United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 20, 2011 No. 109

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 20, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

UNCLE SAM—THE GREAT LANDOWNER

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we've heard the song:

''This land is your land;

''This land is my land;

''From California to the New York Island;

''This land was made for you and me.''

But we need to understand that, in America, the greatest, largest landholder is Uncle Sam—Uncle Sam, the great landowner. He owns 27 percent of all the land in America.

This poster here shows the holdings of Uncle Sam. All of the red in the United States, including the red in Alaska, is owned by Uncle Sam. Over 50 percent of the land in the West is owned by Uncle Sam.

Now, if we were to transfer all of these acres to the east coast, that's about the size of all of the land east of the Mississippi that is owned by Uncle Sam. Looking at it another way, let's go across the seas, to Europe. If you were to take all of the land that Uncle Sam owns and superimpose it on Europe, it would include the United Kingdom, Spain, France, Switzerland, Netherlands, Italy, Austria, Germany, and Poland. That would be how much land Uncle Sam would own if he owned that portion of Europe.

So the great landholder is none other than the Federal Government. The Federal Government owns about 27 percent of all the land in America—623 million acres.

We are now talking about how to increase the revenue for this country.

Maybe we should do something that was thought of years ago. Ronald Reagan may not have been the first, but he did mention in the 1980s that the Federal Government ought to sell some of that land to Americans to help—get this—pay down the debt. This has even been talked about in the White House. President Obama, a couple of weeks ago, discussed selling just one little 300-portion acre in Los Angeles that was worth approximately $2 billion.

Maybe we should sell some of that.

So I introduced the American Land Act, which will do this:

It will require that the Bureau of Land Management and the Forestry Service sell a portion of their land for the next 5 years, and that will be a 26 percent decrease in total land in the United States owned by Uncle Sam. Now, bear in mind—I'm going to make this clear—this does not include the national parks; this does not include the Fish and Wildlife Service, the marshes, the coastal plains, the environmentally sensitive areas. The Federal Government would make the decision as to what would be sold. In 2005, the landholdings of the United States, according to OMB, was worth about $1.1 trillion. So I think, if we sold a portion of this land, it would raise revenue for the United States, approximately $200 billion or less.

Plus, it would do other things.

It would put the land in the hands of Americans. Americans would own the land, and they would pay taxes. They could pay taxes not only to local and State governments, but when they build a business or make a business, they would bring in more Federal income tax. It will save the Federal Government the cost of maintaining ownership, and it will raise revenue and pay down the debt.

Real property in the hands of real Americans.

What a thought.

It will create productivity.

Sell American land to Americans. Let Americans own more of America.

Uncle Sam shouldn't prevent Americans from having a stake, or a share, in America. The United States owns most of the grand estate of our great country, and it's time to let more Americans own it—because this land was made for you and me.

And that's just the way it is.

THE DEBT LIMIT

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

Ms. CHU. In less than 2 weeks, on August 2, we must raise the debt limit or the American Government will go into financial default. If we don't, it will be a disaster for the economy, and real American families will pay the price.

Printed on recycled paper.

That's why for almost 95 years we have kept our promises and paid our bills. Congress has voted to avoid economic default nearly 100 times since 1917 because it was the right thing to do. The debt limit was raised 17 times under Ronald Reagan, four times under Bill Clinton and seven times under George W. Bush; but now Republicans are shying away from their duty, spreading misinformation about the serious threat we are facing, saying there will be no impact on the average American and that it will not hurt our economy.

But that's not true. Let me tell you why.

If we default on our bills, the interest on all our loans would skyrocket just as your interest rate would go up if you missed a credit card payment. This means disaster for all American families. The median 30-year home loan would increase by almost $20,000, or 10 percent. This would hurt an already struggling housing market, pushing home sale prices down and potentially leaving more borrowers underwater.

If we default on our bills, the stock market could plunge, and Americans in their fifties would lose almost $9,000 immediately from the typical 401(k). The S&P 500 could lose 6.3 percent in value in just 3 short months. These losses would affect millions of Americans, who would have fewer savings for their retirements, their supposed golden years.

If we default on our bills, prices for gas, electronics, clothes, and other imported goods could dramatically increase. A U.S. default would create economic chaos, forcing the value of our dollar to decrease, making many products we use every day more expensive at a time when our household dollars are already stretched thin.

We cannot let this happen, but Republican leaders in Washington are playing political games with our economic security. With 2 weeks left and the clock ticking, the time for playing childish political games should be over. Republicans should come back to the table and work with Democrats on a compromise that will avert economic catastrophe, and they should work on a compromise that doesn't hurt the most vulnerable amongst us.

Seniors earn an average of only $19,000 a year. Contrast that to millionaires, who, because of the Bush-era votes, are getting almost $140,000 in tax breaks from the government every year. There is no reason that our seniors and the neediest amongst us should struggle to pay their hospital and electric bills just so we can subsidize a millionaire's yacht.

Yet Republicans want to gut the programs that benefit seniors most—Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare—in exchange for their votes on the debt limit. They actually want to hold your senior years hostage just so they can make a political statement on the debt limit. We cannot balance the budget on the backs of seniors.

For those who believe that the potential for default is not real, let me quote a famous President who said 25 years ago: ''Congress consistently brings the government on the edge of default before facing its responsibility. This brinkmanship threatens the holders of government bonds and those who rely on Social Security and veteran benefits. Interest rates would skyrocket; instability would incur in financial markets, and the Federal deficit would soar.'' That President was Ronald Reagan, making his plea to Congress.

Today, the American people are calling again on this body to do what's right.

I know that, if we can move past all the political posturing, we can reach a bipartisan agreement that protects Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare, that reduces the debt, and that saves our economy from the disaster of default. We must do it now.

□ 1010

HOUSE REPUBLICANS LEADING THE WAY TO RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to be here earlier with Congressman TED POE from Texas explaining about the Federal lands and how they could be developed to create jobs and opportunity. It is particularly fitting that the Speaker pro tem at this moment is DANIEL WEBSTER, Congressman from Florida, because over his head is inscribed a statement, a very wise statement, from the previous Daniel Webster, the statesman of our country. In the inscription over the head of our Speaker pro tem at this moment it says, ''Let us develop the resources of our land.''

And so we know that the original Daniel Webster was correct, and we know that Judge TED POE is correct, and our Speaker pro tem is correct.

Mr. Speaker, last night, the House passed the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act of 2011. As the cosponsor of this legislation, I am grateful to have my colleagues support this measure with bipartisan votes by Republicans and five Democrats. It cuts spending by $111 billion in 2012. It enacts statutes that will enforce spending caps on the Federal Government for the next 10 years to promote jobs. Finally, it requires passage of a balanced budget amendment in order to raise the debt limit.

This positive legislation goes beyond politics and puts forth measures that address the needs our Nation faces. These policies force Washington to do what families and small businesses must do every day: balance the budget. Rather than devise a plan of their own, liberals in Congress simply want to raise taxes. These taxes will harm more families and kill more jobs. As the President said in 2009, ''You don't raise taxes in a recession.'' Of course, today we have nearly 15 million unemployed persons in our country. Unemployment under the failed policies of our President has increased to 9.2 percent. We need to change course.

Cut, Cap, and Balance is a plan I encourage the Senate to pass in order to put our country back on the path to prosperity creating jobs.

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

DEBT CEILING DEBATE

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to start first of all by talking about the tenor of debate in this Chamber. Historically, we've had great debates in this Chamber. I think that the Speaker of the House, JOHN BOEHNER, is an honorable man who cares deeply about this institution, and I think on both sides of the aisle we have very intelligent people who care passionately about their beliefs. We have a Nation that's in the midst of the worst recession since the Great Depression. It prevails on us as Americans to come together and face the problems that our Nation is currently dealing with.

You heard Representative CHU mention it earlier. Ronald Reagan did so at that time with a Democratic Speaker, Tip O'Neill. He did so by appealing to both Chambers about the need to come together, facing the daunting reality of defaulting for the first time on the country's full faith and credit and the impact that that would have on the global economy, on the Nation's economy, but I daresay, more importantly, on one's household economy. From my perspective as a Member here and going back home and listening to our constituents, I think that's the most important thing, is their household economies that are hanging in the balance here.

Washington can oftentimes provide great theater and great back and forth, but we do not want this to become the theater of the absurd as our constituents look on in the pain and agony of being out of work and wondering whether or not their government is going to be there for them.

So I hope that we're able to pass a clean debt ceiling, as Ronald Reagan did 17 times, the same kind of thing that was afforded Bill Clinton and George W. Bush seven times most recently, so that we can get on with the concerns that we care deeply about: whether it's dealing with the national debt and dealing with the issues of spending and making cuts that will strategically grow the economy, or whether it's dealing with investing in the American people and making sure that revenues that come in do so to put America back to work, like the creation of an infrastructure bank funded

by the private and public sectors working together to create those much needed jobs, but essentially putting America back to work.

I recently received a letter from one of my constituents, and I think this sums up the feeling of America. I want to read her words because they tell the story of all too many Americans:

''I'm worried, afraid for myself and all in my situation, and saddened. If I still have not been hired to work in the next few weeks, I will lose the financial ability to live in a room or an apartment and will lose the parts of my life that literally had to be placed in storage, most notably my family photos of my deceased parents, of my children, due to the lack of income or savings to pay the rental fees. I have no one who will take me in or who can afford to do this.''

She went on to say, ''How can you not agree that this is comparable to a natural disaster when individual lives are at stake and left as if to be swallowed by an abyss of dark uncertainty?''

These are the people of our country who we are sworn to serve. This debate is important on the floor. The debt ceiling could be lifted tomorrow, but the pain and agony of the American people are stated more eloquently by the people who are actually suffering, and when she says ''to be swallowed up by an abyss of dark uncertainty,'' that is a moral obligation for us. Rather than talking about staying here over the weekend to make sure we deal with the debt ceiling and all the machinations that are going on between the two Chambers, let's stay here till we put America back to work. That's what we should be doing: out-innovating, out-building and out-educating the rest of the world.

RESTORING AMERICA

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had a very vigorous debate about the unsustainable debt that our country is facing, and we passed a bill, the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill. That bill is really the only one that's been on the table, House or Senate, so far.

So we asked in the Senate, where's their proposal? We asked the White House, give us a proposal that the Congressional Budget Office can actually give us a score on, on how we're going to do this. We need legislative language to move forward on these things. We can't just base things on speeches, as has been said yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this country is at a very pivotal point in its history. There's no question about it. We're at a pivotal point. We can decide, is the United States going to lead in the 21st century as it did in the 20th century and in the 19th century, or will we be swallowed in a sea of red ink, high unemployment and very sluggish growth? That is the basic fundamental problem we're faced with today.

It's within our power in Congress to make policy decisions that will change this equation for the good or the bad for the American people. We have decisions to make, tough decisions. And it's time. It's time to make those decisions.

□ 1020

Now yesterday we debated the unsustainable debt problem that this country is facing, a situation that is going to swallow up savings for every single American, currently, $46,000 for every man, woman, and child in this country; and it's rising. And that doesn't count the unfunded liabilities.

So the debt is clearly a problem, and we have to set the country on a sustainable path with a credible plan to move us forward. But there's another side to the problem that's not being talked about enough, and it's the fact that we are not growing this economy. We are not growing private sector jobs. The previous speaker, my friend from Connecticut, talked about the plight of so many who are without jobs. We have to grow this economy if we're going to create jobs, and that means having a well-thought-out energy strategy for the United States. It means fundamental tax reform to put us on a very competitive footing, whether it's a small business or a large U.S. company, and it also means a very aggressive trade strategy for the United States.

Now I want to talk about trade for a minute because it really does not get enough discussion here in this body. I got some very encouraging news just last week from the World Trade Center of New Orleans, in my home State. It released some quarterly trade figures. In the first quarter of fiscal year 2011, exports from Louisiana manufacturers and farmers grew by almost 50 percent compared to the previous period last year. This is incredible news because Louisiana is rapidly transforming its economy into a global trading economy that helps our farmers, helps our manufacturers. We sell to the world. We create private sector jobs that pay better than the average jobs around the United States. One out of five jobs in Louisiana is related to international trade where we export. This is critical. If we're going to grow this country and grow private sector jobs, we need a trade strategy in place to do this, to help it, to open markets overseas for our farmers, our manufacturers, our small businesses.

We're seeing rapid growth in Asia and South America right now, all based on trade. Hundreds of trade agreements have been basically voted upon in these countries and implemented. Regional trade agreements. Here in the United States, it's been 4 years, and no activity. We have three pending agreements right now: Panama, Colombia, and South Korea. These will basically open markets in countries that are already having pretty much unfettered access into our market. These will create, by the President's own estimate, 250,000 jobs in this country. Those are direct jobs in the short term. That doesn't even speak to the number of jobs that will be created going forward. It is critically important that we move forward on this. There will be $13 billion in exports from these three agreements alone, exports. These are American companies, American farmers selling their goods overseas. This will stimulate growth in this economy and job creation. This is why we need to move forward on it.

But there are other important aspects to this. These three agreements were negotiated in good faith. And so just like the full faith and credit of the United States is on the line with regard to dealing with our debt problem, our credibility internationally is on the line as to whether we're going to be a leader in this world or we're just going to sit back and shrink and see high unemployment and sluggish job growth and lost opportunities for our children and grandchildren. That's what's at stake with this.

These three trade agreements need to be done now. The President could easily send these to Congress, and we can vote on them. That's what we need to do. That's a step forward to restore American competitiveness, to restore American credibility, and to restore American confidence. Come on, Mr. President, lead.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

IN GOD WE TRUST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. A previous speaker referred to our distinguished Speaker pro tem with that historic name and was suggesting that we look for something to guide us that would be over the podium. What I see is ''In God We Trust,'' not the Congress, not the House, not Democrats, and certainly not Republicans, but in God we trust.

Recently, I took this to be a very serious thing. I was saying that in the process of increasing the debt ceiling and cutting back spending, that a lot of people were vulnerable, and I called upon our spiritual leaders not to forget them. And, indeed, whether we're talking about Social Security or Medicare or Medicaid, that all of these things were going to be on the block, subject to being cut. The press said that I was calling upon Jesus to help Democrats.

Well, that's not so. I was calling upon religious leaders, whether they were Christian or Protestant or Jewish or Gentile or Mormon or Muslim to say

''in God we trust,'' and that there comes a time when human beings, regardless of their party registration, need some help in deciding the crucial issues that actually, actually affect the lives of people. And whether we're talking about peace or war, with thousands of people being killed, no one can deny that this is a moral issue, if we were asked whether we support it or not. But yet we find that most Members of Congress cannot even give a reason why we're in Iraq and Libya and Afghanistan.

But having said that, let's face it. It would be ridiculous to assume that I'm making an appeal for Democrats when what I'm talking about is those people who are vulnerable. When flaws in our financial center caused people to lose their homes, it wasn't just Democrats. There were Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and those that have no faith in government who woke up in the morning, they have lost their jobs; they lost their homes; they lost their pension funds; they lost their savings; they had to pull their kids out of school; they lost their self-esteem; some lost their homes. I don't remember anywhere where we're talking about people who are registered Democrats. These are Americans that expected more from their government than just saying that we will be able to address your needs in the by-and-by.

And the very people that are aged, God knows we're not talking about a party label. When we talk about our sick, when we talk about Medicaid, when we are talking about Medicare, when we are talking about Social Security, how in God's name can we say we are just talking about Democrats? No. We're talking about all Americans that invested in this country that now see that some of them are so hopeless.

We had hoped that we would deal with the debt ceiling which gives the President the ability to say, When America borrows, America pays back. We thought that the integrity of our great country would never be challenged, certainly by Members of the Congress. But that's not the case. The President is being held hostage. And what's being held hostage is the budget.

On the other side of the issue is the question of taxes. So it appears to me that wherever you find the vulnerable, somebody should be protecting them since the lobbyists are not knocking on their door saying, Protect the poor. And this is a great opportunity, since the President is being held hostage, that we can reform some of the things that we wanted to do, whether it's the tax system, Medicare, Social Security. But these things are supposed to go through a process.

I was honored to chair the Ways and Means Committee, which constitutionally deals with all tax issues, all fiscal issues. It deals with trade. It deals with Medicare. It deals with Social Security. And it deals with taxes. So you wake up in the morning, and you find out that the Congress, 435 of us who now have this important decision to make as we hopefully move forward after the deadline of August 2, and the Senate are to decide these questions by the Gang of Six. Well, I'll be back because no longer am I making an appeal for the Congress; God bless the Gang of Six in trying to save this great Nation.

□ 1030

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY'S AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, last night this body passed a piece of legislation that takes a first good step toward fixing America's spending problem, toward taking on our spending addiction and addressing the enormous deficits and debt that our Nation faces.

But we all know there's a second component to making sure that we solve this deficit and debt crisis, and that's economic growth. It's jobs. It's allowing the American entrepreneur, the American consumer to have affordable products, and in the case of Kansas, the American farmer and agriculture producer to survive, to continue to do the things that they need to do to feed the world.

I've been in Congress just 6 months now, and I've watched this administration's Environmental Protection Agency act with respect to our agriculture community with radical indifference or, worse, outright hostility. These are folks who are providing affordable food for our entire world, and yet this administration—this administration—seeks to regulate it. It seeks to harass it. It seeks to impose burdens which will cause this great source of wealth for our Nation to leave. I want to talk about that because it's so important for the growth of our Nation and the success of our Nation to continue to have that industry thrive, and I want to talk about some of the things I've seen in just these 6 months.

The American farmer needs energy. The American farmer needs affordable energy. In this morning's Wichita Eagle, our primary utility in western Kansas and south central Kansas said that the utility rules that this administration is about to impose will put them in a place where they cannot comply. Now, I'm not talking about increased costs. We know that this administration has driven higher electricity rates. We're talking about a utility that will not be able to comply with a set of regulations this administration is putting in place. That's not good for the agriculture community in Kansas. They rely on affordable energy.

The examples go on. This administration, under the Clean Air Act, has attempted to regulate dust. Now, I don't know about folks that live out further this way, but in Kansas, on a dry day like today when it's 110 degrees, there's a little bit of dust when you drive your truck down the road. Yet they want to say, no, that's a regulated particulate matter. Where's the common sense?

Today they're changing the clean air rules to take a set of chemicals that are already regulated under a set of regulations that have been in existence for decades and saying, no, we want to add another layer. We want you to now have to be permitted to have these chemicals that have already been demonstrated to be safe in their use in agricultural production.

We've seen what they've tried to do with greenhouse gas regulation as well. We saw this body respond by not giving the President cap-and-trade, and I'm thankful for that. But we've now get the Environmental Protection Agency that's trying to do the same through regulatory fiat. And now the Department of Transportation is chiming in as well, trying to regulate trucks, farm equipment under rules that are normally intended for cross country truckers and trying to regulate them in the same way, putting an additional burden on the agricultural community that has been operating their farm equipment in south central Kansas in an incredibly safe way for decades.

I hope that this administration will reconsider. We cannot continue to drive costs. We cannot continue to regulate the Kansas agricultural community. We cannot harass it into its leaving our country. We know this is important. If we drive up the cost of food, we'll drive up inflation. That's good for no one.

I hope this administration will reconsider, that they'll use some common sense. Our farmers, our agriculture producers want clean air. They make it happen. They need clean water. They ensure that it happens every day. We do not need this administration to harass them into leaving the very profession that is so important to our country.

CUT, CAP, AND CONTINUE WARS

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I'm here catching my breath after the debate over the extreme Tea Party legislation that we considered yesterday. It's easily one of the worst bills I can remember in nearly 20 years of service here in this body. Every time I think they can't possibly go any farther, the majority blows me away with the audacity of their proposals and the cruelty of their priorities.

H.R. 2560, yesterday's debt ceiling proposal, almost makes the Ryan budget look progressive. It makes the continuing resolution passed back in April look positively generous. On this side of the aisle, we call it the Cut, Cap, and

End Medicare plan, which is completely accurate. But I'm going to give it another name today, Cut, Cap, and Continue Wars, because throughout the debate over the debt ceiling there's been an elephant in the room, if you'll pardon the expression, that hardly anyone is willing to acknowledge, and that is the impact of waging not one, not two, but three wars is having on our Nation's fiscal health.

Afghanistan alone is costing $10 billion a month, with the total price tag for Iraq and Afghanistan, going back 10 years, $3.2 trillion. And that's a conservative estimate, Mr. Speaker. These are staggering figures, especially during a recession when Americans are crying out for Washington to do something about creating jobs and breathing life back into our economy.

And what are the taxpayers getting for their trillions of dollars in war spending? More than 6,100 dead Americans, continued violence in Iraq and a Prime Minister who's cozying up to Iran, and an ongoing civil war in Libya, a corrupt regime in Kabul, insurgents that continue to kill at will, in Afghanistan a nation still under crushing poverty, and an Afghan Government that cannot protect its own people.

By any measure, these wars have been a devastating failure. And yet, with barely any scrutiny, barely any debate, and certainly no outrage from Republican leaders, we continue to write that check. Meanwhile, we have domestic programs that work, proven investments in the survival and prosperity of our people: Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid, school lunches, student loans, food stamps, unemployment insurance. But the majority says these programs have to be cut and capped so we can continue three wars.

Republicans want to cut programs that are keeping Americans alive while they want to continue funding the wars that have killed more than 6,100 Americans. It blows my mind, Mr. Speaker.

How about we ask the American people: Which do they prefer? These wars that have been failing us for 10 years or the guaranteed Medicare benefits that will allow them and their families to retire with dignity?

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Do you really believe everything should be on the table? Everything? If you do, let's talk about war spending. And if you're really and truly serious about restoring fiscal sanity, where were you when the Congressional Progressive Caucus released a plan that will put us back in the black within 10 years?

The Congressional Progressive Caucus budget proves that we can balance the budget, but we don't have to amend the Constitution to do it. We don't need to shred the safety net to do it. We don't need to tear the heart out of Medicare to do it.

We can do it by bringing fairness back to the Tax Code, by ending subsidies, handouts, and giveaways to people and corporations who will do just fine without them, we can do it by passing a clean debt ceiling and putting our people to work, and, Mr. Speaker, we can do it by ending these wars once and for all and bringing our troops home where they belong.

COLOMBIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. CANSECO. Mr. Speaker, there are many concerns on the minds of Americans today. But there's one concern that dominates discussion in every coffee shop, grocery store, barber shop, civic clubs or everywhere else that Americans gather, and that is the need to turn our economy around and create jobs.

The American people are right to be concerned about the economy and jobs. We've had 29 straight months with the unemployment rate at 8 percent or higher, the longest streak since the Great Depression. Fourteen million Americans are unemployed, and month after month the jobs reports show anemic job growth.

□ 1040

Over 2 years ago, the American people were told by President Obama and other Washington liberals that if we would just spend over $1 trillion on the so-called ''stimulus'' bill, the unemployment rate would not exceed 8 percent. Well, in the entire Obama presidency there has only been one month—January of 2009—that the unemployment rate did not exceed 8 percent. Every month since the stimulus bill was signed into law in February of 2009 has seen unemployment rates at 8 percent or higher.

It is clear that the approach of attempting to spend and borrow our way to a better economy has not worked. That's why Congress needs to look to policies that will create jobs, like passing the three pending free trade agreements our Nation has with Colombia, Panama and South Korea.

Beyond the fact that the Business Roundtable estimates these agreements will create more than 250,000 jobs and are important for our economy, these agreements are also important to the United States' role in the world. There is no better illustration of this than the agreement we have pending with Colombia. Colombia is an important ally in Latin America, and I do say that today Colombians celebrate Colombian Independence Day. They're serving as an example for other nations and in stark contrast to the dictatorial regimes in Venezuela, Cuba and Bolivia. Colombia should not only enjoy a strategic relationship with the United States, we should also enjoy a strong commercial relationship. Passage of the free trade agreement would build upon the existing relationship and further strengthen it.

Apart from being beneficial for an important ally, this agreement is important for the U.S. economy. Here are just a few of the benefits that will occur with passage of the Colombia Free Trade Agreement: Duty-free access to the Colombian market for more than 80 percent of U.S. consumer and industrial goods, exports, with remaining tariffs phased out in 10 years; immediate duty-free access to more than two-thirds of current U.S. agricultural exports with the remaining tariffs phased out over time; strengthened intellectual property and investor protections; open services markets; and enhanced transparency in government procurement. However, perhaps the most important reason to pass this agreement is that if we don't, our competitors will.

Our competitors worldwide are aggressively moving to pass trade agreements. We have already seen our market share in Colombia jeopardized. For instance, although Colombia has doubled its agricultural imports over the past 5 years, the U.S. has seen its market share shrink by one-half. In 2008, American farmers held a 46 percent share of the Colombian market. Today, that share has diminished to 21 percent. In 2000, China was Colombia's 12th largest trading partner. Today, China is the second biggest trade partner for Colombia behind the United States.

Failure to pass the free trade agreement will allow our competitors to enjoy an artificial advantage. At this point in our economy, why do we not want to do everything we can to keep the jobs we have and create new ones? We need to put the politics aside and recognize the importance of the Colombia Free Trade Agreement, not only for our economy but for our strategic interests. It's time to pass the Colombia Free Trade Agreement.

GANG OF SIX AND CHAINED CPI

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, yesterday the so-called ''Gang of Six'' on the Senate side—six very important Senators—unveiled sort of an outline about how to save $4 trillion over the next 10 years. Immediately it was embraced by President Obama. We really don't know much about it, nor does he, but he immediately embraced it.

We know one thing about it. It contains something called a chained CPI. Okay. Well, who cares about a chained CPI? Well, seniors, they care a lot about a chained CPI; middle-income taxpayers, they care about it—they don't know it yet; veterans, and a whole host of other people.

What is a chained CPI? Well, the pointy heads, like Mr. Furman who work for President Obama, say we're understating and overstating inflation with the way we adjust. There is something called substitution effect. So when prices of things go up, you buy something cheaper, so that means

there isn't inflation. Well, no, wait a minute; the thing you used to buy is still more expensive and you're buying something else? But in the pointy-head economics world, this makes sense.

So let's say how this would work for someone on Medicare: Okay, you can't afford your heart bypass, so instead you'll say to the doc, ''Hey, look, I can't afford the copay on the heart bypass. Why don't you do a hernia instead?'' That's substitution. In Mr. Furman's world, this makes sense.

Now what this would do to seniors on Social Security, we already understate inflation. Seniors haven't gotten a COLA for the last 2 years. Tell me the price of prescription drugs and medical care hasn't gone up over the last 2 years. We need, in fact, a different measure for seniors, for Medicare, for our veterans and others who consume more health care and more essentials, which the CPI doesn't measure. It just measures junk that people buy. That's all it measures. And they're saying because people buy cheaper junk, we should change the CPI. That means the senior, by the time they reach 85 in this brave new world of the chained CPI, will get 100 bucks less a month in their Social Security—not too good. Veterans would see their benefits also be restrained and go down about the same amount.

And then there is this other little impact they're not mentioning. If you're earning $20,000 a year, the tax brackets get adjusted every year. Well, they wouldn't get adjusted so much anymore under the chained CPI. So someone who earns $20,000 a year over 10 years would see their taxes go up 14 percent, but for the rich people, you earn $500,000 a year, you're already at the top; their taxes will only go up .3 percent, three-tenths of 1 percent. Fourteen percent for someone who earns $20,000 a year; .3 percent for someone who earns $500,000. And Obama has embraced this?

What's happened down there at the White House? They're listening to these pointy-head economists, and they're going after programs that are important to the American people. All of this, all combined of this great ''Gang of Six,'' would save $4 trillion over 10 years. That is, seniors will pay more, working people will pay more, veterans will pay more—rich people, not so much—but it would save $4 trillion. Guess what? If we let all the Bush tax cuts expire at the end of next year—all of them, and the stupid Social Security tax holiday—that would be $5 trillion over 10 years and we wouldn't have cut Social Security, we wouldn't have cut veterans benefits, we wouldn't have asked low-income and middle-income people to pay more in taxes. Now does that make more sense? I think so.

Let's hope they rethink this down at the White House, and I hope the American people are watching closely.

CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE

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

Mr. MORAN. Last night, we were asked to amend the Constitution, after two-and-a-quarter centuries, in a way that will permanently limit the ability of our government to foster competitiveness in a global economy, to generate greater equality of opportunity, to treat our seniors with dignity and respect, and to defend and define this great Nation as an ever-shining democratic beacon of hope and prosperity.

So I was proud to vote against the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act. It is the House Republicans' vision for America's future. This is a vision in which the country turns its back on the achievements of the last century and chooses not to invest in meeting the challenges of the next century.

Republicans aim to use a crisis of their own making to hamstring future Congresses, limiting our ability to make necessary infrastructure investments, to care for the poor, aged and disabled, and to respond to national and international crises.

