mr. Speaker, this is bipartisan legislation that has the support of the administration, as well as the leadership of both parties on the other side of the Capitol. It is important that we do not let these programs lapse, because they will expire if we do not pass this legislation today. This is the last day.

I urge my colleagues to support our Nation's small businesses and vote ''yes'' on S. 1082.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

The role of small businesses in moving the economy forward has never been more important. Making up over 99 percent of all U.S. firms, they are critical to innovation, wealth creation, and, most importantly, employment gains. Many look to the SBA for assistance, using its loan, contracting, and training programs to start up or expand.

Unfortunately, the legislation before us, while seemingly uncontroversial, could make it harder for small businesses to access these very tools and resources. This bill, if passed, will break with long-standing House precedent and choose winners and losers among SBA programs. By doing so, it will create confusion among small firms seeking to use the agency's initiatives.

As many of you know, since September 30, 2006, the SBA has been operating under a series of 12 temporary extensions. While these extensions have varied in length, they have always treated all of the agency's programs and initiatives equally. This has resulted in all of the SBA's programs operating unimpeded, ensuring that small businesses have ready access to the tools and resources they need.

Unfortunately, S. 1082 takes the unprecedented step of setting different authorization periods for certain SBA programs, creating a maze of confusing dates and deadlines for small businesses. During a time when efforts are being made to reduce regulatory burden, Congress should make certain that it is not adding to it by its own unnecessary actions.

Given the extraordinary nature of S. 1082, it should not be considered and fast-tracked on the suspension calendar, which is typically reserved for uncontroversial measures. Instead, such a unique and precedent-setting measure should go through regular order, where Members will have an opportunity to amend this unexpected and highly unusual piece of legislation. At a minimum, this would enable Members to have more time to understand the detrimental impact this legislation could have on small businesses. Small businesses, such as those represented by the U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce, also oppose this legislation.

Voting against this extension will not affect any agency program in a meaningful way. Small businesses will still be able to secure financing, receive contracts, and access training through the agency's initiatives. What a vote against this legislation will do, however, is ensure that we produce a more equitable piece of legislation that treats all agency initiatives fairly. If parties are serious about helping small businesses, they will reject this measure and work expeditiously to approve a more responsible extension.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. I thank the ranking member.

In closing, just let me reiterate this is a simple, short-term extension of programs that are very important to our Nation's small businesses. We aren't changing any policy here. We are just extending them until hopefully we can work out the differences with the other body on the other side of the Capitol.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on S. 1082 and keep these programs running so we can hopefully work out these differences.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1082, and in strong support of the Small Business Innovation and Research program. I urge my colleagues to vote yes, and send this extension to the President to prevent this crucial program from lapsing.

This is a short term extension, coming on the heels of 10 short term extensions in the past 3 years.

While I urge my colleagues to vote yes, I also urge members on both sides to continue working on a long term reauthorization that brings certainty to this program while at the same time preserving the initial intent of SBIR: the nurturing of bona fide and innovative small businesses. As of 2010, SBIR had granted 88,651 awards, totaling over $28 billion, to Small Businesses around the country.

This program supports two of the things that I've spent my 35 years in Congress fighting hard to advance: innovation and small business.

Nationally, the program is an unparalleled success. Even though SBIR only accounts for 2.5% of the Research and Development extramural budget, SBIR has provided 25% of the 100 most important innovations as reported by R&D Magazine.

SBIR is the nation's largest source of early-stage research and development funding. This program has provided for more than 50,000 patents since its inception, successfully harnessing the proven innovative power of small, technology-based businesses to meet the nation's technology needs.

On average, SBIR generates seven new patents per day—which is far more than all U.S. universities combined—at less than one-twelfth their level of federal research and development funding.

In Massachusetts, we know about innovation and energy. We might not be blessed with Oil, or Natural gas, but we are blessed with a different kind of energy.

My state of Massachusetts is not just ''The Bay State''—it's also the Brain State.

Since its inception, over 12,500 awards have gone to Massachusetts, totaling almost $4 billion. One need not travel far in my district to see the affects of the SBIR program. Whether it is the development of rapid, painless bedside muscle evaluation of children in Woburn, or the study of Oral antibody therapy for Celiac disease in Wayland, this program pushes small business, the engine of our economy, into new levels of discovery and success.

I thank the Speaker for my time, and urge a yes vote on S. 1082. Let's stand alongside Small Business, and save this crucial and innovative program from lapsing.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1082, the Small Business Additional Temporary Extension Act of 2011.

I commend this legislation, which will provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, including the SBIR and STTR programs.

We all recognize the important role that small businesses play in fueling technological innovation and creating jobs in the United States. That being the case, we should be doing what we can to foster a vibrant small business community and give our small businesses the tools that they need to succeed. The SBIR and STTR programs are such tools—they have been critically important programs for fostering innovation by small businesses.

Through these two competitive programs, the Small Business Administration ensures that the nation's small, high-tech, innovative businesses are a significant part of the federal government's research and development efforts.

Providing more than 50,000 patents since its inception, the SBIR is the nation's largest source of early stage research and development funding.

Unfortunately, the SBIR and STTR programs are set to expire tonight. This short-term extension of the SBIR and STTR programs will provide for the continuation of these important programs as we continue our efforts to enact a comprehensive, long-term reauthorization. Extending the programs by four months will give us the time we need to resolve the few remaining issues, including the establishment of a formal outreach program for women and minority-owned small businesses. Increasing participation is one of the stated goals of the SBIR program, and one for which the National Academies found a decidedly mixed track record.

As we continue our efforts to keep our economy on the path to recovery, it is more important than ever that we recommit ourselves to these programs and get a comprehensive reauthorization bill enacted. In the meantime, I urge my colleagues to support the Small Business Additional Temporary Extension Act of 2011.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1082, ''Small Business Additional Temporary Extension Act of 2011,'' which temporarily extends from May 31, 2011 through July 31, 2011 certain authorities of the Small Business Administration and its programs under the Small Business Act and Small Business Investment Act of 1958. S. 1082 further amends the Small Business Act to reauthorize through Fiscal Year 2011 the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Small Business Technology Transfer (SBIR) programs of the Small Business Administration (SBA), as well as the SBA's commercialization pilot program.

American small businesses are the heart beat of our nation. I believe that small businesses represent more than the American dream—they represent the American economy. Small businesses account for 95 percent of all employers, create half of our gross domestic product, and provide three out of four new jobs in this country.

Through a bipartisan effort, Congress created SBIR in 1982 and STTR in 1992. Comprehensive extensions for the programs were made in 2000 and 2001, respectively. The programs have received numerous temporary extensions since they expired in 2008.

In particular, the SBIR and STTR programs technological innovation in small, high technology firms to meet federal research and development needs while increasing private sector commercialization and helping the government solve its problems. Today, 11 Federal agencies (DoD and NIH to USDA) allocate a portion of their research and development budgets to projects with small businesses.

Studies show SBIR-backed firms have been responsible for roughly 25% of the nation's most crucial innovations over the past decade and account for 38% of America's patents. Among other things, SBIR/STTR technology is used in the military's Bradley tank, the B–2 Bomber, communication antennas for first responders in disaster zones, vehicles for fire fighters combating wildfires, sensors used to detect brain injuries sustained by high school athletes, and electric toothbrushes.

The SBIR/STTR awards have produced returns on investments. For example, some of the firms have paid more in taxes than they received under the SBIR program, have employed thousands of employees, and saved state governments millions of dollars.

Furthermore, small business in Texas would be at risk of losing millions in SBIR/STTR awards, ranking 7th in the nation to receive awards. In 2009 alone, small business in Texas received 278 awards totaling $89.5 million.

Small business growth means economic growth for the nation. But to keep this segment of our economy thriving, entrepreneurs need access to loans. Through loans, small business owners can expand their businesses, hire more workers and provide more goods and services. The Small Business Administration (SBA), a federal organization that aids small businesses with loan and development programs, is a key provider of support to small businesses. The SBA's main loan program accounts for 30 percent of all long-term small business borrowing in America.

I have worked hard to help small business owners to fully realize their potential. That is why I support entrepreneurial development programs, including the Small Business Development Center and Women's Business Center programs. These initiatives provide counseling in a variety of critical areas, including business plan development, finance, and marketing. We must consider what impact changes in this appropriations bill will have on small businesses.

There are 5.8 million minority owned businesses in the United States, representing a significant aspect of our economy. In 2007, minority owned businesses employed nearly 6 million Americans and generated $1 trillion dollars in economic output.

Women owned businesses have increased 20% since 2002, and currently total close to 8 million. These organizations make up more than half of all businesses in health care and social assistance.

My home city of Houston, Texas is home to more than 60,000 women owned businesses, and more than 60,000 African American owned businesses.

According to a 2009 report published by the Economic Policy Institute, ''Starting in 2004, the Small Business Administration (SBA) set goals for small business participation in federal contracts. It encouraged agencies to award contracts to companies owned by women, veterans, and minorities or those located in economically challenged areas and gave them benchmarks to work toward. The targets are specific: 23% of contracts to small business, 5% to woman-owned small businesses, and 3% to disabled veteran-owned and HUBZone small businesses.''

Women and minority owned businesses generate billions of dollars and employ millions

of people. They are certainly qualified to receive these contracts. A mandatory DOD outreach program would make women and minority owned businesses aware of all of the contract opportunities available to them.

FACTS, small business are important because they:

(1) Represent 99.7 percent of all employer firms,

(2) Employ just over half of all private sector employees,

(3) Pay 44 percent of total U.S. private payroll,

(4) Generated 64 percent of net new jobs over the past 15 years,

(5) Create more than half of the nonfarm private gross domestic product (GDP),

(6) Hire 40 percent of high tech workers (such as scientists, engineers, and computer programmers), are

(7) Are 52 percent home-based and 2 percent franchises

(8) Made up 97.3 percent of all identified exporters and produced 30.2 percent of the known export value in FY 2007,

(9) Produce 13 times more patents per employee than large patenting firms and twice as likely as large firm patents to be among the one percent most cited.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1082.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 16

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENT TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for an event on June 5, 2011, to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to support this resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall on June 5 to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha of Hawaii.

King Kamehameha, often called Kamehameha the Great, is a legendary figure in Hawaiian history and culture, and rightly so. He fought heroically for its unity and independence at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries.

His law, or Rule of the Splintered Paddle, protecting noncombatants during wartime has been commended for its justness and established a human rights benchmark that would later be built upon in the Geneva Conventions.

An illustrious statue of King Kamehameha is part of the National Statuary Hall Collection, and it now sits in the Capitol Visitor Center, visible to millions of our fellow citizens.

On June 11, the people of Hawaii will celebrate the 95th annual King Kamehameha Day in Hawaii. In adopting the resolution, the Members of the House will join our colleagues in the Senate in authorizing the use of the Capitol Visitor Center for a similar celebration here in Washington, D.C.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, DC, May 27, 2011.

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I write to formally notify you that the Committee on House Administration hereby waives further committee consideration of S. Con. Res. 16, a concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha, in order that the legislation may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

Sincerely,

DANIEL E. LUNGREN,
Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 16 is entitled, ''Authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.'' It speaks to authorizing the use on June 5, 2011, and states that the preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol. This is not an unusual event. This will be the 42nd time such a celebration has taken place within the Capitol.

This is Hawaii's way to share its most unique history with all. June 11, the day of celebration, is the birthday of King Kamehameha the great. He was born around 1758 and is credited with unifying the eight major islands by the year 1810. Of course, the islands of Kauai and Niihau claim that they eluded him.

This holiday was first decreed in 1871, when Hawaii was still a kingdom, by Kamehameha V, his great grandson. It was the first holiday proclaimed by the Governor and legislature when Hawaii became a State in 1959.

The celebration in his honor is about 140 years old this year. And what we identify with the celebration, the statue of King Kamehameha and the traditional lei draping, is over 100 years old itself.

□ 1820

The American sculptor, Thomas R. Gould, was commissioned by the Kingdom of Hawaii to create the statue. He did so in 1879 from his studio in Rome. It was completed in 1880, but the ship that was transporting it from Germany sank. It was in 1883 when the second statue made its way to Hawaii.

It stands 8½ feet tall with the king in his royal garb. The helmet is depicted to reflect that it is made out of red, very rare feathers, as is his cloak. The spear in his left hand is the symbol that his kingdom is willing to defend itself, and yet his right hand is extended in the gesture of aloha, to welcome, that gesture which is synonymous with Hawaii.

The statue that stands here is the mold of the second statue which stands in front of Ali'iolani Hale, the home of the Hawaii Supreme Court. Many, actually, would recognize it as the new headquarters of ''Hawaii Five-0.'' This was dedicated as a gift to the National Statuary Hall from Hawaii in the year 1969.

Of note is the first statue was found and brought to the Big Island of Hawaii, the birth isle of King Kamehameha I. The tradition of the lei draping dates back to 1901, when Hawaii was still a territory. I personally recall it as a child with firefighters draping the leis on the statue using their very long ladders. We remember it clearly with the longest strands of the yellow plumeria blossoms being the flower of choice. These lei drapings take place on the Big Island as well and have for 42 years also taken place in the Capitol.

On June 20, 2010, President Obama issued Proclamation 8534 in honor of the bicentennial of the unification of Hawaii. The President, who like me and others who were born in Hawaii, recognizes the significance of King Kamehameha to our history. A relevant part of his statement is, ''On this bicentennial King Kamehameha Day, we celebrate the history and heritage of the Aloha State, which has immeasurably enriched our national life and culture. The Hawaiian narrative is one of both profound triumph and, sadly, deep injustice. It is the story of Native Hawaiians oppressed by crippling disease, aborted treaties, and the eventual conquest of their sovereign kingdom. These grim milestones remind us of an unjust time in our history, as well as the many pitfalls in our Nation's long and difficult journey to perfect itself. Yet, through the peaks and valleys of our American story, Hawaii's steadfast sense of community and mutual support shows the progress that results when we are united in a spirit of limitless possibility.''

I would like to also add, as Chairman LUNGREN pointed out, what King Kamehameha is also known for is creating the law of the land, the law, as we call it, the Law of the Splintered Paddle. In Hawaii we also call it Ke Kanawai Mamalahoe. This is an interesting story, and one that people may not believe. It is really the story of a warrior king and his humanity. It was a law to protect the civilians at a time of war. It is a lesson in human life because the king, warrior king, decreed that any human life was precious, and it was wrong for the powerful to mistreat the weaker.

Though many of us think of it as a celebration with parades and, as we call it at home hoolauleas, festivities, and parties, it is more importantly a symbol of that which is Hawaii, that which makes us so unique.

I would like to express my appreciation on behalf of the people of Hawaii, to Speaker BOEHNER, Chairman LUNGREN, the architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Police, and all others who assist in this event.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just say that it gives me great pleasure to join my colleague from Hawaii in bringing this resolution to the floor, particularly because my daughter, who was married in this town on Sunday, is on her way to Hawaii to celebrate her honeymoon and I believe will actually still be there on the 5th of June, so that she will see that up close and personal.

I would urge all my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. Con. Res. 16, legislation to authorize the use of the Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for the Lei Draping Ceremony to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha on June 5, 2011. The concurrent resolution, already passed in the Senate, is cosponsored by the two Senators and my good friends from the State of Hawaii, Senator AKAKA and Senator INOUYE. And I wish to thank all the Hawaiian congressional delegation for their support of this resolution to commemorate this historical event.

Mr. Speaker, the Kamehameha Lei Draping Ceremony in the Statuary Hall of the U.S. Capitol has been hosted by the Hawaii congressional delegation and Hawaii State Society of Washington, D.C. since 1969. For more than 40 years now we have conducted this ceremony each year on or about the second week of June to coincide with the celebration of King Kamehameha Day in the State of Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, the King Kamehameha statue has now been moved to Emancipation Hall of the U.S. Capitol Visitor Center, and in doing so, under section 103 of Public Law 110–437, it requires the enactment of a congressional resolution to authorize this annual celebration-hence, the resolution before the House floor today.

Mr. Speaker, King Kamehameha was one of the greatest Hawaiian warrior kings known among the Polynesian people. After some 2,000 years of tremendous rivalries among the warring chiefs of the Hawaii Islands, it was prophesied among the Hawaiian priests that there will one day be born a high chief who will be a slayer of other high chiefs and he will unite all of the Hawaiian Islands under one rule. King Kamehameha fulfilled that prophecy, after almost 10 years of fighting against other rival chiefs of the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. Speaker, King Kamehameha was about 6 feet, 8 inches and weighed almost 300 pounds. He learned the ancient martial arts, known among the Hawaiian people as lua. He also learned military tactics and the art of warfare from his warrior chief, Kekuhaupio. He was able to lift the ancient Naha Stone, which weighed 4,500 pounds. One of his favorite sports to prove agility and combat readiness involved the ability to dodge spears thrown at him simultaneously. King Kamehameha was able to do this with six spears—he would grab two, parry two more, and let the last two go by.

Mr. Speaker, King Kamehameha unified the islands and established peace and stability. He was shrewd in building prosperity for his people by encouraging agricultural development and promoting commercial trade in Europe and even with the United States. While he was open to new ideas, he was cautious and circumspect in the old way. He instituted the Law of the Splintered Paddle, or Mamalahoe as known among the Hawaiian people, which protected elderly men and women and children from any harm as they'd travel along the roadside.

Mr. Speaker, S. Con. Res. 16 reaffirms that the United States is built upon diversity, and we all share the same ideals of freedom and democracy and a commitment to justice for all people. These ideals embody the legacy of King Kamehameha the Great. It is only fitting that we not only honor the birth date of this great Hawaiian warrior king, but we continue to have the special ceremony of draping hundreds of flower leis on his statue that now stands prominently in the Emancipation Hall of the U.S. Capitol Visitor Center.

I urge my colleagues to support S. Con. Res. 16.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, aloha. I rise today in support of S. Con. Res. 16, which authorizes the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor's Center for the 42nd Annual Kamehameha Day Lei Draping.

