United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 2011 No. 119

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER. 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.

GOVERNMENT'S AUTO PILOT DOWNWARD SPIRAL

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. For weeks now, we've faced the artificial Republican debt crisis, which was a crisis of Republican choice. And now with an agreement coming forward, we should ask the question: Is this worse than the default scare? Well, it's hardly clear. What about a government on auto pilot, locked into a slow downward spiral?

First, this empowers the most reckless and extreme elements, not just in the House Republicans today but is a blueprint for mischief for either party in the future. Next, we are starting down a path of budget cuts that all experts assure us will weaken the economy at exactly the time we need to strengthen economic growth, not reduce demand. Clearly it is a step backwards from reforming how the country does business.

The fixation on triggers, formulas, and supercommittees will make it easier for Congress to duck the difficult policy work and harder to do it, if Congress wants to try.

Even as it would appear we avoid outright default, this agreement casts a long-term shadow over our Nation's reasonableness and our reliability for the next 2 years and beyond. And remember the drama over the continuing resolution earlier this year? There are still two potential government shutdowns over the next 14 months that will invite more legislative blackmail over an extreme agenda since it's clear that recklessness works.

This is all the more frustrating because the path forward is clear. The public strongly supports a balanced approach which would include tax reform that would raise money while making the Tax Code more fair and simple.

Everyone knows we must deal with health care costs; and until recently, there was bipartisan agreement as to how to do that. We should accelerate the health care reforms which are already enacted into law but do it faster to improve care and lower costs.

Do we need to require a commission to implement bipartisan suggestions to right-size the military, both its mission and its budget? Absolutely not. There are ideas floating around and support on both sides of the aisle to do that now.

Most important, perhaps, we should revitalize the economy by rebuilding and renewing America, financed by modest increases in user fees. One of the things that is actually the most simple would be to implement bipartisan suggestions to reform agriculture, to save money while helping people who farm and people who eat by reducing massive unnecessary subsidies to large agribusiness.

This agreement delays the important work while it weakens both the economy and the decision-making process. Government on auto pilot in a slow downward spiral is not a victory.

THE REPUBLICAN SOLUTION TO THE DEBT CRISIS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, here we are, after a long weekend of hyperbole and backroom deal cutting at the White House, and here's the product right here.

If you look through it, it's pretty interesting. There's no balance. There are no revenues. God forbid we would ask, as the Republicans call them, ''the job creators,'' the millionaires and billionaires, to pay anything toward further supporting our country, to close some of the tax loopholes that allow hedge fund managers to pay taxes at half the rate of their clerks, you know, things like that. No, that would be a reach too far to ask them to share in the sacrifice.

What we do see here is that there will be cuts, and very few are specified. But strangely enough, there's one that the Republicans always go after because, you know, they hang out at the country club, and at the country club, nobody's worried about putting their kid through college. But the one specified cut in here is in graduate school financial assistance.

Now, that's kind of peculiar. We have a doctor shortage looming, and medical school is phenomenally expensive. But I guess it's just going to be the rich kids who are going to go to medical school in the future, not the middle-class kids, not the struggling kids. Just the rich kids. So that's the one specified cut, the ''one'' specified cut. The rest, we don't even know.

Talking about a pig in a poke, this is a pig in a poke. Where's that $1 trillion of cuts going to come from? First round, second round, another $1.5 trillion, and not one penny in revenues. And the grand result is about $2.5 trillion of deficit reduction.

Printed on recycled paper.

If we just let all the Bush tax cuts expire—all of them—if we went back to the bad old days of the Clinton tax rates that the Republicans claimed would destroy the economy—except actually what happened was, we had 3.8 percent unemployment, and we paid down debt with the Clinton tax rates. But, yes, ''the job creators'' had to pay a little bit more. Those were really bad times, the Republicans would have us believe. So we don't want to go back there. We want to stay in the current day.

We have been cutting taxes now for 11 years of Bush tax cuts, 3 years with Obama as a coconspirator on the Bush tax cuts. Where are the jobs? Well, let's just keep doing it, and maybe it will create jobs.

It's not going to create jobs. There are no jobs. There are no jobs in this package.

At the least, at the least, they could have extended the Federal Aviation Administration authority. Now, most people think, what does that mean? Well, a week ago last Friday, authority to run the Federal Aviation Administration expired. The air traffic controllers are working under emergency provisions, and they're being paid out of the trust fund, which is being drawn down. But all of the taxes went away. So we're walking away from $200 million a week—that is in taxes that would come from users of the system. Most of the airlines have raised their ticket prices to capture that money.