The 18 percent spending cap mandated by the bill would return the government to spending levels not seen since the establishment of Medicare and Medicaid. The impending retirement of more than 70 million baby boomers means that these spending levels are woefully inadequate, unless we condemn our grandparents to a severely diminished quality of life.

□ 1050

The Republican Party would enshrine constitutional protections for tax cuts and loopholes for wealthy individuals and corporations, requiring an unattainable two-thirds majority in both the House and the Senate for the government to increase the currently unsustainably low revenue levels of roughly 15 percent of GDP.

This would necessarily result in unprecedented cuts in student loans and grants, transportation, education, environmental protection, law enforcement—in other words, the physical and the human infrastructure of our economy.

The only budget plan that comes close to meeting the requirements of these constitutional amendments is the Republican Study Committee budget which eliminates 70 percent of nondefense discretionary funding by 2021, contains deep cuts to Medicare, cuts Medicaid, food stamps, supplemental security income for the elderly and disabled and poor in half by the end of the decade, and raises the Social Security retirement age to 70 years of age.

Yesterday's vote means that the Republican majority is demanding that in return for avoiding an economically disastrous default on our debt, we make $111 billion in immediate spending cuts. These cuts seriously increase the likelihood of a double-dip recession. It is estimated that they could cause the loss of more than a million public sector jobs just in the next year alone.

Last month, the economy added an anemic 18,000 jobs; but the private sector added 57,000 jobs, while 39,000 public sector jobs were lost in addition to the 49,000 public sector jobs lost in the prior month. This is a continuing trend. Half a million public sector employees have now lost their jobs, 200,000 of them teachers, while student enrollment has increased by 750,000. Firing more government workers will only decrease aggregate demand, making it that much harder to sustain the recovery.

We have witnessed this before. In 1937, President Roosevelt responded to similar conservative pressure by substantially reducing Federal spending before the Great Depression was fully in the rearview mirror. It drove us right back into economic depression. The economy wouldn't recover until the increased spending and hiring that accompanied the World War II armaments buildup got the country moving again. After the war, spending on education and housing for our GIs, the Marshall Plan for Europe, and the construction of the interstate highway system established a permanent middle class and sustainable prosperity.

This is not the time for the Democratic Party to sacrifice our values, values held by a majority of the American people, even in the face of opposition that has reached unprecedented levels of ideological radicalization.

We have to address our long-term deficits for the sake of future generations, but we must do so in a balanced manner, combining rational spending cuts and increased revenue. That's what has worked in the past. That's what we need to do now. We must not abandon the people that depend upon the government for a decent quality of life, but we must not let this great Nation become a second-class society and a third-rate economy. If the bill that was passed last night were to be enacted into law, that's the limited vision it would yield. That's why I was proud to vote against it.

WIC ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to clarify a mischaracterization of the administrative costs of the supplemental nutrition program for Women, Infants and Children, commonly known as WIC.

It's interesting, you can come down here to the floor or speak in committee, and we are protected as Members of Congress to say anything we want. It isn't required that everything we say is factually correct. Sometimes those mischaracterizations, misstatements get into the record. And in this case, the complaint or the statement in subcommittee and full

committee and even in debate here on the floor of the Agriculture appropriations bill, it was asserted that the administrative costs in this program are up to 40 percent of the total cost of WIC, this is a misstatement of fact, although it was included in the report language and it was adopted by the committee.

So I come today to point out that the 40 percent administrative cost claimed by the majority is based on selective data from a 2008 Brookings Institute report. It didn't come from the Department of Agriculture, which administers the program. The Brookings report collapsed several legislative mandated nonmonetary programs, including the education of nutrition, the requirement that we support and inform people on how to do proper breast feeding, other client services, issues like health care referrals, even immunization screenings, these were counted as administrative costs when they are mandated by us in Congress to be carried out. They are programmatic costs, and it wasn't proper for the Brookings report to include those as administrative costs.

Breast feeding, nutrition education, and immunization screening are vital programs which improve birth outcomes and reduce the incidence of health problems for WIC participants. They should not be categorized as administrative costs for the purpose of budgeting.

So today, I would like to point out in a recent letter to our Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, of which I am the ranking member, from the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary Vilsack, and I will include this letter at the end of my comments today, he notes that the food and nutrition service delivers its program management and actual administrative costs at a steady 9.09 percent rate, far less than the 40 percent purported in the Brookings Institute report and included in the committee report.

WIC is effective in improving the health of pregnant women, new mothers and their infants. I feel it is important to clarify that the WIC program is meeting its mission. It is meeting the law to safeguard the health of low-income women, infants, and children who are at nutrition risk by providing nutritional food and supplemental diets and information on healthy eating and referrals to other health care services.

As Members of Congress, we should not do the program any further disservice by erroneous figures being included in the report. So today, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the letter from Secretary Vilsack pointing this out and to make the record clear that the WIC program is indeed being administered very soundly and fiscally conservatively.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, July 14, 2011.

Hon. SAM FARR,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FARR: Thank you for your work on behalf of the Department of Agriculture's (USDA) appropriations for fiscal year (FY) 2012. I appreciate the difficult decisions and choices that were before you and the Committee.

As identified in the Statement of Administration Policy, the Administration has serious concerns with H.R. 2112; however, I wanted to weigh in specifically on what I perceive as misstatements regarding administrative costs for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC). I understand that during full committee debate and on page 43 of the committee report, selected data from a 2008 Brookings Institute report were referenced, giving the impression that administrative costs in the WIC Program are over 40 percent of Federal expenditures for the program. The true figure is much lower.

Beyond simply providing assistance in the form of supplemental food benefits, WIC provides low-income mothers, infants, and children with other legislatively mandated nonmonetary program benefits, including nutrition education, breastfeeding support, and other client services such as healthcare referrals and immunization screening, which improve birth outcomes and reduce the incidence of health problems for WIC participants. The Brookings Institute report collapses these important additional benefits under the category of administrative costs. However, these legislatively mandated program benefits provided to participants should not be classified as administrative costs.

For reference, I asked USDA's Food and Nutrition Service to provide me with a breakdown of the Federal cost of food benefits, non-monetary program benefits and administrative expenses for FY 2010. I am sharing this information with you to correct the record and so that you can share it with your colleagues:

Category	Obligations	Percentage of obligations
Supplemental Food Benefits	$4,561,570,027	70.44%
Nutrition Services and Admin. (NSA):		
Additional Benefits:		
Nutrition Education	418,437,331	6.46%
Breastfeeding Support	149,133,594	2.30%
Other Client Services	758,015,711	11.70%
Program Management	588,984,767	9.09%
Total Nutrition Services & Admin. (NSA)	1,914,571,403	29.56%
Total Food and NSA	6,476,141,430	100.00%

I consider the category of program management, which is 9.09 percent of total Federal obligations, to be the true measure of administrative costs needed to deliver the complete suite of benefits to WIC participants. This percentage has remained consistent over the past 5 years.

It is my hope that this will clear up any misunderstanding regarding administrative costs in WIC, and I look forward to working with you in the future. A similar letter is being sent to Congressmen Jack Kingston, Harold Rogers, and Norman Dicks.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. VILSACK,
Secretary.

SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE MILITARY

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, for the last few months I have come to this floor every week to talk about a moral black eye on this country—the issue of rape and sexual assault in the military. I have mentioned the fact that the Pentagon has estimated that 19,000 servicemembers are raped or sexually assaulted each and every year. The victims typically are blamed and the assailants are promoted.

I have shared the personal stories of several women who needed to have a bright light shined on this ongoing epidemic. But it is not only females in the military that are victims. Men are being victimized as well.

In an April 2011 article entitled ''The Military's Secret Shame,'' Newsweek looked at the subject hardly anyone talks about: male on male rape and sexual assault. Mr. Speaker, it is time to break this silence.

Last year, nearly 50,000 male veterans screened positive for ''military sexual trauma.'' Think about that, 50,000 men. That's nearly double what it was in 2003. Another 110 men made confidential reports of sexual assault by other men, nearly three times what it was in 2007. We know the number of actual victims is much higher.

The latest Department of Defense report showed that only 13 percent of those who are raped in the military actually report them. Men keep quiet for the same reasons women do—a military system that gives them virtually no chance of justice.

In 2010, the Pentagon anonymously asked active duty soldiers who had been sexually assaulted why they did not report their attacks. Half of them said they didn't want anyone to know. A third of them said they didn't think anything would be done. And 30 percent said they were afraid of retaliation or reprisal.

□ 1100

I now want to share with you the story of Blake Stephens. I warn you that some of the material is graphic.

Stephens joined the Army in 2001. The verbal and physical attacks started quickly and came from virtually every level of the chain of command. In one of the worst incidents, a group of men tackled him, shoved a soda bottle into his rectum, and threw him backward off an elevated platform onto the hood of a car. When he reported the incident, his platoon sergeant told him, ''You're the problem. You're the reason this is happening,'' and refused to take action. His assailants told him that once deployed to Iraq, they would shoot him in the head.

I recently received an email from Heath Phillips, who joined the Navy at the young age of 17, in 1988. Phillips was attacked on multiple occasions beginning his first weekend on duty. When he reported the assault, he was called a liar, a baby, mama's boy, and a few other choice words. He would complain to the chain of command and be told to shut up, and asked for witnesses. In one particularly horrific incident, a group of men attacked Phillips in the shower and sodomized him with a toilet brush handle. They laughed and joked about it the whole time. After he went to the infirmary, bleeding and in pain, he was told he was fine and to take the day off. Phillips eventually went AWOL to protect himself. He still suffers to this day.

Mr. Speaker, this is a moral black eye on the military, it's a moral black eye on this Congress, and it's a moral black eye on this Nation. It is time to stop talking and to take action.

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR OF INVASION AND OCCUPATION OF CYPRUS

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as I do each year on the anniversary of Turkey's unlawful invasion of Cyprus, to again call upon Turkish authorities to end the 37-year military occupation of this island nation. The tragic history of the occupation is well-documented. Sadly, with each passing year, still more indignities are visited upon the Cypriot people.

On Christmas morning, 2010, a large number of Orthodox Christians made their way to the Saint Sinesios Church. During the prayer service, the Turkish occupation authorities barged into the church, drove out the worshipers, and sealed the doors of the building. This was an assault on religious freedom. A few months ago, on May 2, Turkish occupation authorities demolished the 200-year old Chapel of Saint Thekla located in the village of Vokolida. This, too, was an assault on religious freedom. These are among countless examples of the systematic repression and destruction of the Orthodox Christian faith that is carried on by Turkish authorities on the island.

The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, the body that is tasked by this Congress on the state of religious freedom throughout the world in terms of advising us on that situation, reports that gross violations of religious freedom occur in the areas under the control of the Turkish occupation authorities. Turkey's foreign minister, the Honorable Ahmet Davutoglu, has proclaimed that Turkey's foreign policy is rooted in the doctrine of ''zero problems with its neighbors.'' Unfortunately, the fruits of this doctrine appear to be wholly absent in Turkish relations with the Republic of Cyprus.

Under the auspices of the United Nations, Turkey agreed as a confidence building measure in 1979 to withdraw and hand over the uninhabited city of Famagusta to its rightful inhabitants. Despite the annual calls of the United Nations for Turkey and the Turkish occupation authorities to honor this agreement, Famagusta remains a ghost town. The international community continually demands the withdrawal of the overwhelming Turkish military presence on Cyprus. However, the Turkish occupation authorities have not even considered a reduction of military troops.

As a candidate country seeking accession to the European Union, Turkey has been advised to open its air and sea ports to the Republic of Cyprus as a condition for the further negotiation of the accession chapters. Turkey nonetheless refuses to open its ports to Cypriot-flagged vessels. Cyprus will hold the presidency of the European Union in the second half of 2012. Rather than seize the opportunity to put its ''zero problems'' doctrine into effect, Foreign Minister Davutoglu just the other day threatened the European Union that Turkey will freeze relations with that body when the Republic of Cyprus holds its presidency.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the conduct of a country serious about joining the family of democratic nations. The United States, the European Union, and the United Nations all call for a just and lasting settlement that reunifies Cyprus as a bizonal, bicommunal federation. After 37 years of broken promises, it is high time that this Chamber demand that Turkey conduct itself in accordance with the standards and values expected of a democracy, a member of NATO, and a candidate country of the European Union.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Loving and Gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. Bless the Members of this assembly as they set upon the work of these hours, of these days. Help them to make wise decisions in a good manner and to carry their responsibilities steadily, with high hopes for a better future for our great Nation.

Deepen their faith, widen their sympathy, heighten their aspirations, and give them the strength to do what ought to be done for this country.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BUCSHON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

HONORING U.S. ARMY SPECIALIST JAMES A. WATERS

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor U.S. Army Specialist James A. Waters. Specialist Waters, a 21-year-old native of Cloverdale, Indiana, lost his life in combat on July 1 in Kandahar, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered from an improvised explosive device during an insurgent attack.

Specialist Waters was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 32nd Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division in Fort Drum, New York. Indiana lost a great citizen, who was affectionately known as Jimmy. He planned to marry his high school sweetheart in December.

His sacrifice and valor should be commended, and I would like to offer my most heartfelt condolences to Specialist Waters' family and friends. From a grateful Nation, he will be missed but not forgotten.

IOM REPORT ON WOMEN'S PREVENTATIVE HEALTH SERVICES

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the work of the Institute of Medicine's Committee on Preventive Services for Women, who released their critically important final report yesterday. The IOM's recommendations are clear. Women need access to annual well-woman preventive visits, access to screening for domestic violence, gestational diabetes, and a full range of sexually transmitted diseases. They need to have increased breastfeeding support, and they need to have access to contraceptives, all without cost sharing.

In these hard economic times, these recommendations underscore the imperative that women and their families should not have to choose between preventive care and paying their bills.

The IOM was bold. It broke through the extreme politics surrounding women's health and, instead, relies on rigorous science to make its determinations. We must follow the IOM's lead and ensure all women have access to these services, no matter where they get their health care or how much they earn.

GANG OF SIX

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Gang of Six? The Gang of Six? How about that gang of 234 people yesterday, Republicans and Democrats, who passed the plan that doesn't raise taxes and averts the crisis?

RHODE ISLAND COUNCIL OF COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the extraordinary work of the Rhode Island Council of Community Mental Health Organizations. Representatives from the Rhode Island Council of Community Mental Health Organizations are on Capitol Hill this week advocating for the millions of Americans who suffer from mental illness.

The council's work is vital because, according to the National Institute of Mental Health, an estimated 26 percent of American adults will suffer from a diagnosable mental disorder in a given year, and approximately 6 percent of Americans will suffer from a serious form of mental illness.

Since 1979, the council has led critical efforts to raise awareness about mental health and emphasize the important of mental health care funding. The council's efforts to integrate behavioral health with primary care has saved lives and cut costs in our State, setting an example for the Nation.

The Rhode Island Council of Community Mental Health Organizations is a true leader in the field of mental health. I believe we must make mental health care and full implementation of mental health parity a major priority as we continue to protect health care as a right for all.

I commend the Rhode Island Council of Community Health Organizations on their work to improve and promote mental health care.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF ARCHBISHOP CHARLES CHAPUT

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise before you to recognize the hard work and dedication of Archbishop Charles Chaput, who has served the Colorado Catholic community for over a decade. It was announced this week that he has been reassigned to lead the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. While I am saddened that Archbishop Chaput will be leaving our great State, he leaves behind a legacy of defending the innocent and helping the weak that we can all celebrate with pride.

He first came to Colorado in 1977 to be pastor of Holy Cross Parish in Thornton. After many years of ministry, and having held various important positions in the Church, in 1977 Pope John Paul II appointed and installed him Archbishop of Denver. He has fought against anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance, working tirelessly to advance religious freedom around the globe. His outreach to the Hispanic community is second to none.

I first met him at the Colorado State Legislature where I came to know him as a man of high integrity and deep, deep faith. I admire the archbishop's dedication to all people of faith.

I'd like to offer him my most sincere thanks for all of his work in Colorado and wish him the best of luck in all of his future endeavors.

DEFAULT WOULD DESTROY AMERICAN JOBS

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, Republicans want deep spending cuts with no new revenues as the price of raising the debt limit. Some Republicans have downplayed the impact that defaulting on the national debt would have on our economy and our people, and most Republicans have downplayed the impact on average Americans of the budget cuts they're calling for. This doesn't come as a surprise, but what is surprising is how out of touch they are with mainstream Americans.

Most Americans say their biggest concern isn't government spending; it's jobs. But rather than pursue a real job-creation agenda, House Republicans have passed legislation that would actually slow the economy and kill American jobs. Their demand for even bigger spending cuts in exchange for raising the debt ceiling is the latest and greatest effort yet to kill middle class American jobs.

They say either we cut government spending deeper, or they're going to force us into default, which every economist agrees causes a deeper recession and throws hundreds of thousands of middle class Americans out of work.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for House Republicans to get a grip and offer an agenda that actually creates jobs.

WE MUST PRESERVE AMERICA'S SPACE LEGACY

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago today, Neil Armstrong took one small step on the lunar surface. It was the culmination of a national initiative to put men on the Moon. But although our mission was achieved, it didn't end our yearning to explore. In many ways it only deepened, and I believe it still exists today.

Tomorrow, STS–135 Atlantis is scheduled to land in Florida; and with the completion of the mission, the shuttle program will have come to an end. We now face the uncertainty of where our next steps in space will be.

America's legacy as the unrivaled world leader in space exploration enters into a new and uncertain era. As chairman of the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee, partnered with Chairman RALPH HALL, I will work within Congress, with NASA, and with private entities to ensure America's space exploration legacy is maintained and that last year's NASA reauthorization bill is implemented.

We must continue developing the Space Launch System and Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle in order to achieve assured access for American crews to the international space station. Even in challenging economic times, I urge my colleagues to prioritize human space flight, for it is in times like these that inspiration is needed more than ever.

□ 1210

WE NEED JOBS

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, Republican slash-and-burn politics have not created a single job for hardworking Americans and Republicans have not presented a bill on jobs in this Congress. The fact is we need jobs and we need innovative jobs, and the Democrats have proposed a jobs plan that emphasizes innovation.

We had an opportunity last week to have more investment in solar—less in fossil fuels—solar green jobs that are innovative, create more jobs and protect us in the future so we don't have to spend money on defense to protect those lines that bring us oil from the Middle East, yet we didn't do it.

We need to invest in education, and the Democrats have tried to do that. But the Republicans want to cut Pell Grants and cut workforce investment opportunities. We need to have an educated workforce, and we need to have creative ways to create jobs and not just be slaving to Big Oil and Wall Street.

Jobs is our most important business here. And while I speak of jobs, we have one job the American public wants us to do, and that is prevent a default on our debt and embarrass the United States and wreck the world's economy. That's more important than any pledge, Mr. Speaker, that anybody has taken. Don't default.

CALL FOR SENATE ACTION

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House passed the cut, cap, and balance plan to control government spending and raise the debt limit. Now we need the Senate to act and put their plan on the table.

While it was good to hear yesterday that at least six Senators have reached agreement on a plan to control our debt, what we really need is the other Chamber to bring a plan to the floor and pass it out of the Senate. We have passed a clear plan, one that can be scored by the CBO, a plan that calls for a long-term solution to keep Congress responsible, the balanced budget amendment.

It is clear that we need to act on the debt ceiling soon. Our credit rating is certainly at risk. However, we cannot forget that what is truly at risk is the long-term solvency of our Nation. If we continue on the current path, we will end up being controlled by our creditors, just like Greece, Portugal, and Ireland. Our very independence is at stake here.

By acting responsibly now, we avoid greater pain later. Kicking the can down the road is only kicking our Nation's future.

DEBT LIMIT

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, unless this Congress takes action on August 2, our Nation will stop paying our bills because we refuse to come together and take shared responsibility. These bills pay for policies already purchased, such as the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the 2003 prescription drug benefit, tax cuts, and emergency measures to save our economy.

Yesterday, House Republicans passed a bill that asked for sacrifices from seniors, veterans, and children but exempted corporations from giving up even their most egregious tax loopholes, like those that encourage shipping jobs overseas. That bill also all but guarantees a default by requiring a two-thirds vote from both Chambers before we can pay our bills. To return to the balanced budgets of the 1990s will require a long-term commitment from the entire country, a commitment that will only come if everyone contributes.

We do not need to end Social Security and Medicare, as some would do. We can and must reduce the deficit in a balanced way that ensures the well-being of every American.

JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we need bipartisan efforts that focus on fiscal responsibility while maintaining important investments in our communities that will create jobs and grow the economy.

Even now, I am trying to be confident that the best interests of the American people will prevail, but it is terribly disappointing that ending Medicare for seniors is so important to Republicans that they continue to pursue this agenda at all costs and willingly put our national economy in peril.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has been under the control of the Republicans for nearly 200 days, and they have yet to bring a single job-creating bill to the floor. This is an issue that should always be above partisan politics. It seems that they would rather see the United States default on its existing debt for the first time in history, watch our economy lose hundreds of thousands of jobs, and cause interest rates and consumer goods to skyrocket in the process.

We must do something about it.

DON'T DEFAULT

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I look across my congressional district and across this country where people have lost their homes, they have lost their jobs, and they have sacrificed their retirement accounts because our fiscal house hasn't been in order, and here today we sit awaiting the opportunity to do for the American people what we ought to, which is to prevent a default, to prevent a default that would result in further sacrificing of retirement savings and jobs and homes across this country. They're really depending on us.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to say that we have an important responsibility to our seniors to protect their Medicare and their Social Security benefits, to make sure that we're creating opportunities for education for their children, to make sure that we're creating jobs, rebuilding our infrastructure, our roads, our bridges, our highways, our rail systems, and we haven't done our job.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say it's time for us to stop the silliness, to prevent the default, and to get on with the Nation's business.

STOP PLAYING GAMES, DON'T DEFAULT

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say what my colleagues and I'm sure many Americans across the country are saying: Stop playing the games and get the work done.

I understand we all come here with values, ideas, and principles that we hold dear, but when the facts dispute our ideology, we don't get the choice to change the facts; you change your ideology.

Failure to pay our bills will be catastrophic to our economy; it's that simple. This isn't a question of enabling future deficits. The Federal Government needs to cover promises it made to our soldiers, to our veterans, to our seniors, and to our creditors.

Responsible people in countries pay their bills. Our 40th President knew this. In a radio address he delivered in 1987, Ronald Reagan admonished Congress for bringing the government to the edge of default and urged them to face their responsibility.

Here's what President Reagan said: ''Interest rates will skyrocket, instability will occur in the financial markets, and the Federal deficit will soar.''

We cannot ignore the facts, and allowing our Nation to default no way fixes our budget problems.

Stop playing the games; get the work done; move the country forward.

EMERGENCY WATERSHED PROTECTION PROGRAM

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

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of important conversations that are taking place today, but it's important that we talk about what has happened in New Mexico recently.

New Mexico has been hit by a series of wildfires during this extremely dry fire season. Many communities have been threatened by fires as families have lost their homes and livestock and tribal lands have been damaged.

At a time when many counties are struggling with a drought, the fire

damage to our watersheds, which provide New Mexico with the majority of its surface water, has impacted drinking water supplies and increased the threat of floods during monsoon season.

With the Midwest recovering from floods and tornados and the West battling fires and drought, the current resources available to fight these disasters are simply not enough. Funds for the Natural Resource Conservation Service's Emergency Watershed Protection program, which assist with the protection of watersheds that have been impacted by natural disasters, have almost been depleted as a result of the disasters around the country. It's vital that we provide more resources for this critical program that can strengthen watersheds affected by the combination of fire, damage, high temperature, and lack of rainfall.

I encourage my colleagues to support efforts to address funding shortfalls to the Emergency Watershed Protection program so we can help our communities recover.

□ 1220

WARRIORS' WATCH RIDERS

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the contributions of the Warriors' Watch Riders, a troop support group, for their commitment to our veterans, their families and our community.

Rain or shine, the Warriors' Watch Riders in my district provide a motorcycle escort to our servicemembers and welcome them home as they return to our community.

When one of our servicemembers makes the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty, the Warriors' Watch Riders recognize their sacrifice, honor their memory, and offer support to their families.

I have seen firsthand how the Warriors' Watch Riders bring communities together with the roar of their motorcycles. Bonds are built, tears are shed, and families, friends, and neighbors come together with the Warriors' Watch Riders to show respect for the sacrifices those in uniform make to ensure our freedom.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Warriors' Watch Riders for all they do for the men and women who serve our country.

MEDICARE GUARANTEE THREATENED

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, the Republican bill cuts, caps, and balances all right; cuts Medicare, caps Medicaid, and balances the budget on the backs of our seniors, people with disabilities, and the middle class.

When Willy Sutton was asked why do you rob banks, he said, because that's where the money is.

Asking the elderly and people with disabilities to shoulder the responsibility for our national debt—really? Nearly half of Medicare beneficiaries have income at or below 200 percent of poverty. The median income for seniors is just over $19,000 a year. The Republican proposal will end the Medicare guarantee, double out-of-pocket costs for seniors and people with disabilities, and send them an invoice for $6,000.

Of course we need to address our fiscal challenges, but not by ending Medicare in the process.

REPUBLICAN FRESHMEN CUT SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our Republican friends jumped for joy when they passed a draconian bill that would cut $6 trillion and jeopardize a lifeline for millions of Americans, and that is Social Security. We have all been referring to a President that endeared himself to this whole country, President Reagan. His letter to Senator Baker said: The Nation can ill-afford to allow such a result. The risk, the costs, the disruptions, and the incalculable damage lead me to but one conclusion: The Senate must vote to raise the debt ceiling—in 1983 when the country was much smaller.

But what do we face here? Frivolous activity like Republican freshmen who, in their manner of affect, showing disrespect for the Office of the President. One Member said: ''I have a challenge for the President. I dare him, I double dare him to even think about cutting Social Security.'' What about the Member? Should he be dared to not cut Social Security? The Republican vote yesterday already cut Social Security. And you've just cut Social Security as Republican freshmen. Why don't we engage in negotiation and let the approach be negotiation and resolution—not obstruction. Why don't we engage in negotiation and work together as a Nation, as the American people want? I would like a little more respect from my colleagues for the President of the United States, President Barack Obama.

CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE DEAD ON ARRIVAL

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, last night we voted once again in the House of Representatives to cut Medicare, to cut Social Security, and to reward the wealthiest 2 percent of our Nation with tax cuts, and of course big business with tax cuts. The Republican majority wasted a crucial day of debate instead of protecting and working on the financial security for our Nation.

We could have debated a strong jobs agenda like the Make It in America agenda that the Democrats have. We could have discussed how we could strengthen partnerships with businesses to retain America's workers for the jobs that are actually needed here.

But what did they do? As one former Republican budget adviser calls it, they debated something that was ''a misleading political cheap shot.''

The Republicans Cut, Cap, and Balance Act is harmful for this country, and it is not a serious proposal. It is not going to be signed into law. They wasted our time. So I am glad that that bill is dead on arrival in the Senate. But I really wish, I really wish they would get down to working for America.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2553, AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2011, PART IV

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 357 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 357

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2553) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend the airport improvement program, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this rule and the underlying bill. House Resolution 357 provides for a closed rule for consideration

of H.R. 2553, the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV.

So far in the 112th Congress, three short-term extensions have been signed into law to allow for the continued aviation trust fund revenue collections and aviation program authority necessary to operate America's airports. The latest short-term extension expires this Friday, July 22.

H.R. 2553 would extend the program for a little less than 2 months, until September 16. The bill maintains current funding levels for FAA, its employees, and airports around the country. The bill includes two simple Essential Air Service (EAS) reform provisions, one of which has already passed the Senate by unanimous consent.

Both the House and Senate have passed separate versions of multiyear reauthorization bills, so this short-term extension will hopefully give the House and Senate the time needed to work out the differences between the two bills so we can stop kicking the can down the road.

To say that, that is exactly what we are doing. For starters, this is the 21st extension of the FAA program since the last reauthorization. We have been at this exact juncture 20 other times. The last reauthorization, shepherded by Chairman MICA, was over 7½ years ago. That is a long time. Since September 30, 2007, the FAA has been operating on a series of short-term, stopgap extensions.

Quite simply, it is time to stop doing this. It is too much. The safety of our airline passengers is something we ought to take into consideration and pass a necessary, meaningful and long-term FAA reauthorization.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has worked to provide us yet another short-term extension which will ensure the continued safety of airline passengers, with the hope that the Senate and the House can finally come to the table and realize a long-term reauthorization.

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV, extends aviation trust fund revenue collections and aviation program authority at current funding levels through September 16 of this year while also imposing new restrictions on the Essential Air Service program.

Frankly, it is no substitute for a long-term Federal Aviation Administration authorization, and casts further doubt on airport construction and safety improvements instead of ensuring air passenger safety, creating jobs, or investing in air traffic control modernization.