I would like to thank Speaker BOEHNER, Chairman LUNGREN, and Ranking Member BRADY for their support of this bill. The location of the Kamehameha statue in Emancipation Hall requires that a concurrent resolution be passed to authorize the use of the space for this event.

The Kamehameha Day Lei Draping has been hosted by the Hawaii Congressional Delegation and the Hawaii State Society of Washington D.C. since 1969. The event has been held on or about June 11th to coincide with the celebration of Kamehameha Day, a state holiday in Hawaii. This year, the event will be held on Sunday, June 5.

Born in 1758, Kamehameha was the first monarch to unify the Hawaiian Islands and is fondly remembered as a leader who was daring, strong, and courageous.

As King of all Hawaii, Kamehameha appointed governors for each island, made laws for the protection of all his people, planted taro, built houses and irrigation ditches, restored important cultural sites, encouraged industries like farming and fishing, managed the island's natural resources, and entered into trading agreements with other nations. The flag design he ordered for his kingdom later became the Seal of the State of Hawaii. He would rule the islands until his death in 1819.

I would like to close by thanking the staff of the Committee on House Administration, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, and the Office of the Sergeant At Arms who each year help make this event possible. I urge my colleagues support of S. Con. Res. 16.

Mahalo nui loa (thank you).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 16.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1484, by the yeas and nays;

S. 1082, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1954, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

VETERANS APPEALS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER). The unfinished business is

the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1484) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the appeals process of the Department of Veterans Affairs and to establish a commission to study judicial review of the determination of veterans' benefits, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

YEAS—419

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
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
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
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 (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
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
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
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
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
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
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.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
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
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—11

Braley (IA)
Duncan (SC)
Giffords
Lucas
McMorris Rodgers
Myrick
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz
Tierney
Walz (MN)
Yarmuth

□ 1852

Messrs. LABRADOR and HINOJOSA, Mrs. CAPPS, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: ''A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the appeals process of the Department of Veterans Affairs.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL BUSINESS ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1082) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 33, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

YEAS—387

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
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
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
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.
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)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
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
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—33

Amash
Andrews
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Chaffetz
Conyers
Cummings
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Flake
Graves (GA)
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Honda
Lewis (GA)
Maloney
McClintock
Moore
Napolitano
Paul
Payne
Poe (TX)
Rangel
Reyes
Rohrabacher
Schrader
Serrano
Slaughter
Stark
Towns
Velázquez
Watt
Weiner

NOT VOTING—11

Braley (IA)
Duncan (SC)
Giffords
Hirono
Johnson, Sam
Lucas
Myrick
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz
Tierney
Walz (MN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1901

Messrs. CONYERS and RANGEL changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 378, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

INCREASING STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1954) to implement the President's request to increase the statutory limit on the public debt, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 97, nays 318, answered ''present'' 7, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 379]

YEAS—97

Berman
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Heinrich
Himes
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kildee
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Speier
Stark
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Tsongas
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NAYS—318

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
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
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)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
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 (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Towns
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Wasserman Schultz
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—7

Ackerman
Chu
Doggett
Hinchey
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Meeks

NOT VOTING—9

Braley (IA)
Duncan (SC)
Giffords
Lucas
Myrick
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz
Tierney
Walz (MN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1911

Messrs. HASTINGS of Florida and CROWLEY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I regret missing floor votes on Tuesday, May 31, 2011. Had I registered my vote, I would have voted:

"Yea" on rollcall 377, On motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1484—Veterans Appeals Improvement Act, as amended;

"Yea" on rollcall 378, On motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 1082—Small Business Temporary Extension Act of 2011;

"Nay" on rollcall 379, On motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1954—Debt Limit Extension.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

RENEWING AUTHORITY FOR STATE CHILD WELFARE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1194) to renew the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to approve demonstration projects designed to test innovative strategies in State child welfare programs.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1194

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

SECTION 1. RENEWAL OF AUTHORITY TO APPROVE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS DESIGNED TO TEST INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES IN STATE CHILD WELFARE PROGRAMS.

Section 1130 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a–9) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''1998 through 2003'' and inserting ''2011 through 2016'';

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or kinship guardianship'' after ''placements'';

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''address kinship care'' and inserting ''provide early intervention and crisis intervention services that safely reduce out-of-home placements and improve child outcomes''; and

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D) and inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) If an appropriate application therefor is submitted, the Secretary shall consider authorizing a demonstration project which is designed to identify and address domestic violence that endangers children and results in the placement of children in foster care.'';

(C) in paragraph (4), by inserting ''or kinship guardianship'' after ''assistance''; and

(D) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''and the ability of the State to implement a corrective action approved under section 1123A'' before the period;

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (6);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) an accounting of any additional Federal, State, local, and private investments (other than those with respect to which matching funds were provided under part B or E of title IV) made, during the 2 fiscal years preceding the application to provide the services described in paragraph (1), and an assurance that the State will provide an accounting of that same spending for each year of an approved demonstration project.'';

(3) in subsection (f)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; and'' and inserting '', including all children and families under the project who come to the attention of the State's child welfare program, either through a report of abuse or neglect or through the provision of services described in subsection (e)(1) to the child or family;''; and

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D) and inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) a comparison of the amounts of Federal, State, local and private investments in the services described in subsection (e)(1), by service type, with the amount of the investments during the period of the demonstration project; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) INDIAN TRIBES CONSIDERED STATES.—An Indian tribe (as defined in section 479B(a)) shall be considered a State for purposes of this section.''.

SEC. 2. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise tonight in support of H.R. 1194, a bill to extend the child welfare waiver authority for States.

This bill will allow States to test innovative approaches to improve the way we protect children from abuse and neglect. In doing so, it extends authority that was in place between 1994 and 2006 but has since lapsed.

Since 2006, the Department of Health and Human Services has not had the authority to approve new efforts by States to test better ways of helping children at risk of abuse or neglect. The bill before us today would simply allow HHS to approve new waivers once again so States can test new ways of better serving children and families.

As the current chairman of the Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over child welfare programs, I'm pleased to cosponsor this legislation with my friend, Mr. MCDERMOTT, a current member of the subcommittee, as well as its prior chairman.

The Human Resources Subcommittee held a hearing on child welfare waivers last year, which showed the value of State flexibility in this area. Since 1994, 23 States have run waiver programs that helped inform the child welfare policy debate and, more importantly, improve the lives of children and families. Seven States have been granted extensions and have continued their waiver programs approved before 2006. This bipartisan bill before us today will allow such current waiver programs to continue, while importantly providing the Secretary of HHS with authority to approve up to 10 new waivers a year.

The bill before us is identical to legislation the House approved unanimously on September 23, 2010. However, the Senate did not act on that legislation before conclusion of the last Congress.

This bill is supported by the National Conference of State Legislatures, as well as groups active in promoting effective child welfare programs.

I would like to insert in the RECORD following my remarks copies of their letters in support of H.R. 1194.

Especially in challenging financial times, we must be sure that taxpayer dollars are well spent. The original 1994 law required rigorous evaluations of each waiver program, and this bill continues that requirement. This means States will have the flexibility to test new ideas, but the American people and the Congress will know if these ideas have made a difference. And because these waiver programs must be cost neutral to be approved in the first place, the Congressional Budget Office has assured us that this legislation as a whole is cost neutral.

I would like to include the CBO analysis to that effect in the RECORD as well.

It is fitting we are debating this measure in May, which is National Foster Care Month. National Foster Care Month is a time to celebrate the great work done by thousands of foster parents across the Nation, and also a time to raise awareness of the hundreds of thousands of children in foster care who need a permanent home. This legislation will let States test better ways of helping these young people, including by working with families to keep kids from entering foster care in the first place.

So as we recognize National Foster Care Month, this bill is a great way to work towards solutions that ensure that each child has a permanent home. Child welfare legislation has often been an area of bipartisanship in this Chamber, and I'm grateful that we can continue that tradition with the bill before us today.

I thank Mr. MCDERMOTT for his extensive work on this bill and look forward to continuing to work with him and all our colleagues as this legislation moves forward. I urge support for this legislation.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES,
Washington, DC, April 13, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, Longworth HOB, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
House Minority Leader, Cannon HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), we urge you to support H.R. 1194, a bill to renew the authority of the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to approve demonstration projects designed to test innovative strategies in state child welfare programs. Congressman Jim McDermott and Congressman Geoff Davis have fashioned bipartisan legislation that helps create opportunities to enhance the state/federal partnership to assist our nation's most vulnerable children.

NCSL supports reinstating and expanding federal waiver authority so that states can test the results of increased funding flexibility on the development of service alternatives and on the overall delivery of child welfare services, targeting programs to address the needs of their children. By renewing Title IV–E waiver authority from 2011 through 2016, H.R. 1194 will give states an enhanced ability to provide early intervention and crisis intervention services that will safely reduce out-of-home placements and improve child outcomes.

H.R. 1194 will allow states to improve the quality of their child welfare interventions and reinvest savings in their programs. It will also provide both state and federal legislators more information on what innovations are effective to transform the lives of children who are at risk of abuse and neglect. We applaud Congressmen McDermott and Davis for crafting this legislation.

Sincerely,

HON. MARY JANE WALLNER,
New Hampshire House of Representatives, Chair, NCSL Standing Committee on Human Services and Welfare.

HON. WES KELLER,
Alaska House of Representatives, Chair, NCSL Standing Committee on Human Services and Welfare.

YOUTH VILLAGES,
Arlington, VA, May 24, 2011.

Chairman GEOFF DAVIS,
Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Congressman JIM MCDERMOTT,
Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND CONGRESSMAN MCDERMOTT: On behalf of Youth Villages, I am writing in support of your bill, H.R. 1194, and to thank you for your leadership on this issue. This legislation provides critical authority for the Department of Health and Human Services to extend the Title IV–E waiver program, which has demonstrated substantial impact since creation in 1994. These waivers provide states with greater flexibility in the use of Federal funds for alternative services and supports that promote safety, permanency and well-being for children in the child protection and foster care system.

Youth Villages is a leader in innovative and effective services for troubled youth and their families. Since 2008, Youth Villages has had the opportunity to work collaboratively with several local, privatized child welfare organizations, known as Community Based Care agencies in implementing Florida's Title IV–E waiver. Youth Villages has three offices in Florida and is working with local entities to implement our intensive in-home Intercept services, identify and serve underserved or ''stuck'' populations, and provide them with outcome data to support the impact of their waiver effort.

As a result of the flexibility afforded by the Title IV–E waiver, intensive reunification and targeted prevention services are given greater focus in the state's child welfare service approach. Without the award of the waiver, it would have been difficult for Youth Villages to expand its Intercept program into the state to serve the child welfare population. In the three years that Youth Villages has been operating in Florida, we have served over 300 children and families across the Central and Southern regions of the state. Over 70% at six months post-discharge are still living at home or in a home-like environment. The savings associated with serving these 300 children through Intercept instead of congregate, out-of-home placements amounts to roughly $23 million when considering recidivism rates associated with both Intercept and non-Intercept placements.

Youth Villages pledges its full support of H.R. 1194, as this legislation has the ability to transform the child welfare system from one that incentivizes out-of-home placement to a system that promotes in-home treatment and family unification.

Regards,

PATRICK LAWLER,
CEO, Youth Villages.

CBO ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 1194, A BILL TO RENEW THE AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES TO APPROVE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS DESIGNED TO TEST INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES IN STATE CHILD WELFARE PROGRAMS

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2011–2016	2011–2021
NET INCREASE IN THE DEFICIT													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: H.R. 1194 would renew Section 1130 of the Social Security Act for the 2011–2016 period. Section 1130 allows for demonstration projects related to child welfare to be operated by the states. Those projects are required to be cost-neutral, and the Department of Health and Human Services has mechanisms in place to ensure that this requirement is met. As such, there would be no costs associated with the renewal of Section 1130.
Source: Congressional Budget Office.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1920

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1194, a bill that would reinstate authority within the Department of Health and Human Services to allow up to 10 States and Native American tribes a year to conduct demonstration projects that test ways to improve child welfare programs.

I want to thank the chairman of the Human Resources Subcommittee, Mr. DAVIS, for following in the tradition of the previous chairman, Mr. Linder. He was the one who worked with us last year in putting this through. It's good to have that same thing going through. This is a rare bill. It's actually a bipartisan bill.

This bill reinstates the waiver authority to allow the States and tribes to implement and evaluate innovations to improve outcomes for at-risk families and children. The legislation is cost neutral and renews waiver authority for the next 6 years.

Twenty-three States and jurisdictions received waivers under the previous authority, which began in 1997 and ended in 2006. Although the authority for new waivers has expired, a handful of States and counties have continued demonstration projects, including Florida, Ohio, and Los Angeles County, California.

The legislation also includes a new emphasis on the Federal side of supporting waivers that identify and address domestic violence and related problems, which lead to children being placed in foster care. It emphasizes early intervention and crisis intervention services that safely reduce out-of-home placements.

The waiver authority requires States to report on the Federal, State, local,

and private funding sources that support various services under the demonstration project. This additional information will increase our understanding of waiver policies and increase accountability. The innovative strategies successfully tested in States under the previous waiver authority taught us some lessons at the national level that were helpful because it made child welfare policy more effective.

One of the most successful demonstration projects provided support to grandparents and other relative caregivers who became the guardians of young relatives in foster care. This became Federal policy when it was incorporated into the Fostering Connections Act, which passed in 2008.

Since the waiver authority expired, States, service providers, and foster care experts have called for it to be renewed, to allow continued innovation and evaluation of strategies to address the complex needs of children and families in our 21st-century communities. Many States, like my State of Washington, can do more with limited funds than they have if they have well-defined waivers.

Following a hearing last year in the Ways and Means Committee, I introduced legislation with John Linder, as I mentioned before, to reinstate the waiver authority. We did it late in the session; and a short time later, the legislation passed the House. Unfortunately, it was late in the session, as I said, and the Senate was unable to take up the bill. So we thought if we put it over early this time, maybe it will be dealt with before the end of the 112th. The legislation before us is identical to the bill introduced last year and passed in this House unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, my support for restoring this waiver authority is not meant to suggest that traditional Federal investments are not needed in the child welfare system. We need to fully fund our child welfare programs. These child welfare waivers simply give the States more flexibility in developing innovations. Waivers are not a panacea. They are not a substitute for comprehensive solutions for the problems that remain in the child welfare system.

I also want to point out that the authority provided by this bill in no way affects a child's entitlement for assistance under Federal foster care and adoption assistance programs. This is important to remember for anyone comparing the waiver authority in this bill to proposals for much broader waivers in other safety-net programs. Reinstating the child welfare waiver authority will allow States to continue developing strategies to improve the lives of children and families, who are some of the most vulnerable in our midst.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this legislation.

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

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me thank Dr. MCDERMOTT, first of all, for his consistent, years-long support of our children that are in foster care. And I thank the manager and the Representative of the majority for their hard work.

This bill was introduced in the 111th Congress. It was passed by voice vote. It is an important amendment to the Social Security Act to renew through FY 2016, where it authorizes up to 10 States and tribes to conduct demonstration projects that serve as tests for methods to improve child welfare programs.

As a cochair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, we have worked on a number of issues through the years. We have been privileged to deal with the question of mentoring, the question of bullying, the question of dealing with the disabled child, and, yes, the question of dealing with foster parenting. In fact, some years ago I served as a cochair with then-Congressman Mike Andrews to provide relief to foster parents by finding a process that would provide vacation time for them. I have gone to meetings dealing with grandparents who have become foster parents. So it is important to be able to find the best practices.

The waivers that will come about are designed to afford more flexibility to States in determining how to use Federal funding for child welfare and foster care. The program gave more discretion to the State Departments that administer child welfare programs aimed to foster innovative and effective child welfare programs.

One of the issues in the State of Texas is the age-old issue of aging out. What do you do with the 18- or 19-year-old who had lived in foster care, ages out, and has no place to go? I hope in the course of this legislation we will find that creative thinking.

This bill, of course, addresses delays to guardianship for children in foster care, provides early crisis intervention programs that are so important to improve the outcomes of the foster care system, and addresses domestic violence that results in placement in foster care.

To the late Congressman Mickey Leland, I am reminded that we had a facility called the Mickey Leland refuge or relief area in our district, the 18th Congressional District, that provided an emergency placement for children that had to be taken out of the home immediately. We cradled children from zero to toddler age. Our children need us, and those who are in fact taking care of foster children need us as well.

There are 423,000 children living in foster care; 26,000 of these children are from my home State of Texas. I frankly believe those numbers are even higher. But this legislation will continue a unique opportunity for States granted waivers to address the diverse needs of the cities and regions of the particular States.

I can't think of a more precious resource than our children. I am very glad to be part of the Congressional Children's Caucus; and I deeply believe this particular legislation, Mr. Speaker, provides a safety net for our children. I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1194, a bill to renew the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to approve demonstration projects designed to test innovative strategies in state child welfare programs. My colleague, JIM MCDERMOTT, introduced this bill in the 111th Congress, and it was passed by a voice vote. This legislation, which amends Title XI of the Social Security Act to renew through FY2016, authorizes up to ten states and tribes to conduct demonstration projects that serve as tests for methods to improve child welfare programs.

Under the previous authority, which began in 1997 and ended in 2006, 23 states and tribal jurisdictions received waivers to certain provisions of the Social Security Act. These waivers are designed to afford more flexibility to states in determining how to use federal funding for child welfare and foster care. The program gave more discretion to the state departments that administer child welfare programs, and aimed to foster innovative and effective child welfare programs.

The waiver authority in this legislation requires states to report on Federal, state and local funding sources that support all services under a demonstration project, increasing our knowledge of waiver policies and allow for successful implementation of similar programs in the future.

Under the previous waiver authority, many innovative and effective demonstration projects were successfully tested in States, providing the Department of Health and Human Services with new ideas for implementation at the national level. This legislation does not seek to reduce funding or services for child welfare at any level, but rather seeks to improve these services by allowing states the flexibility to test programs.

The bill introduced by my colleague from Washington addresses delays to guardianship for children in foster care, provides early and crisis intervention programs to improve the outcomes of the foster system, and addresses domestic violence that results in placement in foster care.