Four thousand Federal employees have lost their jobs or are laid off, are collecting unemployment. Republicans don't care about Federal employees; so let's put that aside.

□ 1010

But 90,000 private sector construction workers and small businesses are also unemployed because we have brought all the safety and security improvements across the entire system to a screeching halt because we are not collecting taxes, which the airlines are now capturing for profits. Could that be in here? That would put 94,000 people back to work. No, that's not in here. That's too much to ask.

There isn't a single job in this package. The biggest problem in America, the greatest deficit we have is in job creation. If we could get back down around 5 percent unemployment, guess what: Those people are working, they are not drawing unemployment benefits, they are not drawing food stamps because they are desperate to put food on the table and the unemployment isn't enough, and a quarter of the deficit would go away with people working.

How about transportation infrastructure? One hundred and fifty thousand bridges are crumbling, need to be replaced or rehabilitated; a $70 billion backlog in critical investment in our transit systems across the country, all made in America, manufacturing jobs, engineering jobs. No, can't do those sorts of things in this bill.

We can't make investments because the Republicans say everything government does is bad. So we can't even make investments. We can't discriminate between wasteful spending, consumptive spending, and investments that will put people back to work, as they claim government can't put people back to work.

That's funny. I wonder who built our national highway system. I don't think it was the private sector. I don't think it was the financiers on Wall Street. The billionaires and the millionaires are escaping any meaningful taxation at this point, seeing the lowest level of taxation on their incomes since, you know, forever, basically.

We can't ask them to do anything. We can't invest, we can't create jobs, and we are going to cut student financial aid for sure and a few other things.

DEBT CEILING

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we will be gathering this morning in a number of conferences and caucuses to assess the work over the weekend that addresses a procedural process that most Americans were never made aware of for the last 100 times since 1917, that we raise the debt ceiling. It is tragic that these two words have become such dastardly words in the American psychic and the American vocabulary, and it has been characterized as reckless spending in Washington more than what it is, which most Americans do at the end of the month, and that is to pay their bills.

I had the privilege of joining in a balanced budget process in the 1990s, and, frankly, it was a joy. It was good to do good things in a bipartisan manner on behalf of the American people.

Out of that process came something called the Children's Health Insurance Program that helped insure, over these last couple of years, millions and millions of children and, yes, we had a balanced budget. In the course of it, of course, in the rush of doing that budget we skewed the reimbursements for physicians, the doctors that you see in your hamlets and villages and counties and cities and States, the doctors that many of you send to medical school who happen to be your children, the doctors who take an oath to care for the American people.

Yes, we skewed their reimbursement. So, now, every year we have to confront the unfairness of how we reimburse our doctors, the doctors who work in public health institutions, county hospitals, clinics. This is what happens when you rush to do something that should be ordinary.

So today I rise looking towards the meetings that will go on today. In many of them we will huddle together to try and do the right thing. But I asked months ago for us to raise the debt ceiling, as has been done 17 times for the President of the United States, President Reagan and other Presidents who have asked to have that done, and then begin to look long term. As Mark Zandi has indicated, and a number of economists have said, immediate cuts will be damaging to this economy.

But I rise today to speak of the vulnerable persons who really can't speak for themselves. Many people think seniors have lobbyists in one of the major, largest, if you will, lobbying group for seniors, and they do a great job.

But I know seniors who really are huddled in small apartments and old, old homes left to them by their deceased spouse, something they paid for but has deteriorated over the years. Because we are not helping seniors with their rehab anymore, and many of them got reverse mortgages that really took them to the cleaners and left them with nonperforming contractors who did a poor job on their homes, these are the seniors who don't have voices.

Or, maybe, the vulnerable families in Latino and African American communities where the wealth distinction has showed, where our majority Americans, white Americans, have a wealth factor of $113,000; and, respectively, African Americans have $5,000; and Hispanics, Latinos at $6,000. Now that doesn't cover all. There are people in Appalachia and other places around the Nation where that disparity is very, very strong.

But it does mean that there is a population of vulnerable Americans. And the question is whether or not the approach that we are going to take today in doing something as simple as raising the debt ceiling to allow us to pay our bills has a dastardly part to it that causes the laying off of hundreds of thousands of Americans because there is no job creation.