□ 1230

As I'm sure most Americans would agree, the word ''uncertain'' does not belong in a conversation about our Nation's aviation system and it certainly does not belong in the same sentence as air passenger safety. I note a friend in the House who is a pilot agrees with that statement. Over the course of almost 4 years, however, great uncertainty surrounding long-term funding for the FAA has threatened and continues to threaten both. Without steady funding, the FAA is unable to best manage the long-term programs and projects that are vital to the future of our aviation system, including lifesaving airport safety improvements and the transition to the very important Next Generation Air Transportation System that we know as NextGen.

Make no mistake, the United States has the safest, most efficient aviation system in the world. We can all thank our highly skilled, dedicated aviation professionals for that. But in order to ensure that it remains that way, we must stop kicking the FAA reauthorization can further down the road. I know these cans around here get tired of being kicked down the road.

The measure before us is the 21st short-term FAA extension to be considered since the last FAA authorization bill. Vision 100 expired at the end of September 2007. I repeat: This is the 21st short-term FAA extension we have considered in less than 4 years. It is also the sixth extension of operation authority for fiscal year 2011. Meanwhile, there has been no progress for weeks on a long-term authorization.

While short-term extensions have their place in the legislative process, they should be the exception, not the rule, especially when authorizing the important safety and modernization activities of the FAA. The extension not only fails to address the long-term aviation needs of our Nation, but also denies many of our small and rural communities the air service and economic opportunity made possible by the Essential Air Service program.

By including these policy riders, House Republicans risk a shutdown of our aviation system. Senator ROCKEFELLER, after our Rules Committee meeting last night, made that very clear in a letter from him to Chairman MICA.

Instead of appointing conferees, as the Senate did 100 days ago, House Republicans seem to be pointing fingers and effectively forcing a vote on the future of the EAS program ahead of conference legislation. While House Republicans continue to play the blame game with the Senate, American businesses and workers are losing out on much needed economic opportunities.

Aviation, as we all know, is an economic engine for the United States, contributing $1.3 trillion to our economy, accounting for more than 11.5 million jobs and $396 billion in earnings, and contributing 5.6 percent to our Nation's gross domestic product.

Without full-year funding for the FAA, local officials are unable to move forward with project proposals. Because of this, the FAA is an estimated $800 million to $1 billion behind in obligating funding, which translates to tens of thousands of jobs. Furthermore, if the FAA is unable to utilize these funds before the end of the fiscal year, they risk being reprogrammed or rescinded. This, in my view, is irresponsible, dangerous, and unacceptable. The FAA will have to do more with less, which reduces its ability to help airports finance safety improvements such as special runway overshoot areas, runway resurfacing, proper signage and lighting, and equipment to prevent snow and ice buildup on runways.

These measures not only save lives but increase efficiency at a time when air traffic is projected to continue growing significantly. According to the FAA, the number of passengers on U.S. airlines is forecasted to increase by about 75 percent within the next 20 years and to reach 1 billion passengers annually within the next decade. We must invest more in our aviation system, not less. Long-term FAA authorization should be an immediate priority.

In the 110th and 111th Congresses, the House, under Democratic leadership, passed FAA reauthorization bills that would have created jobs, improved aviation safety, and provided the FAA with the tools necessary to modernize airport and air traffic control infrastructure.

My friends on the other side should do the responsible thing and appoint conferees so that the House and Senate can work out their differences and finalize a long-term FAA reauthorization bill. Unfortunately, my friends on the other side of the aisle are clearly preoccupied with further isolating small and rural communities than moving this debate forward. In fact, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has held no hearings specifically on the EAS program this year, nor did they hold a markup on the measure before us.

The Senate is not going to pass this. The letter from Senator ROCKEFELLER makes it very clear, as the chair of the relevant committee in the Senate, that this is not going to pass in its form with the policy riders attached. Yet, without the ability to offer amendments on the floor, as I requested in the Rules Committee last night, to consider a clean extension, one free of the policy riders that will hurt our small and rural communities, we face a shutdown. I believe my good friend from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) said on Friday this short-term extension would expire and then our aviation system stands to shut down. That would be most unfortunate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. I thank my colleague for yielding, and I'd like to thank my colleagues on the Rules Committee for so expeditiously bringing up this rule for consideration this afternoon of I think it's the 21st temporary extension of the reauthorization of the FAA legislation.

This reauthorization has been held hostage for several years, and it is not cost-free. It's interfering with the efficiency of operations, the ability to plan and to expend funds on needed airport improvements all across the country. So we're paying a price for this sort of thing, and I really don't think we should be allowing people to assert that they have the right unilaterally to hold up the whole process, that it's their way or the highway, especially when what we're doing in this particular mild change to reform a needed part of this legislation, Essential Air Service, which is badly in need of reform, is basically acceding to language that's already in the Senate bill. By agreeing to the bill that in this respect has passed the other House, this is nonnegotiable that we can be so bold as to simply say, Fine, we'll agree to the language that you have which basically provides that if an airport is within 90 miles of a major airport, it's not eligible for Essential Air Service.

□ 1240

The other provides that the cap on subsidy from the Federal Government would be $1,000 per passenger.

Now, what are we talking about? You can rent a car for a lot less than $1,000; and most people, frankly, prefer not to go through a couple of changes, to a feeder airline to a hub to another destination, if you're able to avoid it. An hour 45 minutes, hour and a half air travel is certainly perfectly reasonable, especially when you consider in addition that if it really is essential, the Secretary of Transportation has the ability to waive this legislation. So people are just unilaterally assuming that somehow some terrible thing will happen when the authority already exists in the executive branch to prevent that from happening.

So to further hold the whole system hostage over a small effort to reform what really has been, I think, over a period of years an accumulation of earmarks—people had the ability to provide for a subsidy for an airport in their district in this area or that area because they were in leadership on the committee or in the Congress, and we've seen this pile up and pile up, and it's really about time it gets addressed.

And asking people to find a way to get to an airport, if it's less than 90 miles that they have to find alternative transportation, rather than having the Federal Government subsidize it in a few airports around the country seems to me to be something that is badly in need of doing. It saves money for the taxpayer. Not a whole lot, but I think estimates are between $8 million and $9 million a year. I guess around here that doesn't amount to a whole lot, but in most communities and families and other areas, that's a lot of money.

Of course, we have to remember the Federal Government isn't the only government concerned. If people really do want a subsidized service because of some local need, the community or the State or the county involved is certainly perfectly free to do that.

So why we should be picking a couple dozen communities around the entire United States and subsidizing to the extent of over $1,000 per passenger to provide this sort of almost air limousine service for a few individuals in these communities is beyond me.

Yet if this is nonnegotiable and we can't concede to the language already in the Senate bill and we're going to have to shut down the whole system, except for essential air service, because of trying to do this modest reform after 23 extensions or 24 extensions, we've really come to a pretty kind of arbitrary and unreasonable place here in this House.

So I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman. And I want to associate myself with his very detailed and well-stated opening statement on this legislation.

I think the premise should be that all of us agree on the importance of the FAA. I have served as the chairwoman of the Transportation Security Subcommittee of the Homeland Security Committee and now serve as its ranking member. Through that timeframe, I have seen the overlapping need to view particularly FAA's work and particularly air traffic controller work as part of both the safety and security of this Nation.

I remind my colleagues of the activist role that air traffic controllers in particular took during 9/11. During the massiveness of confusion and the loss of the destination or the placing of three of our major airlines and planes that were flying in, airplanes, the air traffic controller was really a team that was on the first response, if you will. So their work is enormously important.

And my colleague mentioned some numbers that I think are extremely important: $1.3 trillion is what we find as the revenue in the airline industry, 11½ million jobs, a 75 percent increase in employees within 20 years and 1 billion in the next decade. I want to say that this means that we have a great obligation to protect the American traveling public.

I also want to associate myself with the idea of not protecting our small airports and disadvantaging those airports by this legislation. And again I assume Chairman ROCKEFELLER's comments play to that as well.

But I had offered an amendment that was sent to the Senate to establish a mandate that at the top 20 United States airports there should be no fewer than three air traffic controllers on duty during periods of airfield operations. I firmly believe this provision will ensure that air traffic control towers at high-volume airports in this country will be appropriately staffed at all times.

Mr. Speaker, we engaged with the conference committee very diligently. We have all heard the recent stories of air traffic controllers falling asleep or being locked out of the control tower or, for whatever reason, not being able to be on the job, on duty at critical times.

Now, I know that air traffic controllers reflect the diversity of America and the various ills and concerns. We also know they have long concentrated hours and it's a difficult job. Just recently there was a question of whether or not an air traffic controller was inebriated on the job, whether he drank on the job or he came to the job, he or she, with this condition. But if that was the case and there was one air traffic controller there, there's zero. If that was the case and there were two, then there was one.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

I submit that by simply having a codified policy that at the busiest and most critical airports we mandate there be personnel redundancy in control towers, we can make the aviation system much safer and much more secure.

The American passenger has value. Those dear souls who lost their lives on 9/11 who were not exposed to this concept of terrorism had value. The American passenger is entitled to safety and security. Think about the people on planes flying across our country. They are our grandmothers, husbands, wives, babies, family members, businesspersons, associates, colleagues. They're American passengers and their lives have value. To ensure their safety and security, I believe we need more than what is presently moving in this bill that has not come to the floor, and I believe we should move on with the conferees to be appointed because, as I said, I sent my language to the initial negotiation. We need to move on so there's an opportunity for us to work this idea.

But this is more than a study. We don't need another study. We have already seen the mishaps. On 9/11 we discovered the value and importance of these particular workers, and we now have discovered the problem.

I ask my colleagues to raise the question and to question this rule and this bill, or this extension, because we are putting our American passengers in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider yet another extension for FAA programs, I rise today to discuss a key issue that I urge the conferees on the FAA Reauthorization bill to consider.

Prior to H.R. 658 being sent to the Senate, I offered an amendment to establish a mandate that at the top 20 U.S. airports, there shall be no fewer than three air traffic controllers on duty during periods of airfield operations. I firmly believe this provision will ensure that air traffic control towers at high volume airports in this country will be appropriately staffed at all times. This is a matter of national security.

We have all heard the recent stories of air traffic controllers falling asleep, or being locked out of the control tower, or for whatever reason, not being able to be on the job, on duty at critical times.

I submit that by simply having a codified policy that at the busiest and most critical airports we mandate there be personnel redundancy in control towers, we can make the aviation system much safer.

The American Passenger has value. The American Passenger is entitled to Safety and Security.

Think about the people on planes flying across our country. They are our grandmothers, husbands, wives and babies. They are American Passengers and their lives have value. To ensure their safety and security we must insist that Air Traffic Controllers are vigilant. To ensure their vigilance we must set reasonable minimum standards.

After 9–11, we discovered the vital importance of protecting our domestic airspace. Air Traffic Controllers are part of the front line of defense to protect the ensure the safety of our air space. If they lose contact with a plane, they can alert authorities. If an Air Traffic Controller at a major domestic and international airport is asleep at the wheel who will make that call?

It is unfair to put the lives of American passengers at high volume airports at ANY time in the hands of one individual, who may at some point be incapacitated. Even pilots have co-pilots. What if the Controller fell ill? What then? What would you tell those passengers on the plane? Hope for the best? We need to provide the support that Air Traffic Controllers need in addition to the responsibility.

This language I support creates a mandate, that at all times there must be a minimum of three air traffic controllers in the tower during hours of airfield operation. I commend Secretary LaHood for ordering a second air traffic controller to be on duty overnight at National Airport. However, the Secretary's action simply evidences that there is no current mandate for multiple air traffic controllers. According to the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, most airports operate 24 hours a day with two controllers in the tower for the midnight-to-6 a.m. shift. The operative word is "most", we must act to create a uniform nationwide standard, verifiable and enforceable by the FAA. Again, safety and security are mutually needed to protect the public. This mandate of 2 air traffic controllers on duty at the top 20 airports is vital to America's National Security.

I urge the conferees to adopt this important provision.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to my very good friend from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we meet this afternoon to consider this very necessary legislation, too many Americans are looking at yet another Friday without a paycheck. Too many Americans are leery when they hear the phone ring for fear it's another dunning phone call from a creditor they can't pay. Too many Americans are stuck for yet another week in a part-time job that doesn't come anywhere close to paying their families' bills.

The country has a jobs crisis. We have the same number of private sector jobs in America today that we had in 2001, and we have 14 percent more people looking for work. We have a jobs crisis.

This is the 196th day of the majority that now runs the House of Representatives, and on not one of those days has the majority taken advantage of the opportunity to come to the floor, work together on legislation that would address this jobs crisis here in our country.

□ 1250

I believe that resolving this crisis requires us to work together in three areas:

First, we have to get our fiscal house in order as a government. We can no longer borrow 40 cents of every dollar we spend, and we certainly cannot let this country fail to meet its obligation to pay its bills—a deadline that is on August 2. Failure to do that would mean more than simply failing our country's national obligations. It would mean higher mortgage rates; it would mean higher car loan rates, higher small business rates; and if we miss the deadline, it would mean not enough money to pay Social Security checks or our troops or our creditors. We cannot let that happen.

Just across this Capitol, there are signs of hope, where Members of the other body from both political parties have begun to have a serious proposal put on the table that would significantly address our budget problem by reducing entitlement spending, which we must do; by reducing spending on regular government programs, which we must do; by reducing spending on defense in areas that would not weaken our country, which we must do; and yes, by requiring the wealthiest and most successful of Americans to pay a bit more towards solving this problem. That is a fair and balanced way to approach this problem. I am heartened by the fact that, across the Capitol, both Republicans and Democrats are beginning to make that effort. We should make the same effort here, something we could agree to.

Second, we've got to stimulate the demand for businesses in this country. I think the main reason so many employers are not hiring is they legitimately fear there won't be enough customers to buy their appliances or their antibiotics or their software, that there isn't enough demand in our economy.

One of the reasons we don't have that demand is we send $1 billion a day to Middle Eastern countries which sell us oil. Why don't we keep that $1 billion here in the United States of America and put it to work by putting Americans to work, whether it's in building windmill farms off the coast or solar farms throughout our rural areas or in exploring regular, conventional sources of energy in a safe and environmentally conscious way. Let's do that.

Why aren't we investing to give ourselves a continued lead in the biotechnology industry? As scientists are figuring out ways to grow new tissue that heals hearts and livers and kidneys, why aren't we working to retain our leadership position in the world in order to create jobs here in our country?

So these are ways that we could and should work together.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ANDREWS. Why aren't we doing far more than we're doing this afternoon on this airport bill?

Airport investment puts Americans to work, and good air travel makes growth possible, but look at what we're doing: a temporary, scanty extension of our investment in our air traffic system because we can't get our fiscal house in order to agree to the kind of extension that we need.

We have 196 days of missed opportunity. Let's not make tomorrow the 197th day of missed opportunity. Let's come together; work together as Republicans and Democrats, and create an environment where entrepreneurs can begin to create the jobs that we so desperately need here in our country. Yes, we have a deficit in America—it is a very serious deficit—but the most serious deficit we have is a jobs deficit, and until we can find a way to put 15 million unemployed Americans back to work, our deficits will continue.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the people who might be watching this that we're talking about House Resolution 357, which is a rule that would allow us to reauthorize an extension of the Airport and Airway Extension Act, which is called H.R. 2553. That's our discussion. That's what we're talking about.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would ask my good friend from Florida whether he has any other requests for time. I am prepared to close.

Mr. WEBSTER. No. I am ready to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. In so doing, Mr. Speaker, having now fully

read Senator ROCKEFELLER's letter, I do ask that it be made part of the RECORD. I will read only four sentences from it. He says to Chairman MICA:

''I strongly urge you to reconsider your position and send over a clean FAA extension and appoint conferees for the FAA reauthorization bill, as the Senate did on April 7, 2011, to move this important legislation forward. Further efforts to add policy components to FAA extensions that have not been negotiated with the Senate will likely shut the FAA down.''

As Transportation Secretary LaHood and FAA Administrator Babbitt have said, the United States faces a pivotal time in aviation history. In order to ensure the safety of the flying public and bring our air transportation system into the 21st century, the FAA needs a long-term reauthorization bill. While H.R. 2553 buys us a little more time, we cannot afford to continue ignoring the underlying problem.

Mr. Speaker, I try very much not to be as parochial as I can be in many instances, but in West Palm Beach, we are building a new airport tower, and we need the NextGen facilities. At the Fort Lauderdale Airport—that is my hometown airport—we are expanding the runway. It becomes increasingly difficult to complete the projects when money for doing so comes in increments rather than in a block that will allow that they go forward in a meaningful way.

Toward that end, the failure to enact a multiyear FAA reauthorization is just going to result in delays to much needed infrastructure improvements, including, as I have mentioned, the ground-based and NextGen technologies; and it will ultimately cost our Nation more in the long run with regard to passenger safety, jobs and the environment.

Enough is enough. We need a clean extension now in order to pass a long-term authorization as soon as possible. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule and on the underlying bill.

UNITED STATES SENATE, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION,
Washington DC, July 19, 2011.

Hon. JOHN MICA,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

JOHN, As you are well aware, Congress has passed 20 routine Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) extensions since 2007. I was genuinely hopeful that we would have had a comprehensive bill after four months of negotiations, but appreciated that a handful of difficult issues remained to be resolved before agreement on a final bill could be reached. I was under the impression that we were still operating on a shared desire to complete this important legislation.

It is for this reason that I am deeply puzzled by your decision to introduce an FAA extension with language that adversely affects the Essential Air Service (EAS) program. This surprise maneuver is a complete reversal from the discussions we have been having for several months, and strongly suggests you have not been negotiating in good faith.

As troubling and problematic as the extension you introduced is, I am even more taken aback by the blistering press release you issued in conjunction with it. Its hostility was unexpected. The tone and tenor of the release was so different than any of our previous interactions, I almost did not believe you wrote it.

As your press release inferred, you inserted the EAS language into the FAA extension in retaliation for the Senate's refusal to accept your language on the National Mediation Board (NMB). At no point during our discussions, have we ever linked reforms to the EAS program to language on NMB. I made it clear from the beginning of our negotiations that the NMB language included in your bill—or any other language adversely impacting workers rights—could not pass the Senate. As you know, the Senate voted on this issue last year and our Leadership considers this matter settled. Your attempt to punish the Senate by hurting small community air service has backfired—this language only guarantees that the Senate will reject the FAA extension.

As I told you on numerous occasions, EAS is critical to West Virginia. Specifically, I discussed how Morgantown and Clarksburg depend on the EAS program. Air service has been a critical factor in the economies of these communities, and drives economic growth across my state. Our every conversation had me convinced that you appreciated the reasons I am so dedicated to supporting this program. I believed you when you indicated you wanted to work with me on reaching language acceptable to both chambers. The language in the FAA extension you introduced with Congressmen Camp and Petri makes it harder to find a path forward on this issue.

Over the last twenty-four hours, it is my understanding that you have asserted to others that you had no role in developing this extension, claiming that it was a leadership decision. If this is true, I am unclear as to why you sponsored it, and issued such a searing press release along with it. If you truly have no authority to make final decisions on the FAA bill, I urge the House to formally appoint conferees and allow me to negotiate directly with your colleagues who can make decisions.

I strongly urge you to reconsider your position and send over a clean FAA extension and appoint conferees for the FAA reauthorization bill, as the Senate did on April 7, 2011, to move this important legislation forward. Further efforts to add policy components to FAA extensions that have not been negotiated with the Senate will likely shut the FAA down. You need to think about this very, very carefully. Any consequences resulting from such an action will fall squarely on your shoulders. Right now you are in control of the agency's immediate future.

Sincerely,
John D. Rockefeller IV.

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

Mr. WEBSTER. In closing, I would like to address one thing about the change that's in this particular reauthorization, that of essential air service, which has basically become the government-funded corporate jet program. We've tried to reduce that. If you're a businessman and you live in a rural community, instead of being willing to drive an hour and a half to get on a plane at a medium- or small-sized hub, you're willing to have the government fund your airplane for you. It's basically a corporate member, somebody who has a business there. He gets on a jet, and to the tune of up to $3,720, we subsidize that. The taxpayers of this country subsidize that, so it's like a subsidized corporate jet.

It's a sad thing. We want to reduce that. We'd like to do away with it, and a lot of us would like to do away with it altogether; but it would reduce that down to $1,000 instead of having to drive, maybe, an hour and a half to an airport. It's a sad thing.

However, another sad thing is that we're here. I am sad about the fact that we're standing here on the floor once again to vote for another extension. I wish it had worked out. I wish we could get together, and I hope that happens in the next few weeks if we approve this. This extension is necessary to ensure continued safety for all who fly, be it for business or pleasure or for any other reason, in the American skies.

I ask my colleagues to join me today and vote in favor of this rule and of passage of the underlying bill.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 183, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 608]

YEAS—239

Adams	Carter	Gallegly
Aderholt	Cassidy	Gardner
Akin	Chabot	Garrett
Alexander	Chaffetz	Gerlach
Amash	Coble	Gibbs
Austria	Coffman (CO)	Gibson
Bachus	Cole	Gingrey (GA)
Barletta	Conaway	Gohmert
Bartlett	Cravaack	Goodlatte
Barton (TX)	Crawford	Gosar
Bass (NH)	Crenshaw	Gowdy
Benishek	Culberson	Granger
Berg	Davis (KY)	Graves (GA)
Biggert	Denham	Graves (MO)
Bilbray	Dent	Griffin (AR)
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Griffith (VA)
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Grimm
Black	Dold	Guinta
Blackburn	Dreier	Guthrie
Bonner	Duffy	Hall
Bono Mack	Duncan (SC)	Hanna
Boustany	Duncan (TN)	Harper
Brady (TX)	Ellmers	Harris
Brooks	Emerson	Hartzler
Broun (GA)	Farenthold	Hastings (WA)
Buchanan	Fincher	Hayworth
Bucshon	Fitzpatrick	Heck
Buerkle	Flake	Hensarling
Burgess	Fleischmann	Herger
Burton (IN)	Fleming	Herrera Beutler
Calvert	Flores	Huelskamp
Camp	Forbes	Huizenga (MI)
Campbell	Fortenberry	Hultgren
Canseco	Foxx	Hunter
Cantor	Franks (AZ)	Hurt
Capito	Frelinghuysen	Issa

Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—183

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

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Blumenauer
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Ellison
Giffords
Hinchey
McDermott
Runyan
Young (AK)

□ 1330

Messrs. CONYERS, CLYBURN and Ms. BROWN of Florida changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. LEWIS of California, CAMP, McKINLEY, and CRENSHAW changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, due to official House business, I was unable to vote on the following measure:

Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule for H.R. 2553—Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV (H. Res. 357).

Had I been able to vote, I would have voted "nay."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 178, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 609]

AYES—242

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

NOES—178

Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell

Sherman	Tierney	Waters
Sires	Tonko	Watt
Slaughter	Towns	Waxman
Smith (WA)	Tsongas	Welch
Speier	Van Hollen	Wilson (FL)
Stark	Velázquez	Woolsey
Sutton	Visclosky	Wu
Thompson (CA)	Walz (MN)	Yarmuth
Thompson (MS)	Wasserman Schultz	
Thompson (PA)		

NOT VOTING—12

Bachmann	Ellison	McDermott
Blumenauer	Giffords	Runyan
Capuano	Gutierrez	Scott (VA)
Castor (FL)	Hinchey	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1337

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, due to official House business, I was unable to vote on the following measure:

H. Res. 357—Closed Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2553—Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV.

Had I been able to vote, I would have voted "nay."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2553 and to include extraneous material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2011, PART IV

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 357, I call up the bill (H.R. 2553) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend the airport improvement program, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 357, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2553

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 ''Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TAXES FUNDING AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) FUEL TAXES.—Subparagraph (B) of section 4081(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''July 22, 2011'' and inserting ''September 16, 2011''.

(b) TICKET TAXES.—

(1) PERSONS.—Clause (ii) of section 4261(j)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''July 22, 2011'' and inserting ''September 16, 2011''.

(2) PROPERTY.—Clause (ii) of section 4271(d)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''July 22, 2011'' and inserting ''September 16, 2011''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 23, 2011.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 9502(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''July 23, 2011'' and inserting ''September 17, 2011''; and

(2) by inserting ''or the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV'' before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 9502(e) of such Code is amended by striking ''July 23, 2011'' and inserting ''September 17, 2011''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 23, 2011.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 48103 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following:

''(8) $3,380,178,082 for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on September 16, 2011.''.

(2) OBLIGATION OF AMOUNTS.—Subject to limitations specified in advance in appropriation Acts, sums made available pursuant to the amendment made by paragraph (1) may be obligated at any time through September 30, 2011, and shall remain available until expended.

(b) PROJECT GRANT AUTHORITY.—Section 47104(c) of such title is amended by striking ''July 22, 2011,'' and inserting ''September 16, 2011,''.

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES.

(a) Section 40117(l)(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''July 23, 2011.'' and inserting ''September 17, 2011.''.

(b) Section 44302(f)(1) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking ''July 22, 2011,'' and inserting ''September 16, 2011,''; and

(2) by striking ''October 31, 2011,'' and inserting ''December 31, 2011,''.

(c) Section 44303(b) of such title is amended by striking ''October 31, 2011,'' and inserting ''December 31, 2011,''.

(d) Section 47107(s)(3) of such title is amended by striking ''July 23, 2011.'' and inserting ''September 17, 2011.''.

(e) Section 47115(j) of such title is amended by striking ''July 23, 2011,'' and inserting ''September 17, 2011,''.

(f) Section 47141(f) of such title is amended by striking ''July 22, 2011.'' and inserting ''September 16, 2011.''.

(g) Section 49108 of such title is amended by striking ''July 22, 2011,'' and inserting ''September 16, 2011,''.

(h) Section 161 of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (49 U.S.C. 47109 note) is amended by striking ''July 23, 2011,'' and inserting ''September 17, 2011,''.

(i) Section 186(d) of such Act (117 Stat. 2518) is amended by striking ''July 23, 2011,'' and inserting ''September 17, 2011,''.

(j) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 23, 2011.

SEC. 6. ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 41731(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iii) as subclauses (I) through (III), respectively;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(3) in clause (i)(I) (as so redesignated) by inserting ''(A)'' before ''(i)(I)'';

(4) in subparagraph (A)(ii) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking ''determined'' and inserting ''was determined'';

(B) by striking ''Secretary'' and inserting ''Secretary of Transportation''; and

(C) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) is located not less than 90 miles from the nearest medium or large hub airport; and

''(C) had an average subsidy per passenger of less than $1,000 during the most recent fiscal year, as determined by the Secretary.''.

(b) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO DECIDE A PLACE NOT AN ELIGIBLE PLACE.—Section 41731(b) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' and inserting ''Secretary''; and

(2) by striking ''on the basis of a passenger subsidy at that place or on another basis'' and inserting ''on any basis''.

(c) EXCEPTIONS AND WAIVERS.—Section 41731 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) EXCEPTIONS FOR LOCATIONS IN ALASKA.—Subsections (a)(1)(B) and (a)(1)(C) shall not apply with respect to a location in the State of Alaska.

''(d) WAIVERS.—The Secretary may waive subsection (a)(1)(B) with respect to a location if the Secretary determines that the geographic characteristics of the location result in undue difficulty in accessing the nearest medium or large hub airport.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1340

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

Mr. Speaker, for the third consecutive Congress, we are working to pass a long-term reauthorization of the FAA. This year both the House and Senate passed their own reauthorizations; but, unfortunately, negotiations with the Senate have slowed, and it is necessary for us to pass another extension to enable the FAA to continue to operate.

This bill is a short-term extension of FAA funding and programs through September 16 at current levels. This extension also includes important reforms to the Essential Air Service program. These reforms could result in as much as $20 million in savings for the American taxpayer.

The first reform provision was adopted unanimously by the Senate and is included in its reauthorization bill. That provides that only airports that are 90 miles or more away from a large- or medium-hub airport would be eligible to participate in the Essential Air Service—90 miles away. People can obviously and in most instances would prefer to drive 90 miles rather than take a connecting flight. It seems like a sensible thing. We hadn't thought about it when we passed our original

legislation; the Senate did. We are including their reform. So we are, in effect, acceding to the Senate. In the case of one airport under the current program which is within 90 miles, we are paying a per passenger subsidy of $851, and the nearest hub is 82 miles away. That is a $10 per mile subsidy.

So the second provision dealing with Essential Air Service caps the subsidies for each passenger, in addition to the fares they pay, at $1,000. During this economically difficult time, it is not possible to justify using taxpayer dollars to pay a subsidy of $1,000 per passenger at an EAS airport, and subsidies can frequently exceed that amount. If there are difficulties with that, there is other language that would allow the executive branch to waive this provision.

The EAS provisions included in the extension are limited and sensible reforms that target the most indefensible of the subsidies. If we can't do this, what can we do, especially after 23 or 24 extensions that have been holding the whole program and the efficiency and improvements in the air infrastructure of our country hostage.