The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) reports that at the end of 2009, there were 423,000 children living in foster care. 26,600 of those children were from my home state of Texas. In fact, the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services estimates that as of February 2011, 3,726 children in Houston were living in foster care. As the Representative for Texas' 18th Congressional District in Houston, I am committed to increasing the efficiency and improving the outcomes of foster care and other child welfare systems.

This legislation would continue a unique opportunity for states granted waivers to address the diverse needs of the cities and regions in that particular state. Of the 3,726 children in foster care throughout Houston, nearly 2,000 of those children are African American. While foster care disproportionately affects African Americans in Houston, these demographics change throughout the state. This program encourages innovation based on the needs of

states, and will certainly contribute to national initiatives.

Child welfare is a deeply important issue for this country. The Department of Health and Human Services estimates the 2010 Census will show the number of children in foster care is over half a million and will only continue to rise. It is our responsibility to take any possible measure to improve the outcomes of foster care, and renewing the authority granted to Health and Human Services under H.R. 1194 is essential to that goal.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I simply want to say again ''thank you'' to my colleague from Kentucky. This working relationship on behalf of children is one that has never gotten really political, and it is one of the nicest things about serving in Congress. So I appreciate having GEOFF come on as the new chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful again to acknowledge my colleague Mr. MCDERMOTT and his many years of work on this issue. The staff in both the majority and minority on the subcommittee have worked very hard through time on this issue to bring this bipartisan measure to the floor today.

Passage of H.R. 1194 will renew child welfare waiver authorities so States can again test new ways of helping at-risk youth. These waivers will let States develop new ideas, and allow them to spend money on what we know is most effective, which is working to keep children safely together with their families.

I urge passage of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUAYLE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1194.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1930

HONORING MOUNTAIN HOME RESIDENT SERGEANT AUGIE HELD

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, on Thanksgiving Day 1944, current Mountain Home, Arkansas, resident Sergeant Augie Held took a bullet in his left shoulder. Held was 22 years old at the time and a member of 84th Infantry Division, Bravo Company. That was how Sergeant Held received his first Purple Heart. He was back to battle a mere 3 weeks later.

On December 19, 1944, during the Battle of the Bulge, Sergeant Held earned his second Purple Heart. Members of his company tried to take shelter from the cold in a barn, where they were attacked. Bullets and schrapnel went flying, and Sergeant Held took a piece of schrapnel to his left wrist.

Just 2 months later Sergeant Held was caught in mortar fire. Mortar hit so close to him it knocked him unconscious and a piece of shrapnel was embedded in his cheek, and that shrapnel stayed with him until he went stateside, and that was how Sergeant Held earned his third Purple Heart.

Sergeant Held is one of many First District residents in my home district in Arkansas who selflessly fought for America. Our district has an amazing group of veterans from World War I to the current War on Terror who put America first and their own lives second. These are the people that make this country great.

Yesterday was Memorial Day, a day to honor those who fought for our country and also remember the fallen soldiers who made the ultimate sacrifice. My family and I spent this weekend honoring all who served, not only in the First District of Arkansas but all across America.

I want to thank the troops and their families for the shared sacrifice they make to our country. And a special thank you to Sergeant Augie Held, who is a living reminder of why I am so proud to be an American.

REMEMBERING RICHARD ''PINKY'' MCNAMARA

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of Richard ''Pinky'' McNamara, entrepreneur, philanthropist, and former college athlete.

Pinky passed away last week at the age 78 after a battle with Alzheimer's disease. He attended the University of Minnesota on an athletic scholarship, eventually earning three varsity letters as halfback for the Golden Gophers.

Shortly after his graduation in 1956, Pinky embarked on a successful career in business, buying struggling companies and turning them around.

Over the years, Pinky McNamara would donate millions of dollars to his alma mater's liberal arts and athletic departments. Along with his brother, Bob, another former Golden Gopher, Pinky helped raise the funds to bring football back to the university's campus that he loved.

His philanthropic efforts will leave a lasting and permanent mark on campus, with the university's McNamara Alumni Center named in his honor. Pinky may be gone, but his legacy will always live on at the campus he loved.

NATO ASSEMBLY IN BULGARIA

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I return from a meeting of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly in Varna, Bulgaria, where the U.S. delegation was chaired by Congressman MIKE TURNER, accompanied by MIKE ROSS, JO ANN EMERSON, and JEFF MILLER. We were welcomed by the former Mayor of Varna, Hristo Kirchev, who is a champion of freedom and democracy in a nation which, since 1990, has evolved from the chains of communist totalitarianism to being a vibrant free market democracy today.

Parliamentarians from NATO's 28 member nations and delegations, from Russia to Montenegro, were briefed on issues critical to promoting democracy in the world. Secretary General Anders Rasmussen presented a clear report on NATO's progress in Iraq and Afghanistan, while encouraging civil society movements in North Africa. Prime Minister Boyko Borisov of Bulgaria gave a stirring promotion of a missile defense system for Europe. Bulgaria is a valued partner of America.

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

MEDICARE

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

Mrs. BLACK. I have been doing town hall meetings for the last 4 months, and up to this point I have had about 12. When Medicare comes up, people tell me, Don't touch my Medicare. Hands off my Medicare.

And you know what I tell them? There is a dirty little secret that the Democrats in Congress and the President don't want them to know, and that is their Medicare is already changed. Because last Congress, when this House passed ObamaCare, they robbed $500 billion from Medicare to pay for their government takeover of health care.

Not only that, but ObamaCare set up an Independent Payment Advisory Board, or an IPAB, and you know what those 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats will do? They are going to ration your Medicare to cut the costs and limit seniors' access to Medicare.

You know what else happens under this plan in a decade? There is no Medicare because the program will become bankrupt.

Now, the truth about the Republican plan and the Path to Prosperity: Under our plan we save Medicare. We address the unsustainable growth rate of Medicare so the program doesn't go bankrupt in 10 years. The Democrats have no plan to stop Medicare's descent into bankruptcy, but the Republicans do. And unlike ObamaCare, where you

have no choice, the Republicans give you a choice.

Now the dirty little secret is out there, and the real choice is in front of us. The choice is easy.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON MEDICARE

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, the CMS actuary just came out with the grim news. Apparently the insolvency date of Medicare was just moved up 5 years to 2024—that is only 12 years from now—and will probably move up further before we get there.

Furthermore, this is after one-half trillion dollars has been shaved from current Medicare to extend the life of Medicare, and, as we all know, that money is already infamously booked twice: once for middle class insurance subsidies and the other to extend the life of Medicare.

The 2012 budget that passed the House with bipartisan support is the beginning to the solution for this problem. It preserves Medicare for those 55 and over and reforms it to a market-based system with lots of choices for those under 55 today. Meanwhile, Democrats simply play ''mediscare'' on this issue and insist on doing nothing.

HONORING OUR SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a lot of times our constituents are confused about the processes of this House. The one thing that we are not confused about is when we all join together in unity, our patriotism, our respect, affection, and admiration for the United States military.

Yesterday, many of us interfaced with families, Gold Star Mothers and Blue Star Mothers, families who had experienced a wounded soldier or one who had lost their life in battle. It was a serious time, and I, too, commemorated and celebrated with my fellow Houstonians and Texans, even those who came up to me and said veterans can't get jobs.

And so for me to come today and to participate in a mockery of a placed-on-the-floor vote on the debt ceiling when everyone knew, and our good friends on the Republican side, that it was a joke, but it was not a joke for me. I voted ''yes'' because the responsible position is to ensure that America pays her bills, not to leave soldiers on the battlefield with no equipment, no shelter, no food, and certainly not to take away veterans benefits, Medicare, Medicaid.

Let us be responsible, and let us stand for the American people. I did that today.

□ 1940

GOP DOCTORS CAUCUS

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we're going to spend the next hour tonight discussing basically the health care debate and what has occurred in the past 2 years here in Congress. And we have asked our physician colleagues and Health Caucus to come down and spend this hour discussing this issue.

Now, I think before we start, what we need to do is talk about why we're having this debate. Obviously, we needed health care reform in America. And one of the frustrations at least I've had since I was here was during our last Congress, we had nine physicians in the Physicians Caucus, M.D.s and then 13 people total in that caucus, and none of us was consulted about the health care bill.

And when I came to Congress, I asked myself the question, just as I was seeing a patient, what's wrong with the American health care system? And the problem with the American health care system is today still, and getting worse, is that it costs too much money to go to the doctor and go to the hospital. So when I would see patients in my office, I could see the costs ever rising. Back in the eighties, we tried plans called managed care capitation. In our State, we tried to reform our Medicaid program. All failed to hold the costs down.

The second problem I saw with the American health care system is that there are a group of our citizens who didn't have access to affordable health insurance coverage. If it was affordable, we would all have it. As an example, let's say a sheetrock worker or a carpenter that puts up studs in a house or a homebuilder may not have a business big enough to afford health insurance coverage. And maybe this person's wife worked at a local diner, and together they make $40,000 a year. In our area you can get along just fine making that amount a year. They couldn't afford $12,000 premiums.

And the third problem I saw, which is a liability issue, is that we see ever-escalating health care costs, and I see Dr. GINGREY is here with us, a fellow OB/GYN as I am, and we saw costs from the time I began my practice from $4,000 in 1977, which is what the malpractice insurance was at that time, to over $70,000 today. Who bears those costs? Our patients.

Again, back to number one. We began this debate on what I think was a false premise. Basically, the health care bill was to cover those people who didn't have insurance. And this particular bill, the Affordable Care Act, so-called ObamaCare, did do a couple of things. One, it has done nothing so far—it is beginning to be initiated, as far as lowering the health care costs—it has done nothing. If you look at every business around, those rates are skyrocketing and making it less affordable for us.

Number two, it did increase access. And how did it increase access? At least it appears so far that it increased access by massively expanding Medicaid. And the one thing about the bill I do like is allowing young people to stay on their parents' health coverage until they are 26.

In a committee hearing we had the other day with HHS Director Sebelius, I asked her how many people would this bill cover, this 2,500-page bill? And she estimated a number, 30 million or 32 million more American citizens. The CMS's own actuary estimates, the Congressional Budget Office estimates it will add 15 million more people to Medicaid, a system that's already bankrupt in the States. The CMS actuary actually believes it will be 24 million more people on Medicaid, and you add 6 million more young people to that, and really without this incredibly complicated bill, in two paragraphs you could have done exactly what they did with this bill without all this complicated issue that we're going to talk about later tonight.

So we did nothing to lower costs. We did increase access by increasing Medicaid and potentially exchanges. And we can talk about that later. And then lastly, liability, which there is nothing in the Affordable Care Act for that.

The other thing that is not in the bill, glaringly not in this bill, which is incredibly important, is the so-called doc fix. And so our viewers can understand what that is, as a physician, when I see Medicare patients, the Federal Government pays a certain amount with Medicare part D and the person getting the care pays for those premiums also.

In 1997, to help hold health care costs down, there was a formula put in so that if the costs went above a certain amount, the doctors were, the providers were cut. Right now, if we hadn't passed a temporary fix of this, the doctors would have had a 26 percent decrease, and in 2 years that's going to be a 30 percent decrease in their payments. So what difference does that make if you're out there and you're a Medicare-age patient, as I became last summer? So I can speak from some experience. I signed up for Medicare last July.

The problem with it is there's a cost to the physician opening and practicing in their office. And we don't pay the cost of the care. And we are already seeing in our area where very fine physicians are no longer accepting Medicare patients. We believe this could get much, much worse under the Affordable Care Act.

And as the two past speakers brought out, what this bill also did, and what we're going to discuss tonight in more detail, is not just the entire health care bill, but it's going to be Medicare and one specific part of it called the

Independent Payment Advisory Board. But to get to that, we have to explain the problem and why we're having this discussion.

One of the charts I want to show you is this and why we're having the discussion right here is because right now we're looking at a budget that if we do nothing at all—and I'll use President Obama as an example. President Obama just turned 50 years of age. In 2025, he'll be Medicare age. And guess what? Four things will make up the entire budget of this country: Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security and interest on the national debt. And that could come even sooner where those things make up all, depending on certain economic factors. So this is the reason we're having this discussion.

And I had a person come up to me this weekend at a Memorial Day event and said, Dr. ROE, I'm concerned that my children and grandchildren will not have Medicare. And I said, that is exactly the reason we are having this discussion. I have that same concern. We want to save this program for future generations. And he said, well, why don't we just cut foreign aid? And I said that's fine. And last year we cut earmarks. That makes up only 2 percent of our budget. If we completely did away with all foreign aid, which some people I think would agree we need to do, but if we did that, it would only cover, it would take 15 years of no foreign aid to take care of Medicare for 1 year at today's dollar expenditures.

Let me give just a little bit of history on the Medicare program, which has been very successful and very popular in this country. In 1965 it came out. It was a $3 billion program, and the reason it was is because we had seniors that didn't have a way to put money back and to take care of their health care after they had retired from their work. So this program was started, Medicare part A, which is the hospitalization part, and Medicare part B, which is the physician part. It was a $3 billion program at that point. The government estimator said in 25 years, in 1990, this will be a $15 billion program. The real number was over $100 billion. And today, just 20 short years later, it's over $500 billion. So this is a totally unsustainable growth rate that we have to deal with.

Now, in passing, as our two previous speakers mentioned, we've cut, this bill cut $500 billion out of Medicare. This one little thing that was left out of those talks, though, this year, beginning in January 2011, our baby boomers hit retirement age, age 65, Medicare age at 3 million per year, approximately 10,000 a day. And guess what? In 10 years, we're going to have 500 billion less dollars to spend on Medicare and 35 million more people to take care of. And so you do the math. How are we going to control this? How are we going to control these costs?

Well, the President suggests a plan called the IPAB. Right now in Medicare we have MedPAC, a Medicare advisory board which gives advice to this body right here, the Congress, about how we are going to spend our Medicare dollars and suggestions. And the Congress has the right to make those decisions.

Well, this Medicare board, this IPAB board that's going to be in effect in 2014, starts this year with some funding; 2014, 15 bureaucratically appointed people will make decisions based on nothing but cost. Let's say we spend $500 billion on Medicare, and the actual cost of providing the care to our citizens is $550 billion. We've lost our ability in this body right here to say how those dollars are spent. That board will make a decision to cut the spending to $500 billion based on nothing but cost, not quality and not access.

And I can assure you, if you have 35 million more people or 36 million more people chasing 500 billion less dollars, three things happen. One is access to your doctor goes down, costs will go up, and essentially you will have, with this board, rationing of care.

□ 1950

I have several of my colleagues here. There are many more things we can talk about. We have the next hour. I want to recognize my colleague, Dr. HAYWORTH from New York, for some comments.

Ms. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Tennessee, Dr. ROE, for yielding me this time.

In New York's District 19, I have been sharing a headline with our seniors and with all of our citizens, which is that the Affordable Care Act ends Medicare as we know it. It ends Medicare as our seniors know it. And you, sir, have stated the reason exactly. The Independent Payment Advisory Board, which was written into law and passed by the 111th Congress, signed into law by President Obama, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, will assure that our seniors, starting in 2015, when they have to make a 0.5 percent cut in Medicare's budget, our seniors will stop having the access to care that they are accustomed to. And they will not be happy about it.

And then in every successive year, in 2016 it will be 1 percent; 2017, 1.25 percent; 2018, 1.5 percent, if I have done that math right, Dr. ROE. Our seniors will find that their access to the doctors they know, the doctors they prefer, will not be the same.

So when we talk about what we need to do as a Nation, we in the House majority have pledged to our seniors that we will keep the promises that America has made to them, to make sure that Medicare benefits remain secure and safe for as long as they need them, which is why in the budget that we passed in April, the Path to Prosperity Budget, we guaranteed that seniors 65 and above, and in fact our citizens age 55 and above, will not see changes to Medicare as they know it. That gives Americans 10 years at least to prepare for a more secure future for Medicare for exactly the reason that you have talked about, Dr. ROE, which is we do have many blessings in this extraordinary country, and one of them is that we do continue to make wonderful advances in medical science. They do come at a certain cost. So we have a challenge that we need to face together. There are certainly ways in which we can, together as a Nation, figure out how we make our health care more cost effective, and there are lots of opportunities.

It is true, there is waste, fraud, and abuse in the system. That needs to be addressed. There are also ways we can protect our health better in our youth that Americans haven't necessarily had to think about nearly as much in the past couple of decades, but that they are starting to think about. So we need to make sure that we are making those advances together and that our seniors and all Americans who need advanced care will be able to get it, that the sickest among us will not be deprived of care because of the arbitrary decisions of a board that has to cut budgets. Again, that is the headline. The Affordable Care Act ends Medicare as you know it, but what the budget that the House Republican majority passed in April does is to restore Medicare as our seniors know it and allow all Americans time to prepare for a better future for Medicare.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the doctor for being here. And just for the viewers today, I want to thank all of my colleagues for being here, and all of you are health professionals, not career politicians. I want to point out that Dr. HAYWORTH just joined us in the Congress. I am a one-term congressman. I practiced medicine for 31 years. I know you did for a long time. We have OB–GYN doctors, ophthalmologists, family practice, cardiovascular surgeons, and nurses, in the well tonight. These are not long-term politicians. These are practicing health care providers who have been out there.

I think the question I always ask myself when I look at legislation, having just left the examining room, how does this legislation affect the care that I can give my patient. I think that is the one that we all worry about. We worried about it with insurance companies. All of us have fought with insurance companies about providing care. I believe at some point in time—we all do this—that care is going to be rationed. The question is: who is going to do it? Is it going to be a Federal bureaucrat and a Federal nameless, faceless panel here in Washington, D.C.? Or is that decision going to be made between a patient, a doctor, and their family? I believe that is who should be making health care decisions in America. It should be made in the examining room in the doctor's office with consultation, not by some nameless bureaucrat up here in Washington, D.C.

I thank you for being here, Dr. HAYWORTH, and I now yield to Dr. GINGREY, my good friend from Georgia, and a fellow OB–GYN.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for leading this hour on such an important discussion. And of course I thank all of my colleagues on the floor here tonight.