Because when you cause us to stop spending money to encourage the economy to move such as the 3 million jobs that were created with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, then there is no job creation. Our private sector is not moving as fast as we would like.

We hope this will spur them on, but I have heard that before. I have heard, during the TARP and the bailout of banks, just give us a chance. And you ask any small business around America whether they are able to access capital to build their structure and their business, small businesses that I truly believe are the backbone of America. If we did nothing on this floor but every day do something, give a gift to small businesses and health care, give a gift to them in tax relief, give a gift to them in incentive to grow their business, and you would see Americans being hired.

Small businesses are as small as one individual sitting in front of their computer. That is what we should be doing.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about going forward with a complex approach to the debt ceiling while thousands of Americans are out of jobs, where airlines are taking money they should not take, while the FAA is shut down. We have many other problems to take care of while construction jobs are at a standstill.

What about the vulnerable Americans? That's what my concern will be about as we go through these meetings and approach this floor today.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 18 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 pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) at noon.

PRAYER

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

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

We ask Your blessing upon those who have worked so hard these past few days to help bring our Nation to a level of security. Not all are completely satisfied, but help us all to proceed graciously, remaining vigilant for those values held most dear while being just.

In the days that come, help each Member to understand well and interpret positively, as they are able, the positions of those with whom they disagree. Grant to each the wisdom of Solomon, and to us all the faith and confidence to know that no matter how difficult things appear to be, You continue to walk with our Nation, as You have done for over two centuries.

May all that is done today in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan 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 PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 375, legislative business is not dispensed with on this day.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

THE WINNERS TODAY ARE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today the agreement that we will be voting on is another example of the historic pivot here in Washington because never before in history has an increase in our Nation's debt limit been tied to cuts in spending.

No longer will the debate be about how much more is the Federal Government going to spend; the debate now is how much spending is going to be cut.

This legislation will require more than $2.1 trillion in Federal spending cuts; puts in place firm caps to hold down future spending; both Houses of Congress must have an up-or-down vote on a balanced budget amendment; it does not impose any job-killing tax increases; it avoids a default on Federal obligations that would be disastrous to our economy; and it begins a process to put this Nation on a path to prosperity.

We have so much more that still needs to be done, but this is further progress in turning the Federal Government toward fiscal sanity so we can leave a better America for our children and our grandchildren.

ORDINARY FOLKS EXCLUDED

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, it seems whenever important decisions are made by a few people inside a room inside the Beltway, ordinary folks are not only excluded from the room but seem to be excluded from the minds of the people in the room.

I'm talking about ordinary folks working to keep their heads above water; ordinary folks working to keep their mortgage, keep their homes; retirees living on a fixed income; students hoping to have help in going to college; those who are working to improve people's health and our Nation's energy supply—ordinary folks.

What makes anyone think that a supercommittee of 12 people operating in a room inside the Beltway in November is going to do a better job looking after the interests of ordinary folks.

REMEMBERING JUDGE MATTHEW J. PERRY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, South Carolina lost one of its greatest leaders, United States District Judge Matthew J. Perry. Judge Perry symbolized courage and leadership and was a towering figure during the civil rights movement of the 1950s through the 1970s.

After having served in the U.S. Army from 1942 to 1945 as a sergeant in the Quartermaster Corps, Judge Perry graduated from South Carolina State with a B.S. in business. He went on to graduate from South Carolina State Law School in 1951. As a young attorney, Judge Perry established his credibility in South Carolina by defending many of the students protesting segregation during sit-ins.

In 1976, he was nominated by Senator Strom Thurmond to the U.S. Military Court of Appeals in Washington. In 1979, he was the first African American to be appointed as a U.S. District Judge for South Carolina. He has been the recipient of the Order of the Palmetto, the highest civilian honor of the State of South Carolina.

Our Nation has truly lost a legend who has made a difference for all of the people of South Carolina.

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

DEBT CEILING LEGISLATION

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. This is a little different than the Reid bill we voted on

on Saturday. It actually increases military spending $78 billion over the bill that we voted on on Saturday, and it decreases domestic spending by $80 billion. And it doesn't end the wars, unlike the Reid bill we voted on on Saturday.

It has one specified cut—student financial aid. That's the only cut specified. What kind of world do you people live in?