The House-passed bill actually phases out the Essential Air Services program for all but Alaska and Hawaii. We are not insisting on that at all. We are modifying that and going along with largely what the Senate itself has been suggesting in this regard. So these provisions are a compromise, and EAS will continue to be discussed as we work to finalize the bill.

As Congress tries to find a way forward to address deficit and long-term debt issues, if we can't put an end to these extravagant subsidies, then we will never be able to rein in spending where really hard decisions are necessary.

Although I continue to hold out hope that we will reach a compromise with the Senate in the near future, it is necessary to pass this extension to provide the FAA with continued funding authority and provide needed EAS reform. Ultimately, we need to get back to the negotiating table to work out a long-term FAA bill. Short-term extensions are not the way to run such an important agency.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, July 18, 2011.

Hon. JOHN MICA,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MICA: I am writing concerning H.R. 2553, the ''Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV'' which is expected to be scheduled for floor consideration this week.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Code. Sections 2 and 3 of this bill amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by extending the current Airport and Airway Trust Fund (AATF) expenditure authority and the associated Federal excise taxes to September 16, 2011. In order to expedite H.R. 2553 for Floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on the bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 2553, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, July 18, 2011.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2553, the ''Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV.'' The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure recognizes the Committee on Ways and Means has a jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2553, and I appreciate your effort to facilitate consideration of this bill.

I concur with you that forgoing action on H.R. 2553 does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include our letters on H.R. 2553 in the Congressional Record during House Floor consideration of the bill. Again, I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I look forward to working with the Committee on Ways and Means as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,
Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2553, the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011. This is the 21st extension of the FAA authority to fund airport improvement projects at current levels, through September 16, 2011. Regrettably, unlike all of the prior 20 extensions of the FAA authority, this bill includes a policy rider eliminating Essential Air Service eligibility for 13 airports in small and rural communities.

The issue today is not whether we support the Essential Air Service program or not. We should not be legislating on this extension. We should have a clean extension so we can move it over to the Senate and make certain that the FAA is funded through September 16.

There have been no hearings on proposals to reduce EAS this Congress and no hearings on this bill either. Members with affected communities should be allowed to make their case to the House and offer amendments to the bill that would preserve service to their communities.

Instead, this extension is inviting opposition and creating major problems because the Senate has indicated they will not accept this extension. Policy riders should be left out of the extension and taken up by the House and Senate conferees, if, in fact, we ever have conferees appointed here in the House.

Earlier this year, the House and Senate both approved comprehensive FAA reauthorization bills. In February, the Senate passed the FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 87–8. Passage of the Senate bill was widely applauded by both labor and industry stakeholders, and it was estimated the bill would create at least 10,000 jobs.

In contrast, in April of this year, the House passed an extremely controversial H.R. 658 by a vote of 223–196, the narrowest vote margin for House passage of an FAA reauthorization bill in nearly three decades. The bill has been harshly criticized by labor and industry stakeholders because it would undermine aviation safety, slash FAA funding, and destroy good-paying airport construction jobs.

Since Chairman MICA introduced the FAA reauthorization bill, we have been warned and we have warned, actually, that it contains a number of controversial poison pill provisions that seriously jeopardize the enactment of a long-term reauthorization act this year.

The failure to enact a long-term FAA reauthorization act is costing taxpayers millions of dollars and the Nation tens of thousands of good-paying jobs. Short-term stopgap funding authorizations have stymied airport construction, job creation, and the FAA's overall ability to efficiently administer its programs. Further, multiple FAA extension acts have created uncertainty among local airport officials regarding the total amount of Federal funding available this year for airport construction. As a result, State and local airport officials are advancing fewer projects, less new construction is moving forward, and fewer jobs are being created.

Last week the Airports Council International of North America sent a letter stating that if Congress did not extend the airport grant program through September 30, ''safety and security projects will go unfunded and the much needed jobs associated with these projects will not materialize.'' So I am puzzled why the majority would disregard this warning. It is time that we move forward and that we get a clean extension so we in fact can move to conference and get a bill that is agreed upon that we can bring to the floor that can be signed by the President.

For the majority of the House who claims to care about creating jobs, reducing bureaucracy, and listening to the business community, this extension bill goes out of its way to create unnecessary red tape and problems.

The FAA needs the certainty, stability, and direction that a long-term

reauthorization act provides. Further, the American people and the American public deserve a long-term FAA reauthorization act that will create jobs, improve safety, and modernize our infrastructure. We need to stop playing partisan games, quit posturing, and pass a clean extension through September 16, appoint conferees, and in fact reach agreement on a long-term FAA reauthorization bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), chairman of the full Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank our chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, Mr. PETRI, for his leadership. Also Mr. COSTELLO, who formerly chaired the committee and now is the ranking member. I want to thank him for his dedication to our Nation's aviation system, safety. And also Mr. RAHALL. You couldn't ask for better partners. Mr. RAHALL is the Democrat leader of the committee, and we have a great working relationship. We have had a great working relationship to try to move forward legislation like a long-term reauthorization of FAA and other major transportation legislation that has been mired in delay. Quite frankly, my colleagues, I find myself very frustrated being here.

Now, this is the 21st extension. I complimented and don't let me not compliment the staff on both sides. We have great professionals that deal with this.

□ 1350

The Congress is fortunate and the Nation is blessed to have the kind of leadership we have with staff working on these important issues to move what accounts for about 8 to 9 percent of our GDP. That's the aviation industry forward, setting the policy, the programs, the funding formula, all those things these folks are responsible for. And they're good stewards of that responsibility. So I thank them in advance. I also want to thank Senator ROCKEFELLER, Mr. Speaker, and others who have worked with us trying to bring this to a conclusion. KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, the ranking Republican on the Senate side, worked in good faith to try to get this, again, inexcusable delay in passing the long-term reauthorization.

That being said, again, I find myself so frustrated. This is the 21st delay. We have a former chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. PETRI now chairs it. He's been active on this. I was chairman for 6 years of the subcommittee. We were all wanting to do the same thing—and that's move forward with reauthorization.

The irony of this is I chaired the Subcommittee on Aviation in 2003, when we were wrote the last reauthorization. And we did that in some 6 months. And there were controversial provisions. That 4-year bill expired in 2007. We have not passed a reauthorization, even when the other side had humongous numbers in this Chamber and control of the other body. At one point, I think 60 votes to get something done. Nothing was done. Seventeen extensions under their watch. And, quite frankly, I'm embarrassed that this is the fourth extension. But I'm trying to do in 6 or 7 months what couldn't be done in almost 5 years. And we're going to get it done. We're going to get it done one way or the other.

Now, we have also done three what they call clean extensions to move this process forward. And we did need some time. You have to be reasonable because this is a new Congress. The other body, the Senate, passed their bill in February. We passed the first day in April our legislation. And here we find ourselves on the fourth, again, extension, which is regrettable.

All this, I say, my colleagues, could be resolved I think in a matter of an hour. There's been great work and discussions, informal discussions, in what we call preconference, where some of the principles get together and discuss the terms. All these issues are not new. Mr. COSTELLO and I, Mr. Oberstar and I, we had discussed this. In fact, I think the other body took up the pending legislation from last time. My goodness, it was pending for 48 months. So there's no new issues here. Again, we find ourselves stalled in the process.

That being said, I call on the Members to pass this extension. This is a clean extension, except for one change; and it has two parts. The first part deals with Essential Air Service. That's the program that underwrites, again, routes for air service from local communities. This is a program that started at about $50 million a decade ago and now is approaching $200 million. We had a vote here in the House, and we decided to sunset that program, I guess with the exception of two of our exceptional States, Hawaii and Alaska, who have some unique geographic limitations on service. But the other body passed a provision, the Senate, passed a provision that would eliminate service based on distance, I think it's 90 miles, and it affected some 10 communities. Mr. Speaker, I'll insert in the RECORD the 10 communities affected.

So this is language that the other body passed and we are including. Now, I have made one exception, and it affects three airports, three States: Nevada, Montana, and New Mexico. A provision I put in is that no State or no airport operation that has service where the subsidy exceeds a thousand dollars a ticket can receive that subsidy. I don't think that's unreasonable, when we've got from now until the beginning of August to get our Nation's finances together. I want to see folks come down here to vote to continue to see subsidies for more than a thousand. One of these subsidies, and I won't state the State but you can figure it out, is $3,719 per passenger. That's obscene when our country is on the verge of debt crises and disaster.

If I have to take the entire reauthorization and we continue—now this extends through the 16th of September. I'm putting everybody on notice that each time we will pass reauthorization, if we have to do it extension by extension. So we're starting with this small part of what the other body has passed, and I'm adding what I think is a reasonable provision. A thousand-dollar subsidy in itself is almost obscene, if you ask the average Member of Congress. In fact, when I went to the Rules Committee, one of the members on the other side of the aisle was stunned that we were paying those kinds of fees.

Now, don't come here and tell me that we don't legislate on extensions. In fact, the other body put an entire bill, a regional safety legislation, on one of the past 17 extensions. So we've done this before. We need to work together on this. I would implore Members on both sides of the aisle to support this because this is in the people's interest. This has to move forward. I don't know of any other mechanism. I certainly am not going to allow this fiasco to continue and certainly I don't want the FAA to close down at midnight on Friday night. And that won't happen. Essential services will continue. Air traffic controllers will be at their job. There may be some people furloughed. But it is not my fault. It will be the responsibility of the other body, who does not take this up and pass it. They will be furloughing people and putting people out of jobs.

If you want to see people work, then let's pass the FAA bill. It has the Next Generation air traffic control provisions. It has safety provisions in there that are long overdue.

So, again, I'm a bit frustrated. I want the best for the Nation. I want the best for our air traffic control system, our aviation system, and thousands of people who depend—not just working in the Federal Government, but in this important industry—to move forward. Again, I'm so disappointed. But we're going to find one way. I may not be the most powerful Member, I may not be the most intelligent Member, I may not be the highest ranking Member. But I'll tell you what: I am a persistent Member. And we will pass reauthorization one way or another. We're going to get it done. So I appreciate everyone's indulgence in working with me on this project.

SUBSIDIZED EAS COMMUNITIES AND DISTANCES TO NEAREST HUB—BASED ON FY 2009 HUB DATA

[Excludes communities located in Alaska]

EAS Community	Nearest large/medium hub	Miles
Athens, GA	Atlanta Hartsfield-Jackson Int'l, GA (L).	72
Morgantown, WV	Pittsburgh Int'l, PA (M)	75
Jamestown, NY	Buffalo Niagara Int'l (M)	76
Bradford, PA	Buffalo Niagara Int'l (M)	77
Hagerstown, MD/Martinsburg, WV.	Washington Dulles Int'l, VA (L)	78
Jonesboro, AR	Memphis Int'l, TN (M)	82
Johnstown, PA	Pittsburgh Int'l, PA (M)	84
Oil City/Franklin, PA	Pittsburgh Int'l, PA (M)	85
Lancaster, PA	Philadelphia Int'l, PA (L)	86
Jackson, TN	Memphis Int'l, TN (M)	86

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. I commend our ranking member, Mr. COSTELLO, Chairman MICA, Subcommittee Chairman PETRI, my senior Senator, JAY ROCKEFELLER, in the other body and his ranking member, KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, for the tremendous efforts they have put in this legislation and so much other legislation important for our infrastructure in this country. I recognize that those on the majority, their heart is in the right place. Perhaps those whose pay grade is above them have different opinions and different agendas on this legislation. And perhaps that's the reason why we need to appoint conferees, as the other body has done, and move forward and let the normal process work its will in this legislation.

But instead, we're here to consider the 21st short-term extension of FAA programs and authority and the fourth short-term extension this Congress, as our chairman has just stated. Twenty-one extensions. It's now old enough to drink. Instead of celebrating, however, this should give all cause for concern. This past Saturday marked the 100th day since the Senate appointed conferees on long-term reauthorization. The sun has risen and set over the Capitol more than 200 times since then. House and Senate negotiators have boiled down the remaining issues to just a few.

□ 1400

But the House Republican leadership still has not appointed conferees to move this process forward, despite the fact that, as Chairman MICA has acknowledged to the press late last week and even in his comments here today, the remaining differences are so few they could be resolved by conferees in 20 minutes. So I ask: What is the Republican leadership waiting for?

We find ourselves now faced with the need for a 21st extension. Unlike the three other extensions this Chamber has passed this year, this extension contains a policy rider that would cut 13 small and rural communities from the Essential Air Service program.

There have been no hearings on proposals, as Ranking Member COSTELLO has stated, to reduce EAS and no hearings on this proposal in particular. That said, I would note for the record that the provision of this extension dealing with EAS is an improvement over the proposal in the House-passed reauthorization bill that would have cut the EAS program altogether for the lower 48 States.

There's no question that a sunset of the program would not pass the Senate and be enacted, and at least my Republican colleagues have stepped back from the brink on that particular proposal. However, I am disappointed that instead of appointing conferees to address the future of the EAS program and other outstanding issues in this long-term reauthorization, my Republican colleagues have instead chosen to force a major policy provision into an otherwise clean FAA extension bill at the last minute.

Holding hostage the negotiations is not the way to move the reauthorization process forward. In fact, it is almost guaranteed to set us back in our efforts to work with the other body and reach agreement on a long-term reauthorization.

I object to the tactics used by my Republican friends and colleagues, and I implore them to act in good faith, appoint conferees, and work toward enactment of a long-term reauthorization bill that will put Americans to work and improve the safety of our skies.

Mr. PETRI. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Thank you so much for yielding again.

The question has been brought up to try to shift the responsibility for, again, the possibility of the other body's not acting here to the question of the Republicans not appointing conferees.

I might point out just for the record that in the 110th Congress—this is for an entire 2 years—the Senate never passed an FAA reauthorization bill, so we never even got to preconference. We never got to the issue. So they never appointed conferees. There was a bill passed. And, again, huge majorities on both sides.

In the 111th Congress, the House and Senate passed FAA reauthorizations and preconferenced for 5 months without naming conferees. They never named any conferees.

This process of preconferencing is part of the bipartisan nature of our committee and our work and bicameral discussions. As I said, they've been excellent. The staff has been working well. These aren't new issues. The other side controlled the process for some 4 years. The bills have been out there for some time.

I have the commitment from the leadership, when we are ready to go and having resolved most of the issues, and, again, there are only a couple and everyone knows what they are, I think that they can fall in place. But we need the leadership of the other body, in fact, the leader of the other body, to step forward and act in a responsible manner in dealing with me or the leadership of the House or someone in responding to a major impediment that we have to move this process forward. Then our leadership has said they will appoint conferees. We can sit down, resolve those issues in a public forum, and pass this. We could do that tomorrow.

So, again, it's not the question of appointing conferees. And if I have to take more strident measures to get this job done, we're going to get the job done one way or the other, as I said.

Now, I had a Republican ask me to modify the language that the Senate passed before the Rules Committee. There's a tape. You can all see it; it's part of the RECORD. And I said, No, I don't want to do that. I want to take what the Senate passed. The only difference here in the Essential Air Service is that I provided language that says that if you get more than a $1,000 subsidy that affects three airports, that will not be allowed. That's the only thing standing between us and shutting down part of our Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield myself 10 seconds just to make a point to the chairman.

The 5-month period that he referred to, one, the Republicans in the Senate, as he knows, blocked our ability to appoint conferees. In particular, the Senators from Tennessee put a hold on it until the Colgan families made their point to let the hold move forward.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the former chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This used to be a legislative body. I'm not quite sure what it is now.

The way, traditionally, the House and the Senate resolve differences is the House and the Senate each pass a bill—most people learn this in their high school civics class. Then each side appoints conferees and they get together and hash through the differences. I've actually served on some of those conference committees. I've actually voted across the aisle on some provisions of bills in those conference committees.

But not now. What they're saying here is, after they have worked out all the differences with the Senate and only in the way that their bill passed the House—that is, my way or the highway, or, my way or your plane's grounded, however you want to look at it—then they will appoint conferees to a meaningless conference on something that's already agreed to and then we'll come back and pass their bill.

It doesn't work that way. It won't work that way. And this is just not a simple problem, because if the FAA has to close down all of its capital improvement programs—Friday night, very expensive, 4,000 people laid off—thousands of projects across the country that would put construction workers to work and suppliers to work won't happen. So this isn't a no-cost playing games kind of thing that they're doing here.

And what's it all about? The bottom line is it's about whether or not labor should have the right to organize. That is what hung up the bill in the Senate before because they wanted to have a level playing field. We wanted to have a level playing field between providers of railroad and airline services and allow people to actually organize, to be

represented. And, of course, Federal Express hated that, and their two Senators held up the last conference in the last Congress, plain and simple.

Now they're on the same wavelength here. The Republicans here want to overrule the National Labor Relations Board and impose a rule for organizing that says you have to have a majority of people voting and a majority of the majority voting; i.e., if you apply the same rule that they want to the United States House of Representatives, not one Member of this House would have won their election. Not even some people who are in totally partisan districts, Democrat or Republican. No one would have won because no one got a majority of the majority of the votes. That's the rule they want to apply to labor.

So if you want to organize a union, there's 100 people. First off, you've got to get 51 positive votes. Anybody who doesn't vote counts as a negative vote. So if we apply those same things, we would never have Federal elections in this country. You would never be able to elect anybody to anything. And they say, oh, that'll be fair for labor.

That's what's hanging up this bill: their anti-labor fervor, their hatred of working people and their right to organize. It's absolutely obscene that they are going to do that and cost us more jobs by not having a capital improvement program.

Mr. PETRI. I would just point out to my colleagues that the provision that was changed by the National Labor Relations Board to which my colleague referred has been the law of this land for a generation. So it's not anti-labor fervor at all; it's more regular order.

Madam Speaker, how much time does each side have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentleman from Wisconsin has 12½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois has 19¼ minutes remaining.

□ 1410

Mr. PETRI. I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Thank you, my colleagues.

You just heard the comments. Again, I couldn't have a better friend or compatriot on many issues and on many improvements that we've made to transportation on the committee together: Mr. DEFAZIO, the gentleman from Oregon. He said this used to be a legislative body. Yes, it was a legislative body before the other side took over 4 years ago and closed down quite a bit of the process.

Now, has this been an open process on the FAA reauthorization? I submit to you that it has been from the committee.

Go back and check the committee records. We held more votes on this FAA reauthorization in committee than we held probably for the last 6 years—I know certainly for the last 4 years—on that one piece of legislation. On the floor, we had an open process. I think there were some 30 amendments, and 23, I believe, were made in order. So, unless they were duplicative or the Rules Committee took them out, it was an open process as opposed to a closed process with closed rules that, again, we had on major pieces of legislation for some time. So this has been an open process.

The House is going to act. The House is going to pass this. If we have to pass additional extensions, as I said, with the rest of the reauthorization piece by piece, then we are going to pass a reauthorization to set the policy, the programs, the projects, and the priorities for our aviation industry and for FAA. The only projects that will be stopped are projects for which, if the other body doesn't act on this extension, they will be responsible for.

The only difference in the extension—and we gave them three clean extensions, and this is a clean extension with their provision that passed with their language unanimously in the other body—is that I added three States—actually, three airports—that subsidized in excess of $1,000 per ticket, per passenger.

Again, when the Nation is going down the tubes almost literally because of debt, we can't make one little, tiny change and move this process forward? keep people working? put safety provisions that are in this reauthorization that we don't have now and move forward with it? There is something wrong.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me thank the leadership on the committee and then simply appeal to my chairman, Mr. MICA, to come and reason together, because this has been a committee that has had a history of reasoning together. Without my standing here and going through it, you are very aware of what the most objectionable part of this extension is.

If we are serious about passing an extension, let's pass the extension and deal with the other issues at another time. Yes, it has been since 2007, and it has been because of the battling back and forth. You're either pro-labor or anti-labor, but we are ruining the lives of workers. We are subjecting safety to the whims, and we are messing up projects and wasting money by allowing this bickering to continue.

I would simply appeal to our chairman to please come to the table, and let's pass a clean extension bill.

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

Madam Speaker, I just thought, as long as we were spending some time talking about the modest cleaning up of the series of, kind of, earmarks that have accumulated over the years in the Essential Air Service program, which was referred to by the chairman of the committee as a program that started out as a true essential air service to help provide access to the outside world to very isolated communities, it has gradually been kind of earmarked, going from $50 million to some $200 million in cost. They're not isolated, but they are subsidized. God knows why.

Let me just mention a few of the areas that would be affected by these modest changes: that it has to be more than 90 miles from another airport and, secondly, that we try to cap the subsidy, unless it's varied somewhat by the Secretary, at $1,000 per seat, per flight.

One that would be affected that is currently being subsidized is Jonesboro, Arkansas. It's 82 miles from Memphis. You can't drive 82 miles, and you want the Federal Government to provide service?

Athens, Georgia, is 72 miles from Atlanta, and it's getting subsidized.

We're worrying about billions of dollars of subsidies. If we can't even do this, where do we start? They say a big journey starts with a single step, and we're not willing to take even in this small area the most modest of steps.

Harristown, Maryland, which is north of here, is 78 miles from the Dulles Airport. It's getting a subsidy of over $800 per flight, and it's right near Baltimore as well.

There is Glendive, Montana, which is 60 miles from another essential airport in Montana. It's just 60 miles. You could drive over to Sidney—but no, they're asking for a $1,357 subsidy, per passenger, flying from Glendive under this program.

Alamogordo, New Mexico, is 89 miles from a hub airport in El Paso, but instead of driving 89 miles, there continues to be a $1,500 subsidy. You can rent a car. This is a profligate, hard-to-defend use of the taxpayers' money, yet people are talking about closing the government down or the FAA down unless they can spend $1,500 to subsidize a flight when you can drive 89 miles to another airport.

This is what we're talking about, and this is why my constituents and many others are wondering when we're going to get serious out here about taking the modest steps to get our financial affairs and our stewardship of the Federal taxpayers' money under better control.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the debt limit isn't the only deadline that is upon us. Here we are, facing Friday—D-day for the Nation's aviation system. This is the third Congress where our committee has passed this bill. Most of the sections of the bill do not have major disagreement. But, now, we are going for a bare 2-month extension.

On the policy rider, all I've got to say is, why make it more difficult when

you know that when it goes to the other body, it's either going to be stripped out or we're going to be facing another terrible deadline.

I appreciate that negotiations have been going on all along with staff. I do believe, though, that the failure of the majority to appoint conferees is a problem with this bill because, once members are appointed, it seems to me that sends another signal and gets another set of people in it to move the bill. So the conferees do matter and should have been appointed.

These are difficult issues, and they shouldn't be left to linger: Next Generation Air Transportation.

□ 1420

If we don't modernize our air transportation, we're going to be left behind even developing countries. Runway safety. We've had collisions on runways at airports right here where there are major airports. Aircraft noise, and we always have this issue, of whether or not the perimeter rule is going to be extended or violated again. Well, you know, I oppose increases of the perimeter rule, but I oppose even more not sitting down to figure it out with conferees at the table.

We've got the air ambulance operation issues, the oversight of foreign carriers and, of course, the notorious national mediation board issue, where what constitutes a majority could only be an issue in this Congress. Is it the majority of votes cast, or is the majority of those in the class or in the whole group? If it's a majority of votes cast, then, of course, it's what all of us in the Congress use every 2 years to get elected.

There are matters in this bill that the Congress has to do anyway that would be especially useful to do now as we recover from the Great Recession.

We should pass this bill providing jobs, which is something we have to do anyway, now, when it would count, would matter very much to the entire country. Let's reauthorize the entire bill and quit short-term extensions.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois has 15¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. PETRI. I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, the chair of the Aviation Subcommittee went through the list of the airports that are within 90 miles that would be affected by the provisions of this extension.

Now, all of those 10 airports were included in an amendment and a provision that's in the Senate bill and passed unanimously. The only difference, and he spoke briefly to one of them, again is the provision that I put in putting a restriction on paying more than a thousand dollars per ticket, per passenger subsidy. Those subsidies start in Montana at one airport with $1,357.

Another airport, one airport in New Mexico, has a subsidization per ticket per passenger of $1,563.

Now the granddaddy, the big enchilada in this whole thing is one airport in Nevada. Every ticket is subsidized $3,719.

Now you're telling me that they are going to close down parts of the FAA to preserve this subsidy when this Nation is on the verge of a financial debt crisis unheard of in the history of our Nation.

So, again, I've tried to deal on a bipartisan, bicameral basis working with folks to get this done. Twenty-one extensions over 4 years. I'm not adding an entire bill. I'm adding that one provision. The other side added in one of their extensions an entire bill.

The other language Mr. PETRI spoke to was 10 airports that are within the distance of 90 miles that the Senate passed unanimously. So it's not like I am taking some language.

A Republican tried to change that in the Rules Committee, and I recommended against it. And we did not change it because, again, I want to have language that the Senate passed.

So that's what we boil down to on the eve of a crisis with FAA, on the eve of a crisis with our Nation's finances, we're going to come and vote here. And I want people to go back and say, ''I voted for a $3,700 subsidy for air service for one passenger for one ticket.'' I want to see that list of names.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, at this time I would yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I rise today in continued opposition to the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, H.R. 2553. I will continue to oppose the FAA reauthorization until the FAA rethinks their ill-advised redesign for the airspace around New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia.

I have opposed this airspace redesign from day one, along with some of my Republican colleagues in New Jersey as well, and have thwarted its implementation every step of the way.

Time and time again, the FAA has pursued the airspace redesign while ignoring the concerns of my constituents in Rockland County, New York. The FAA created their proposal with zero input from the very people whose lives would be most harmed by the proposal. In fact, even when we brought this up to the FAA, they had to be dragged kicking and screaming into holding a public forum in Rockland County. This plan, which will only save minutes on flight time, will disrupt the lives of thousands of residents in my district in Rockland County in New York and in northern New Jersey who live under the new flight plans.

As my constituents have noted to me, the noise and air pollution in the area will increase. It is unknown how this increase in air pollution will affect the disproportionate rate of childhood asthma in my district. The modernization of our aviation system is necessary to bring it into the 21st century, to keep pace with the increased number of flights, and to also maintain our technological advancements by implementing new equipment to keep our system the safest in the world.

However, there are several alternatives to this plan, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposition to this reauthorization. Not only are we going to have planes going into Newark Airport fly directly over my constituents, but now there are other paths of planes coming in from JFK airport as well.

This is government at its worst running roughshod over the people that it's supposed to serve, not taking any kind of input. In fact, they come up with a redesign plan. And then when it's challenged, the person who decides the challenge was the very author of the redesign plan to begin with. Sounds like a kangaroo court to me.

So I am going to continue to oppose these things. I think at a time when we're all talking about government spending less and being more sensitive, this is a good place to start. And I will continue to oppose the FAA reauthorization until the FAA halts and revises their deeply flawed airspace redesign plan for New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia.

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

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

Madam Speaker, we heard from Chairman MICA, who we have worked with very closely. He has done, I think, his very best up to this point to try and get an FAA reauthorization bill both out of the House and to the point where we can get it to a conference committee.

So he said he is very frustrated with the process. We are very frustrated with the process. And today the extension that the majority is offering even frustrates us more because we know that this is an extension, not a clean extension, but it has a rider on it involving Essential Air Services.

The debate today and the discussion about this extension is not about Essential Air Service. Some members may support Essential Air Service, others may not support it. There's been a lot said on the floor today about subsidizing a $3,000 subsidy per ticket. Just for the record, we are not debating that. That is to be taken up by conferees if we ever get to conference. Members can, in fact, have their opportunity to make changes in the EAS program at that time. It should not be a part of this extension.

But for the record let me say that in reference to an airport that was mentioned in Montana, it is actually 607 miles from Denver, to the Denver airport. So if you live in that community, it's not just a short drive to get in a rental car and drive to the Denver Airport. Also, the Nevada airport that was

referenced from Salt Lake City, you are talking 234 miles. And the list goes on and on.

□ 1430

So that's an issue that we can debate at the appropriate time. Some changes may need to be made to the Essential Air Service program. But I think also we need to keep in mind, we're not just talking about passengers getting from point A to point B when there's hundreds and hundreds of miles to get to the nearest large hub airport to catch a flight, but we're also talking about moving medical supplies, donor organs, and a number of other things. So it's not just passengers.

And let me also say, my friend Mr. MICA mentioned as well that we've had an open process here. Well, in fact, we have not. The process has not been open on this extension. In fact, the majority dropped the bill on Friday without consulting the minority. They did not consult with us about what may be in the extension. In addition to that, they went to Rules Committee and asked for a closed rule so that no Member who might be affected by this legislation or might have an Essential Air Service airport in their district that may want to go to the Rules Committee and, in fact, get an open rule or come to the floor to debate the merits of keeping their airport on the EAS program, they did not have that opportunity because the majority asked for a closed rule.