I understand that Dr. ROE has authored the repeal legislation of IPAB, this Independent Payment Advisory Board, created under ObamaCare.

Dr. ROE, Mr. Speaker, just said that the doctor-patient relationship, the provider-patient relationship, be that provider an advanced practice nurse or psychologist, a physician, even the hospitals, of course, are huge providers of health care, and who should we be concerned with as Members of Congress. Well, it is those 700,000 people that each of us represent all across this country and that doctor-patient, provider-patient relationship that is most important. Cost, of course, is important. But, first and foremost, is the sanctity of that care, and that is exactly what Dr. ROE is speaking of, Mr. Speaker, and why it is so important that we do vote to pass his bill, and we do it as quickly as possible to repeal this very bad decision.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, back I think in December of 2009, almost 2 years ago now, our colleague on the other side of the aisle, a senior member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts, RICHARD NEAL, offered a letter that many of us in a bipartisan way cosigned. I think there were over 100 signatories to that letter literally begging the President and the administration to forget this idea of creating this exact same board that Dr. ROE is talking about and my colleagues will be talking about tonight. It was called something different then in the construction phase of ObamaCare.

But whatever you call it, today of course we understand it as IPAB. IPAB, Independent Payment Advisory Board; I call it IBAD, Independent Bureaucratic Absolute Dictators, these unelected 15 people that can literally, and will, as the gentlewoman from New York just said, Dr. HAYWORTH, they will have the ability come 2014 to start making these cuts and to make them where the biggest growth area and cost is.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we all know, they say that there will be no rationing. Well, you can say it is not rationing, but if it walks like a duck and quacks like a duck and looks like a duck, it's a duck. And it is rationing. What will happen, and we know it, we health care providers that have spent, what, 500 years of clinical experience in the aggregate, we know exactly what these bureaucrats will do. They'll say if someone is above a certain age, let's pick one, say if you're 65 years old and you come down with leukemia, lymphoma, and what you desperately need when that chemotherapy has failed to keep you in remission is a bone marrow transplant, but because that is so expensive, the decision will be made that no, nobody over a certain age, nobody over a certain age will be eligible for a transplant of a kidney, of a lung, of a liver, of a heart, indeed. This is something that is absolutely unacceptable to us. It is unconscionable.

So, Mr. President, and I say this through you, Mr. Speaker, please, listen to us. Listen to us. We have another letter coming. It is going to be signed by all 21 of the members of the House GOP Doctor's Caucus. I wish we had some Democratic members as a part of this group, but hope springs eternal and maybe they will. But listen to us because we know of what we speak. Don't make this mistake. Don't go down this road. This is not the way to solve the Medicare crisis and the insolvency that is coming very quickly by 2024.

□ 2000

You say you can't accept the House Republican budget, the so-called ''Ryan budget,'' the path to prosperity that includes some, I think, significant and very thoughtful, adult, mature decisions regarding what we need to do on Medicare. All right. Let's get together. Let's get in a room and let's talk about it. But you want to kick the can down the road and do nothing except slash Medicare to pay for your new signature issue, ObamaCare—slash it by $500 billion. Don't put it back into Medicare, but create this whole new program and force more people on to Medicaid, weaken Medicare and then just hope for the future. Well, I think the American people have seen enough of that.

I know there are a number of my colleagues here tonight who need time, but I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, and I will close with this:

On the House GOP Doctors Caucus Web site, Mr. Speaker, folks, my colleagues, you can go to that Web site, and your constituents can go to that Web site. It's DoctorsCaucus.Gingrey.house.gov or DoctorsCaucus.Murphy.house.gov. The reason for the ''Gingrey'' and the ''Murphy'' is that we just happen to be the co-chairs now of the House GOP Doctors Caucus. That, obviously, will change in future Congresses, but that's the way to go to the Web site. We are going to ask you to sign a petition: Oppose the Democrats' Medicare cut board, because that's what it is, a ''cut board.'' Visit the GOP Doctors Caucus Web site. Sign the online petition: Oppose the Democrats' Medicare cut plan.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to point out to our viewing audience tonight that when the House version of this bill was discussed through three committees, when this was debated 2 years ago, this was not in the House version of the bill. This was not there. This independent payment advisory board did not exist. When this bill the House passed through three committees and then here as debated on the House floor went to the Senate, we knew that bill couldn't pass over there, so they brought one out that didn't go through a single committee hearing with this IPAB in it. We have right here the letter that many, many bipartisan Members—Dr. FLEMING is here. Dr. GINGREY, myself, and others—signed along with many people. BARNEY FRANK signed this, opposing this bill, as well as BOB FILNER, Dr. MCDERMOTT, JIM MCGOVERN, and on and on and on. They all think this is a bad idea.

Why do we think this is a bad idea?

We believe as the people's representatives—that would be us—that if there is going to be a cut in Medicare that some faceless, nameless board shouldn't have the right to do that and that the Congress would advocate its, I believe, constitutional right to control spending. So that's the reason we are having this debate now. This should never have been in the health care bill.

Before I yield to my friend from Louisiana, with regard to this right here, President Obama said on Medicare reform: Now, we believe the reforms we propose strengthen Medicare.

That would be taking $500 billion out. I have a hard time believing that's going to strengthen it when we've got 35 million more people going into it.

It will enable us to keep these commitments to our citizens.

If we are wrong and if Medicare costs rise faster than we expect, this approach—that's this IPAB—will give the independent commission, which is this 15 bunch of bureaucrats that are going to make $165,000 a year, I might add, the authority to make additional savings. ''Savings'' means we cut the money so you don't get care. Let me interpret this for you: by further improving Medicare. You tell me how that improves Medicare if you cut services to people and if they don't get the care they need.

I would now like to yield to my friend from Louisiana, Dr. JOHN FLEMING, a family practice doctor.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman, my colleague, my fellow classmate, Dr. ROE from Tennessee.

What I thought I would do is take just a moment and discuss the historical aspect of Medicare and how we got to where we are today.

I began medical school only 7 years after Medicare began. In fact, my colleague, Dr. ROE, I think you're probably of similar age and station in life and also Dr. GINGREY who is here, and some of us may even remember before that.

I watched Medicare grow, and the promise to physicians and patients at that time was that government, if this is passed, would not mess with anything. It would all be between doctors and patients. However, by the time we got to the '80s, we found that couldn't be true. The costs were exploding far beyond inflation, so the government—Congress, in fact—began to go through a number of calisthenics in order to make it work.

One was RBRVS, which was a formula by which doctors would get paid rather than by what their costs were—then DRGs, diagnosis related groups, to tell hospitals exactly what they're going to be paid regardless of their costs, then CLIA, and then finally SGR, sustained growth rate, which we're struggling with now.

It basically means, if we miss budget targets, doctors get across-the-board cuts, which would be up to 25 to 30 percent today. Of course, Congress keeps kicking the can down the road because Congress knows that, if we were to actually implement the cuts that are required by law, physicians would stop taking Medicare patients, and we'd have a serious, serious problem.

So, if we fast-forward to today, why is it that we can't control the costs to Medicare? I just have to bring it down to the bottom line here. You control health care costs by one of two methods:

One is a market-based, patient-centered method in which the patient is in the driver's seat, working in partnership with his or her health care provider, making the decisions, but also having a responsibility to control costs, which means the patient has skin in the game, meaning through health savings accounts and things of that sort. They have an investment in controlling costs for them. Therefore, they control costs for the rest of the system. Fraud, waste and abuse is taken care of by the user, the consumer in that case, making, in fact, the patient a savvy consumer.

On the other hand, you've got a command and control, top to bottom, which is what ObamaCare is. The only way that you can control costs, Mr. Speaker, by doing that is to use a system like IPAB, this independent payment advisory board—15 appointed officials who have absolutely no accountability to anyone. They are unelected and unknown, for the most part; and if you have a problem with their decision, there is nobody to go to. No one is going to answer the phone.

So what does this relate to ultimately?

We get an inkling of where we're going with this through funds going into this comparative effectiveness board, where studies will be determined to see how effective various treatments are and for whom. This comes down to what is already implemented in Great Britain, NICE, which stands for the National Institute of Clinical Excellence. For a lot of people, it's not so nice.

So how does it work? It goes like this:

There is a certain number of procedures, diagnostic-or treatment-wise, and there is so much money that can be spent on those. Then there are the needs, the people who actually need these. So a determination is made based on a graph, if you will, or on a matrix as to someone's value to society, as to the value of one's life. In fact, they actually have a numerical value each year for what one's life is worth. They go to this matrix, and they determine in Great Britain whether or not it's worth that investment for them. That may mean a hip replacement, it may mean renal dialysis, or it may mean that your cancer doesn't get treated.

In fact, if you look at the comparative statistics between the survival rates of prostate and breast cancer, which are two of the main cancers we deal with in this country, against Canada, which also has socialized medicine—and Great Britain—there is absolutely no comparison. The death rates are much higher in those countries.

So today I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if we continue down the ObamaCare road, the implementation of IPAB, which is controversial even among the left of the left and is very concerning for everyone, I think this is sort of the last shoe to drop when it comes to the creating of a government-run, socialized health care system in which bureaucrats, rather than you and your physician, will be making decisions about your individual life.

We very much want to repeal ObamaCare; but even if for some reason we can't or until we do that, we desperately want to get rid of this IPAB, which we view to be toxic for our health care system and for our culture in general.

With that, I want to thank the gentleman for having this discussion tonight, and I look forward to many more.

□ 2010

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

We are blessed to have not only physicians in our Health Caucus but registered nurses with years of experience in health care.

I would like to now yield to the gentlelady from North Carolina for her comments.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you, Dr. ROE. My comments are coming to you as a nurse in health care. And, Mr. Speaker, I know you understand the situation that we're discussing tonight as well.

The situation at hand tonight, there are so many to choose from. We are all vehemently against ObamaCare, and we know that it must be taken down. We voted to repeal it only to fall on the steps of the Senate with nothing forward, so we are taking it apart piece by piece.

This Independent Payment Advisory Board, let's think about that for a moment. One of the points that my colleagues have made is that this is an independent board that is going to make decisions about your health care, the American people's health care. If they receive Medicare, a board somewhere in this country—I guess I would imagine here in Washington—will come together. Your situation, your diagnosis will be sent in, and they will convene and they will decide whether or not you're going to receive the procedure that's being put forward or whether your physician will actually get paid for that procedure. So not only does this limit the health care that you might be able to receive, but it also dictates to physicians what they can and cannot do.

Imagine a physician sitting down with a patient and discussing the possibility of hip surgery after a broken hip only to find out a day later that that surgery cannot be done because this independent board has decided that that patient's age is too progressed, or maybe the patient takes too many medications, or they just feel that this isn't going to be a positive outcome. Imagine that patient, imagine that family looking into that doctor's eyes and saying, You cannot do my surgery? You cannot fix my hip? I was a normal functioning individual 2 days ago, and now I cannot have surgery? This is what ObamaCare has put in place. It has cut $500 billion out of Medicare, and it's going to put a panel in place to limit the amount that can be spread around. $500 billion, that is an incredible amount of money.

I just want to elaborate on my comments. The board, itself, is just unbelievable. But let's face it. Right now in America, physicians are closing their doors. Physicians are dropping patients with Medicare because they simply cannot afford to do business any longer. All of these things that we're facing right now—we talked about the SGR. We talked about how physicians are being paid. There is so much uncertainty in the health care world directly because of ObamaCare. Hospitals are scrambling to figure out and crunch the numbers on how they're going to be able to continue to provide care throughout the years moving forward.

We must follow through on this legislation because it is going to affect every American; it doesn't matter how old you are. This is just a start. This is just a foot in the door. A board like this is dangerous beyond all imagination. I applaud you, Dr. ROE, for all of the work that you have done because this is the right step to take, and I thank you.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Before the gentlelady leaves, let me just point a couple of things out that concern me about this bill, and again, back to my premise that health care decisions should be made between patients and their doctor.

I have had patients in my practice who have been in their seventies or eighties who are much healthier than someone who may be 40 years of age. I have seen them. As a matter of fact, at home, one of the folks who helps cut wood and clean and take care of the Appalachian Trail, does trail maintenance, is 92 years old. And he's out hiking on the trail, a very healthy gentleman. And we see this over and over.

This Independent Payment Advisory Board—and I'm going to run down it real quickly just to let you know what authority this U.S. Congress right

here, and I think this is a bipartisan agreement that we're doing away with—it's created under ObamaCare. The Senate version. Not from the House of Representatives, remember. It creates targets, and it requires Medicare to make those cuts when those targets are reached not based on quality and access but just a specific number. And it targets only senior benefits and providers.

And here's the other little thing that's not known that we haven't even talked about tonight. This IPAB will start out for the first 5 years affecting prescription drugs and physician providers, but at the 5-year mark, your hospital is also included in that. That means that they can cut the payments to hospitals, and maybe many rural hospitals—we fear, where I live in a very rural area in America—may close because of this very provision right here. And it's targeted at high-growth areas.

Seniors are shut out when IPAB selects Medicare cuts. And there is no one they can go to to even complain about this. They can't go to their doctor, and they can't go to their Congressman because the Congress gave up its ability to control those decisions.

So one of my great frustrations is this Congress right here is giving up its constitutional authority. And we are beholden to the people who elect us to do what's right, not some nameless bureaucratic board.

I would now like to yield to the gentleman from Indiana, our new Member here, Dr. LARRY BUCSHON, who is a cardiovascular surgeon. He brings great expertise in cardiovascular surgery.

Welcome to the floor tonight, Dr. BUCSHON.

Mr. BUCSHON. Thank you, Dr. ROE, for yielding.

I was a cardiothoracic surgeon just recently, last year, prior to coming to Congress. I helped patients and their families make informed decisions regarding the care they needed or the care their loved ones needed. I provided a professional opinion based on the facts and sometimes had to convey information and news to patients and their families that they didn't want to hear.

Mr. Speaker, I came here to tell the American people the truth that sometimes can be difficult to hear, but the American people deserve the truth about what's happening with health care in this country.

The majority of my patients were Medicare patients. We know that Medicare is one of the main drivers of our long-term systemic debt.

I want to reiterate that on May 13 the Medicare Board of Trustees released their annual report on the program's financial status. In it, the Medicare Trustees stated that the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will become insolvent in 2024. That's within 13 years, Mr. Speaker, 5 years sooner than last year was predicted.

And from a physician's standpoint, according to the American Medical Association, one in three primary care doctors is currently limiting Medicare patients in their practice, and one in eight physicians is forced to refuse Medicare patients altogether due to the cuts already that have been made in the Medicare program. And with the Medicare population estimated to double by 2030 to approximately 70 million Americans, imagine the access problems we're going to have then.

Today, the average couple that turns 65 has paid in over $100,000 to the Medicare program but is receiving over $300,000 in benefits. Mr. Speaker, this is not a sustainable model. Without significant reforms, beneficiaries in the future are going to be at risk for limited access to quality care they deserve and they count on, and ultimately face rationing of care, waiting lists, and dramatic cuts to current seniors based only on the cost, not based on what Dr. ROE has said, the quality of care or what type of care they need, but based on the money alone.

Anyone promoting the status quo is dooming Medicare to failure, and soon. It's coming up in 2024. Our plan doesn't affect any American over age 55. They have counted on these benefits. But what it does is preserves the program for future Americans. Again, the status quo is dooming Medicare to failure, and soon.

Congressional Democrats and the current administration have offered no plan to date except the Independent Payment Advisory Board that Dr. ROE and others have been talking about in the ObamaCare bill; again, I want to say again, 15 unelected Washington, D.C., bureaucrats making decisions about Medicare, making decisions about the future of health care for our seniors.

IPAB was thought to be maybe the silver bullet—if you listen to them tell the story—to control costs. But what IPAB really will do is will recommend cuts be made to the program—not savings, cuts, we're talking about here. CMS will then make those recommendations to Congress unless we get a two-thirds vote. They go in play. They start to happen. We have given up, as Dr. ROE said, our congressional authority to do something about the future of health care for our citizens.

This is a misguided approach that will, again, empower this group of unaccountable bureaucrats to determine the type of health care you may receive based on your age and your health. Health care decisions are best made when left up to the patient and their doctor.

□ 2020

You and your doctor and your family know what's best for you, not the government.

And I want to finish by saying, for me, personally, Mr. Speaker, this is about the future of health care for the American people. I fear for what the future may hold—access problems, waiting lists, rationing of care. Look at other countries that have socialized medicine. All of these things are occurring. This may be based on your age, based on your health. We don't know what they're going to be based on in the future. It could be based on other factors.

Do we really want this type of health care for the American citizens? I would answer ''no'' on behalf of my patients and on behalf of all Americans and, especially in the case of IPAB, on behalf of our American seniors.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Dr. BUCSHON, let me throw this question at you a little bit.

When you are seeing patients in your practice and basically those health care decisions are made between you and them, when you look at their relevant clinical data and their symptoms and you can see that there is a lesion, maybe a heart surgery that you can do to help them, and it's based on what their needs are—and I have never understood since I have been in this Congress why health care has ever been a partisan issue—have you ever seen a Republican or a Democratic heart attack in your life? No. And I've never operated on a Republican or Democratic pelvic cancer in my life.

Why in the world—so this is one where there is bipartisan support because both sides of the aisle understand this is a very bad idea to get on this slippery slope where you allow Washington bureaucrats, and they can be called ''experts'' if they want to be, but they're going to be making clinical decisions for people they never have placed an eye on or a stethoscope on their chest.

And I, for one, am going to go down swinging on this because I believe this affects all the people in this country, and potentially in a very negative way, including the President, because he will be under this same plan.

And, unfortunately, many people will probably try to opt out. We're already seeing all of the opts out for the private health insurance plans. But I, as a 65-year-old, can't opt out. I'm in. I'm going to be part of this. And I know what my patients have wanted. And I just wondered if you feel the same way I do about that.

Mr. BUCSHON. I feel exactly the same way, Dr. ROE.