And, of course, it doesn't ask a single thing of millionaires, billionaires, corporations that avoid taxes. It doesn't close a single loophole. It doesn't ask one millionaire or billionaire just to go back to Clinton-era taxes. And it does nothing about our most serious deficit in this country, and that is the jobs deficit.

Unless you really believe that tax loopholes, tax cuts, and cutting investment in aviation and surface transportation creates jobs on your planet, this bill creates none here today.

CRISIS OF DEBT

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a crisis. It's not a crisis of a debt ceiling. It's a crisis of debt, of Washington spending too much, not taxing or borrowing too little. The problem isn't the debt ceiling; it's the debt. We can no longer continue to commit generational theft by our uncontrolled spending habits to our children and grandchildren.

Luckily, the Congress has made significant progress in the first six budget bills in cutting real spending for this upcoming fiscal year. And House Republicans have fundamentally changed the debate in Washington. We are no longer talking about job-killing tax increases. We're talking about spending cuts and long-term spending reform—our goals from day one.

It's time for President Obama and the Senate Democrats to join us in our efforts to control spending before time runs out. We must solve this crisis to encourage job creation and return America to its greatness. America's great people are ready.

□ 1210

AND JUSTICE FOR ALL

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. It really is about justice for all. The question becomes as we go into our conferences and caucuses to discuss this new debt ceiling legislation: Who will this help?

Will it help the small businesses, which are the backbone of America? Will it help the students who are now standing at the doors of colleges and seeing them slam shut? Will it help those in nursing homes who now, because of drastic cuts in Medicaid, will see their places of abode lost? Will it help the hospitals, which care for the sick, because there is no Medicare reimbursement or Medicaid?

We are going to be looking at this to see how it helps or hurts the American people; but I tell you who it helps: big businesses. Are they going to now step in and create jobs? Because, when we cut across the board, public sector jobs will be cut all across America.

It has always been the government that stoops and comes in to raise the American people up when there is a need. Are we going to help the returning soldiers, 160,000-plus, who have PTSD? For those who want to come into the workplace, will the corporate sector now stand up and be counted?

Will only the friends of the Republicans be helped and not the poor and working Americans—where is the justice for all. That's where we needed bipartisanship on something that has already been done a hundred times: the simple raising of the debt ceiling; instead we have put the burden now on the backs of those who cannot speak for themselves.

ENCOURAGING THE IRON WILL OF SUCCESS IN AMERICA; A NATION PLUMMETING INTO MEDIOCRITY

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Instead of appealing to America's greatest aspirations, hopes, and dreams, there are those who are appealing to our basest character, using fear and envy and greed to prey upon those we are supposed to lead. We can no longer sow the seeds of this dependency, feed it with despair in hopes of reaping the benefits of power, all the while weakening the iron will of this Nation and plummeting it into mediocrity.

We must encourage inventiveness, entrepreneurship, and the risk that comes with leadership. We must not attack and mock those who work hard. It is not a path to greatness but a road to mediocrity and servitude where people are encouraged not to reach for the stars but to grab what they can get from the government.

Those who prey upon the fears of the weak insult them twice—once in trying to frighten them, another for believing they are too weak to understand they're being fooled. We have had enough of unemployment, of the weakening of our Nation, the drama of hand-wringing, the cowardice of blaming, finger-pointing and deflection, insults to opportunities of job creators, and the ransom we pay to other nations in the form of energy, manufactured goods and massive interest on our massive debt.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for leaders to stop using ''success'' as a dirty word and as a justification to take more and more from those who create jobs. Whether the worker wears a blue collar or a blue suit, all work is good and noble, and it is time to encourage, not to criticize, the work.

TO HOLD THE PRESIDENT ACCOUNTABLE

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Today, the Senate will begin debate on the debt ceiling agreement. It is being billed as a two-step approach to hold President Obama accountable:

To hold the President accountable or to hamstring his agenda to revive and redirect our economy to domestic manufacturing and clean energy—or to limit investment in infrastructure, education and health care?

To hold our President accountable or to stifle our meager recovery to make it harder to create jobs and lower the unemployment rate?

To hold our President accountable or to use the forced caps to undermine Republicans' main target—the Affordable Care Act? Saying there will be no cuts to Medicare services is a sham because cuts to Medicare providers will reduce beneficiaries' access to needed care.

To reduce domestic discretionary spending to the lowest level since Eisenhower years? We might as well resign ourselves to giving up our place of leadership in the world.