Had the majority come to us in the minority and said, We want a clean extension; we want to move it forward, we wouldn't be here today. We, in fact, would probably have voice voted this extension. It would have gone to the Senate. It would have been voice voted there. And, in fact, we would have been a step closer to making certain that the FAA is able to operate after the deadline on Saturday.

Finally, let me say that we are frustrated because I've heard Chairman MICA say many times and, as the ranking member, Mr. RAHALL, has said, We have worked closely together. We have done everything we can do in order to work together with Mr. MICA and Mr. PETRI in order to get a bill. But I have read reports and I have just heard Mr. MICA say on the floor again today that, you know, we could wrap this conference up in 20 minutes. And he said today we could wrap it up within an hour, that there is only one issue that is remaining.

Just for the record, let me say, if that's the case, we have not been consulted on that one issue. There are several issues. And just for the record, I would say major issues that have not been resolved on our side, on the House side between the majority and minority, let alone with the other body are: one, funding levels; two, Essential Air Service; three is repeal of the National Mediation Board rule; four is the DCA perimeter rule, often referred to as ''slots.''

Other outstanding issues are occupational safety and health protection for flight attendants, the 3-hour rule for tarmac delays, the lithium battery issue, and the aircraft activity disclosure to the public, the BARR program. And I have a list of other things to our knowledge that have not been resolved.

So when the chairman or others say that we could wrap this up in 20 minutes or in 1 hour, I don't believe that is the case. In fact, I know it's not the case. We have not been consulted or negotiated to the extent that we could reach an agreement among ourselves on the House side, let alone with our colleagues over in the other body. So let me just say that it's a disappointment to me.

We have worked closely together to move the FAA extension on a permanent basis. We are here on Wednesday. The FAA extension, in fact, will expire—the FAA will have to lay off employees this Saturday if, in fact, this extension is not approved by both bodies and sent to the President. And the Senate has already told us that they are not going to accept this extension with this rider, in fact, in the extension. They will approve the clean extension. And it's my understanding the other body is going to pass a clean extension and send it over here sometime today or by the end of the week.

It would be my hope that the majority would, in fact, accept a clean extension so that the FAA can continue to serve the flying public and do all of the things that are essential to keeping the safest aviation system in the world as safe as possible so that we can begin to try and get a permanent bill and a long-term bill as well.

Finally, I would conclude by saying that we need to appoint conferees. The Senate has passed their bill in February of this year. We have passed our bill in April. And we are here now in the latter part of July, and Chairman MICA is saying that all of these issues have been resolved but one, and we do not even have conferees appointed. So I would just encourage the leadership—Ranking Member RAHALL. And I have sent a letter to the Speaker and to the leadership and to the majority saying, Look, let's appoint conferees. The Senate has appointed conferees.

The only opportunity we had to appoint conferees in the last Congress was, in fact, stifled and held up by the Senate and, frankly, by two Senators from the State of Tennessee over one issue.

Let's get the nonsense behind us. There are things in the Essential Air program that I would like to see changed. There are things in the bill that I would like to see us reach an agreement on. The only way to do that is to get an extension passed so the FAA can get past Saturday and operate until September 16. It will give us an opportunity to appoint conferees so that we can meet with the conferees who have already been appointed in the other body to reach a permanent agreement.

The American people deserve better than what they're getting today on the floor of this House, and the American people deserve to know that we, in fact, are doing everything that we can to move forward to keep the safest aviation system in the world exactly that—the leader in safety around the world.

So with that, I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this extension in the hopes that we could pass a clean extension.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, let me just conclude by urging my colleagues to support this 21st extension with a very, very modest change from a purely clean extension in that it yields to the Senate for a provision that's included in the Senate bill to eliminate, quote-unquote, ''Essential Air Service for airports within 90 miles of another airport.''

We've talked about the individual flight subsidy. Let me just look at this issue from another point of view to make it perfectly clear what we are talking about.

Eight of the 10 airports that would be affected are because they are within 90 miles of a hub airport. So that makes it much more convenient to just drive over. And what's the subsidy to each airport each year? Let me just mention it: Athens, Georgia, over $1 million of Federal money so that people don't have to drive 72 miles. We have Morgantown, West Virginia, right near the Pittsburgh hub, nearly $1.5 million. The same thing with Hagerstown, over $1 million so you don't have to drive 70-some miles to Dulles. Jonesboro, Arkansas, gets an $800,000 subsidy when it is right next to the Memphis International Airport. The same thing, $1.6 million going to Johnstown, Pennsylvania, which is 84 miles from the Pittsburgh International Airport. Franklin/Oil City is getting a subsidy of nearly $1 million a year. They are 85 miles from the Pittsburgh International Airport. Lancaster, Pennsylvania, nearly $1.4 million, also by Pittsburgh. And Jackson, Tennessee, $1.2 million in Federal taxpayer money, which is only 86 miles from the Memphis International Airport.

It's hardly essential use of Federal taxpayer money to provide nonessential, subsidized airport service for people who could otherwise drive in an hour, hour and a half to a hub airport that most of the people in the area probably are doing already. So it's a very modest step. We are just doing what the Senate provides. I would urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2553, the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011. This bill would add controversial policy riders that have not been negotiated and would cause undue harm to critical FAA programs that support thousands of public and private sector jobs. I urge my colleagues to pass a clean FAA extension so that capital accounts

which support Grants-in-Aid for Airports, Facilities and Equipment can continue to remain functional. Without this much needed funding stream these programs would be shut down, and approximately 4,000 employees would be furloughed. With a 9.2% unemployment rate nationwide Congress must act in a bipartisan manner to help stabilize and enhance job creation. Again I urge my colleagues to come to a reasonable consensus and support a clean extension of airport and airway funding.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 357, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

□ 1440

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RAHALL. Yes, I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rahall of West Virginia moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2553, to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 7. BAGGAGE FEES FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) FEES.—No air carrier may charge any fee for the transport of 4 or fewer items of baggage checked by a member of the Armed Forces who is—

(1) traveling in scheduled air transportation on official military orders; and

(2) being deployed on or returning from an overseas contingency operation.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''baggage'' does not include an item whose weight exceeds 80 pounds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, in June, the American public learned that a major U.S. airline greeted a group of Army soldiers who were returning home from the front lines in Afghanistan with a bill for almost $3,000, or $200 apiece for each soldier to check four bags on a scheduled domestic flight. Americans were rightly outraged by the incident, which was explained in a YouTube video posted by one of our troops. In the video, one soldier notes that his fourth bag, for which he was charged $200, contained an M–4 carbine rifle, a grenade launcher and a 9-millimeter pistol, ''the tools I used to protect myself and Afghan citizens while I was deployed.''

A spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars told the Associated Press the fees were ''the worst welcome home any soldier could receive. The shock of even being charged is enough to make most service men and women simply shake their heads and wonder who or what it is they are protecting.''

Members of the Armed Forces who are serving our country on the front lines should not endure personal financial hardship when they are traveling to or returning from war zones. Yet, the media's reporting of the incident last month showed that major U.S. carriers were applying the same or similar policies across the board. Airlines were charging soldiers to check four reasonably sized bags and were profiting at the expense of the brave men and women of the Armed Forces who were going to or coming home from war.

This amendment, this motion to recommit, prohibits U.S. air carriers from charging soldiers for up to four bags of checked baggage. It applies to bags that weigh 80 pounds or less and is consistent with many airlines' published policies.

I urge my colleagues, in a bipartisan fashion, as they should, to support this amendment. If the amendment is adopted, it will not kill the bill. The House will vote on the bill immediately after this amendment is adopted.

This motion recognizes a tremendous debt of our gratitude owed by the United States to the men and women of our Armed Forces. Members of the Armed Forces who are going to the front lines or coming home from a war zone should not be given a bill with their boarding passes.

I urge my colleagues to join me in ensuring that our Nation's airlines treat our warriors with the respect they deserve for defending our country. This should be a bipartisan, overwhelming ''yes.''

And I close by saying, vote for our veterans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. I withdraw my point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. CRAVAACK. I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Madam Speaker, I think it is absolutely outrageous what happened to those soldiers. As a military officer for 24 years, and as an airline pilot for 17 years, I think it is absolutely heinous what happened to those soldiers. Quite frankly, it's outrageous. And I think we should ask Chairman MICA for open debate on this issue. It's something that definitely should be taken a look into.

As a matter of fact, I think it is so critical I will ask Chairman MICA to make sure that this never happens to another United States servicemember.

But, unfortunately, Madam Chairman, we're bringing this up on a motion to recommit. My question would be, why didn't we bring this up earlier, this act? We should be debating this when——

Mr. RAHALL. Will the gentleman yield on his question?

Mr. CRAVAACK. Just a moment, sir, and I will yield.

We should have opened this up when we had open committee, and this should have been brought up then. But not now, in the motion to recommit, when we have FAA jobs on the line, and we need to get this bill moved forward.

I look forward to engaging in that debate a little bit further on, and I look forward to working with you and ensuring that this does not happen again, but now is not the time. We need to investigate this a little bit later on.

I yield to the gentleman fron West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. In response to the gentleman's question asked a few seconds ago, it was a closed rule. There was no way we could have brought this up in the amendment process. The gentleman's party controls the rules of this body and controls the legislative debate.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Reclaiming my time, we did have an FAA open debate, Madam Speaker, and we could have brought this up at this time.

Mr. RAHALL. If the gentleman would continue to yield, the incident did not occur until after the markup of this bill, by the way.

Mr. CRAVAACK. We should not be opening this at this time on a motion to recommit. I will fully work with the other side in trying to make sure that this does not happen again to another soldier, and I look forward to that discussion, but having it right now is a little bit disingenuous on this FAA reauthorization.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 233, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 610]

YEAS—187

Ackerman	Becerra	Brady (PA)
Altmire	Berkley	Braley (IA)
Andrews	Berman	Brown (FL)
Baca	Bishop (GA)	Butterfield
Baldwin	Bishop (NY)	Capps
Barrow	Boren	Cardoza
Bass (CA)	Boswell	Carnahan

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

NAYS—233

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

NOT VOTING—12

Bachmann
Blumenauer
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Ellison
Giffords
Hinchey
Hoyer
Payne
Pelosi
Runyan
Young (AK)

□ 1513

Messrs. STEARNS, STUTZMAN, PEARCE, MARCHANT, CANTOR, and ROSKAM changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. WELCH, DOGGETT, SCHRADER, RICHMOND, BISHOP of Georgia, OLVER, and BERMAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 177, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 611]

AYES—243

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

NOES—177

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.

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

NOT VOTING—12

Bachmann	Ellison	Payne
Blumenauer	Giffords	Pelosi
Capuano	Hinchey	Runyan
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANKFORD) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1523

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 2596, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012

Mr. WOLF, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–169) on the bill (H.R. 2596) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, 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 pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

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.

APPROVING RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS AGAINST BURMA

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 66) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 66

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress approves the renewal of the import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1) and section 3A (b)(1) and (c)(1) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This joint resolution shall be deemed to be a ''renewal resolution'' for purposes of section 9 of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

SEC. 2. PAYGO COMPLIANCE.

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.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This joint resolution shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this joint resolution or July 26, 2011, whichever occurs earlier.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this joint resolution, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 66, which would continue the imposition of sanctions against the repressive regime in Burma for another year.

The purpose of imposing sanctions against Burma is to promote democracy and respect for human rights and improve living conditions for the Burmese people. Unfortunately, the ruling junta is still dedicated to working against, not toward, those objectives. For that reason I am in favor of continuing our practice of extending import sanctions against Burma for another year.

Burma's regime is one of the world's most repressive and continues to oppress democratic movements and humanitarianism. On November 7, 2010, the military junta, known, ironically, as the State Peace and Development Council, or SPDC, held an election for the first time in 20 years. However, while elections are usually considered a step towards democracy, in this case it was actually a step backwards. These elections were not transparent, inclusive, or credible.

Notably, Burma's leading pro-democracy party, the National League for Democracy, as well as others, was not allowed to participate in the elections. And by ensuring that most candidates were former high-ranking government and military officials, the election ''victory'' by the government-backed Union Solidarity and Development Party simply means that the military junta remained in control with the veneer of an election to simply justify itself.

Shortly following the elections, Aung San Suu Kyi—freedom fighter, Nobel Peace Prize recipient and Congressional Gold Medal winner, and general secretary of the NLD—was finally released after having been falsely detained for 15 of the past 21 years.

However, in a move highlighting how little things have changed in Burma, the junta recently warned Suu Kyi that ''there may be chaos and riots'' if she continues on her cross-country tour to meet with supporters. The government also chided Suu Kyi and the NLD for their political work and threatened that ''they should stop doing so to avert unnecessary consequences.'' On Suu Kyi's last tour in 2003, she was attacked by a pro-government mob that killed many of her followers and landed her under house arrest for the next 7 years.

In short, the recent election does not represent any kind of shift in domestic Burmese politics. In fact, the political situation in Burma and for the Burmese people has not changed at all.

The human rights situation is no better. The State Department human rights report on Burma, echoed by the March United Nations Human Rights Council Resolution, cites a laundry list of grave human rights violations that are simply appalling. According to the State Department, this repugnant regime, in which military officers wield the ultimate authority at every level of government, continues to use forced labor, denies participation in any democratic processes, and commits extrajudicial killings. The regime detains civic activists indefinitely and without charge, and it engages in harassment, abuse, and detention of human rights and pro-democracy activists. The regime is rumored to hold an estimated 2,100 political prisoners.

Ethnic violence inflicted by the army is also rife. There have been recent reports of renewed fighting in the northern Burmese province of Kachin between the government and ethnic minority villagers, resulting in reportedly up to 20,000 refugees. Not only have these people been driven from their homes and many killed, there have also been widespread reports of the rape of women and children.

What have we been doing on our end? I'm pleased that this Congress amplified our sanctions 3 years ago to eliminate trade in jewelry containing Burmese rubies and jadeite, even if the jewelry was made in, and exported from, a third country. The expansion was designed to bring about multilateral pressure on the regime through the United Nations and the World Trade Organization, similar to successful legislation on conflict diamonds. I urge similar campaigns against Burmese rubies and jadeite at the U.N. and WTO.

I must be clear that I generally view import sanctions with great skepticism. However, if there is a right way to impose sanctions, I think that these Burma sanctions are crafted to maximize the ability to effect change. For example, they require the administration to issue annual reports on Burma that include findings on whether U.S. national security, economic, and foreign policy interests are being served so that we can make an informed decision.

□ 1530

Perhaps the most critical aspect of the Burma sanctions program is that they require us to redirect our attention every summer to the question of whether these sanctions should be continued. Because they are not self-executing, we here in Congress must consider this issue and vote to continue them on an annual basis.

I continue to believe that our greatest hope for effecting real change in Burma is multilateralism. I am therefore disappointed that there has not been sufficient multilateral pressure against this regime.

I strongly urge the administration to put more pressure on our trading partners to place the leaders of this regime under targeted economic pressure that denies them access to personal wealth and sources of revenue.

I call on the United Nations, Burma's Southeast Asian neighbors in ASEAN, and the People's Republic of China to step up engagement considerably.

I support this resolution because it increases our chances to bring about this multilateral effort, to promote democracy and to end the longtime suffering of the Burmese people.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 66, a measure to renew the ban on imports for Burma.

Over the past 23 years, Burma's authoritarian regime has detained or killed political opponents, waged war against ethnic minorities and, in the process, accumulated one of the worst human rights records in modern history. Finally, in 2010, with continued pressure from Congress and the inspiring leadership of Nobel Peace Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi, Burma's military junta promised to lay down its arms and clear the way for democracy. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it was a sham.

Parliamentary elections held last November were rife with fraud. Opposition parties were intimidated by the police and banned from offering up candidates. Votes were rigged to provide electoral legitimacy to the existing military rule. Once again, the people of Burma were denied a free and fair opportunity to choose their own leaders. Human rights abuse is widespread and continues to go unprosecuted. Under the guise of a new civilian parliament, it is ''business as usual'' for the old regime.

In light of the unchanged political reality in Burma, the renewal of America's ban on Burmese imports could not be more urgent. We must send a message to Burma's new rulers, who turned out to be the same old rulers, that empty promises of democratic reform are unacceptable.

Now, there are some who question whether we should maintain our import ban following Burma's election and the formal dissolution of the military junta. Even our European allies have begun to rethink their strategy as EU travel and financial restrictions have been lifted on certain officials in the new government.

The problem with that approach, Mr. Speaker, is that meaningful reform has yet to take place in Burma. By opening our borders to Burmese imports, we would only strengthen and enrich the same old regime that maintains a stranglehold on civic and family life in Burma. According to the U.N., the new government has failed to make any significant progress on land confiscation, forced labor, the internal displacement of people, extrajudicial killings, and sexual violence against women. The Obama administration affirms this view.

Burma's sanctions are unique because they have the widespread support of the Burmese people. Aung San Suu Kyi, herself, recently said, ''Sanctions must remain in place'' and ''should only be lifted when something has changed here.'' Aung San Suu Kyi's political party, the National League of Democracy, also confirmed its view that American sanctions ''do not hurt the public at large'' as the true target is Burma's undemocratic leadership.

In response, true to form, the so-called ''new government'' warned publicly that Suu Kyi and members of her party could meet ''tragic ends'' if they continued to call for international sanctions.

In passing H.J. Res. 66 and reauthorizing the Block Burmese JADE Act of 2008, Congress will send a clear message of support to the people of Burma in their aspirations for true democracy and lasting peace.

Until there is meaningful reform in Burma, Mr. Speaker, we must keep steadfast in our support of the Burmese people and maintain the pressure on Burma's undemocratic rulers. I urge my colleagues to pass House Joint Resolution 66.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this important resolution to renew sanctions against the brutal military dictators in Burma.

The plight facing the people of Burma remains terrible. The ruling party in Burma continues to use the rule of law and government apparatus to deprive minority groups of their human rights and their lives, and it does so with impunity. The regime's human rights violations continue to be horrific. The regime in Burma is responsible for committing virtually every human rights violation imaginable. The atrocities perpetrated by the regime range from the use of rape as a weapon of terror, the recruitment of child soldiers, ethnic cleansing, forced labor, political detention, and the list goes on.

I have received firsthand reports in my office which detail the dictatorship's use of ethnic minorities as human landmine sweepers. Over 1 million refugees and 500,000 internally displaced peoples have been forced to flee their homes, and 750,000 of the country's inhabitants remain stateless. Indicative of the times, the regime has now turned to the censorship of the Internet, as well as that of individual e-mail accounts and social networking sites, to block the dissemination of evidence related to the atrocities.

The Burmese Government must realize that such attempts to hide its record of abuse, as well as its dishonest elections and mock constitutional reforms, cannot cover up the junta's war against its own people. Such a record only demonstrates the regime's illegitimacy.

I call on the administration to renew its efforts in fulfilling the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, particularly the provision which requires our government to craft a multilateral sanctions regime against Burma.

By renewing these sanctions, Congress is making our Nation's concern for human rights paramount in our foreign relations interests. The administration should do the same. The people of Burma must know that we stand with them.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank my friend from Washington for yielding me such time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 66.

This measure is a sign of how we can all work together on foreign policy when we put our minds to it. I want to acknowledge the bipartisan support, both here in the House as well as in the Senate, for human rights in Burma.

The Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act and the Burmese JADE Act together have prevented hundreds of millions of dollars from getting into the hands of the Burmese military apparatus. By passing these bills into law and renewing them this year, we have ensured that the 65 million people of Burma see us, the United States, as an ally in their struggle for human rights, and we have helped send a signal to others around the world that the United States will not turn a blind eye to crimes against humanity.

There is no question that Burma is ruled by one of the world's most brutal governments. Over the past year, we have seen ongoing abuses committed by the Burmese military, including rapes, torture and killings. Just last week, Human Rights Watch released a report, documenting how villagers are subjected to summary executions, torture and being used as human shields during conflict. The women in Burma live in constant fear of rapes by soldiers of their own military. For the leaders of the Burmese military, rape is a tactic of war—one used to torment and to intimidate entire populations, not just their immediate victims.

In fact, just 2 weeks ago, on July 5, the Burmese soldiers carried out four more rapes against ethnic civilians. The innocent victims were of all different ages. One of those victims was as young as 12 years of age. That's right. A 12-year-old girl was raped by a member of the Burmese military.

□ 1540

As a result of thousands of brutal rapes and other abuses, Burmese villagers continue to flee their homes into the jungle where they live as refugees or internally displaced people.

As bad as these abuses are, this bill is not only about stopping human rights abuses. We must remember that the inspiration for this measure came from the remarkable woman, Nobel Peace Prize recipient Aung San Suu Kyi. She led her political party to victory in Burma's last free and fair election in 1990. Many people call her the Nelson Mandela of Burma, and the U.S. House of Representatives voted to award her the Congressional Gold Medal.

Up until last November, she was also the world's only imprisoned Nobel Peace Prize recipient, and today, even though she is no longer under formal house arrest, the military has threatened her over and over again in an attempt to intimidate her into silence. She has called on the people throughout the world to take action saying, ''Please use your liberty to promote ours.''

She and the democracy movement in Burma have also called for us to maintain sanctions on Burma. This is similar to how the African National Congress led by Nelson Mandela called for sanctions on South Africa in the 1980s.

Passing this bill isn't all we must do. I want to urge the administration to fully implement the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act and Block Burmese JADE Act. The JADE Act gives the administration tools to implement tough bilateral financial sanctions on members of the Burmese regime and its cronies, and we should proceed as soon as possible.

It's important to remember that the United States isn't the only country that has imposed sanctions on Burma. This is not a bilateral effort. It is a multilateral effort. While every country has different types of sanctions, those that have taken action include Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the European Union, and more. We should be doing all we can to expand these sanctions into an even greater multilateral effort. That's why in the Burmese JADE Act, we ask the President to appoint an envoy to work internationally on increasing pressure on the Burmese regime.

Now that this envoy has been nominated, I urge our colleagues in the Senate to confirm him without haste, and I hope he gets to work right away on strengthening and implementing multilateral pressure.

I also believe the administration should work proactively to establish an international investigation into crimes against humanity committed by the Burmese military. The Burmese leadership is clearly carrying out crimes against humanity. The sooner these abuses are investigated, the sooner they will end.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the right thing to do. I stand in strong support of this bill, and I urge its immediate adoption.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Washington, and I rise in support of this resolution.

When I first visited Burma decades ago, I learned what a difference a misguided regime can make. Burma had been a vibrant country known as the Rice Bowl of Asia. Burma had a rich history, fertile land, abundant resources, and a productive population.

In the years following the coup in the early 1960s, the authoritarian regime impoverished the nation and brutalized its people, a pattern that persists today. For more than 20 years, the United States Government has sought to use its influence to try to create conditions for a restoration of democracy and the rule of law in Burma. One tool has been the use of sanctions.

The Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act was signed into law 8 years ago this month, and it requires the President to impose a ban on the import of products from Burma. It blocks U.S. support for loans from international financial institutions and freezes the assets of and bans visas for key members of the military junta that has imposed its will on the Burmese people for decades. I believe these sanctions should be renewed because there is evidence they are working.

Last November, Burmese elections were clearly illegitimate and not a free expression of the will of the Burmese people. But the continuing international pressure on and scrutiny of the junta may be having some tangible effects.

As the international crisis group noted earlier this year, two senior junta leaders have resigned since the elections, and there is some evidence that pressure has eased on some of the minority ethnic groups in the country.

Burma's greatest human rights figure, Aung San Suu Kyi, told the Australian Broadcasting Network yesterday that continued use of targeted sanctions is important. ''I think it's much better to have very, very clear targets,'' she said, and continued, ''I do not think it's really very reasonable just to say, 'We want an improvement in human rights, in your human rights record.' It's too vague. The release of political prisoners, the inclusion of all in the political process, the rule of law and so on—pick out the important points and say, 'Well, if you want sanctions removed, you've got to do these.' ''

Mr. Speaker, we need to continue standing with Aung San Suu Kyi and all of the freedom-seeking Burmese. This resolution gives us a chance to do that, which is why I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this resolution.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. I would only say that this bill expires on the 26th of July, so we need to act on it quickly.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I am in full agreement. We need to move and pass this, and I think we'll get it passed.

I must say to the gentleman from Washington, at least we have a trade bill on the floor. I hope there are many more to come. We're waiting for the President to send the three pending agreements to us so that we can move forward on these and embark on a very aggressive trade agenda.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 66, a resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act (P.L. 108–61). I am proud to have once again introduced this legislation this year with the gentleman from New York, Mr. CROWLEY.

In 2003, Congress passed the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, legislation that

I co-authored with my friend, the late Tom Lantos. President Bush signed this bill into law and Congress has reauthorized these import restrictions every year since. The legislation bans imports from Burma and the issuance of visas to those officials affiliated with the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC), the military junta that rules Burma and brutally represses its people. This law also bans U.S. financial transactions that involve individuals or entities connected with the SPDC.

The sanctions are critically important to keeping the pressure on the Burmese junta. The government continues to have one of the worst human rights record in the world and routinely violates the rights of Burmese citizens, including the systematic use of rape as a weapon of war, extrajudicial killings, arbitrary arrests and detention, torture and child labor. Moreover, the Burmese regime has more child soldiers than any other country and has destroyed more than 3,700 ethnic villages, displaced approximately 2,000,000 people, more than 600,000 of which are internally displaced, and has taken nearly 2,000 political prisoners.

We must continue to stand with the Burmese people and expose the despicable and reprehensible actions of the SPDC. Sanctions are critical to putting pressure on the junta. In 2008, the Tom Lantos Block Burmese JADE Act (P.L. 110–286) was signed into law, which bans the importation of Burmese gems into the United States and freezes the assets of Burmese political and military leaders. While these steps are significant, others must follow ours and the EU's lead. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) must impose multilateral sanctions against Burma's military regime including a complete arms embargo.

While I applaud the confirmation of Derek Mitchell as Special Coordinator for Burma, there are additional provisions of the Tom Lantos Block Burmese JADE Act that have yet to be implemented. I urge the Obama Administration to call for a UN Commission of Inquiry on Burma to investigate war crimes and crimes against humanity. This Commission is necessary to prevent further killings and to encourage a meaningful political dialogue.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 66, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A LITTLE LOCAL FLAVOR

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, two things come from a town called Kiln, Mississippi: a famous NFL quarterback and Lazy Magnolia Beer. We know Brett's story, but let me tell you about Lazy Magnolia.

One Christmas, Leslie Henderson bought her husband, Mark, a home brew kit. The two engineers started brewing beer and eventually turned their hobby into a business.

We can fix our faltering economy by giving small business owners more responsibility. H.R. 1236, the Small Brew Act, does that, allowing a much needed tax cut to our small brewers. By lowering the tax on the beer they produce, these companies will have more revenue to invest in maintaining and hiring employees. This legislation therefore promises to create over 4,000 jobs.

On that Christmas a few years ago, Lazy Magnolia Beer had no employees. Today it provides jobs to about 20 people in Hancock County. That, my friends, is an American success story.

CONGRATULATING NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS COUNCIL FOR HUMANITIES ON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, one of the most significant and enduring community groups in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands was formed, the Northern Mariana Islands Council for the Humanities. Since its founding, the council has become a well-respected, community-based organization committed to fostering awareness, understanding, and appreciation of the humanities in the Northern Mariana Islands through its support of educational programs that relate the humanities to the indigenous cultures and the intellectual needs and interests of the people of the Commonwealth. The Northern Mariana Islands Council for the Humanities has enhanced the lives of our residents as individuals and enhanced our community as a whole.

The council's board of directors is and has always been extraordinarily passionate and successful in setting and achieving goals that benefit our diverse and remote community. The council's achievements belie our modest population and resources.

Please join me congratulating the Northern Mariana Islands Council for the Humanities on its 20th anniversary of serving the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands community.

Twenty years ago this past April, one of the most significant and enduring community groups in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands was formed: the Northern Mariana Islands Council for the Humanities.

My island community is a melting pot of cultures, an amalgam of languages, the possessor of a 3,500-year-long and colorful history, and the newest participant in this great experiment called democracy in America. The National Endowment for the Humanities founding principle is that knowledge of the humanities—the ideas, people, and events that make up the record of human thought and experience—is both personally rewarding to Americans as individuals and critical to our common civic life as a nation. I suspect that nowhere is this sentiment as relevant as it is in the Northern Mariana Islands.

In the two decades since its founding, the NMI Council for the Humanities has become a well-respected community-based organization committed to fostering awareness, understanding, and appreciation of the humanities in the Northern Mariana Islands through its support of educational programs that relate the humanities to the indigenous cultures and the intellectual needs and interests of the people of the Commonwealth. The Council also sponsors programs that explore, document, and recognize the many contributions to our community made by the non-indigenous residents of the Northern Marianas. In furtherance of these programs, collaborative relationships have been established with a variety of local, regional, national, and international organizations and individuals.