For me, again, I've never seen a Democrat or a Republican patient. I see a patient. In fact, in my practice as a heart surgeon, frequently, I didn't even know what type of health care coverage that patients had.

For a doctor, like you or me, for any health care professional, what matters is what's the right type of health care to provide for that patient regardless of ability to pay. And what we're looking at here is the potential where these bureaucrats may tell you, Dr. ROE, that you cannot treat this patient based on their decision about whether or not it's affordable for the American people. They're going to make decisions based on money, not based on what needs to be done.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. What I believe will happen in that situation is that the Federal Government will have overpromised, and what we, as physicians, will do is provide that care and shift that cost somewhere else until there is nowhere else to shift it; because I know how if I see a patient that needs care and they are 75 years old, let's say, and they have needed surgery and I can improve the quality of their life with that, we're going to do it in some kind of way. And you know; you've done it. We just figure out later how to pay for it. That's not the way to do this.

I thank the gentleman.

I'd now like to yield to the gentleman, my colleague and good friend from Tennessee, Dr. SCOTT DESJARLAIS, also a new Member of Congress. Welcome to the House floor tonight.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Thank you, Dr. ROE. I appreciate you leading this discussion.

I rise tonight in support of my many physician and other health care colleagues that are in the Chamber tonight to discuss what I agree should be a bipartisan issue. It has been so disturbing to me after being in Congress just 5 months to see some of the disrespect that goes on across the aisle on the floor back and forth. But when it comes to our seniors' health care and health care in general, it's something I take very personally.

I think I can speak for all of my physician colleagues, nursing colleagues, our dental colleagues, that are in the Doctors Caucus, that none of us went to medical school or nursing school or dental school to become politicians. We went into those fields because we care about people, and we're now here for that exact same reason. And to sit in this Chamber and listen to accusations about this plan of PAUL RYAN's to help save Medicare is just more than I can stand to not get up and at least share my thoughts. Because the bottom line is, as some of my colleagues have mentioned tonight, the CBO states that the cost of doing nothing is that Medicare will be broke in 9 years.

We've also heard that 10,000 new Medicare recipients are entering the pool each and every day. We also have talked about the fact that the average age of a Medicare recipient in 1965 in terms of life expectancy was 68. So, at that time, you were expected to be on Medicare, Dr. ROE, for approximately 3 years. Well, thankfully, due to advances in medicine, men and women are both living on average at least 10 years longer.

And I think Dr. BUCSHON mentioned that the average couple pays in about 100,000, or 109,000 into Medicare taxes but are extracting 343,000. So it doesn't take a mathematician or CPA to figure out that this program has been severely mismanaged.

So when we step up as a conference and as conservatives to help save the Medicare program but yet we watch, one after another, Members from the other side of the aisle get up and use scare tactics on our seniors saying that this plan is cutting their Medicare, that's just simply untrue, and I think that we need—and we need to set the record straight and people deserve to hear the truth as has been spoken here tonight.

So I join you in my concerns that these are patients we're talking about. These are people. And seniors deserve to know the truth that if they are 55 and older, this plan does not affect their Medicare.

I know that the message has been unclear because I conducted a tele-town hall just last week before the Memorial Day weekend, and we had over 20,000 people call in. And the majority of the questions that we were asked was, Why is my Medicare being cut?

So I think that we need to reiterate the fact that, if you're 55 and older, there are no changes. If you're under 54, we're taking steps to make sure that your Medicare will be preserved and saved and protected for future generations. Anything else would be simply irresponsible.

Another claim that was disturbing to me was the special election in New York. Some claim that the reason that the conservative candidate lost was because of our attempt to save Medicare. And it was spun as that cutting Medicare is something you just don't touch politically. But I know a lot of us, including yourself, Dr. ROE, didn't come here to play politics. We came here to do the right thing, and the right thing is to tell the American people the truth. And what we're trying to do is protect that plan.

The plan that is going to cut Medicare that has been mentioned already is the ObamaCare plan. And that seems to have been pushed to the back burner, and that's a dangerous thing. The IPAB bill that you sponsored, and I'm proud to cosponsor, is a great example of that.

So we need to speak boldly and let the people know the truth so our seniors are not afraid and scared by political tactics. I'm proud to join you tonight in this discussion.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Let's go back to what you were saying, Dr. DESJARLAIS, just a moment ago. We've discussed tonight this Independent Payment Advisory Board in some detail, about what it does. We've also discussed the Ryan plan, about what is in the future.

Well, why are we having that discussion? Well, we're having that discussion because we see Medicare as it is being unfundable in 2024, 13 years from now, and that could be a moving target and change. So we want to sustain this—I think both sides want to sustain Medicare as it is.

So we know that people are 55 and older—if you're 70 years old now, nothing changes. My mother is 88 years old and nothing will change for her. But if you're 54, what happens to you? And why do we think that will work?

Well, what happens to you at 54 is you're offered exactly the same health care plan that I have and you have right now. Maybe you have. I have Medicare part A. I would like to still have the plan I had. But you'll have exactly the same plan that Dr. DESJARLAIS has. And what plan is that?

Well, basically what the premium support is is that a person just looks—when you turn 65, you'll look at your health care plan as if—say the Federal Government is your employer. They pay that part of your premium and you pay some other. Now, a higher-income senior like you or myself, we're going to get a bigger chunk of that. So it's going to be indexed based on what your income is. If you're 65 years of age and you're—let's say you have multiple health problems and you're going to have a more expensive plan, you'll pay less than that.

□ 2030

If you are a low income senior, you will pay less than that. Why do we think that will work? We've heard all these things about insurance companies. Why do we think that will work? Well, the one single plan that has ever come in under budget that the Federal Government runs that I know of in health care is Medicare part D.

Now, whether you believe in doughnut holes or not doughnut holes, but in the 10-year budget estimate, Medicare part D, which is the prescription drug plan, was estimated to cost about $630 billion or $640 billion over 10 years. It came in about $337 billion, a 41 percent decrease. So when patients have choices, and people can go and it is not one shoe fits all, one size fits all, people have choices to be able to go out and pick out what kind of health care plan is best for them—for me, I like a health savings account. Someone else may pick another plan with a 20 percent copay. But those patients, those Medicare recipients at age 65 will be able to make that choice, not some nameless board deciding what kind of care you get.

Now, I will say that we do need to help control the costs. That's why we're having this discussion. But again, I believe who should be making those decisions are patients and their families and their doctors.

I want you to stick around for a minute because I've got some more questions. But right now I would like to yield to ANN MARIE BUERKLE, a great new member of our Health Caucus, a nurse, and an attorney. I won't hold that against her. She is from New York, and welcome to the meeting tonight.

Ms. BUERKLE. And I thank you. Thank you for this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise here tonight, along with my colleagues and other members of the Doctors Caucus, with

such concern about what is being proposed in the health care bill and what is now law. I think we need to have a frank discussion with the seniors, Mr. Speaker, because of the demagoguing and the fearmongering that has gone on by proponents of this health care bill.

The fact is this health care bill, Mr. Speaker, is law. If it goes on without being interfered with, Medicare as we know it will be decimated. Five hundred billion dollars in cuts. That's going to affect the seniors. That's the law, and that's what's in place right now.

What we are proposing on the Republican side is that: it is a proposal. But it is a place to begin the discussion about how we are going to save Medicare. And we must say over and over again to our seniors this bill will not affect you if you are 55 years and older. You will retain the exact same benefits that you have now. But we as health care providers, we as those who went into health care as advocates because we care about people, we want to protect and preserve Medicare. That's what this proposal is that the Republicans put forth in the budget.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the irony in all of this is those who pushed this health care bill, organizations who pushed it on seniors and said this is a great bill, and vote for this health care bill, they now have waivers from the health care bill. They now are saying, well, it's good for all of you folks, but it's not so good for us. That should raise red flags.

So I am so pleased to be here tonight with my colleagues to be able to have this conversation with the seniors, Mr. Speaker. They need to know the truth. They need to know that we want to preserve Medicare. We want to make Medicare better for us, for our children, and their children. And that's what this is about.

I thank you for this time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentlelady.

Who more than anyone than the Health Caucus and the physicians caucus wouldn't want to maintain Medicare? And one of my frustrations that I have had in this body is, how can you solve a problem if you can't discuss it? And right now we're not even able to discuss in a logical way how we reform Medicare. And those Medicare changes, we've only mentioned a few of them I might add. There are many others in here. In 2012, that will be just next year, there will be Medicare cuts to dialysis treatment. Medicare cuts to hospice begin in 2012. And on and on.

And it's one thing to have a problem. It's quite another to not even be able to discuss the problem. So let's just summarize it briefly here, and then I will yield to you that are still here. We had a problem in this country with health care costing too much and a group of people that couldn't have access to care and a liability crisis. We did nothing with this ObamaCare bill to curb the costs.

How we helped pay for the Affordable Care Act is we took money out of Medicare. And to control spiraling Medicare costs, we set up a board, this bill set up—not we, but this bill set up a board called the Independent Payment Advisory Board. Most people, including many physician friends of mine, don't have any idea what this is. It is a very bad idea. It's not a good idea in England, where it's being used. That's where the group that wrote this bill got it.

And you know why they want this? Why the people that signed this, the Senate and others? Because they don't have to be accountable. They can blame somebody else when needed care isn't given. Oh, it isn't my fault. This board did it. Well, it is our fault. If we give up that right, it's our fault if those cuts occur to our seniors and we cannot provide the care that they need.

So why we are having this discussion is we have got a budget problem. We have got a $1.6 trillion budget deficit in this country we have to close. And how do we do that? We look forward and see where are the costs going forward? As I mentioned, when the President of the United States is 65 years of age, 15 years from now, four things will take up every tax dollar that we take in. So it's mandatory that we begin now solving this problem.

I think the plan is a great plan, the Ryan plan. It allows people to plan. It also, I believe, will allow you more choices. And I believe that that's exactly what the American people want in health care, is not someone up here in Washington making those choices for us and our patients, but the patients and the doctors making those choices.

I will yield to the gentleman, Dr. DESJARLAIS, if you would like to have some comment about that.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. You are correct, and I agree with everything you said. The point that a lot of folks made on the campaign trail is there is simply too much government medicine. There are unsustainable costs. I know our colleague from New York, ANN, as an RN, probably recalls the day where she spent more time on patient care than documentation. And now most nurses will acknowledge that it's just the reverse; they spend much more time on paperwork and bureaucratic issues than taking care of patients.

And I think that it's important that we remember that just a short time ago, when the Affordable Health Care Act, more commonly known as ObamaCare, was being pushed forward, Americans vehemently opposed this bill. I don't want them to forget all the reasons why they opposed it. They didn't ask for it. We can't afford it. And we don't need it.

There were approximately 30 million uninsured people, according to the President, at the time. But yet up to 75 percent of people rated their health care as good or excellent. So we're taking a system that has flaws and excessive costs, and trying to completely turn it upside down with this Affordable Health Care Act, which we all know is going to lead to rationing of care, decreased quality of care, and increased costs. You can't add people to a system and decrease costs without rationing care.

So I think it's important that the people stay engaged and speak out and acknowledge that they want the relationship to be between themselves and their doctors, and not between Washington bureaucrats such as what the IPAB is proposing. That's exactly what we're going to see. And we need to stand firm. The American people don't need to forget why they were opposed to the ObamaCare bill in the first place.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

I yield now to Congresswoman BUERKLE from New York for closing comments.

Ms. BUERKLE. Thank you very much.

I think it's so important to have this conversation with the seniors. We want to preserve your relationship with your physician. There is nothing more sacred than that relationship. This IPAB panel will disrupt that. It will come right between you and your physician.

It's so important that we get the facts out, that we have this conversation with seniors, that you understand that we are fighting to preserve Medicare, fighting to preserve Medicare as we know it, and Medicare and the patient-physician relationship.

With that, I thank you for this opportunity.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentlelady.

I will finish by saying that I know that the Health Caucus and the physicians caucus are totally committed to this bipartisan bill, this repeal of this IPAB.

Again just to summarize what it is, it is 15 bureaucratically appointed people approved by the Senate, submitted by the administration. I don't want a Republican President or a Democrat President appointing these people. What they will do is make a decision based totally on cost. The Congress then requires a two-thirds override to change or they have to make the cuts, we have to make the cuts someplace else. CMS will be in charge of how those cuts are taken care of.

□ 2040

I think that responsibility, that fiduciary responsibility, is right here in the elected body that meets with the people.

I thank the gentleman for being here tonight, I thank the gentlelady for being here, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must remind all Members that

remarks in debate are properly addressed to the Chair and not to a viewing audience.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2017, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. REED (during the Special Order of Mr. ROE of Tennessee), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–95) on the resolution (H. Res. 287) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2017) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin our remarks today which will focus on our Make It in America agenda, the agenda that we put together to put the American people back to work to really support manufacturing, and we are going to have a good discussion about that.

I would like to yield first to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) who has some important remarks to share.

Ms. SEWELL. Thank you so much for yielding.

I rise before you today to discuss the recent disasters, natural disasters, that have affected families, businesses and communities across this Nation. In the aftermath of such disasters, there must be a shared commitment to rebuilding communities across this Nation.

My thoughts and prayers are with the people of Joplin, Missouri, who suffered the most recent wrath of nature. We in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama suffered massive devastation during the April tornados. Nine out of 12 counties in my district suffered tremendous damage. These pictures only show part of the story. Homes were destroyed. Schools, churches, businesses, and communities were destroyed; and many of my constituents lost the lives of their friends and loved ones.

I want to thank the President and the First Lady for visiting my district and seeing the devastation firsthand. Mr. President, you told us then that you had not seen such devastation before. You also said that you would make sure that we were not forgotten.

Thank you, Mr. President, for your commitment to rebuilding Alabama. I want to thank your administration for responding so quickly.

Within hours, FEMA administrator Craig Fugate was on the scene to survey the widespread damage. The emergency disaster declaration and the major disaster declaration were approved within hours.

I also want to thank Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano, HUD Secretary Shaun Donovan, Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack and SBA Administrator Karen Mills for traveling to my district days later.

As a result of the April tornados, 67 lives were lost in my district alone; and in the State of Alabama, 238 people lost their lives. I want to extend my deepest condolences to those who have lost their loved ones. I want to thank all of the first responders who were on the scene to help so many of the victims.

I also want to thank the volunteers who continue to work tirelessly to restore the lives of families who lost all that they had. The destruction and loss of lives has been absolutely heartbreaking. But out of this tragedy, we will triumph. We will recover, rebuild, and restore our communities. We will be better and stronger than before. I am inspired every day by the resilience that my district in the State of Alabama and the people have shown. Neighbor helping neighbor.

The response by the State and local government has been tremendous. I want to thank Governor Bentley of Alabama for his leadership and timely response. The coordinated efforts of my local mayors have been amazing. I would like to thank Mayor William Bell of Birmingham, Mayor Walt Maddox of Tuscaloosa, Mayor Cunningham of Geiger. Your leadership and tireless efforts have been commendable.

I also would like to commend the Alabama Emergency Management Agency under the leadership of Art Faulkner. I would be remiss if I did not mention the incredible support and help of my colleagues within the Alabama delegation.

What we have learned is that what affects one of us indeed affects all of us. Together, I know we will work to rebuild Alabama.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlewoman, and I know we all stand in strong support of the work that is under way in your district and all across this country and our hearts and prayers continue to go to the families who have suffered such tragic losses during those terrible, terrible incidents. We compliment the first responders and the mayors and all those you have recognized tonight.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to turn to the agenda that we announced several weeks ago that involves really comprehensive pieces of legislation to really support American manufacturing.

Our country has a proud tradition of making things. We built the world's strongest middle class because, in large part, so much of what the world needed, we made here in America. And for millions of Americans, our tradition of making things here has been a source of opportunity and great pride. Today, with millions of Americans still out of work and with an economy which is still struggling, it's time to draw from that tradition to build a positive, job-creating agenda.

The American Dream used to mean something, that if you put in a hard day's work you could expect good American wages, benefits, and a better life for your family. It meant that when products said ''Made in America,'' people knew that they were getting the highest quality manufactured goods money could buy. It's time working Americans used our strength in numbers to reclaim the American Dream. Working people deserve a voice at the table; and if we lose that voice, we will lose what our grandparents fought so hard to leave us.

We should start with manufacturing. The number of Americans involved in producing goods is still near its lowest point since World War II. Manufacturing is central to our economy. The National Association of Manufacturers tells us that manufacturing stimulates more economic activity than any other sector. It's time we started expanding opportunity and stopped shrinking the middle class.

So this effort is to really understand that we have to start making things again, that manufacturing matters. My friend, Mr. GARAMENDI, certainly our leader in this Make It in America agenda, is someone who has spoken so passionately and so forcefully about our ability again to lead the world in making goods so that we can start shipping goods that are made in this country all over the world. Instead of exporting jobs, let's export American-made goods.

I tell my constituents—I hear from them all the time—go into a store and try to find something made in America. It's almost impossible, and it doesn't have to be that way. We still have the best workers in the world, we still make the best products in the world, and what we need are good public policies that support American manufacturing, that support job growth in American manufacturing to give fair trade and tax policies that give American manufacturers a fighting chance to compete in a global economy and efforts to be sure that our trading partners like the Chinese stop cheating and play by the rules and are held accountable when they do.

So we put together an ambitious agenda to really make things again in this country. Because when we make things in America, families can make it in America.

We have a series of bills we want to talk about tonight, but think of those days when you would go into a store and you would pick up an item and it said ''Made in the USA'' and the kind of pride we felt because we knew that was a product that was made well, built well, that would stand the test of time, and we could sell it all over the world. We can do that again.

We are doing it. We have some great manufacturing in this country. We are seeing a real growth, particularly in new manufacturing, high-tech manufacturing, which requires innovation and entrepreneurship and the kinds of investments in technology that will help us lead the world in this new knowledge-based economy. So this effort is to really understand this is part of our history, it's part of the present day, and it is part of our future as a great economic power.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) who has been such an important voice on the importance of rebuilding and strengthening manufacturing in this country.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. CICILLINE, it does not surprise me at all that you have a passion for this issue. You come from a part of the United States that really started the industrial revolution, the Northeast, and your State in particular, the industrial revolution started there.

And over the years it gave great strength to this Nation, and it was the manufacturing that provided the economic underpinnings for the growth of the American economy. Unfortunately, your part of the State, perhaps for a variety of reasons, some of them having to do with national policies, began to lose its industrial base.

But with your representation and your passion for this issue, I have absolutely no doubt that once again the Northeast will find the resiliency and the right national policies to rebuild the manufacturing base there and across the rest of the Nation.

We are already beginning to see it as a result of the stimulus program, and some of the specific laws that were built into that program are now rebuilding the manufacturing base in the Midwest.

□ 2050

Specifically, a requirement that for the high-speed rail systems and the rebuilding of the American intercity rail programs, those goods, trains, rails, electronic systems, control systems, have to be built in America. And guess what? International companies are establishing, reestablishing, and building manufacturing facilities in America to take advantage of that money that was in the stimulus bill. Simple, little things, not an increase, but rather using our Federal money wisely. We can do it. We must do it. We will make it in America once again, and it will be the great American manufacturing sector. And when we do this, America will make it.

There has been a lot of discussion here on the floor today about deficits. What are we going to do about the deficits? Are we going to raise the debt limit? Of course we're going to raise the debt limit. We have to. America stands behind its debts. We will pay. It will engender a debate. Fine. Let's make this part of the debate. Let's make this part of the debate.

In dealing with America's deficit, are we willing to put in place the policies that will rebuild the American manufacturing sector? And I know it is the Democratic agenda to do just that, that we will rebuild the American manufacturing sector. And in doing so, we will rebuild the American economy and provide one of the critical bricks in solving the deficit problem. Without a growing economy, without a strong middle class, the deficit will never be solved. So we ought to do it.

How can we do it? Well, how about our legislative agenda? Why don't you start us off on a couple of the bills and see where it takes us?

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman.

I think one of the important investments that we need to make in supporting manufacturing that you just referenced is infrastructure. And one of the parts of the Make It in America agenda is the making of a national infrastructure bank which will create a public-private partnership to finance the construction of roads, bridges, transit, and the ability to move information, goods, and services in the 21st century.

If we're going to successfully compete in the manufacturing sector, we need to have an infrastructure that has the ability to move goods, services, and information to be competitive and succeed in the 21st century economy.

When you look at what other nations who are investing in manufacturing, are investing in their infrastructure to support manufacturing, in roads, in bridges, in transit, in information technology, and the ability to move goods and services competitively, they are racing by us, literally and figuratively. And what we need is an infrastructure that will support this growth in manufacturing, an infrastructure that will really allow American manufacturers to compete successfully in the 21st century.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If you would yield, the infrastructure bank is a great idea, and it is one which allows us to build immediately. And over time, as those projects pay off, they repay the loans. It is a very, very wise investment to create an infrastructure bank. Other countries have it. And in the United States, there are certain localities and States that also have it.

Another piece of legislation dealing with infrastructure actually is a bill that I put together that says, we spend a lot of money. It's part of the excise tax money that goes out to build highways, to pay for buses, trains, light rails and the like. And my bill is pretty simple. It's our tax money. Use that tax money to buy American-made equipment. Why would we send our tax money off to China to buy a Chinese bus? Hey, we make great buses. We make a great bus in the Bay Area. The GILLIG Corporation makes a bus that is a superb bus. And we need to spend our taxpayer money buying American-made buses, trains, light rails and the like.

We're going to spend billions. Is the money going to be spent in America or is the money going to be spent overseas? My legislation says buy American-made equipment. Pretty simple. After all, it's our tax money. One of several bills—the infrastructure bank and this particular bill—in building the American infrastructure.

I notice one of our colleagues here from the State of Hawaii.

Mr. CICILLINE. Yes, I know she, I'm certain, is going to join the conversation.

I think the point you made, Mr. GARAMENDI, is an important one. These are not always pieces of legislation that require additional investments of resources. It's also about ensuring that the resources that we're expending are used in ways that support the growth of American jobs and American manufacturing, and your bill is an excellent example of that.

I think we also have, as part of this package, kind of as a beginning point, the development of a national manufacturing strategy, a legislation that would direct the President to convene the stakeholders in industry, in labor, and manufacturers to really develop a national manufacturing strategy with benchmarks and with ways to hold ourselves accountable to meeting those benchmarks; because, again, all of our competitors who are serious about growing manufacturing are doing it pursuant to a well-conceived and developed manufacturing strategy.

We need to put the same kind of thoughtful consideration in the development of that strategy and then really hold ourselves accountable with good benchmarks. And I think that's a great other piece. Of course, my favorite in the package is my very own Make It in America block grants.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It's always good to talk about your legislation. This is a great way to get things started. This is a great way to do it. It came from a fellow from the East Coast, the great State of Rhode Island, and it basically is a block grant program to jump-start the infrastructure programs all across the Nation.

The thing that's really good about this is it's a competitive block grant. You're just not going to go out with earmarks because somebody has seniority, but it's going to be based on the quality of the program, the jobs that are brought, the necessity of moving people. I think it must have been a genius out of Rhode Island. Was it you, Mr. CICILLINE, who came up with that idea?

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for that excellent question. But this legislation really grew out of my visits to manufacturers in Rhode Island, some who have been very successful, some that are growing, some that have not been growing. And I said, What are the impediments? What would allow you to grow? What do you need as an American, as a Rhode Island manufacturer? And developed this idea

of the Make It in America block grant that would provide resources in a competitive process as you described, for manufacturers to retrofit their factories to make energy improvements in their plants, to train workers on new equipment, to buy new equipment, to engage in activities which will allow them to increase their exports, but really a shot in the arm to help manufacturers to compete successfully in the 21st century by identifying what they need.

And, look, we invest lots of resources in other areas of our economy. We don't do enough for American manufacturing. This would respond to many of the urgent issues that Rhode Island manufacturers, American manufacturers are facing, do it in a competitive way with real measurement of outcomes, but really invest again in making things in this country.

I know the gentlelady from Hawaii has now joined us, who has also been an important part of the Make It in America agenda.

I would like to yield to Congresswoman HANABUSA.

Ms. HANABUSA. Thank you very much. It's very fascinating to watch the both of you go back and forth on this.

Hawaii doesn't have manufacturing like the traditional form of manufacturing. However, there is one part of our economy that is very critical, and it's under fire. And I would like to discuss that, because I have some statistics as to how, when we protect what is made in America, we are able to actually see the results.

And I'm talking about the Jones Act, which has different ramifications for all over, but for Hawaii, because we are in the middle of the Pacific, what we tend to forget is that our oceans are our highways. And what people think is that, gee, if we had ships coming in from foreign-flagged vessels, we might have a reduction in the costs. And that is exactly where we do not want to go.

Let's talk about manufacturing and how it affects us. First of all, shipbuilding, the gentleman from California and I sit on the Armed Services Committee, and tomorrow in one of the subcommittees, they're going to discuss the 30-year plan of shipbuilding in the military. And the military, I know from conversations with my own hometown people who are in the maritime industry that they have been called to Washington because the NAVSEA component wants them to continue to build in America. They want them to build the ships because we can't, the military can't continue to keep this industry alive. They need help from the private sector. So let's look at: Why wouldn't the private sector do this?

And one of the pieces of legislation that has been there to keep the private sector in the manufacturing of ships has been the Jones Act.

Now, let's understand what it means for a State like Hawaii, and then maybe we can, by going through that, understand what the ramifications are when we talk about Make It in America, because people may not see that actual connection to how we benefit from it.

We have, for example, in my district alone, 16,494 domestic maritime industry jobs. This is the second highest of all congressional districts. This is according to a PricewaterhouseCoopers Transportation Institute survey or statistic that they did.

□ 2100

Now, the total gross economic output from domestic maritime activity is $3.389 billion annually for the State of Hawaii. Gross output is defined as the sum of receipts or sales and other gross income generated in this maritime sector. Executives and other workers related to the domestic maritime industry receive total compensation of $785.9 million annually. The total value added for goods and services moving by domestic waterborne transportation is $1.24 billion annually.

The State of Hawaii is a top contributor to the domestic maritime industry, ranking basically in the top eight of four categories, top eight. Think about how small we are: jobs, economic output, labor compensation, and value added. There are over 23,000 domestic maritime jobs in the State of Hawaii, and the total gross economic output for the State is well over $4.7 billion annually. And the related labor compensation is $1.1 billion annually, and the annual value added is about $1.7 billion.

Now, nationally, the domestic maritime industry accounts for about 499,676 jobs; $29.1 billion in labor compensation; $100.3 billion in economic output; $45.9 billion in value added; and $11.4 billion in taxes. There are more than 40,000 vessels in America's domestic fleet, one of the largest in the world. But remember something, and one of my Senators made the statement—and I was stunned by it—he said after World War II in terms of ruling the high seas, America had over 90 percent, over 90 percent; and we are now in the low 20s.

What does that mean for us? Think about the industry. Think about the manufacturing. Think about the high-quality jobs that the maritime industry represents, and what are we doing about it. We know trade. We also know in terms of the military that the maritime industry is critical, but the military alone cannot keep that industry alive.

That is why—let us not forget the Jones Act comes from the Merchant Marine Statute. And what has been done in the past? In the Persian Gulf war, for example, and in other types of areas where we don't have enough ships, we go to the private sector; and we are able to do that because they are American flagged, American owned, and American manned—manned, not to be referencing other than man or woman.

But that's what it is all about. We are, no matter what, the greatest power in the world. That's what we are. That's what we represent. And why would we not recognize that there are many things that we do best and we rule the high seas, as they said. And now we are willing to sacrifice that to other countries? That should not be the case because trade, maritime, is a major component of our success and our ability to continue to be independent.

And we know, the gentleman from California and I as we sit through many of our hearings, that the new military is looking at a marriage with the commercial areas, a marriage with using all of the different ships, plus airlines, to transport things. You know, that is the future; but to make that future a viable future and a cost-efficient future, we have got to continue to make it in America.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlelady.

I think the other very important part of that conversation has to be a continued investment in science and research and innovation. A lot of the things you are talking about, kind of new manufacturing, we are going to continue to rely on the knowledge economy and the brilliant new innovators and the great new scientists and the great new technologies and research. We need to be sure that even in these difficult budget times, we are making investments in science and research that will help protect those jobs of the 21st century so we can not only develop the ideas, but then manufacture the products. I think that is an additional important point.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I only want to take a second here. I notice one of our colleagues from Texas has joined us. She is a strong advocate of returning American manufacturing.

I want to thank our colleague from the great State of Hawaii for bring to our attention the critical importance of transportation on the sea and in the American flag. Just for a moment, she caused in my mind a memory to return about an article that I read about where the ship is flagged. That is where it is licensed. I recall that I think it is from Florida, the Carnival Cruise lines, a billion-dollar operation with the ships actually flagged, I believe, in Panama. Interestingly, the tax that they pay to the U.S. Government, that is their corporate income tax—zero, nada, nothing—largely because they are able to avoid the American laws by flagging their ship offshore.

We need these ships flagged in America for many reasons, and certainly the issue that she raised about national defense. Corporate tax policy, the R&D tax credit, another one of the bills that the Democratic Caucus has put forward to permanently put in place the research and development tax credits so that we can expand the genesis, the beginning of tomorrow's manufacturing, which actually comes through the research. I can go on and on about that.

Representing California, we think research is really, really important. That is why we supported, without any Republican support, the STEM program, science and technology, which is research and also the education that goes with.

One of the things that I found so disturbing was the effort by our Republican colleagues to back off the research, to reduce the research in America, when in fact that is where the future comes from.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman from California.

I think that point cannot be stated often enough, that part of our ability to make it in America, not only manufacture but invent and create and make the new discoveries, is understanding that we need to maintain our investment in science and research to compete in this global economy. I thank you for raising it.

I am delighted that we are joined by our colleague from the great State of Texas, someone who has been a very forceful and strong advocate for manufacturing and making it in America.

I yield to the gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

It is my privilege to be able to join the gentleman from Rhode Island, a former mayor of one of our great cities, who understands when he looks at his constituents in city government that job creation and manufacturing churns the economy of local government as well.

I am delighted to say to my friend from California, Texas is right with you. I don't think any State can reject the value of research. We have the Texas Medical Center. It has research in many different components, but they all come together to generate jobs and a better quality of life.

And I am amazed at how astutely correct the gentlelady from Hawaii was on this whole idea of shipbuilding and the flags that ships fly under and the loss of income.

But more importantly, most of us grew up, young as we are, with this country being the grand shipbuilder. We were proud of that. We loved those christenings; but, more importantly, to see those great ships.

So I rise today to support you and to join also, if I might, with my colleague from Alabama, having had the opportunity to join her there in Birmingham and Tuscaloosa. Let me say to her and to those who have lost so much in Alabama and throughout the areas surrounding Alabama, and certainly to our dear friends in Missouri, and the tragedy of such a high cost of life, let me say to them that we will never give up on helping you.

My point is this: it is interesting that today we had an example of the lack of seriousness that my Republican friends have regarding job creation.

□ 2110

No matter how we voted—I voted ''aye'' on the debt relief, or the debt increase—we all know that our commitment is to save Medicare and Medicaid, and that it is also to generate revenue.

How do we generate revenue? We put the punch back in manufacturing. We manufacture and we create jobs. How did FDR do it? He put people to work. Eventually, the government got out of putting people to work, and you saw this big manufacturing boom—shipbuilding, building homes. We all remember the massive homebuilding that President Eisenhower engaged in—manufacturing, making a whole bunch of things.

Let me tell you why this is so important and how sad I was that the debt relief was, in fact, a mockery, because, if you commemorated soldiers yesterday, let me tell you what the unemployment rate is for veterans: 7.7 percent. The unemployment rate for those Afghanistan veterans—and I would include Iraq—is 10.9 percent.

How do you put these folks to work? You put a boost and a punch in manufacturing. You let these guys come back and use the skills that they've gained in working—or soldiering, if you will—in Iraq, in fighting for our freedom in Afghanistan and other places. You say to these guys, I don't just mourn the loss of your comrades on Memorial Day; I listen to the voices of your families and yourselves. When you come back, I've got jobs for you.

Let me tell you how you do it, because I am big on making things. Here we go. Here is one of our bills that we are very interested in, H.R. 613. We build airports. We refurbish airports. We make them better. We fix our highways. We build or we engage in high-speed rail—trains, transit—and we make it in America. Let me say this: we make sure that trains are made here in America, are assembled here in America. We go back to making the same trains that we had to make when everyone said, Go west, young man. Go west, young woman. That's how Texas got here. That's how California got here.

So it saddens me that instead of spending the time today in looking at H.R. 1730, which will be discussed, or H.R. 613 or the research tax or the ability to give incentives for research or to help the Texas Medical Center or Silicon Valley, we did something that we didn't take seriously—the need of America to pay her bills.

Then, of course, what does it mean when we talk about ''making it in America''? Boy, this is exciting to me. We begin to appreciate chemistry and physics because we are in the business of inventing and therefore of making. This picture shows research and what happens when you get through with research. It is extremely important that we, in essence, show the importance of what happens to Americans. They get to work.

My point is that there are a lot of Americans who can be helped if we engage in job creation by making it in America. As we have all committed to do, I am beginning to go around to my district and am excited about all the manufacturers I am finding. I'll tell you, you just go around to say ''thank you'' to these manufacturers, ''thank you'' to what's happening. If we were to invest in America and make it in America, it would be a better deal not only for America and those Americans here but for our young people graduating from college and for our soldiers coming back.

So I want to thank the gentleman for, I think, the right approach, which comes right after the mockery of a debt relief that was not serious. For those of us who believed it was important to be serious and who may have voted ''aye,'' we really wanted to be discussing job creation, and we really wanted to be discussing having jobs, as well as providing for those who are ready to work. Let's see if we can get something done, so I join with the gentleman in working on these important issues.

I close by simply saying: what an excitement to make ships again, to build the trains for high-speed rail, to make America's infrastructure in such a way of using our manufactured products. What a way to put America back to work.

I hope we will continue to press this issue. I believe the Democrats are going to be able to get this done—to make it in America, which will create more jobs for America and will generate the revenue that will really bring down the deficit.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlelady for her passion, and I am really hopeful that this is an issue on which we can really build some bipartisan support.

We put forth from the Democratic Caucus a very ambitious and detailed agenda on how we can make things again in this country and on how we can rebuild manufacturing and can really lead the world in the manufacturing sector again. I hope it's not a Republican or a Democratic issue. I hope people understand this is good for our country, is good for America, is good for American workers, is good for our economy; and I hope we will be able to find some support on the other side of the aisle for making it a reality.

I know a big piece of this is also supporting small businesses, which are an important part of the manufacturing sector. I would like to welcome the gentlelady from Alabama again and thank her for being part of this discussion.

Ms. SEWELL. Thank you so much for allowing me to be a part of the Make It in America Special Order hour.

I want to acknowledge the importance of small businesses in making it in America. Small businesses play a critical role in our economy. They provide jobs, they spur innovation, and they strengthen our economy. Small businesses are responsible for generating half of our Nation's gross national product and for employing half

of its workforce. That is why I have introduced the Small Business Start-Up Savings Account Act. More folks would benefit if they were provided incentives to allow them to save money to start up a business.

On average, an entrepreneur who wants to launch a new business spends $80,000 in first-year start-up costs. Entrepreneurs often go into large amounts of debt to start their businesses. They may even try to save money ahead of time in order to start these businesses. Many even use their savings from their retirement accounts to build the capital they need to run their businesses.

This bill would allow entrepreneurs to save money tax free so that they could start their small businesses. Similar to the retirement accounts, this bill would allow entrepreneurs to save up to $10,000 per year and to grow that amount tax free. Once people start their small businesses, funds from their savings accounts can be used for operating expenses.

In his State of the Union address, President Obama charged America once again to spark its creativity and imagination. He reminded us that we are the Nation that put cars in driveways, computers in offices, the Nation of Edison and the Wright Brothers, of Google and Facebook. In America, innovation doesn't just change our lives; it is how we make our living.