The Council accomplishes its mission through financial support from the National Endowment for the Humanities, with which it is affiliated, as well as from the local government, businesses, and individuals throughout our islands. The Council has also been designated an ''educational institution'' in the Commonwealth, enabling financial donors to take advantage of a local educational tax credit program.

The Council's 13-member board of directors is, and always has been, extraordinarily passionate and successful in setting and achieving goals that benefit our diverse and remote community. Its achievements over the past 20 years belie our modest population and resources. In fact, one former board member is a recipient of the National Humanities Medal—which is awarded to no more than 12 recipients each year whose work has deepened the Nation's understanding of the humanities, broadened our citizens' engagement with the humanities, or helped preserve and expand Americans' access to important resources in the humanities.

Some current programs undertaken by the Council include: the nationally-acclaimed Motheread/Fatheread program that encourages literacy skills among parents and children; a teachers institute that provides primary-school instructors with a thorough overview of local history; a weekly radio show that provides wide-ranging humanities-based programming; a Micronesian authors initiative that publishes the work of local authors; a community lecture series on humanities topics of interest; a multiyear project to revise the Chamorro-English dictionary; an initiative to promote geotourism in the CNMI; a digital database of primary source documents and images to facilitate the study of local history; and diversified classroom programs that introduce students to the humanities at an early age, including a poetry competition, a junior high school mock trial competition, an annual Covenant Day debate, and curricula that explore multiculturalism in the Commonwealth.

Support of grassroots humanities projects in our community is also a primary focus of the Council. During the past 20 years, over 150 individual grants totaling approximately $900,000 have been awarded to community groups through the Council's community grants program.

At a time in our nation's history when we encounter oftentimes fierce polemics and uncivil discourse, humanities councils serve an

important role. The Northern Mariana Islands Council for the Humanities has, for the past 20 years, enhanced the lives of our residents as individuals and enhanced our community as a whole. I have faith it will continue to do so far beyond the next 20 years. It promotes teaching and learning of the humanities in our schools, facilitates research and original scholarship, provides opportunities for lifelong learning, preserves and provides access to cultural and educational resources, and strengthens the institutional base of the humanities in the Northern Marianas.

Please join me in congratulating the past and present directors, staff, and supporters of the Northern Mariana Islands Council for the Humanities on its twentieth anniversary of serving the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands community.

□ 1550

ISSUES FACING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, today we have a wonderful group of women who are going to come together and discuss the issues at hand right now in Washington and across America as we all are so concerned with what is happening to our economy.

Some of you out there are up late at night wondering how you are going to be paying that mortgage, wondering how the car payment is going to be made and which payments you'll make this month and which payments you may have to put off for another time. We're all doing it. We might as well all admit it. And it's time to come together for solutions and answers.

We, as GOP women in Congress, know how important these issues are. We are the women that are taking care of our children. We're taking care of our households. We're taking care of our parents and their health care needs, and we're watching out for our neighbors to make sure that they're okay.

And we continue on this path. We simply cannot run on this path of unsustainable spending and financial uncertainty. We need jobs back in this country. There are those who have jobs and are worried if they're going to be able to keep them. And yet there are others who have lost their jobs and wonder if they'll be able to find another job. We understand this. We understand that it's affecting all of our households, and we're going to come together and discuss these very important issues.

Before we get started, I'm just going to pass along to you one of the greatest quotes that I think hits home to all of us from Ronald Reagan: ''All great change in America begins at the dinner table.'' How true is that.

Now, in many of our households, we don't all eat dinner together anymore like we used to. When I was growing up, dinnertime was a specified time and we all came together. And if you didn't get to the table, you didn't eat. Today we're all on different schedules, but that dinner table still remains. And we still sit there and we discuss these issues with our spouses.

My husband is a doctor. Brent is a surgeon. He practices in Dunn, North Carolina. We have a son, Ben, who's 16. I'm worried about his future. I'm worried about my husband's practice because he is suffering, realizing that the volume of patients he once was seeing has decreased. That's out of fear, and that's out of the health care system that we have created now.

So as we move forward, I am going to be introducing to you some of the greatest women that I have had the honor of getting to know here in D.C. I have many friends back home, but these ladies are my family here, and I'm going to start off with my esteemed colleague from North Carolina, Ms. SUE MYRICK. She has been a mentor to me but mostly a friend.

I thank you, SUE, for coming today and sharing your thoughts.

Mrs. MYRICK. Well, it's my honor to be here. And I thank you for yielding me the time.

As you said, we have a lot of colleagues here, and most of us share the same ideas relative to what we're about. You mentioned and are talking there about the dinner table and women being financial planners. We do the budget. We're the ones that take care of our families, as you said. We're the health care providers, all of that.

You mentioned your husband's in business, but I, also, am a former small business owner. And when I look at what's happening today, there are so many businesses—I think there are, like, 400 new businesses every day that are started by women in this country. And when I talk to business owners at home, they say to me: I am really concerned about the fact that I could expand my business, but I'm afraid to because of the uncertainty that's out there. I don't know what policies are coming down. I don't know what kind of health care costs I'm going to have. I don't know what tax policies and what, if I hire somebody, it's going to cost me to retain that employee. I don't want to go out and hire them and train them and then have to turn right around and, you know, maybe let them go because I can't afford to keep them.

So the policies that we're working on—and all of the women in Congress on our side of the aisle that really care about these issues—are to make sure that we put policies in place that help and promote those small businesses to exist because they hire most of the people in the country. Most of the jobs are provided by small business. And it's really important.

I also, from another standpoint, used to be the mayor of Charlotte. Unfortunately, the first and only female mayor. I wish somebody else would run on the female side, but that's beside the point.

What I wanted to say is that we had to operate with a balanced budget, very simple. And you can do it. We've been talking this week and actually passed a bill yesterday of cut, cap, and balance. I mean, what a novel idea. It's the way all of us live all the time. It's how we do our business. And there's no reason the Federal Government, like the 49 States that balance their budgets, can't be living under a balanced budget.

Yes, it's tough. We have to make some hard decisions. But the bottom line in all of that is we can do it. And if we have the resolve and the American people want us to do it, there's no such thing as government money. It's all the taxpayers who send their money up here to Washington. That's what we're spending. And we've been spending too much of it.

So I'm encouraged by the fact that we really did have a vote on that bill yesterday that says we're going to live within our means, we're going to do what you do every day, and that we, as women, can have a voice in that and we'll continue to have a voice in that.

And I thank you so much for putting this together so that we have a chance to express that to the American people.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much.

I yield now to Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER from Washington. Thank you so much for coming today. She is one of my fellow freshmen, and we have gotten to be good friends.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Thank you so much. It's a pleasure to be here.

This is one of the most monumental times we face as a Nation. We are right now making decisions that are not just going to impact those of us here today but our children and our children's children.

I am so proud to be a part of this body that passed a bipartisan solution to our budgeting problems just yesterday. We passed, like the gentlelady spoke about, a balanced budget amendment.

I know there's a lot of controversy happening right now, and it's frustrating to watch people posture here in Washington, D.C. Folks back home are sending me emails, and they're calling me, saying, Can you just get some solutions done, Washington? And you know my what my response is? I completely agree.

It is frustrating to watch partisan bickering taking place. And I kind of smile to myself and I think, Just put more women in charge because we're going to fight for solutions. And that's what we are here doing today, promoting the solutions that we were able to pass on the floor just yesterday, solutions that require this House, this body, not to spend more money than it has coming in.

You know, it shouldn't be a radical concept. It shouldn't be controversial in the least. Every mother watching

this, every mother in America, daughter, sister, aunt understands you cannot spend more money each month than you have coming in, no.

Women in the household tend to be the decisionmakers when it comes to finances, to health care, to education, to taking care of older parents or family. Women tend to be those decisionmakers, which gives us a solution-oriented bent, which is why we're here today saying we are willing to work with anybody who puts a plan on paper to move this country forward, that reduces government overspending.

Again, very simple, don't spend more than you have coming in every month. That is a plan to economic prosperity. Don't treat small business owners—many of whom are women—don't treat small business owners as your personal piggy bank. You can't just go back to the cash cow every time you want to spend more money.

It's ironic. Margaret Thatcher—in fact, I saw this quote, I think it was yesterday, which basically said—I'm going to paraphrase her a little loosely. But she said: The problem with socialists is eventually they run out of other people's money. And that's the reality. Women understand, you just can't live beyond your means for sustained amounts of time.

For too long people of both parties—right, Republicans and Democrats—overspent. People of both parties in the White House have overspent. We can talk a long time about what got us here, but that's not going to get us out of the mess. What we need now are our solutions. And the solution that was passed yesterday—again, a bipartisan solution to cut the overspending, cap future growth of government, and balance our budget—is a solution that's going to get our country on a path to prosperity. It's going to tell job creators, keep doing what you do best; entrepreneurs, keep dreaming, hire more people.

□ 1600

In my neck of the woods in southwest Washington, we have double-digit unemployment. Three years plus now of families hurting. Enough is enough.

I encourage the Senate, I encourage the White House to come to an agreement, show us something on paper. We're willing to work together and to negotiate. We're all about making a solution happen for the American people. But let's live within our means. It shouldn't be that difficult.

With that, I thank the gentlelady for putting this together, and I'm proud to be a part of it.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much.

I yield now to my very good friend from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), who is the mother of two, and she is wise beyond her years.

Mrs. ROBY. I thank you very much for those kind remarks, and, again, what an honor and a privilege to be here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives representing Alabama's Second District, but also here just to embrace the very quote that you began with: All great change in America begins at the dinner table, from President Ronald Reagan.

As I sit here, and I've been listening to my colleagues, I can't help but reflect back on my time as a child around the dinner table with my parents and my siblings. I am so grateful for the parents that I have that encouraged debate, yet taught me the responsibility that I have as an American and as an individual. Certainly I credit my wonderful parents for the opportunities that I've had to lead me to this place today to have the privilege and honor of representing Alabama's Second District.

This week, this Congress is embarking on a historical path. We all understand the responsibility that we have, and each of us brings to the table a unique sense. As women, as those who pump gas and go to the grocery store and see the rising costs of milk, we bring a perspective to this Congress that I think is vitally important to demonstrate exactly where this country is now. The people that are having to make the choice between whether they're putting food on their table or gas in their car so that they can get to their job to provide for their family. So again, thank you for letting me be a part of this.

All of us that are here on the floor today, since the day we walked in, particularly this past January, we have been fighting to tighten the government's belt. Every American has done so in the past several years, and it's time that this Federal Government did the same. We did it with the continuing resolution. We did it with the House budget resolution, and we've been doing it throughout the appropriations process, and we have done it this week.

Our children, my children, my children's children, they deserve a future free of crushing taxes so that they have the same opportunity that I mentioned that I had before. They deserve to be free from a life of indebtedness to China.

The Cut, Cap, and Balance Act ensures that we fulfill our constitutional obligation to pay our debts. We're at a place right now, you and I could never call up our credit card company and say, hey, credit card company I've maxed out my card. I don't have any cash to pay you the interest on what I already owe, so could you just increase my credit limit? Can you imagine? Can you imagine going to your husband and saying, I maxed out, but I need a little bit more so I'm just going to call the credit card company. That's exactly what's going on here. And if we don't insist, just like you and I would in our home, just like our spouses would, just like we would for our children, if we do not insist that there are significant spending reforms where we cut up that credit card and say no more—your child wouldn't change his or her behavior if you just continued to give them more; nor would you change your behavior if your credit card company allowed that kind of action. We should require the same of our Federal Government as we do in our home.

It is so urgent that we provide the American people with honest, honest solutions, and I believe that we have demonstrated that this week. I look forward to the next coming weeks as we can do all that we can, as Republican women, to help turn this tide of spending in this country so that we can save this country for the next generation. It cannot be about the next election. It must be about the next generation.

Mrs. ELLMERS. I would now like to yield to my very, very special friend, Mrs. BIGGERT from Illinois, who has been a voice of reason. She is a strong woman here in Congress for us in the GOP conference, and I appreciate all of her remarks, which are always extremely thoughtful.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Thank you, and I thank you for doing this.

I think that we've got such great women that have come into this Congress in this last term and are really, you are all moving forward and really, I think, setting the tone for what's going to happen in the future, and I appreciate that.

But, you know, it is time for America to live within its means. I got an email from a constituent from Lockport, Illinois recently, and she wrote to me imploring Congress to say no, no to all personal income tax increases. And she further explains that she's a single mom. Just think of how many single moms are out there having to work to keep their kids clothed and in school and keep her home going.

She said that she is a single mom, struggling to keep her home, raise her son, and pay her bills. She says, I cannot pay any more taxes. I will lose everything. There are so many like that out there.

A gentleman from Downers Grove, Illinois, wrote to me and said, it's sad to see the constant disagreement in Washington over almost all issues, including national security, foreign affairs, et cetera. But the budget must be controlled. This is the hard-earned money of American taxpayers that must be spent wisely. Less is better.

We must live on budgets and not be able to borrow whenever we run out of money, as the gentlelady just said. We don't have a credit card. Most people don't have the credit card that they can go and get their limit raised. Neither should we. We have to cut taxes and stop spending. So let's get people back to work so that this country can prosper and be great again.

For too long the government spent the taxpayers into a debt that they can not afford. And despite trillions in the so-called stimulus, the economy has grown only weaker as a result.

So consider these troubling statistics. Our tax burden is approaching the

highest levels in our country's history and is expected to rise. Unless we take action now, it could exceed 20 percent of GDP in just 3 years, a record we've only seen once in 35 years.

Similarly, household taxes are excessively high. Even in the slow economy, at over $18,000 last year, the average household tax burden has almost doubled in the last 50 years. What's worse is that the interest on our debt for 1 year is equal to the entire budgets of the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and Veterans Affairs combined.

In individual terms, it means that each American's share of our debt is over $46,000. When I think of my family and future generations, this means that my nine grandchildren would collectively owe over $414,000 if they had to pay their share of our debt today. Before my youngest grandson graduates from college, he would owe $103,000 on our national debt. This is unacceptable. And that's why we took this first step to address the crisis yesterday by passing the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act. And our colleagues across the aisle would argue that this plan goes too far by restricting future borrowing. But the reality is that this bill simply caps spending at the same sustainable rates as past generations, about 20 percent of GDP, a post World War II average. No more and no less.

Don't we care as much about our children and grandchildren as our parents did? I do, and so do the people who sent us here to Congress. So we need to show our creditors, our competitors, and the American people that we are willing to make the tough choices needed to restore confidence and growth in the United States.

I'm so proud of all the women that are participating in this and are really making a difference and showing that we can move forward and balance our budget and live within our means like families across America.

I thank you for leading this effort.

□ 1610

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you.

And to your point, I would just like to refer to this chart right here. As you can see, we have two individuals who are talking about how they're going to pay those taxes, and that checkbook right there, with obviously a nice lady's hand filling out that check. We don't know what it's for, but we all know that feeling. And this actually ran in The Chicago Tribune May 6, 2011. It says, ''Financial planners say they are seeing more women becoming the sole decisionmakers when it comes to the family's finances,'' as you were speaking. ''More and more women are taking on the role of their family's chief financial officer; they set the budget, pay the bills, make the grocery list, and can tell you how much it truly costs to run the family.'' And I believe that the American people, as you do, should be able to know how much it costs to run the country, and we should stick to that budget as well.

Thank you so much for your comments.

I would now like to yield to my good friend who, the last time we had a Special Order, I just literally watched her because she is a numbers person, and I am always so impressed by that because I am not a numbers person. So thank you to the gentlelady from Kansas. She is, again, just so incredibly smart, and I thank you, LYNN JENKINS, for coming today to help us with this effort.

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding.

I am LYNN JENKINS from the Second Congressional District of Kansas, a proud Republican woman, a mother of two, and a CPA with nearly 20 years of experience helping small businesses, major corporations, and American families budget and return to solvency.

You see a family up there in the picture. I have spent nearly two decades working with families across the dinner table to help them chart their way back to prosperity and fiscal responsibility, and I can tell you that if you want to be serious about balancing your budget and returning to solvency, you have to look at both sides of the ledger; you have to look at what you're taking in and what you're spending, and you have to look at your assets and your liabilities.

When it comes to spending and liabilities, it seems that in this town there is some consensus that Washington does indeed have a spending problem. The time to rein in this out-of-control wasteful Washington spending and debt is long overdue. That is why the House has passed a responsible, fact-based budget that will curb Federal spending by more than $6 trillion over the next 10 years, and why just yesterday we passed a measure to again cut spending by trillions of dollars and cap any future spending as part of a deal to grant the President his request to raise the debt ceiling.

But it is our assets that make our country truly blessed because our greatest asset is the strength, the drive, and the ingenuity of the American worker and the American business owner. That is why we need to enhance this asset and therefore increase our revenues in a way that grows the economy. And it is not to hit our small businesses with tax increases or more regulation, but rather to institute these pro-growth policies like House Republicans are doing in our efforts to reform the Tax Code to make it fairer and flatter, to increase exports by finally passing the three pending trade agreements, increase our energy production, and remove the burdensome regulations that are stifling growth and hiring.

You simply can't tax your way out of this mess and into a robust economy; you have to grow your way out of it. You don't have to take my word for it. The President himself agreed with me just last year when he said raising taxes would ''just take more demand out of the economy and put businesses in a further hole.''

Balancing our budget is critical to our future, just as it is critical to every business and family across this great country. So it's my hope that the establishment here in Washington can finally see the error of its ways, make real cuts to this out-of-control spending binge, put hard caps on the attempts to increase spending in the future, and establish some pro-growth policies that will lift us out of this stagnant economy and into the prosperity the American people deserve.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you very much.

I now yield to my good friend from South Dakota, part of our freshman leadership, part of our freshman class who has truly shown her leadership. Thank you for coming today, Mrs. NOEM. I am very excited to hear your comments.

Mrs. NOEM. Thank you, and I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me today. I certainly appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only as a proud Republican woman as well, as my good colleague from Kansas said, but also as a wife and as a mother and as an American concerned about Washington, D.C.'s spending habits.

We not only need a solution to dig ourselves out of the situation that we are in, but we need to make sure that we don't find ourselves back in the same place. We need to make sure that we are putting us on a new fiscal path that certainly addresses the problems that we have in front of us. The frustrating thing about that entire process is that this President has been on the sidelines. Certainly we all know the Biblical phrase that ''without a vision the people perish,'' and that is truly what is happening to America today—that we don't have a leader who has been willing to step forward and give us a plan to tell us what he truly thinks are the options that are available to us. Instead, that has been left to others to lead, and he has been more than willing to stand on the sidelines and to criticize every single one of those options that have been brought forward. In fact, his original budget, which was proposed in February of this year, failed to even address our most difficult problems.

The Democrat-led Senate voted down his budget unanimously. No one jumped onboard because they recognized that, under his plan, that we doubled our debt in 5 years and tripled it in 10. It certainly wasn't going to be the answer to what we needed to prevent this most predictable financial crisis that we find ourselves in.

Since then, the executive branch has failed to provide the American people with a solid plan to move forward. During a House Budget Committee hearing the CBO director, Douglas Elmendorf, referenced President Obama's revised budget speech by saying this: ''We don't estimate speeches. We need much more specificity than was provided in

that speech for us to do our analysis.'' And essentially what he was saying was, we can't score a speech, we don't know what a speech means. Anybody can give a really great speech; what we need is leadership. We need someone to step up to the table and tell us what we need to do to address our problems so that we can put it into action.

House Republicans have taken this lead in the looming budget crisis. We have shown time and time again that we are serious about cutting our spending, we're serious about balancing our budget. In January, we passed H.R. 1, which continued funding through 2011, only to have it stalled by the Senate, which in effect essentially delayed any action until it got down to the brink of a government shutdown. In March, we passed our budget plan for fiscal year 2012. We are still waiting—more than 800 days—for the Senate to pass anything that resembles a budget. We are doing our work here in the House, but we can't do it alone; we need a willing partner in the President, and we need a willing partner in the Senate.

Last night, the House again passed yet another plan to get our fiscal house in order. We voted overwhelmingly to support Cut, Cap, and Balance. I supported this plan because my constituents have been calling for weeks telling me to support serious change, serious spending cuts, and a balanced budget amendment. They realize they can't spend more money than what they have in their households; they want their government to have some common sense.

South Dakota families and businesses understand the need to balance a checkbook. Our country, just like our families, can't continue to spend more than it makes. Even my 9-year-old son realizes that. Recently, he had the chance to come out with me to Washington, D.C., and he wanted to spend some time at the Spy Museum, he had been talking about it for months. So he did a lot of chores around the ranch to earn some money, but when he got there and he got to walking through the gift shop, he realized he didn't have enough money to buy everything that he wanted. He saw a lot of things he wanted to take home with him, but he didn't have the money, so he had to prioritize. He had to pick and choose and leave some things there because he simply couldn't afford that. Was he disappointed? Absolutely. He was heartbroken. But I tell you what: That taught him a life lesson that he will only learn from people that have common sense, that understand you cannot spend money that you do not have and you have to prioritize and make choices.

America is out of money. We know this, and President Obama knows this. And yes, we do need fundamental tax reform; yes, we need to identify our priorities; and yes, we absolutely have to stop spending money we don't have. Strong leadership, action, courage, along with responsible solutions, are needed from all of us if we want to preserve the American dream for our kids and our grandkids.

□ 1620

As a wife, mother, and a Republican woman, I support a balanced budget amendment, smaller government so my kids can grow up with the liberties and freedoms and so that they don't have to worry about paying the bills that we are continuing to rack up in this country. It is time to change our ways.

I certainly thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much for your comments.

You know, it's interesting, we all have our stories, our anecdotes about our household budgets and what we're dealing with. My son is 16 years old, and he received his driver's license a couple of months ago. But the deal with him is, Ben, you can't get a car until you finish that Eagle Scout project. And you're going to have to be responsible to pay for the gas that goes in it. Well, there's not a day that goes by here in Washington that I don't receive a picture that he texted me of the newest truck he's found or the newest Jeep. But there again, he understands the deal. The deal is no vehicle until the Eagle Scout project is at least under way. I'm yielding on that. I'm negotiating with him, but that's the plan.

Sometimes, as you said, we just can't have everything that we want. In a perfect world we could, but we can't because when taxpayer dollars are being spent, it's not an endless flow of money coming into Washington that is from some unknown source. It's taxpayer dollars that we are spending. We have to be good stewards of that. And what better way to do that than the Cut, Cap, and Balance plan that we passed here in the House yesterday evening.

It was so incredibly powerful to see those numbers up on the board and to think that we could actually put a balanced budget amendment in place, which is basically amending the Constitution. This would be a historic moment for us, and we will be part of it. And President Obama would be the President that puts that forward for future generations. I just again am so proud of it. Like I said, when you bring it home, we all have to deal with those budgets in our own household. Washington should be doing the same.

I would like to yield now to our vice-chair, the gentlelady from Washington, another member of leadership and a voice of understanding, reason and leadership for the GOP women, vice-chair of our GOP Conference. Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, thank you so much for coming to offer your comments.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you very much. I am proud to be here this evening to join the Republican women. I want to especially thank you as our leader from North Carolina. I am proud that you are one of the dynamic Republican women freshmen who joined the House this year.

As I think about what the solution is that faces America, I believe Republican women are a big part of that solution. We see that for all of the people in America that are frustrated with leaders in Congress who go behind closed doors and strike a deal without putting it to the people, Republican women, women are seen as being honest and trustworthy and problem-solvers. And Republican women are also seen as being fiscally responsible and the ones who, I believe, are a big part of the solution. So I am proud to join you all this evening.

In so many ways we are at a crossroads here in the country. We have had record unemployment, over 9 percent for a record amount of time. We have also reached a record in our spending. As I think most people in the country are aware, the President has asked Congress to raise the debt ceiling by $2.4 trillion to get us through November of 2012. That is his request. The Republicans believe it is very important that as we look at our fiscal situation, that we are not just continuing down the current path of raising the debt ceiling, of adding to the credit cards, but that we are changing course and cutting up those credit cards.

I think it is important for people to realize what that means for them and their families. This request would be $20,000 for every American family, $20,000 in additional debt for every American family across this country. It is very important before we vote to raise that debt, add that debt to our families moving forward, that we change course. And the real question in my mind is whether or not the President recognizes that we cannot continue down this path. When you think about our future, economic opportunities, national security interests, it is very important that we change paths.

That's why I am proud of the legislation that passed the House last night with an overwhelming majority. We actually got some Democrat votes. It is a bipartisan bill that passed the House with 234 votes. Now it is over in the Senate. We already know that 37 Senators have signed on to support this bill. We want to make sure that America realizes that there is a plan on paper that has passed the House and does have support in the Senate, and we want to continue to build on that support.

Cut, Cap, and Balance is a reasonable, credible plan to addressing where we find ourselves as a country. Yes, it includes cuts in current-year spending. It includes caps as we move forward so that we are going to bring down how much we are spending, and it includes a balanced budget amendment. I am a strong supporter of a balanced budget amendment.

When I was first running for Congress in 2004, I talked a lot about the balanced budget amendment. What I didn't appreciate was to what degree

the Federal Government spends money, borrows money, and prints money with no limits. I thought there must be some limits. There are no limits on the Federal Government's ability to borrow, to spend, and print money; and the balanced budget amendment was one that even Thomas Jefferson, after they finished writing the Constitution, said: If I can make one change, it would be to limit the Federal Government's ability to borrow money. It's been a debate through the ages. It is long overdue. This is the time. It's about America's future, and I'm proud to stand here tonight in support of Cut, Cap, and Balance and the balanced budget amendment and getting our fiscal House in order for our economy today and for keeping the American Dream alive for many years to come.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much.

I would now like to yield to the gentlelady from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Thank you.

I would like to thank my colleagues here today for the opportunity to talk about something that is extremely important to every woman in America, every person in America. It is not really a man or woman thing, or a child or a grandparent thing. It is all of us. So I look at things a lot of times, like a lot of people, I try to put my own life filter over what is going on here.

I'm in the sandwich generation. I have elderly parents who are having bumpy roads with their health. I just today for the very first time had my only and most beautiful granddaughter with me today on the House floor. I realized poor little Celia has $45,000 worth of national debt on her head. And then I think of my parents trying to manage their health care and their finances in their senior years: have they prepared enough, and did they make the right choices. I think about all of the in-between generation, the sandwich generation which I am, and I know that we want to make the right choices for ourselves so when our children are taking care of us, those decisions can be easier for them and we can be well prepared.

Quite honestly, with a $14 trillion debt, I don't think we're going to be prepared. What kind of handcuffs are we putting on our future generation?

I think about times in my life when maybe I have gone up to the limit on my credit card or maybe things haven't been as—particularly when we were younger, trying to buy a house for the first time and trying to figure out how we were going to manage the dollars when we were first getting started, and when we realized maybe we were going a little over the limit or spending too much, was the first thing we thought about, was it let's get a loan, let's ask our parents for more money?

No, the first thing you think about is how are we going to cut back? How are we going to save? How are we going to live within our means? Because that is the reasonable and rational way. That is the way that our parents did it, and that's the way we've tried to do it.

But that's not the way things go on here in Washington. A lot of people say why is it only about cutting spending. Because if we don't prove and show we can cut spending at the beginning before we talk about anything else, we are never going to do it. I think those are the hard decisions. Those are the kitchen-table decisions. All great change in America begins at the dinner table. That is a Ronald Reagan quote. That is absolutely true. That is why I think the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill that we passed yesterday makes so much sense to a lot of American women around the kitchen table because that's what they're doing.

□ 1630

And so I think when we think about it in terms of the balanced budget, when I listened to the debate yesterday, I think about my home State of West Virginia. We have a balanced budget. We have hundreds of millions of dollars in surplus right now because we are not permitted by law to spend more than we bring in. And so we had a good year this year for a lot of different reasons. But I think some of it is the smart budgeting that we did up front as a State—make tough decisions as a State to make sure that at the end of the year we're not dipping into the rainy day fund, that we're not finding ourselves saying the only way we can save ourselves is to raise somebody's taxes. It's because the spending decisions that were made in the front end with a budget—we have a budget for the first time in, I think, 3 years in the House.

And everybody around their kitchen table makes a budget. If they don't make it every year, certainly when they're in trouble they start making a budget. You do really simple things like decide not to go out to eat, stop your magazine subscriptions. The easy things first and then the really hard decisions. That's where we are right now are the hard decisions.

I think as a daughter and as a mother of a daughter and a mother of now a granddaughter, I think women make a lot of these decisions. I see the generations changing. I see the decisions maybe that my mom made were not as involved as the ones that I'm making. And I certainly can see that my own daughter, independent, on her own, is going to be so much more empowered financially to make decisions. So let's not leave her and the next generations holding a big IOU on their back. Let's take the opportunity.