The government can't guarantee a company's success, but it can knock down barriers that prevent hard-working Americans from starting their very own small businesses. Innovation is the key to keeping America number one, and small businesses have always been at the forefront of American innovation. We can't expect to stay competitive in a global market without making the creation of small businesses a centerpiece in our playbook.

In the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama and throughout this country, the number one issue is job creation. Ordinary Americans with dreams of starting their own businesses will create most of the jobs that will employ the workers in America. In fact, over the past decade and a half, America's small businesses have created 65 percent of all jobs in this country. As we continue to build our economy, we must again build things in America, and we can do that through innovation and job creation through small businesses right here in America.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass this legislation and to help make things right here in America. I want to again applaud the gentleman from Rhode Island for leading us in this discussion tonight. It is critically important to the people of Alabama, whom I represent, and this Nation that we make things right here in America.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlelady.

I think this is one of those issues where the American people are well ahead of the elected officials because I think most Americans recognize the importance of our making things again in this country. This agenda, this Make It in America agenda, is really about two things: one, rebuilding our manufacturing sector so that we can make products here in America and can sell them from here all over the world; and, second, creating good jobs so that more families are able to make it in America.

Americans inherently know that manufacturing is critical to our Nation. It is not just that manufacturing creates good-paying middle class jobs and fosters innovation but that we've also been incredibly proud as a country about the fact that we make things and that we make the best products in the world.

□ 2120

We need and want more success stories like General Motors' recent announcement that they will be adding and preserving over 4,000 jobs across the United States, or Ford's decision to move 2,000 jobs back to the United States from Japan, Mexico, and India. In fact, Ford is planning to add another 7,000 jobs here in the United States. We need more stories like that that recognize that we make the best products and we have the best workers in the world.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I was just listening to you discuss the situation with General Motors and Chrysler. That was a very courageous move that the Democratic Congress, together with President Obama, made when they made a decision to save the American automobile industry.

Many people, particularly the Republicans here in this House, said don't do it, government shouldn't interfere with business, let the good go and the bad die. Well, this was several hundred thousand small businesses across the Nation that are supply chains that would have died. But the decision was made—a very courageous decision by the President—to support the foundation of one of the great industries in this world and one of the great industries in America. And so General Motors and Chrysler did receive a bailout. And here we are today with two companies back at it, making cars, making it in America, and by golly, we're going to ''Import from Detroit.'' You know, that was one of the greatest advertisements there ever was. But that's what this is all about, that's what this Make It in America agenda really is.

There is another piece of this agenda that we really must pay attention to, and that is the future energy sources of America are going to be renewables, together with gas and nuclear, but these new industries need support in their early days. And this is a tax policy. There has been in place for about 7 or 8 years now a very robust tax policy to support the new renewable industries. The production tax credit. When you put a solar panel up on your roof and you draw down the energy, there is a tax credit available to homeowners. Those are very, very good. We need one more little twist to it. I saw this in my own district with those wind turbines down there. They were being made offshore, and yet our tax money was—appropriately—supporting the energy, but if you add to it one additional fact, and that is the tax policy that supports a wind turbine made in America so that our tax money uses American-made equipment.

Another piece of legislation I have simply says, in the green technologies, wonderful, we need to do it, but let's make sure that those solar panels, those wind turbines are made in America.

Mr. CICILLINE. One of the most frustrating parts of that is when you look at the technology that forms the basis of those products, they were developed in large part—sometimes exclusively—by the great scientists and researchers at our great universities, and then they are manufactured outside the United States, and we're using public money to make those purchases. So you're absolutely right, having that requirement that it be manufactured in the United States is a critical part of it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. A pretty basic thought for me is that it's our tax money; spend it on American-made equipment.

The other piece of this is that these tax policies, these subsidies really work. And I want to give you an example. About a century ago, nearly a century ago America decided it needed a new energy source called oil. Over the years, subsidies were put in place to encourage investment in the oil industry and it worked, it worked phenomenally, created the best, most profitable industry in America, the petroleum industry; $970 billion—just slightly short of $1 trillion—of profit after taxes for the petroleum industry. And after a century of being subsidized by taxpayers, it's time for those to end. Let that industry help us with the deficit.

End the subsidy for Big Oil. Return the money to the American Treasury. Bring down our deficit. There's a lot of money here. Depending on how you count it, it's somewhere between $2 billion, $3 billion, or $12 billion a year in subsidies for this industry. Let's end that. But unfortunately, we're involved in a debate here in Congress over whether we keep the tax subsidy for Big Oil and shift the burden of solving the deficit to seniors, an incredible policy put forth by our Republican colleagues that would force seniors to pay more for their medical insurance and literally terminate, end Medicare for everyone that's not yet 55 years of age. Terminate Medicare, shift the tax burden to them, and keep the tax subsidy for Big Oil. Hello? What's that all about? Big Oil doesn't need any more help. The deficit needs the help. Don't give the tax breaks to Big Oil. And for

heaven sakes, don't terminate Medicare and force today's seniors and tomorrow's seniors to add the burden while keeping the benefit to Big Oil.

This is about choices here. This is about choices. How do we use our tax money? For the future energy industries? Do we use our tax money to benefit Big Oil and force seniors and nursing homes to pay more? That's not out there 10 years from now, that's right now, because the Republican budget reduces Medicaid. The biggest single part of Medicare is to subsidize seniors and nursing homes. So seniors and nursing homes, their families would pay more while Big Oil is protected.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank you for raising that point.

This is a very, very important question that we have to decide in this Congress: What are our priorities? What investments are we going to make both to rebuild our economy and get people back to work, but also to keep our commitment of promising aid to our seniors. This proposal that was made by the Republicans in this very Chamber to end Medicare to people 55 and under, end Medicare, and at the same time to reestablish the doughnut hole today so it would make prescription drugs more expensive for seniors, make nursing home care unavailable to many seniors, slash funding for Medicare, and really shift control to the private insurance companies to make health care decisions for our seniors—a terrible idea. And at the same time, as you pointed out, preserving tens of billions of dollars in subsidies to the Big Oil companies that have record profits, that don't need a check from the taxpayers that adds to our debt, and at the same time not making investments in the kinds of things we need to rebuild manufacturing and to make it in America.

It's the wrong priorities. We've got to protect our seniors, keep the promise we made to them, make the right investments here, and get rid of tax subsidies for Big Oil, get rid of the waste and fraud. Make cuts the right way, but make the right investments at the same time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We heard a debate here earlier, and while we're on Make It in America, this kind of moves us a little bit away, but they were saying earlier that in the health care reform, the Affordable Care Act, money was taken out of Medicare. Not true. Money was taken out of the pockets of the insurance industry who were given, back in the Bush era, an additional subsidy. It terminated a subsidy of $500 million that the insurance companies had to participate in Medicare. Why in the world we would subsidize the health insurance companies who this year are showing record profits, I don't know, but the Republicans perhaps want to keep that subsidy there for the health insurance companies just as they want to keep a subsidy there for Big Oil, rather than taking care of our seniors, shifting the subsidies to tomorrow's energy sources.

These are policy choices. And the policy choice of the Democratic Party is to protect seniors, to make sure that Medicare is there today, tomorrow, and forevermore. Let me be very clear about this. If you want to have a fight on this floor, then you fight with us over Medicare. We will not tolerate the termination of Medicare, period. And we don't want to shift costs to seniors. We want to make sure that those companies that are profitable, the oil industry, pays its fair share and terminate the subsidies to them.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. There is just a whole litany of things that I think have been mentioned today that are so very important.

One, I want to again emphasize when you invest in America, you create jobs. Look at what is happening to the auto industry. And I am far away from the auto industry. I happen to be in Texas. But I can assure you that I can point to an auto dealership that is alive today because we said ''yes'' to manufacturing and owning businesses and keeping the doors open. Now this same auto dealership—which, by the way, is in American-made cars, GM—is expanding, is refurbishing, will be hiring new people, will be selling more cars because we were engaged.

□ 2130

And I think the point that we have to create jobs to reinvest in this community points again to preserving Medicare, which is not being done by our friends—certainly the vote that we had today had nothing to do with the debt ceiling, had nothing to do preserving Medicare and Medicaid. And I truly believe there is a nexus, there is a connection—invest in America, create jobs, have revenue returned back to the economy, bring down the debt, and watch America churn like an engine that is purring and doing better.

We can make it in America. We can applaud our manufacturers. We can grow them. And I think the investment in America's auto industry is evident by all of the jobs being brought back home.

Let me end by saying to all of those who can hear us: American manufacturers, American corporations, bring your jobs back home and participate with Democrats in their serious effort to enhance making it in America and creating more opportunity. You are better off here. You can watch your company grow, and you can support the continued growth of America and opportunities for small businesses and the young people who are now coming out of our many colleges and schools ready to work.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlelady, and I thank you for your passion on this issue and again for restating the urgency of job creation and getting the American people back to work as our number one priority.

The Make It in America agenda will help do that by restoring making things again and understanding it has to have a central place in rebuilding our economy, by building an environment in which American manufacturers can grow and create jobs and making sure our businesses are competitive all across the world.

Many of our Make It in America bills have won bipartisan support, and now we can win bipartisan support in the new Congress when we work for stronger job training partnerships, fight for a fair playing field for American exporters, and hold China and our other trading partners accountable for currency manipulation and unfair trade practices.

Make It in America also means recommitting ourselves to the future of America's middle class by ensuring that we are out-educating, out-innovating and out-building our competitors. We, of course, have to cut wasteful spending and restore fiscal responsibility by making priority investments that are necessary to keep our Nation competitive.

As the gentleman from California has just put forth, that board which really does describe the issues that are part of the Make It In America agenda: focusing on fair trade policies; tax policies which support job creation in American manufacturing, that give American manufacturing the tools they need to succeed; energy policies that will increase investments in renewable energy, clean energy to make American manufacturers more competitive; labor policies; educational investments, educational investments; protection of intellectual property; and investments in infrastructure. Those are really the outlines of what we know we have to do to really support making it in America, to support manufacturing, and to support rebuilding and strengthening the middle class of this country.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If anyone understands the history and the importance of manufacturing, it's the gentleman from Rhode Island. The Black River down through Rhode Island was the very first place that America started its manufacturing base, using water as a source.

And today, as we look to the future of American manufacturing, we do have to deal with the energy issues. And we probably should take a full night here and just talk about how the American economy can benefit from a new energy strategy.

Tax policies we've discussed here a little bit.

One of the things we didn't discuss here on tax policy was we put forth a bill last year that took away $12 billion of subsidies that American corporations had when they shipped jobs offshore. I have no idea how such an incredibly stupid policy got into the Tax Code, but it did. It's gone. It was a Democrat agenda to eliminate those

tax subsidies that shipped jobs offshore. Unfortunately, not one Republican joined us in eliminating that crazy tax subsidy. That money is now back to help deal with the deficit.

Labor policies, education—another full night can be taken on just education. We talked a little bit about science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, the STEM programs. But it's much, much more. It's the reeducation of our workforce. Intellectual property, research, how you protect that, critically important. We did have a good discussion about infrastructure.

This is our agenda. This is the American agenda. This is the agenda about the future. And it is so much an important part of dealing with the deficit. There is not an economist out there that tells us we can actually deal with the deficit unless we get people back to work. And the people that we want to get back to work is American middle class. The American middle class needs to be rebuilt along with our manufacturing base, and we can do it with the set of policies that we're putting forth here.

We ask for our Republican colleagues to join us on these smart pieces of legislation.

Mr. CICILLINE, this is your night. You've led us in this. I yield back my remaining time for your closure.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman from California for your leadership on this and your participation tonight. I thank the gentleladies from Alabama and from Hawaii and from Texas for joining us as well.

I'll just end by saying you're right. Rhode Island was really the birthplace of the industrial revolution. And when you look at the role manufacturing played in the early days of our country's economy of the industrial age, Rhode Island played a really important role; and from Woonsocket to Providence to Newport to Pawtucket, we have examples of great manufacturing facilities. And what we need to do is put in place the tools and the policies that can rebuild that strength—and not only in Rhode Island but all across this country—that takes advantage of the great American ingenuity, of the great American innovation and the great American entrepreneurship to make the best products to solve the new challenges of the 21st century, to build products and to sell them all over the world, to create jobs as we sell American-made products all across the world.

And we can do it. We have the best workers. We make the best products. What we need are policies at the national level that recognize this is a key part to rebuilding our economy, a key part to the American—the rebuilding of the American economy, and understanding that we can make things again in this country. And by doing so, we can make sure that American families make it again in America.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMERICA'S DEBT CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUFFY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) is recognized for 23 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROBY. We face a budget crisis in this country. America is broke. Without bold action, our budget situation will get worse, not better. We also face a severe economic recession. The current national unemployment rate is 9.0 percent, and it has been as high as 10.1 percent back in April of 2009.

With so many Americans out of work, the Federal Government should be doing everything in its power to encourage economic growth—not discourage it.

Cutting spending is critical to creating a pro-growth environment. Cutting spending is essential to free market job creation. House Republicans are the only group in Washington showing leadership on this issue. We have voted repeatedly to cut spending in the short term, and we have passed a budget that would reduce spending by $6.2 trillion over 10 years.

By contrast, it has been more than 750 days since Senate Democrats have even passed a budget. Recently, Senator REID said: ''There's no need to have a Democratic budget, in my opinion. It would be foolish for us to do a budget at this stage.''

That is a breathtaking statement for two important reasons: First, the Senate is required by law under the Congressional Budget Act to pass a budget. Second, working families all across America live within their means every single day by following a family budget. It's simple. They don't spend what they don't have. So I ask: Why shouldn't Democrats in the Senate live by the same rule?

Now the White House is asking us to raise the debt limit and Secretary Geithner wrote, ''Never in our history has Congress failed to increase the debt limit when necessary.'' The White House wants a clean increase in the debt limit. That means they want Congress to approve more debt without cutting back on any spending. That is a failed policy.

The vote we took tonight is a clear indicator that House Republicans reject that approach. Our message is clear. We will not vote to raise the debt limit without significant reforms to change the culture of spending in Washington. If the White House wants us to consider raising the debt limit, they should be at the table proposing significant reforms that yield trillions, not billions, in savings to the American people. So far, that has not happened.

□ 2140

Tomorrow, the President has invited House Republicans to the White House to discuss the debt ceiling. His request for a clean increase in the debt limit was rejected tonight. I hope that tomorrow the President will offer serious proposals to cure Washington's addiction to spending. No lip service. No gimmicks. No smoke and mirrors. The American people don't want more political posturing. Real spending cuts. A true commitment to that is what will spur job creation and get our economy back on track.

I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentlelady from Alabama for her leadership on this issue, and the time tonight to be able to talk about an issue that's very important to my constituents in Colorado, the Fourth Congressional District, and around this country. There hasn't been a town meeting gone by where somebody hasn't stood up and said, ''Congressman GARDNER, what do you think about the debt ceiling? What's going to happen to this country? What happens if we continue to spend the kind of money that this Congress, this Nation has seen over the past decade?''

As we turn our focus and continue to focus on jobs and growing our economy, the only way that this Nation is going to be able to create long-term jobs and job growth is if we do everything we can to make sure we are cutting spending and reducing the size of government.

In 2006, President Obama talked about a failure of leadership, a failure of leadership to increase the debt ceiling, and that he would vote against it. He did vote against it because he believed to continue to kick the can down the road, to continue to spend money without a plan to reduce our debt, address the deficit, he believed was failure of leadership.

Tomorrow we have an opportunity to visit the President at the White House. And I hope we hear from him why he believed that in 2006 an $8.4 trillion debt was too much, why it was a failure of leadership to go beyond $8.4 trillion in debt. Because the President is now asking us to go beyond $14 trillion in debt, to pass a debt ceiling that would allow Congress to spend even trillions more than the $14 trillion debt that we have today. The people in my district are concerned that there is no stop sign in place for the fiscal recklessness that this Nation has seen. The failure of leadership continues from one Congress to another without a plan in place.

I have had the opportunities over the past several years to attend high school financial literacy classes, where

we're teaching our 8th-, 9th-, 10th-, 11th-, 12th-graders what it means to balance a checkbook, what it means to make sure that they are keeping their records straight. Unfortunately, this Congress has failed to learn those same lessons that our high school students are being taught in Colorado, what it means to be able to say ''no'' to spending, what it means to be able to say ''no'' to spending money that we don't have.

Mr. Speaker, I can't think of anything more pressing facing this country at the moment than to make sure we send a strong message to the rest of this country that we have learned a lesson, that we will create jobs in this Nation, and we will do it because we said enough is enough when it comes to reckless spending. That we have put in place policies that will make sure we stop the runaway debt and deficit.

The House took a stand today. We drew a line in the sand with a vote 97–318 that this House rejected the President's request to increase the debt ceiling.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DOLD. I appreciate that. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. It is indeed an honor to be down on the floor with you talking about something that is certainly near and dear to my heart, and that's jobs. That's going to be reining in the out of control debt that we've got going on in our country today. The thing that I think is important that my colleague pointed out, and something that I want to make sure we emphasize is this is a Washington problem.

Mr. Speaker, this has been going on on both sides of the aisle for a long time. Republicans had deficit spending. The Democrats' answer was to spend more. It's about time that we stand up and say, ''Enough is enough.'' Back in 2006, the President actually said, ''Leadership means that the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. America and Americans deserve better.''

Well, I couldn't agree more. We cannot continue to shift this burden onto our children and grandchildren. A $14 trillion debt. I went down, actually, today and saw the debt auction. In just a matter of minutes, we saw them in essence auction off another $50 billion of U.S. Treasuries. Most of that was auctioned off in under 2 minutes. We cannot continue to spend the amount of money that we are spending and still expect that we are going to provide the American dream for our children and grandchildren.

To me, I think that's the American compact that those I think on both sides of the aisle can agree upon; that we here in the Congress have to step up and provide leadership so that our children and grandchildren will have opportunities greater than the ones that you and I know today. Unfortunately, I fear that if we continue down the path that we go down, that we are heading down right now, we may be the first generation of Americans that leave our country actually worse.