Another question I get is that we've raised the debt ceiling how many times in the past—numerous times in the past. I think they were quoting 17 times under Ronald Reagan or something like that, if I recall correctly. And that is correct. We have raised the debt ceiling. I've voted to raise it before. But this is different. We need to seize this opportunity. Because if we don't seize the opportunity to clamp down on the spending now when the American people realize what an issue and what a problem and what a generational burden we're passing on—we have the ear of the American people, and that's the difference. That's the difference.

A lot of things in our lives are all about timing. Certainly political lives are all about timing. Sometimes you can have the greatest candidate in the world, and if it's not the right time, they can't make it. And this is the time. This is the time for us to grab the reins, to say to the Senate and the President and the American people, We're ready, you're ready, and let's join together and do this.

So I look forward to hopefully Cut, Cap, and Balance making it through the Senate. But at least if it doesn't make it in the form we pass today, the concepts within this—cutting, capping, and balancing our budgets—are everyday events in people's lives. We need to do it here. I look forward to joining with all my fellow women Republicans we're talking with today, with the rest of the women in the country, but also every man, woman, and child in this country, because it's all about every American, and we don't want to see an overburden on either the older generation, the younger generation, or the generations to come.

Thank you for having us. I look forward to working together.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much.

I would like to now yield to one of my fellow freshman colleagues who I have gotten to be very good friends with. She is an incredible individual. She is a great person to be serving with. I truly appreciate all of her input, thoughtful comments. We discuss issues every day here in Congress.

I yield to my good friend, SANDY ADAMS, from Florida.

Mrs. ADAMS. Thank you.

I join my fellow Republican women today to come and talk to you about what we passed yesterday, Cut, Cap, and Balance. I want to reach out to the American people and tell them why. August 2 is quickly approaching, and what we have heard from our President is, first, the Biden talks. Then it was the ''grand bargain.'' Then it was the McConnell-Reid deal. Then it was Gang of Six. Again, all of these are proposals, all of these are ideas. Nothing on paper. Nothing to be scored by the Congressional Budget Office. Not one thing put down in writing so that the American people and, quite frankly, Congress knows what is truly in these plans.

So now, just yesterday, the House Republicans passed Cut, Cap, and Balance with bipartisan support. It's the only legislation that has been introduced to Congress that actually addresses the debt, the deficit, and the ability to get our budget back in order, balancing our budget, the only one scored by the Congressional Budget Office. I supported that legislation and I

will continue to support it because it is the only legislation that has been brought forth to handle our debt, deficit, and our budget. Not any of these other plans that have been floated out there, spoken about, talked about, nothing in writing.

As I heard one of my colleagues say earlier, the Congressional Budget Office said, We can't score a speech. And the American people don't really know what's in that legislation unless you write it down and let them take a look at it. That is so important for the American people. They want to know what we are doing. That's why it was so important that we had Cut, Cap, and Balance out there. The American people had a chance to read it, review it. They've seen what we have done. And I'm hearing from the people in my district that they're happy. They're happy that we have passed a responsible bill.

We're facing $14.3 trillion in debt. It's equal to about 95 percent of our entire economy. And $3.7 trillion of that was just accrued under President Obama's watch. To put that in perspective, it took the United States from 1776 to 1992 to accrue that same amount of debt that we've accrued in about 2½ years. We're mortgaging our children's future. We're borrowing 40 cents on the dollar, much of it from the Chinese. And we are sending the bill to our children and grandchildren. This has got to stop.

If we don't listen to the American people, then shame on us. We have heard them loud and clear. We know they want us to get our fiscal house in order because every day the American people are making their hard decisions on what they're going to buy, whether it's gas, whether it's prescription drugs, whether it's food, because everything is going up. And the jobs are going away. We have a high unemployment rate. We have different credit rating places telling us, Get your fiscal house in order or we are going to downgrade you. If that happens, the American people are the ones that suffer with us. This affects each and every one of us.

That is why I am proud to have supported Cut, Cap, and Balance. That is why we stand here today talking with you, the American people, letting you know we heard you. I'm ringing the alarm. My colleagues in the House are ringing the alarms. But the Senate Democrats and this President don't seem to be listening. We have a problem, and it is not a tax problem. It is a spending problem here in Washington. We need to get that spending under control.

Since 1917—I think that's when they first passed this debt ceiling legislation, and I think, personally, they passed it with hopes that Congress would never spend more than they took in. That's my opinion. I wasn't here back then. But I will tell you that year after year, Congress has voted to ignore, to move on, to continue the spending without addressing the true drivers of our debt. We have to address those drivers.

If Congress isn't willing and the President isn't willing, then the American people are willing, and they're saying, Send us the balanced budget amendment. Let us show you where we are on this. Forty-nine States have a balanced budget requirement and they're able to live within their means. We should do no less. The American people live within their means, States live within their means, and Congress and the Federal Government should do no less.

□ 1640

Years of kicking the can down the road have come to an end. Reckless spending needs to stop. And the Senate's repeated failure to pass a budget and do their jobs that has led us to this economic crossroads needs to stop.

I'm asking my colleagues in the Senate, take up this bill, pass this bill. Listen to the American people. They want the opportunity to vote on a balanced budget amendment. Let them. What are you afraid of? Let the American people's voices be heard. Let them vote.

Americans deserve better, and we have proven that here in the House. I hope that our Senate colleagues are listening. I hope our President is listening. August 2 is quickly approaching. You do not have a scorable plan written down. We need to make sure that we protect our American heritage for our future generations.

Mrs. ELLMERS. I thank the gentlelady.

I now yield to the gentlelady from Ohio.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I thank my good friend Mrs. ELLMERS from North Carolina for hosting this Special Order this evening because this is about America's future and about America doing what each and every woman, each and every man, each and every family has to do each and every week at their table, and that's balance the budget and pay the bills.

The greatest President, they say, in the last century was Ronald Reagan. And in his farewell speech, he said, ''All great change in America begins at the dinner table.'' And it does. It's the universe of our home life. It's where we educate our children, where we feed our children, where we stake out the ideas on how we want our future to go, where we plan parties, where we plan events, and where we discuss Grandma's departure. It is the center of our home. And it is from that that I want to focus on what I think needs to be said tonight.

We have to balance our budget in America, in this House, in this Chamber, at this kitchen table. We have all seen what it is to take a checkbook, take the bills, and make them come together. That's what we need to do, and that's what I believe a balanced budget amendment will force this Congress and future Congresses to do: balance our checkbook.

Just like mothers and grandmothers across this country, I have a major stake in the future of our Nation, and that is not just my daughter and her wonderful husband, but my Michael and my Anthony, my wonderful little grandchildren.

My father was the epitome of the American Dream. He came from nothing, but he worked hard and started his business and paid the bills of those businesses at their little, small kitchen table. And he grew that and gave us the opportunity to make sure that what we wanted to accomplish in the United States was available to us. And that's what I did for my daughter. And, you know, when she started her little business, do you know where she started it? At the kitchen table in the house she grew up in. And she's got a thriving little business. But she's got two little children, and we want that American Dream for them.

We've got to get our fiscal house in order. We cannot keep creating the debts and deficits that we are creating in this country. A balanced budget amendment will force us to do the right things for our country just as moms and dads across the Nation have to do all the time at their kitchen tables; that's live within their means.

I urge the Senate to take up the balanced budget amendment. I urge this Chamber to adopt it, I urge the Senate to adopt it, and to make it a reality.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much.

I now yield to my other—I say ''other'' but we have many—good friend from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), who is one of those great freshmen that I'm serving with.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, RENEE. We certainly appreciate your hosting this today, and I certainly am glad to lend my support for a balanced budget amendment.

It goes back to my childhood. I've shared this before, but I wanted to share this again because this is what I grew up with, and I believe it's what most Americans grew up with.

I grew up on a farm, and it was just my mom and my dad and my sister and me. And every January my mom would get out all these ledger papers and lay them out on the kitchen table. That was before the days of the computers. Each page represented a month. And she and my dad would spend days, literally, charting out the cash flow for our farm for the rest of the year. And they would try to estimate how much the yield was going to be on the corn and the soybeans, and they had to guess how much the price was going to be, and they researched the cost of the seed and the other inputs and the fuel, and they charted that all out, and then our mortgage payments.

They were able to, through working that pencil and erasing and reworking it, figure out how they were going to make everything work, how they were going to be able to live within their means. It wasn't always easy, but as the years went on and conditions changed, Mother would get that eraser out and she would readjust that cash

flow to make sure that we stayed in balance, make sure that we had everything that we needed. And that's just common sense. That's families balancing their budget.

I carry on that tradition. I do it, and people all over Missouri's Fourth District do it. Families I talk to, they say, Every year we balance our budget, how come Washington doesn't? Every small business I visit says, We balance our budget, how come Washington doesn't? Every farmer and rancher I visit with says, We balance our budget, how come Washington doesn't?

We have got to start taking the common sense from the people and apply it here in Washington.

Even the States, they certainly are one up on us here—49 out of the 50 States have a balanced budget amendment. They live within their means.

Yet Washington thinks they don't need it. Well, I think they do. With a $14.3 trillion debt that we have now, it is evident that people here cannot live within their means, and they need to have the constraints of a budget.

So we've passed it here in the House. It was the right thing to do. It's supported by the American people. Now the Senate and the President need to get on board.

Why the President would oppose our cut, cap, and balance plan, I have no idea. I want the President to share with me and with all of us and the American people why he does not support balancing our budget. We do it at home. We need to do it in Washington, and we need to do it now.

Thank you.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much.

The gentlelady from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) will be finishing this evening's comments.

She is a good friend to all of us as freshmen, a mentor to us, and I thank you for coming this evening as well. It means very much that you contribute to this.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about my experience balancing budgets because I had to manage many different kinds of budgets, and some all at the same time.

As a business owner for 23 years, I had to balance my insurance company's budget. As the mayor of Fort Worth, I had to balance the city's budget. And as the mother of three, I had to balance the household budget.

What is the same about every budget I have ever balanced is that there was never any choice. There were very serious consequences for not being fiscally responsible, whether it was in my business, at city hall, or at home.

Most Americans have had the same experience I've had. We all sit around the kitchen table and figure out how to make ends meet, and then we ask why can't Washington do the same thing?

Families and businesses have to balance their budgets every single day. It's only right that the Federal Government, with $14.3 trillion in debt, should finally have to do what all Americans already do. But when Washington is asked to balance the budget for the American people, this seems to be too tall an order.

Washington could learn a thing or two from the women in Congress: 10.6 million businesses owned in the United States are owned by women, and women now make up the majority of the workforce. We're the leaders of Fortune 500 companies. But as we've taken an even greater responsibility, we haven't given anything up. We're balancing budgets at our business during the day, and when we get home, we're taking care of our families' finances, and many of us care for our aging parents and their budgets too.

□ 1650

We know what it means to make ends meet, and we've lived up to that responsibility in every part of our lives. It's now time for Washington to do the same.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much.

My good friend was pointing out the need to be following our finances as more and more women are becoming businessowners. They are the breadwinners, as you can see from this chart here, once again figuring out the bills, balancing the budget, taking care of our family members and their health care needs. It's so important.

In order for us to be good stewards of taxpayer dollars here in Washington, it's time for a balanced budget amendment. I am very proud of what our House did in a bipartisan effort yesterday, and I'm hoping that the Senate and the President will also be part of that very significant, historic move so that we can get this country back on sound financial ground.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to be joined by my colleagues today, and we are going to talk about the financial situation here in the United States and about the meaning of the various ideas and proposals that have been put forward.

I want to compliment my colleagues on the Republican side for their tenacity in putting out their sound bites, but I think it's very, very important for the American people to understand in detail exactly what is being proposed here. Yesterday, we did have what was called the Cut, Cap, and Balance proposal. You might also call it the ''Cut, Slash, and Burn'' proposal because, once you get past the sound bites and get into the details of what has actually been proposed, you've got to stand back and go, Whoa. Wait a minute. Is that really what a balanced budget amendment is all about?

We're going to go into that in a few moments to really understand exactly what this balanced budget amendment is and the effect that it will have on Americans, particularly on women in America; but before we go there, we need to step back a bit and understand how it is that we got into this situation with this deficit of $14 trillion. How did we get here? It's really important to understand that. Before you go off and try to solve the problem, you need to know what is the situation, what is the circumstance.

This little chart here lays out where the deficit came from. Now, understand that, at the end of the Clinton administration in January 2001, the United States Government was running a surplus, a $300 billion-plus surplus. It had run that for the previous 2 years. So we had a surplus, and we were on the path during the decade 2001–2010 to literally pay off the entire American debt. It would be paid off. Now, whether that's a good idea or not, you can debate that, but that's what we were on. So the trajectory was, had we maintained the same policies, the same growth in our economy, we would have paid off the total debt. However, something happened.

Now, what happened?

What happened was a change in policies and two wars: the Iraq and the Afghanistan war following the 9/11 event in 2001 and then the Iraq war in 2003—neither war paid for. For the first time in American history, neither war was paid for—all borrowed money for the first time ever in America's history. Another thing happened along the way, and that is: in 2001, the first George W. Bush tax cut followed in 2003 by the second George W. Bush tax cut.

Here is what they meant. Take a careful look at this. This is where the deficit started. We started here with the Bush-era tax cuts and then over the years so that in 2019—20 years—we have this extraordinary growth in the deficit caused by those tax cuts. Of course it assumes the tax cuts will continue on into 2019.

The red area here are the wars. Again, not paid for. So the Iraq war and the Afghanistan war.

The other thing is this downturn in the economy. The downturn in the economy occurred in 2008. How did it happen? Why did we have that crash of the American economy?

We had it because the Federal Government stepped back from regulating the financial institutions, allowing them to run wild, assuming that they would be smart enough to regulate

themselves. That didn't happen. They were smart enough to be extraordinarily greedy. Wall Street went on a greed binge, and the result was the collapse of the financial industry. Needless to say, there are other players in this game. Many Americans, hundreds of thousands of Americans, joined in the game and took out mortgages and bought houses, but there was no way they could possibly afford them. It was the financial industry, the mortgage industry and the Wall Street bankers, and we wound up with the great collapse of 2008.

To deal with that, the bailout of Wall Street occurred. Most of that has now been paid back. It worked. Did it work for the benefit of Americans? It stabilized the financial institutions, and it certainly worked for the benefit of Wall Street. That program occurred in the final months of the George W. Bush administration. Unfortunately, the American economy has not recovered despite the spending of some $700 billion in the stimulus program. It actually worked. It didn't work enough to get the economy moving forward, so we wound up with this huge deficit.

Going forward, the deficit remains in place because the wars continue: $178 billion a year spent on the war in Afghanistan and Iraq. Also continuing are the George W. Bush tax cuts. This is where the deficit is coming from. Thirdly, the economy has not recovered. That's where the deficit is.

Now, what do you do about that? Do you put in place a constitutional amendment that has something really interesting? When the American public understands what is in that amendment, it's not just a balanced budget; there are real things in that amendment. Then that amendment, if ever put in place, will have extraordinary consequences for America—in my view, none of them positive.

A sound bite is great: Balance the budget. Force the government to balance the budget just like we do at home. Hello, America. Do you really balance your budget every month? every year? I don't think so. We take out a mortgage to buy a house. That's borrowing money, folks. That's not balancing your daily budget. That's borrowing money, and now you've got to pay the mortgage, pay the interest. When you lose your job or when you're laid off or when you're cut back in hours, what do you do? You do your best to cut expenses, and then you probably are going to borrow more money—maybe the home equity loan, maybe the credit card—to get by. We all do that, all of us. It's not so easy to at the end of every year balance the budget.

Forty-nine States? Yes, they have balanced budget amendments. I'm from California. Democrat Jerry Brown: facing a balanced budget amendment. Guess what? He borrows money. He doesn't balance the budget. Oh—and his predecessor, Arnold Schwarzenegger—Republican, said he was going to ''blow up the boxes'' and balance the budget. It happened twice in the 7 years that he was Governor that he was able to balance the budget.

Why did this happen? Why did it happen? America, ask the question: What is in the balanced budget amendment? I'll tell you what's in it: a requirement that a two-thirds vote be enacted for every expenditure and every tax increase—a two-thirds vote. This is a fundamental shift in the very nature of American democracy.

□ 1700

We had a dozen wonderful Representatives of the Republican Party talk for an hour here, and not once did they mention that the American democracy will be forever changed. No longer majority rule. A fundamental tenet of American democracy, majority rule, pushed aside. And now should this ever become law, a minority rule, one-third of this House, one-third of this Senate dominating the will of 65 percent of every elected Representative and Senator. The end of the most fundamental tenet of American democracy, the end of majority rule.

It also works in a very pernicious and bad way. You can cut taxes with a majority vote. It takes a two-thirds to raise taxes.

So years and years ago, the oil industry had the opportunity in our democracy to receive a tax reduction. They got a tax reduction. And the oil industry went on with that tax reduction, called a subsidy, so that they can explore for oil and gas. For a hundred years they have had a tax break. Now, we can give them another tax break; but under the balanced budget amendment, it would take a two-thirds vote to take away the tax reduction, the tax break, the subsidy that they have received for a hundred years, a century, would take a two-thirds vote to do that because that would be considered to be a tax increase.

So what does it mean to the oil industry? Well, here's their profits from last year. Let's see: Exxon, $10.7 billion; Oxy, $1.6 billion; Conoco, $2.1; Chevron, $6.2 billion; BP, of gulf fame, $7.2 billion, that's their profit. Part of that profit is your tax dollar. Part of that profit is the tax dollar of every American that has been given to the oil companies for more than a century so that they can go explore for oil.

Is there an American that believes that the oil industry needs our tax dollars to continue to be viable? I don't think so. But if the constitutional amendment passes, becomes part of our Constitution, a majority of this House and the Senate could increase the subsidy, but it would take a two-thirds vote to get our money back. We need to understand the details of what a balanced budget amendment means.

I've been joined by my wonderful friend and extraordinary Representative from the great State of New York representing the Hudson River Valley in the capital region.

We had a discussion last night about a piece of this, and I've been waiting for you to arrive when we could talk about how the balanced budget amendment and the cuts in the legislation that was passed yesterday would affect women.

We just had 20 women from the Republican Party here telling us that we ought to enact a balanced budget amendment. What does it mean for women who are 65 and over?

Would you please join us and enter this conversation.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, and thank you for bringing us together on some very important discussions and laser-sharp focus which is essential as we face this default crisis, where there are those who are dragging their feet and not resolving the default crisis and refuse to have us pay our bills. And when we default on our debt, it's very problematic because it can disrupt our pensions, it can disrupt our 401(k)s, it can disrupt our mortgages because of the interest rate being somewhat fluctuated by that default crisis and our failure to pay our bills.

What I think is important here is that you outline how unfair this process can be, how it can be routed to support easily deep pockets, efforts to give windfall industries a mindless handout, the big oil companies getting a handout. It's much easier to retain that benefit, and it's very difficult to save Medicare. It's a simple majority that can end Medicare.

Many of us go home every week, others as frequently as they can because of the distance they have to travel to get to their districts, and we're greeted by signs like this: Hands off my Medicare.

And it's no wonder, because what we've seen yesterday was the third attempt in this given few months of the 112th Congress to end Medicare. Three votes. One with the Republican Study Committee, one with the Ryan plan, a Path to Prosperity—which we have redesignated as the Road to Ruin. And then yesterday with this cut, burn and whatever, slash-and-burn attempt. I won't even get into the nomenclature because it's misrepresenting what would really happen.

Yesterday, we had a vote on this floor to make it easy to end Medicare and easy to maintain handouts to the oil companies. And when we look at the dollars that are saved by ending Medicare, we see where they somehow are transitioned over to tax cuts that are maintained for the millionaire-billionaire community, mindless handouts, the Big Oil industry.

So this is buyer beware week. We've seen this three times over, and it's an assault on the middle class.

When you talk about the impact on women, you know, an armchair scientist can take a look at the population of seniors and understand the proportional representation to the greater degree is women in that category. So this is an assault on senior women who require Medicare.

We talked about this last night on the floor, that things have changed since 1965 when President Truman and Mrs. Truman were the first to sign up for Medicare with that wonderful legislation. They began a process of dignity for our Nation's seniors where affordable, accessible care, a certainty in their lives, became a much-needed concept because there was cherry-picking going on. There was the unaffordable notion, the inaccessible notion of health care insurance coverage.

And to put that now at risk and develop and mess with our Constitution to make that all work, it's no wonder Wall Street, The Wall Street Journal, called it a very foolish approach. They labeled it in just very negative tones.

And certainly Bruce Bartlett, who was the economic adviser to President Reagan, said that it was akin to an intern writing a bill on a napkin. Well, I think that's a pretty tough slam for our interns. They would do better.

So we need to go forward with sensible strategies. We need to solve the default crisis. And let's face it, it should be about investing in jobs.

The jobs crisis is the number one priority of the American public. We see it in public opinion surveys over and over again. And that job crisis when we resolve it addresses any revenue crisis, any spending crisis, any deficit crisis. This is the best solution: Create jobs, invest in innovation, infrastructure, education.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, once again you are on the right track here.

Earlier before you came in I was discussing our Republican colleagues, Women's Day, and they were all talking about the great value in the balanced budget constitutional amendment.

My colleague from Colorado, JARED POLIS, came running over and said, They don't understand. They need to know what's in this. And I'd like you to explain.

I started off with the majority, two-thirds vote. You're a constitutional specialist. What does all of this mean to America if they really understood and got past the sound bite? ''Balanced budget'' sounds good, but what does it actually mean?

□ 1710

Mr. POLIS. It's particularly ironic that this session of Congress opened with a recital of the United States Constitution which really just, in the vote yesterday, has been debased. And our democratic Republic has been debased to an extent that I certainly have not seen in this body prior under either party.

Let's talk about exactly what was attempted yesterday in this constitutional amendment that would have essentially passed as part of a resolution. It's one thing to say that we want to eliminate Medicare. The House worked its will through the Ryan budget, phasing out Medicare for those who are under 55 years of age. The people of this country will have the opportunity to change that. We saw an election in upstate New York where I think and most people think that the people of this country soundly rejected the effort to eliminate Medicare.

But regardless, that's what elections are about. I know that in the last election, Democrats didn't fare too well. A majority of this House was elected that wanted to phase out Medicare for people under the age of 55. Likewise, in the next election, if people run on that, a majority might arise in this body that supports keeping Medicare solvent for the next generation.

What was attempted yesterday was circumventing the public will by inserting into the United States Constitution exact fiscal policy that essentially wouldn't allow Medicare to exist in any form similar to what it is today. It would actually specify an exact percentage of the gross national product that the public sector can contain in our governing document.

This is unprecedented. Who hears of putting numbers, 19.7 percent, 19.5 percent, 20, 21 percent—we're talking about the percentage of the economy that can be public sector versus private sector. Who knows what the ideal percentage is? That's what elections are about. That's what we fight off every day here on the floor of the House. Some will say we should have it a little bigger; others will say we should have it a little smaller. The people of the country have their say. To somehow take that out of the realm of public discourse and insert that into our governing document is unprecedented. It castrates the United States Congress. It castrates and eliminates our ability to make public policy, for better or worse.

I had an exchange with one of my colleagues on the Rules Committee as we were bringing this to the floor the other day. I said, This is such an absurd concept. Imagine for a minute that there was a Democratic majority and we were saying, You know what, we want to put in our Constitution that public expenditures have to be at least 22 percent of GNP or—but it never even crossed our minds. There is no Democratic proposal like that because it just doesn't make any sense. That's what elections are about.

And yet here the Republican majority is trying to insert into our governing document—the one that they say that they have great respect for, the one that they began this session of the House by reading—inserting exact formulated fiscal policy regarding the exact size of the public sector, taking that ability away from the voters of this country, taking the discussion away from the deliberative bodies of the House and the Senate, taking it out of the hands of an election for President of the United States, removing the fundamental issue of what role government should play from political debates.

That is grossly undemocratic. It should be an insult to all of us who value our democratic Republic, who value our democratic institutions.

However flawed, our representational system of democracy is the most effective in the world. The people's voice will be heard. By taking away the people's voice and castrating the United States Congress to specific policies prescribed in the Constitution, we remove the ability of present and future voters of the country to have their voices heard. Regardless of where anyone comes down on the policies, regardless of what percentage of the GNP you think it should be, I hope that most Americans believe that it's a fundamental value to have a say in our system of governance and to have these debates and to have them be part of the public discourse, and that was proposed to be taken away completely by a bill that passed yesterday in this body by a majority vote from the Republican side.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so much for bringing our attention to the way in which the balanced budget amendment would fundamentally alter the very nature of our government.

Earlier I talked about the majority vote versus the minority rule that is in this amendment. And now you bring to our attention the percentage that is in the amendment. Those percentages have real meaning beyond the issue of just a very, very important issue, the very nature of our government, and the reason why we have representative government, why we have the Senate, why we have a Congress.

But there's something else to it and that is, the percentage that they have chosen would force the government expenditures to go back to the 1965 level where there was no Medicaid and no Medicare program in America. So, once again, there are different ways of assaulting and terminating Medicare. One was the direct way that was in the Republican budget that passed this House earlier in which they explicitly said that for all Americans who are not yet 55, there would be no Medicare. They would be given a voucher, and they would have to go buy insurance from the private insurance market, which all of us understand is a very difficult place to get a fair deal. The other way of doing it is in a constitutional amendment, as was proposed yesterday, that would make it impossible to fund Medicare and similarly impossible to fund things like natural disasters.

Let's assume we were at 18 percent, which is the number they've chosen, of GDP and the Federal budget, and we have the great Mississippi flood or the great Missouri flood or the earthquake in California or the hurricane in Florida, billions of dollars. The Federal Government would have no ability under this amendment to step in.

Let me turn to Mr. TONKO. I know you had some other things that you wanted to bring to our attention.

Mr. TONKO. Well, by their own acknowledgement, their own leaders indicated that this would enshrine the Republican agenda to end Medicare in the

United States Constitution. So what we end up with is that we have these very bold statements made, that right there after the freedom of religion and the freedom of thought, the freedom of assembly, we can have the freedom from health care for anyone age 65 and older. That's not quite an honorable position to follow or to promote.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Freedom ''from'' health care.

Mr. TONKO. Yes. I just think that what we have witnessed is a messing with a very precious document, one that governs this democracy, this Republic in a way that was carefully planned by our founding parents. And to take that precious document and to use it in order to promote a political agenda and one that denies access to a health care concept is wrong.

When we look at this 1966 threshold, when we take it back to spending opportunities at that vintage, we need to keep in mind that Medicare, assisting grandparents, grandma and grandpa, means that they're denying the fundamental fact that since 1966, grandparents, grandma is living 10 years longer, on average. So it's not real to take us back to this unwarranted threshold of 1996. And also, we've had much progress in technology and research in medicine so that there are new opportunities for which we avail ourselves the funds.

So I think that a lot of this is not based on reality. It's not based on the desire to serve. It's rather based on denial. And that's not what this should be about. There is a certain bit of dignity. There is a respect factor shown to the senior population. And I can tell you, when you get messages like this at home, Keep your hands off Medicare, we're getting this in letter format, email format, faxes coming into the office, phone calls. Nine to one, every 10 calls coming in, you'll get nine phone calls of advocacy to not only keep Medicare but to strengthen it.

And what we did, as you know, Representative GARAMENDI, we went through and provided those screenings and those annual checkups and made certain that no copayments or deductibles would hold back the opportunity for our seniors. We made certain that we began the process of filling the doughnut hole, and we found savings in the Medicare situation.

And, yes, they're right. They talk about cutting back. We found savings by reducing the profit columns of the insurance industry when it came to Medicare and then transferred—in a very fungible way, we transferred those savings into the development, positive outcome for seniors in the pharmaceutical area because we know that the doughnut hole is a very pricey thing for many people. In just a few months into a calendar year, seniors are dipping into their own pockets to pay for the pharmaceutical costs in order to stay well or to recover from an illness.

So there was great compassion shown here, and we moved forward with a way to fill the doughnut hole completely, completely. And we began that process last year. That is denied again in this process.

Again, to the fact of being concerned about women, if you are concerned about women, why would you cut Head Start programs? Many working moms require Head Start, not only to maintain a career or perhaps work, because you may be a single parent, or even a double income household still needs that job.

□ 1720

Head Start is a good way to develop the social, the educational, and the cognitive skills of youngsters. Why would you deny a quarter of a million of children Head Start? That's that attack on women, working women.

Why would you reduce education by 12 percent in title I areas, as they had suggested, as they did with their budget. That's an attack on educators, most of whom are women. It's still a very highly predominant field for women.

So when we look at some of the attacks here by gender, by age, by income strata, it's clearly assumed here, and documented, that it's an assault on middle class America, on working families. And it is time to grow the middle class, strengthen the middle class, enhance their purchasing power. In so doing, you develop a stronger America.

And so we need to go forward with a laser sharp focus and an honesty that's built by truth, not fiction, and do what is best as we go forward to invest in infrastructure, education, and certainly the improvements that we need to make in innovation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Before we leave the balanced budget amendment, the bill that was on the floor yesterday had two other pieces to it. One of them was to go after the budget of the United States and reduce it by $111 billion, beginning in October of this year. That has real impact. Part of that impact would be felt on Medicare.

Let's just put some understanding into what Medicare is all about. Our colleague from Connecticut did this last night, but it really, I think, is well worth repeating, and so I am going to just read off some statistics, so please bear with me.

In 1965, when Medicare was established, 44 percent of all seniors 65 and over did not have health insurance. Now, of those, 40 percent of the seniors lived in poverty. So you had heavy poverty and you had no insurance. The two are tied together. You get sick, you lost your money, you spent everything you had. The life expectancy at that period was 70 years.

Now, what's happened in the intervening years since 1965? Now, 40 million seniors, nearly every senior in the United States, has health insurance. Not just a little health insurance, they have a comprehensive health insurance policy that covers most everything they need—doctors, hospitals, and drugs.

The poverty rate for seniors has fallen from 40 percent to 10 percent. Why? Social Security and Medicare.

Now, they lived to 70 in 1965. Today, seniors live to an average age of 78½ years. Why? Because they have medical care and they have Social Security providing them with the basics of life.

Now, what happens if the Republican budget were to pass and Social Security were to end, not only for those who are 55 years of age now and want to have Social Security 10 years later in their lives when they become 65, but immediately for seniors, now, if the Republican bill passed, would become law that passed yesterday, and the previous one, the budget bill were to become law? $880 billion would be removed from Medicaid.

Medicaid's a different program than Medicare. This is for impoverished people in America, almost all of whom are in nursing homes. $880 billion, over 10 years, removed from Medicaid. So those seniors, most of whom are women—and I would remind you that we heard from the Republican women here earlier promoting a program that would cut $880 billion out of Medicaid, 70 percent of which goes to nursing homes, the majority of whom in those nursing homes are women. This is not a women's program that they've put forward.

And on the drug side, you were talking about this, Mr. TONKO. This is an immediate reduction, an immediate reduction in the drug benefits, so that 3.9 million seniors would wind up paying $2.2 billion more immediately if the Republican budget were to go into law because of the reduction in the Affordable Care Act that provided this benefit.

These are just some of the things that the American public needs to understand when you get past the sound bites. We must balance the budget and, therefore, the balanced budget amendment.

Well, wait. What is it? What does it really do? It terminates majority rule in America and institutes minority rule so the fundamental of American democracy is trashed; requires that the budget of the United States be ramped back, back, back to the 1965 percentage of GDP, before there was Medicare, which, inevitably and inextricably means that Medicare is over once that balanced budget amendment passes.

Mr. TONKO, please continue.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, what I didn't hear, though, was the resolve of the default crisis. I didn't hear advocacy from the other side about paying our bills. I'm hearing about cutting away at middle class values and middle class needs. I didn't hear about the default crisis and paying our bills.

We're saying we need to respond to a default crisis, and we're also talking about a jobs agenda. We haven't seen one jobs bill in the House brought forward. And that is a major concern, because the jobs crisis, when resolved by

producing jobs and investing in jobs, resolves the revenue crisis, the spending crisis, the deficit crisis. So we need to go forward.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You've moved to a subject that we really want to get to, which is jobs, but this is my favorite.

Mr. TONKO. Just on the Medicaid/Medicare piece, if I could just say one thing.

When we fall short on the Medicaid side, it falls again upon the property taxpayer, and again, if you're on a fixed income, as many seniors are, and again, the disproportionate number of women in households in the senior years are going to be, again, impacted by a property tax that, when levied on that home, doesn't know if you're unemployed, on fixed income, underemployed, so it will be hitting a retiree on fixed income very, very hard.

And so we're transferring from a progressive income tax and a progressive series of taxes at the Federal level on over to a State situation where it's going to trickle down into a property tax, which is grossly unfair.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And on the individuals.

Let's move on beyond it. But this is something that I always put up when we talk about Medicare, and that is it was 1965. This is a tombstone, and it says: Medicare 1965–2011. Created by LBJ. Destroyed by the GOP. No doubt about it.

Mr. TONKO. We've had three votes to end Medicare.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Three votes in the first 6 months, now 6½ months of this new Congress, three votes by the Republicans that have put up three different measures that terminate Medicare as we know it.

Mr. TONKO. To give tax cuts to the job creators.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Oh, to the job creators. You must mean those wealthy folks.

Mr. TONKO. We're told it's the millionaire-billionaire tax cut that responded to the needs of the job creators.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We've been joined by an individual from the great State of Vermont who has spoken many times on this floor about jobs and about what we need to do.

Thank you for joining us. Share your thoughts.

Mr. WELCH. We are in a very serious situation now. We're what, 11 days away from perhaps, the first time in the history of this country, not paying our bills. And it's extraordinarily damaging what that will do to our economy. I mean, interest rates will go up. If we have a 1 percent increase in our debt service, that's going to mean $140 billion more in taxpayer expense to service the debt. And I don't care whether you have a NANCY PELOSI point of view that we could use that money better on infrastructure or an ERIC CANTOR point of view that you could use that for tax cuts, that's money out the door. That is squandered money. And the damage to the economy and to this asset, the AAA rating, is enormous, and that ripples through the economy and starts hurting people, individuals.

If you have a mortgage, your mortgage rates can go up on an adjusted rate loan. If you want to buy a car, you have to borrow some money, your rates are going to go up. If you have put aside money for your kids to go to college, which is, as we all know, incredibly expensive, the markets are going to create an immense amount of turmoil, and the likelihood is you'll take a real hit on that.

□ 1730

If your retirement savings, if you're about to retire and you've been saving all your life, that can get whacked. This is reckless and irresponsible. We have to pay our bills.

Now it is true that we've got a long-term fiscal challenge that requires a long-term fiscal plan, but this first time in the history of our country literally holding hostage our obligation to pay our bills to getting your way on your design of how we should have a long-term fiscal plan, that's never been done before.

You know, in all candor, both sides in the past have tended to grandstand when it comes to the debt ceiling. The custom has been around here that the party that's out of power and doesn't have the responsibility to get the debt ceiling passed so that we pay our bills grandstands about it, but neither side has ever actually held that debt ceiling and that obligation to pay our bills hostage.

Ronald Reagan, who was not at all shy about engaging in tax fights and budget fights, raised the debt ceiling. He never would use the full faith and credit of this country to win his battles because he knew that would cause too much harm to the economy; it's putting a loaded gun at the head of the American economy. We have got to get back to the basics here. We've got to pay our bills.

My hope is that then we would work together because we don't have to cut Medicare to get to fiscal solvency. We do have to reform the way we deliver health care to bring down the cost of health care, but if we have a balanced approach where we include revenues, we include the Pentagon, and we, as Democrats, look very hard at various spending programs and are willing to share in the effort to get ourselves onto fiscal solvency, we can do that. So we can make progress if we work together and just recognize the obvious: we've got to pay our bills, and we also have to work together to get a long-term fiscal plan.

Mr. GARAMENDI. PETER, as we stand here on the floor of this House debating an extraordinarily important moment in time about the direction we're going to go, this issue of paying our bills, we need to understand that what we're really talking about here is not tomorrow's bills; we're talking about expenditures that have been made over the years dating back to World War II and even before World War II, expenditures that have been made, votes by the majority of this House and by the Senate, signed by the President, America decided to spend the money. Earlier, I put up a chart here talking about where it came from—this House. And George W. Bush voted to reduce taxes, created a deficit, had to borrow money, voted to start and to carry out two wars, Afghanistan and Iraq, borrowed money to do it. These are past expenditures. And here we are 12 days away from the default crisis where our Republican friends are using this moment in time where we're not really discussing tomorrow's expenditures; we're talking about yesterday's expenditures, and they're saying give us our way or else America defaults.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, I think that the message from the Democrats in the House of Representatives is straightforward and very logical: Don't end Medicare. We saw three votes to end Medicare in the House. We say save Medicare, make it stronger. But then we talk about cutting, cutting programs that don't create jobs; do those cuts where there are not jobs created. Where there are, save those programs, strengthen them; provide for jobs by investing in education, in innovation, and in infrastructure. And it's very easy when you take the education investment, the infrastructure investment, and certainly the education investment, that equals jobs for Americans, for middle class Americans. And that's what it's all about. If we create jobs, it drives down the unemployment factor, drives down the deficit. And there's no stronger form of medicine, bar none, than jobs being created. It solves a revenue crisis, it solves a deficit crisis, it solves a spending crisis.

Some of these programs are correlated directly with unemployment. There is a need to address the needs of the unemployed, the poor. If you put people to work, if you invest in retraining programs, education, if you invest in R&D to grow, move ideas along to a manufacturing mode and then you make it in America, these are the values that we embrace as a party in the House.

I think it has been a refreshing message, one that really gets to something here. And at the same time we're speaking to the default crisis, we're saying this is how we resolve that default crisis. Don't walk away from the obligation, the responsibility to pay our bills. And as you said, two wars, a pharmaceutical deal for part D for Medicare, and millionaire and billionaire tax cuts were all spent, those were all forms of spending. And all of that, all of that was borrowed in order to spend on tax cuts. And now the bills have come home to be paid. It happened a decade ago—it doesn't matter,

they are bills that have to be paid. We cannot put the economic vitality and viability of this Nation at risk or trigger an international economic crisis by not paying our bills.

So we address the default crisis, we save Medicare and strengthen Medicare, and we have a formula of innovation, education, and infrastructure that equals jobs for Americans, working families, and middle class Americans. It's straightforward. It's straightforward.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We kept hearing from our Republican colleagues that what America needs is a cut, balance—how does that work?

Mr. TONKO. I don't know because it was messing with the Constitution. And The Wall Street Journal advised, don't mess with the Constitution, leave the Constitution out of this. And there were those who were economic advisors to President Reagan who said this is frightening—the exact words were very denouncing. And so no one took that seriously. And we spent hours here debating on a format that adjusts the Constitution, and some of the best minds who have worked in government from very conservative perspectives have said this was a wasteful measure.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, the Republican—we heard it here over and over again, it was cut, balance—whatever. What I kept hearing is cut, slash, and burn because they're going to cut and slash critical programs for seniors.

I think what Americans really, really want, they want a job.

Mr. TONKO. They want to work.

Mr. GARAMENDI. They want to go to work. They want an invest, grow, and build policy—not a cut, slash, and burn policy, but an invest, grow, and build. They want to invest, as you say, in education. They want their kids to have an education. They want to build the infrastructure. And they want to see the economy grow. But I'll tell you what happens when you start cutting, slashing, and burning. Here's what happens: If you take a look at the American economy, beginning in December of 2009, just start right there, just say that's the equilibrium point—wasn't a good day at all in America, a lot of jobs were not available. But we've seen 2.8 million jobs created in the private sector, okay. Simultaneously, we have seen cut, slash, and burn at the Federal level, as the Republicans have taken control and put in their continuing resolutions and reduced the Federal budget—and at the State level, and we've seen 378,000 jobs lost in the public sector. These are police, firemen, teachers, people that are out there making sure that our food is safe, and so forth.

So the reality is, we're seeing the government jobs go down. For every 100 government jobs that are cut, 30 private sector jobs are lost because those people depend upon the payroll from those government jobs.

The Simpson Bowles deficit commission said it very clearly: This is a long-term problem. We need to solve the deficit over the long term. We cannot and should not solve it with immediate cuts because it will impair the recovery of America. And here's what's happening: We're seeing the growth in the private sector retarded as the public sector reduces. This is the effect of the cut, slash, and burn strategy that our Republican colleagues want to put forward.

So what's going on in Vermont?

□ 1740

Mr. WELCH. Well, let's talk about the balanced budget amendment. We in Vermont don't have a balanced budget amendment. We're the only State that doesn't have it. We have always managed to balance our budget. And we have done that when we have had Republican administrations and Democratic administrations.

The balanced budget amendment in Congress I think has some hazards because the Federal Government at certain times is the one tool that the American people have to be countercyclical. If the economy is really going down and it requires the Federal Government to step up to try to maintain purchasing power, that is debatable; but it is the only tool that we have as citizens is the Federal Government to do that.

I think what the balanced budget amendment suggests is that you can legislate away your future problems. You can come up with a fix that is going to guarantee you're not going to have to suffer through trying to figure out how to solve very difficult problems, either because it is a national security threat, it's a collapse in the economy like we had with the collapse of Wall Street.

And by and large it's not any way for us to avoid making direct and difficult decisions where we balance our revenue needs and we balance our spending needs based on the circumstances, and that's the constant work of Congress. It requires the application of judgment, it requires cooperation, and it requires the ability to be flexible and responsive to the circumstances that exist.

A balanced budget amendment is one size fits all that puts us in handcuffs in an effort to try to avoid getting out of balance.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. WELCH.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) has joined us, and directly in front of me is the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Let me turn to the gentleman from Colorado first.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI.

I think you all have been focused on the real issue in front of us. We have some budget issues, but the best way to handle our debt is to put people back to work. The quickest way to reduce the debt or the deficit is to put people back to work. All of a sudden you have revenue coming in, and you don't have to pay unemployment and COBRA and you don't have to pay so much Medicaid. That's the first order of business. Plus, it really makes people feel valuable. Anybody knows that a job gives you dignity. That's what you're looking for, a good job to care for your families and provide for the future. That's what we have to do here.

And Democrats, our formula is innovate, educate, rebuild our infrastructure, equals jobs, equals good jobs that are long lasting that people can rely on and they can work and feel good about their lives and the future for their family.

Now, one of the things that we have said as Democrats is if we make it in America, we will make it in America. Instead of sending jobs overseas, let's have them here. We have the finest people in the world, some of the most talented and skilled people anywhere, and we need to be making things in this country.

In Colorado, for instance, one of the places where we can see these jobs is in our energy sector, both in traditional energy, oil and gas development, but also in new energy—energy efficiency, renewable energy, solar, wind, biomass, new jobs, good jobs. And so all this budget talk, all of this balanced budget stuff that I think does real damage to the Constitution, that should be going to the side. We have to focus on putting people back to work with good jobs that last a long time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let's just get ourselves into a good discussion here. The great Midwest, Ohio, the industrial center of America, being rebuilt by BETTY SUTTON.

I yield to the gentlelady from Ohio.

Ms. SUTTON. Thank you. I thank my colleagues for being down here fighting the fight that the American people want us to fight. And that's a fight for jobs. The American people, the people I represent in Ohio, their number one priority by all means is about putting people back to work. As Representative PERLMUTTER just stated so eloquently, it is really about empowering people. They don't want a lot from their government, but they do want a government that works with them and for them, and to the extent possible plays that role that will help spur our economy, invest in infrastructure which puts people back to work, and levels the playing field for our manufacturers.

I come from a place where we have a very strong manufacturing base, and it hasn't always been treated fairly. We have had a lot of unfair trade deals that have been passed that hurt the people that I represent, and we have a lot of policies that frankly didn't do them well. We can do better.

But here we are 200-some days into this new Congress under this Republican leadership and not a single jobs plan to come before this body. It is quite amazing to think about. Instead, what are they talking about, imposing a budget that ends Medicare and protects the very tax breaks that end up shipping our jobs overseas.

Well, I am proud to stand with you tonight and work on those policies that will put America back to work and strengthen not only our infrastructure but our economy which will keep our place in this world as leaders. And so as we move forward, I hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will get focused on what America needs, and that is jobs, jobs, and jobs.

We have a role to play. We can deal with the deficit. We should deal with the deficit; but the kinds of cuts that they are talking about, ending Medicare, taking this out of our seniors instead of cutting those tax breaks that have existed for those oil companies and others at the very top that have been a burden to our middle class because they are the ones who have to make up the difference, let's focus on jobs. Let's encourage our colleagues in the GOP to get on board and start working on what America needs, and that is to put America back to work.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And we're going to make it in America. America is going to make it. This is a great, strong country. Yesterday, I heard during the debate that we're broke. We're not broke at all. We've got a deficit problem; we can deal with that with some good policies when we put people to work.

This is America, and we're going to make it in America.

Let's look at that chart that Mr. PERLMUTTER has over there. Trade policies. We talked about that a little bit.

Taxes. We're spending our tax money on buying equipment that's made overseas when it ought to be made in Ohio—the buses, the trains, the solar panels, and the wind turbines. How about doing those in Colorado? You have a plant there. Use our tax money to buy American-made equipment.

Talk to me about research. Mr. TONKO, you come from one of the great early research centers of America.

Mr. TONKO. The original tech valley. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI. I know we don't have much time. I'll do this quickly.

The 21st Congressional District that I represent in upstate New York is the host community to the Erie Canal barge canal. It gave birth to a necklace of communities dubbed mill towns that became the epicenters of invention and innovation. That same pioneer spirit is fed today. It's part of our DNA. But you need investments in R&D. It's why my region is now one of the top five in the country for the growth of green collar jobs, innovation that is being advanced simply by investing, as we did in the prior Congress, in job creation. Not cutting programs that provide opportunities for work.

Instead, they are going and building up programs like handouts to the oil companies that aren't producing a job, tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. They need the dollars for that. They're cutting valuable programs that either speak to the dignity factor for our seniors through Medicare or advancing research and development that grows jobs. That's what we need to do.

The Democrats are on message. Jobs, jobs, jobs. Solve the jobs crisis, you'll resolve the deficit situation, the revenue situation, and the spending situation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We're going to put people back to work, and one way we're going to do it is with a clean energy policy. We need a national security policy on energy. I know that part of that solution is going to come from Colorado where they are doing the research and where they are making some of this equipment and from middle America. And I suspect even Vermont will have a piece of this puzzle.

Mr. PERLMUTTER, tell us about energy systems in Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I know time is short, but in Colorado, we are very fortunate to have the National Renewable Energy Lab which is the finest lab of its kind anywhere in the world to help us develop ways to better use our energy. A gallon saved is a gallon earned, you know that kind of thing, but focus on energy efficiency, renewable energy, solar, wind, biomass, geothermal, those are new jobs. And to be more efficient with traditional energy sources, to be smarter about how we use them and how we extract them.

This is about restoring the American Dream for people, that they have good jobs, a good education, dignified and healthy lives of seniors. That's what we want to restore for America, not all of this gloom and doom and all that we're hearing and cuts. This is about restoring the American Dream, and we can do this.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Okay, we are going to have our bullet session here. We'll start with Ms. SUTTON from Ohio.

Ms. SUTTON. Thank you again for having this hour. It is so important that we do make it in America. I talked a little bit about jobs. I have a bill right now that is pending that I would encourage the Republicans to join me in passing. It's called the Keep American Jobs From Going Down the Drain Act. It says that as we rebuild our infrastructure here, our water infrastructure and sewer infrastructure, we do it with American iron and steel and manufactured goods. It's a jobs bill; it's a strengthening bill. It's good for America. This is a strong and great country. And I agree with my colleague, we can do better by it.

□ 1750

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Our country is strong. Our economy is one that is bolstered by job creation. And we've said it so many times over and over again: Don't cut valuable programs. Allow our seniors the dignity of Medicare. That enables them to have economic sustainability, vitality. That is important. And we invest from children to seniors in a way that produces jobs, strengthens regional, State, and the national economies, and we go forward.

And I think the optimism is there. Our message is one of can do, not denial, cuts, slash, burn.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH. Three points:

One, let's pay our bills. We always have; we always will;

Two, let's have a long-term budget plan to stabilize our budget with a balanced approach—revenues as well as cuts, the Pentagon as well as reforming how we deliver health care;

Three, let's make it in America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We're going to make it in America. When we do, America will make it. We will put forth, as Democrats, a jobs program. We're going to invest, we're going to grow, and we're going to build this economy. That's our promise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE FORMER LIBERIAN REGIME OF CHARLES TAYLOR—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112–45)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RENACCI) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication stating that the national emergency and related measures dealing with the former regime of Charles Taylor are to continue in effect beyond July 22, 2011.

The actions and policies of former Liberian President Charles Taylor and other persons, in particular their unlawful depletion of Liberian resources and their removal from Liberia and secreting of Liberian funds and property, continue to undermine Liberia's transition to democracy and the orderly development of its political, administrative, and economic institutions and resources. These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 20, 2011*.

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 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1835

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT) at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1315, CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2011

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–172) on the resolution (H. Res. 358) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1315) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2551, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–173) on the resolution (H. Res. 359) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after 3 p.m. and July 21 on account of attending a funeral.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 21, 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:

2554. A letter from the Acting Director, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Competitive and Noncompetitive Non-Formula Federal Assistance Programs — Administrative Provisions for the Sun Grant Program (RIN: 0524-AA64) received July 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2555. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement; Prohibition on Interrogation of Detainees by Contractor Personnel (DFARS Case 2010-D027) (RIN: 0750-AG88) received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2556. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Simplified Acquisition Threshold for Humanitarian or Peacekeeping Operations (DFARS Case 2011-D032) (RIN: 0750-AH29) received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2557. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule — Truth in Lending [Regulation Z; Docket No.: R-1422] received July 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2558. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Consumer Leasing [Regulation M; Docket No.: R-1423] received July 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2559. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Truth in Lending [Regulation Z; Docket No.: R-1424] received July 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2560. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2561. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Ear, Nose, and Throat Devices; Classification of the Wireless Air-Conduction Hearing Aid [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0361] received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2562. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; 2011 Management Measures; Correction [Docket No.: 110223162-1295-02] (RIN: 0648-XA184) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2563. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; 2011 Specifications for the Spiny Dogfish Fishery [Docket No.: 110303179-1290-02] (RIN: 0648-XA163) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2564. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No.: 110111018-1279-03] (RIN: 0648-XA109) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2565. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Alaska Plaice in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XA482) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2566. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Alaska Plaice in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XA483) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2567. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Management Measures [Docket No.: 110422261-1309-02] (RIN: 0648-BA70) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2568. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 2011 and 2012 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish; Correction [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 6048-XZ90) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2569. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Operation and Maintenance of the Neptune Liquefied Natural Gas Facility off Massachusetts [Docket No.: 0808041026-1295-02] (RIN: 0648-AX09) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2570. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Limited Access for Guided Sport Charter Vessels in Alaska [Docket No.: 110601314-1313-01] (RIN: 0648-BA99) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2571. A letter from the Assistant Department Administrator for Operations, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule

— Limited Endangered and Threatened Species: Threatened Status for the Oregon Coast Coho Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit [Docket No.: 110531311-1310-02] (RIN: 0648-XA407) received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2572. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures [Docket No.: 100804324-1295-03] (RIN: 0648-BA01) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2573. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Monkfish; Amendment 5 [Docket No.: 090225241-1233-03] (RIN: 0648-AX70) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2574. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Optional Standard Mileage Rates [Announcement 2011-40] recevied June 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 290. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to ensure that memorials commemorating the service of the United States Armed Forces may contain religious symbols, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 295. A bill to amend the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998 to authorize funds to acquire hydrographic data and provide hydrographic services specific to the Arctic for safe navigation, delineating the United States extended continental shelf, and the monitoring and description of coastal changes (Rept. 112–157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 441. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue permits for a microhydro project in nonwilderness areas within the boundaries of Denali National Park and Preserve, to acquire land for Denali National Park and Preserve from Doyon Tourism, Inc., and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 112–158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 470. A bill to further allocate and expand the availability of hydroelectric power generated at Hoover Dam, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–159, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 489. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the C.C. Cragin Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 643. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain land located in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112–161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 670. A bill to convey certain submerged lands to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in order to give that territory the same benefits in its submerged lands as Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa have in their submerged lands (Rept. 112–162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 686. A bill to require the conveyance of certain public land within the boundaries of Camp Williams, Utah, to support the training and readiness of the Utah National Guard; with an amendment (Rept. 112–163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 765. A bill to amend the National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986 to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture regarding additional recreational uses of National Forest System land that is subject to ski area permits, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–164. Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 944. A bill to eliminate an unused lighthouse reservation, provide management consistency by incorporating the rocks and small islands along the coast of Orange County, California, into the California Coastal National Monument managed by the Bureau of Land Management, and meet the original Congressional intent of preserving Orange County's rocks and small islands, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1022. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of alternatives for commemorating and interpreting the role of the Buffalo Soldiers in the early years of the National Parks, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1141. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System (Rept. 112–167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1160. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey the McKinney Lake National Fish Hatchery to the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLF: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2596. A bill making appropriations for Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 320. A bill to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California (Rept. 112–170). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 266. An act to redesignate the Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge as the Sam D. Hamilton Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge (Rept. 112–171). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 358. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1315) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–172). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 359. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–173). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Budget discharged from further consideration. H.R. 470 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 2594. A bill to prohibit operators of civil aircraft of the United States from participating in the European Union's emissions trading scheme, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. SCHOCK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LATHAM, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 2595. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of permanent national surveillance systems for multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, and other neurological diseases and disorders; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 2596. A bill making appropriations for Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 2597. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to allow for certain claims of nationals of the United States against Turkey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 2598. A bill to establish a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) Master Teacher Corps program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. HAYWORTH (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. COLE, Mr. HANNA, Mr. DOLD, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2599. A bill to prevent Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and other Federal residential and commercial mortgage lending regulators from adopting policies that contravene established State and local property assessed clean energy laws; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KISSELL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BARROW, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SIRES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PENCE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 2600. A bill to provide for implementation of the National Pediatric Acquired Brain Injury Plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2601. A bill to provide permanent authority for the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to enter into stewardship contracting projects with private persons or other public or private entities to perform services to achieve land management goals for National Forest System lands and the public lands that meet local and rural community needs; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. SHULER):

H.R. 2602. A bill to improve the accountability and transparency in infrastructure spending by requiring a life-cycle cost analysis of major infrastructure projects, providing the flexibility to use alternate infrastructure type bidding procedures to reduce project costs, and requiring the use of design standards to improve efficiency and save taxpayer dollars; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 2603. A bill to prohibit the enforcement of a climate change interpretive guidance issued by the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 2604. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of securities of a controlled corporation exchanged for assets in certain reorganizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Ms. LEE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H. Res. 360. A resolution expressing support for the sixth IAS Conference on HIV Pathogenesis, Treatment, and Prevention and the sense of the House of Representatives that continued commitment by the United States to HIV/AIDS research, prevention, and treatment programs is crucial to protecting global health; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. LEE, and Ms. BASS of California):

H. Res. 361. A resolution concerning efforts to provide humanitarian relief to mitigate the effects of drought and avert famine in the Horn of Africa, particularly Somalia, Ethiopia, Djibouti, and Kenya; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 2594.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 2595.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 2596.

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. PALLONE:

H.R. 2597.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 2598.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. HAYWORTH:

H.R. 2599.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause (Art. I, §8, cl. 3) of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 2600.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 1.

By Mr. LUJÁN:

H.R. 2601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2602.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 2603.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8 Clause 18

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2604.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 104: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 121: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 140: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 198: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 207: Ms. BASS of California.
H.R. 343: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 350: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 361: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 422: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 452: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SCHILLING, and Mr. LEWIS of California.
H.R. 507: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BOSWELL, and Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 576: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 591: Mr. HOLT and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 615: Mr. WOODALL and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 637: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 687: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 692: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 721: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 733: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 735: Mr. HURT.

H.R. 791: Mr. JONES and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 808: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 835: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 942: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 969: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1001: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1025: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1070: Ms. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 1084: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1155: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1156: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1172: Mr. COHEN and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1283: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1297: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 1325: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1340: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1344: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1351: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1370: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1385: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1397: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 1416: Mr. AUSTRIA.
H.R. 1418: Mr. MCKEON and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 1465: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 1466: Mr. REYES, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FARR, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1513: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 1533: Mr. LANDRY.
H.R. 1588: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1648: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1653: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 1683: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1700: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 1712: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1744: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1781: Mr. TONKO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1802: Mr. TONKO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1822: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 1872: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 1897: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1919: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1947: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1974: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1980: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 2005: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 2010: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 2014: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BONNER, and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 2036: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 2076: Mr. ROSS of Florida and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
H.R. 2137: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 2146: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2164: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2182: Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 2198: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2204: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 2236: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 2239: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2245: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2250: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 2257: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2267: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2268: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 2324: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WU, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2341: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2397: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2402: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 2407: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 2412: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 2433: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 2442: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 2447: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2457: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 2458: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2492: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. DENT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2499: Ms. LEE
H.R. 2505: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2514: Mr. SCHILLING and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 2527: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2529: Mr. HECK and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 2530: Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. REYES, Mr. JONES, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2541: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 2544: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2557: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 2570: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 2581: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2587: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. ROSS of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 64: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H. Res. 137: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H. Res. 262: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Res. 317: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 333: Mr. PAYNE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative ELLISON, or a designee, to H.R. 1315, the Consumer Financial Protection Safety and Soundness Improvement Act of 2011, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. COLE

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 to implement any rule, regulation, or executive order regarding the disclosure of political contributions that takes effect on or after the date of enactment of this Act.