We are looking for leadership. I am here on the floor reaching out and telling the President that we want to see a plan. Not that we want to reject a plan; we want to see a plan. Tell us why we need to raise the debt ceiling. Tell us what spending constraints are going to be put in place in Washington.

Both sides of the aisle need to just basically change the way that we're doing things so that we can provide some fiscal discipline for future generations. When I look at it, and I know we have got some other small business men that are up here with me today, I look at it like we've just purchased a small business. Well, actually it's a big business in the United States of America. It's also the greatest business on the face of the Earth. It has some debt. We know we are obligated to pay that debt. But we also know that we have to restructure how the company, in essence the United States of America, is taking on that debt. And until we are prepared to do that, we can't expect that we're just going to continue to run the organization, the company, the United States of America, the same way it's been run.

There is plenty of blame to go around. The time for leadership is now. And I welcome the opportunity to sit down with those colleagues on the other side of the aisle to come up with a solution so we can all march forward together and solve the big problems of our time.

With that, I will yield at least temporarily to my friend from New York.

Mr. REED. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, but I believe the gentlelady from Alabama controls the time.

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you.

I yield to the gentleman from New York as much time as he would like to consume, but we do have to be done in about 10 minutes.

Mr. REED. I appreciate that. I appreciate the gentlelady yielding. And I appreciate joining my colleagues, fellow freshman members of the Republican class who have come here to Washington, D.C., with the same philosophy that I believe I bring to the table. And that is exactly the point that we have been articulating here tonight. We need to get our fiscal house in order.

So many people ask me why is that so critical to our future? And when I go to my town hall meetings, and I go and talk to my constituents back in New York, I tell them there are two reasons. One, we all know that if you run a business at the debt levels that we run this government at, it will go bankrupt. And we are talking about the bankruptcy of America. That is not acceptable to me. It's not acceptable to my colleagues here tonight. And we're going to work day in and day out to prevent that.

But second, and more in the short term, we need to get our fiscal house in order so that we send a message to all of the world markets that the American market is alive and well. And you can invest your capital, you can invest your millions of dollars back here in America and put people back to work. It's not about creating jobs that are government jobs. It's about creating wealth. It is about creating a private sector that is strong, that is putting people to work day in and day out, putting food on their tables, feeding their families, providing for their education, and giving that way of life that we here have enjoyed to their children, to our grandchildren, and to generations that have not even seen the face of the Earth.

So for those two reasons, it is time that we honor Senator Barack Obama's quote that we need to stop shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better. I call on the President to put forth a plan to deal with this problem once and for all.

□ 2150

Mrs. ROBY. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois for such time as he may consume.

Mr. SCHILLING. I would like to thank the gentlelady from Alabama for giving me the opportunity to speak here tonight.

As a small businessman and a new Member of Congress, I believe that the people did not send us here to raise the debt limit without a clear path to fix this huge mess that we have. It's an honor to represent the people of the 17th District in Illinois. It's with great honor, of course, that even greater expectations come.

Future generations are depending upon us to get it right. You know, they didn't send us here to bury our heads in the sand and continue this path that we have been going on.

As one of the new 87 freshmen who was sent here to deliver a message from America that enough is enough, when it comes to the failed policies of the past, I will continue to persuade my colleagues that we must get this under control. We reached the statutory debt limit on May 16 of 2011. Secretary Geithner has said we have enough borrowing to get us through August 2 of 2011. After that, if the debt ceiling is not raised, then America will default on its obligations.

Secretary Geithner has said that it would be insane not to raise the debt limit. I believe the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. The debt limit has been raised 51 times since 1978. Today we are facing a crushing debt of more than $14 trillion. The insanity must stop here.

Mrs. ROBY. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas as much time as he may consume.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you very much. I am glad to be able to join you here on the floor tonight to ultimately talk about jobs. I have heard some folks mention debt and some other issues, but it all relates to jobs.

I hear folks from the other side of the aisle say, when are you going to have a jobs bill? And what I try to convey to my constituents and to my colleagues here is that when we are talking about the debt and getting our spending under control, we are talking about jobs.

This country has not seen job loss like we will see if we have a debt crisis. And if we want to be the country like many of us grew up in, a country that is innovative and leads the world in technology and advancement, then we have to deal with our crushing debt.

What has been striking on the issue of the debt here tonight is I have been listening to colleagues from the other side of the aisle and I have heard about all these plans. I have heard about plans to pay down the debt, plans to deal with the deficit. I have heard about their Medicare plan.

The bottom line is, they don't have a plan. This President, in the Senate controlled by Senator REID, they don't have a plan. They don't have a plan for Medicare, they don't have a plan in the form of a budget, they don't have a plan to get the debt under control, they don't have a plan. Their only plan is to let the House lead.

They will let us be bold while they are politically timid. They have no plan. It would be easy to have a debate between our plan and their plan, but they don't have a plan.

So we are left with a situation, for example, on Medicare, something that we want to preserve, something that is a big driver of our debt. On the issue of Medicare, the other side of the aisle likes to compare our plan, which reforms and saves Medicare, they like to compare our plan to the current plan.

Well, that's fiscal fantasy, folks. Why? Because the current plan goes away. The status quo goes bankrupt. So the idea that they can adopt the current plan status quo as their plan is nonsense; it's nonsense. We see it with Medicare; we see it with the debt.

I, like my colleagues here, simply call on the Democrats and the President to propose something, something that we can discuss, something that addresses our problems. I can tell you, I can only speak for me and my constituents, but unless we see some serious structural changes to the spending, the out-of-control spending in this town, the ''no'' that I voted on raising the debt limit tonight will be the same ''no'' over and over again until this President and the Senate get their act together and give us a real plan.

Mrs. ROBY. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DOLD. I appreciate the gentlelady for yielding.

I was just struck by something that the gentleman from Arkansas said. It is about jobs and that I think is something that we focused on here this evening, but there are 29 million small businesses in our Nation. And the thing that I hear from small businesses and businesses all around my district is the uncertainty. Uncertainty out there is causing, in essence, paralyzing businesses and preventing them from moving forward. If we can create an environment here in Washington that allows half of those companies to create a single job, think about the job growth we will have then.

I am just wondering if the gentlemen from Arkansas or from Colorado or the gentlelady from Alabama has heard some of the same things back in their districts about uncertainty.

Mrs. ROBY. Absolutely. You know, everywhere we go we hear about this job-killing legislation that is keeping small business owners, even those that have the ability to create jobs, fearful to do so because they don't know which regulation they are going to be hit from next, what legislation we are going to pass to find out what's in it is coming their way. So I hear it all the time. It is stifling to our economy.

We need to create, we need to make sure that we are creating an environment so that the private sector can create the jobs and not rely on the government.

I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. You make a good point. I tell you, the stark contrast between what we are talking about here and from what I hear on the other side of the aisle is this: our colleagues, our Democrat colleagues talk about the government creating jobs. They say we need to create jobs.

I understand, and I think we understand that the private sector creates jobs. Small businesses create jobs. Individuals create jobs. People pursuing their dreams and exercising economic freedom, that's who creates jobs.

It's our job to help create an environment where individuals and businesses can flourish and continue to lead the world. It is not the government's job to create jobs. We are here to create an environment for businesses and individuals and small businesses so they can flourish.

Mrs. ROBY. I will now yield to the gentleman from New York, and then we're going to wrap this up.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentlelady from Alabama.

I was struck by something my colleague from Arkansas said about a plan. Let's be clear about the proposed plans that have been allegedly floated by our President up to this date and what we voted on today.

You know, we get knocked a lot for not engaging in a bipartisan practice, but let's be clear what the record showed and in this Chamber today and in the Senate last week. President Obama put forth and requested a clean debt ceiling, an unconditional debt ceiling, just raise it $2 trillion.

Bipartisan support tonight rejected that proposal. That's the status quo proposal that we can no longer afford. Last week, President Obama's budget, 97–0 in the Senate, was soundly rejected. I believe President Obama's quote from 2006 is completely accurate. His words predicted exactly where he is at. America has a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you so much to all of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that allowing the Federal Government to take on more debt without cutting up our credit cards is irresponsible.

I am Margaret and George's mom, and I know you represent families here tonight. We all have a responsibility, to my children, to your children, to future generations of this country to leave this country better off than the way we found it. It all starts with cutting spending and getting our economy back on track.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of account of serving as pallbearer for State Representative David Umphlett.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 1, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1713. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Aluminum tris(O-ethylphosphonate), Butylate, Chlorethoxyfos, Clethodim, et al.; Tolerance Actions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0490; FRL-8869-6] received April 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1714. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Carbon Dioxide; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-1077; FRL-0873-1] received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1715. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clothianidin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0771; FRL-8873-3]

received May 26, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1716. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Metarhizium anisopliae strain F52; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0194; FRL-8872-3] received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1717. A letter from the Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Governance and Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Funding and Fiscal Affairs; Risk-Based Capital Requirements (RIN: 3052-AC51) received May 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1718. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1719. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-B-1180] received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1720. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1183] received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1721. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1722. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1186] received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1723. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Race to the Top Fund [Docket ID: ED-2010-OESE-0005] (RIN: 1810-AB10) received May 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1724. A letter from the Director, Policy Issuances Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Formulas for Calculating the Basetime, Overtime, Holiday, and Laboratory Services Rates; Rate Changes Based on the Formulas; and Increased Fees for the Accredited Laboratory Program [FDMS Docket Number: FSIS-2006-0025] (RIN: 0583-AD40) received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1725. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irradiation in the Production, Processing, and Handling of Food [Docket No.: FDA-1998-F-0072] (Formerly 98F-0165) received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1726. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting Fiscal year 2010 Office of Inspector General Medicaid Integrity Report; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1727. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Northern Sonoma County Air Pollution Control District (NSCAPCD) and Mendocino County Air Quality Management District (MCAQMD) [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0302; FRL-9292-6] received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1728. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gases: Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0923; FRL-9299-1] received April 26, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1729. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0946; FRL-9294-7] received April 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1730. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Nuclear Power Plant Simulation Facilities for Use in Operator Training, License Examinations, and Applicant Experience Requirements, Regulatory Guide 1.149, Revision 4 received April 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1731. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-036, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1732. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-029, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1733. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-022, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1734. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2010 Annual Report pursuant to Section 203, Title II of the Notification and Federal Antidiscrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act of 2002; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1735. A letter from the Deputy Director, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, transmitting the Agency's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1736. A letter from the Acting Staff Director, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1737. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting The Activites of the Department of Justice in Relation to the Prison Rape Elimination Act, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 15604 Public Law 108-79, section 5(b)(1); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1738. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers from Linde Ceramics Plant in Tonawanda, New York to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1739. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Visas: Documentation of Nonimmigrants Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended (RIN: 1400-AC87) received May 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1740. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Report on Denial of Visas to Confiscators of American Property'', pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1182d Public Law 105-277, section 2225(c); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1741. A letter from the Office of Government Contracting and Business Development, Small Business Administration, transmitting the annual report on Minority Small Business and Capital Ownership Development, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 636(j)(16)(B); to the Committee on Small Business.

1742. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Corrections to Remove Obsolete References to Non-Automated Carriers from Electronic Cargo Manifest Regulations and to Update Terminology (CBP Dec. 11-10) received May 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1743. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Eliminating the Decision Review Board (RIN: 0960-AG80) received May 2, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1744. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting three legislative proposals to be a part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2012; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, the Judiciary, and Foreign Affairs.

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. CULBERSON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2055. A bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–94). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 287. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2017) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–95). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WESTMORELAND (for himself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. MACK):

H.R. 2056. A bill to instruct the Inspector General of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to study the impact of insured depository institution failures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2057. A bill to prohibit the receipt of Federal financial assistance by sanctuary cities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 2058. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the capital gain or loss treatment of the sale or exchange of mitigation credits earned by restoring wetlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 2059. A bill to prohibit funding to the United Nations Population Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 2060. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to adjust the Crooked River boundary, to provide water certainty for the City of Prineville, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FARR, and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 2061. A bill to authorize the presentation of a United States flag at the funeral of Federal civilian employees who are killed while performing official duties or because of their status as a Federal employee; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 2062. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 45 Meetinghouse Lane in Sagamore Beach, Massachusetts, as the ''Matthew A. Pucino Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 2063. A bill to eliminate the requirement that, to be eligible for foster care maintenance payments, a child would have been eligible for aid under the former program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children at the time of removal from the home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2064. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to allow employers to verify the identity and employment eligibility of an employee from the time of application for employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. SLAUGHTER:

H. Res. 286. A resolution recognizing, on the occasion of the 52nd annual meeting of the Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group in September, 2011 in St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada, the immeasurable assistance Gander International Airport, the Government of Canada, and the citizens of Gander, Newfoundland and Labrador, provided to the United States immediately following the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

33. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado, relative to House Joint Resolution 11-1005 designating January 23 of each year as ''U.S.S. Pueblo Day''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

34. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to Substitute Senate Joint Memorial No. 8004 urging the Congress and the National Park Service with Washington state to ensure that all citizens have the continued opportunity to access the upper Stehekin Valley; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

35. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Alaska, relative to House Resolution No. 8 opposing the designation by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of 3016 square miles of upper Cook Inlet and Kachemak Bay as critical habitat for beluga whales; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

36. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of North Dakota, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4013 urging Congress to adopt a federal balanced budget amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

37. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to Joint Resolution H.P. 1079 memorializing the sovereignty of the State of Maine under the Tenth Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

38. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 3048 urging the Congress to call a convention for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to avoid a ''runaway convention''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

39. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of North Dakota, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4007 urging for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

40. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to Joint Resolution H.P. 1090 urging the Congress and the President to amend the federal Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

41. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 8008 requesting that the Department of Labor provide federal unemployment tax relief to Washington State unemployment tax paying employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

42. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 101 urging the Congress to pass the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2012; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2055.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power. . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 2056.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2057.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution clause 18.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 2058.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7: All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay 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.

Amendment XVI (16th Amendment): The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 2059.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and 3 and implied powers to not act in these areas.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 2060.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 2061.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.''

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 2062.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 2063.

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. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2064.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as related to the following clauses in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution:

Clause 4: The Congress shall have Power To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.R. 96: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 104: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 114: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 143: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 157: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 178: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 198: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 300: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 376: Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 452: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. GOWDY.
H.R. 456: Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 466: Mr. HOLT, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 502: Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 546: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 574: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 607: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 615: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. HURT, and Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 645: Mr. HURT and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 674: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 676: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 709: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 733: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 735: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 795: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 854: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 864: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 891: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 931: Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 942: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 959: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 972: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 991: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 998: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 1002: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 1004: Mr. AUSTRIA.
H.R. 1006: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1009: Mr. BARTON of Texas.
H.R. 1041: Mr. BONNER and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1058: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1082: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 1119: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1173: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 1195: Mr. AUSTRIA.
H.R. 1236: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1249: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1259: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 1260: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H. R, 1285: Mr. MICA.
H.R. 1286: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. LANDRY.
H.R. 1297: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1309: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1317: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1327: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1331: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 1350: Mr. STARK and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1358: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 1375: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. WATT, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1386: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1394: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1397: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1404: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1462: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1475: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1479: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 1489: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. BARTLETT.
H.R. 1523: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1551: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 1574: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1588: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1607: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1612: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1614: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1672: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1681: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1686: Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 1695: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1734: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 1744: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 1747: Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 1754: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1755: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 1756: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1775: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 1776: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1794: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1798: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1803: Mr. FILNER, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 1805: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1815: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1839: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 1856: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1867: Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1895: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1901: Mr. STARK, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1902: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1904: Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1905: Mr. BARROW, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HURT, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 1910: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1932: Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1938: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 1941: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 1964: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 1969: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 1980: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 2008: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 2018: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 2026: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2031: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 2033: Mr. WU, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H. Con. Res. 51: Ms. LEE of California.
H. Res. 13: Mr. SARBANES.
H. Res. 16: Mr. POE of Texas.
H. Res. 25: Mr. GARDNER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SCHILLING, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Res. 60: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RIVERA, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H. Res. 111: Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H. Res. 134: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. BERMAN.
H. Res. 180: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H. Res. 258: Mr. POLIS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 270: Mr. PETERS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

4. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Miami-Dade Board of County Commissioners, Florida, relative to Resolution No. R-210-11 urging the Congress to pass legislation opposing cultural and commercial exchange between Cuba and the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. CARTER

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Climate Change Adaptation Task Force of the Department of Homeland Security.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. ROYCE

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 2, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 17, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 50, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 50, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $37,500,000)''.

Page 50, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $37,500,000)''.

Page 64, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $75,000,000)''.

Page 64, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $75,000,000)''.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 64, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $75,000,000)''.

Page 64, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $75,000,000)''.

Page 92, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. HIGGINS

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 47, beginning at line 14, strike ''*Provided further*, That funds provided under section 2003 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604) shall only be provided to the top 10 highest risk urban areas:''.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. LATHAM

AMENDMENT NO. 6: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is essential for Federal agencies to find and implement efficiencies in their operations in order to be successful in setting and meeting performance goals;

(2) the use of continuous process improvement methods to find such efficiencies, commonly referred to as ''lean six sigma'', can reduce unnecessary costs and improve the effectiveness of Federal agencies; and

(3) the Secretary of Homeland Security should consider the use of such management methods within the Department of Homeland Security.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $100,000,000)''.

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $100,000,000)''.

Page 18, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $100,000,000)''.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 12, line 6, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide assistance to a State or local government entity or official that is in violation of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 2, line 10, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $600,000)''.

Page 92, line 7, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $600,000)''.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

Page 24, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 25, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 13: Page 25, line 25, insert before the period the following: '': *Provided*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security enhances the coverage of inbound high-risk flights in accordance with the Department's risk models''.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. AMASH

AMENDMENT NO. 14: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any action by a political appointee (as that term is defined in section 106 of title 49, United States Code) to vacate, reverse, or otherwise overrule any decision by an employee in the civil service of the executive branch implementing section 552 of title 5, United States Code, popularly known as the Freedom of Information Act.