We do need a clean debt ceiling but with no conditions; and, yes, we need to reduce our deficit. I didn't like the suggestion that all of the Bush tax cuts expire when I first heard it, but if we end them now, we could save $2.5 trillion over the next 10 years.

Not a bad place to start.

A BALANCED BUDGET, NOT A BALANCED APPROACH

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

Ms. FOXX. At the beginning of the debt ceiling debate, House Republicans made it clear that if the President and congressional Democrats wanted us to pay their bills, they were going to have to commit to cutting up the credit cards.

The simple truth is that in just 7 months, House Republicans have already changed the broken political system in Washington to move away from ''how much can we spend?'' to focus on how we can stop spending money we don't have.

House Republicans have led the fight for controlling spending and saving our children and grandchildren from national bankruptcy, voting to actually shrink a Federal Government that has done nothing but expand for 40 years. The cuts may be small relative to the size of the problem, but the change in direction is historic. For the first time in the history of modern Federal budgeting, House Republicans will cut discretionary Federal spending for 2 straight years.

President Obama wanted a ''balanced approach'' to solve our debt crisis, which means historic tax increases on job creators. We don't need a ''balanced approach,'' Mr. Speaker. We need a balanced budget.

IN HONOR OF THE CHERISHED LIFE AND CAREER OF A FINE PHYSICIAN, DR. ROBERT McGUIRE

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. I rise today to honor the life and career of one of the finest physicians and gentlemen I have ever met, Dr. Robert McGuire of Cheyenne, Wyoming.

Dr. McGuire's career brought to his attention and to his care thousands of women in my State, and he made their lives better, including my own. Through his skill, through his patience and attention to the people he was treating, he made the profession of medicine honorable and cherished by the people he served so well.

His career has ended so he might fight his own battles with cancer. I wish him the very best regards in his fight. I thank him for the difference he made in my life and in the lives of thousands of women in my State of Wyoming. I wish him Godspeed.

Take care, Dr. Robert McGuire.

WE MUST MOVE FORWARD, ENACTING COMMONSENSE SOLUTIONS TO REVIVE THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

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

Mr. DOLD. Our economy has seen incredibly weak economic growth over the last two quarters. Just today, we found out that manufacturing is at its lowest level in the past 2 years. My district, the 10th District of Illinois, is one of the largest manufacturing districts in our Nation, and there is no doubt that families are struggling.

I am optimistic that Washington is finally coming together and finding common ground on this debt ceiling debate. We must—I emphasize—we must move forward. Hardworking taxpayers have had enough, and I get it. We must have spending discipline here in Washington—no more budget tricks, no more accounting gimmicks, no more empty promises. American families have to tighten their belts, and they should expect that Washington will do the same. Now is the time to move forward and focus on jobs.

If we are serious about paying down the debt and increasing revenue, then we must empower job creators. Small businesses in our Nation are overburdened by economic uncertainty, government regulations and redtape. We need to implement commonsense solutions that create jobs and get our economy moving again.

□ 1220

MOURNING THE LOSS OF ARMY FIRST LIEUTENANT DIMITRI DEL CASTILLO

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, the duty we perform today to cut and cap America's spending, to put us on track to a balanced budget, and to pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution are vitally important but pale in comparison to the sacrifices and duties of our Armed Forces, our men and women in uniform.

It is with profound sadness today that I join with the family and friends and the neighbors of United States Army First Lieutenant Dimitri del Castillo in mourning his loss. On June 25, 2011, he was killed while fighting in Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

In 2004, it was my privilege to nominate Dimitri for an appointment as a cadet to the United States Military Academy at West Point. Upon his graduation, he was commissioned in the Infantry, where he sought out the Army's toughest challenges immediately. He graduated from the demanding Airborne and Ranger courses and later passed a series of rigorous skill and endurance tests to earn the Army's coveted Expert Infantryman Badge.

Dimitri deployed with his unit to Afghanistan in April of 2011, and while conducting combat operations he was tragically killed when his unit came under fire by enemy forces. For his heroic actions that day, Dimitri was awarded posthumously the Bronze Star Medal and the Purple Heart.

Though we mourn his loss, we are immensely proud of Dimitri's accomplishments and we are immensely proud of the men and women who fight for us every day to make it possible to savour the freedom left to us by our founders. May the Lord bless and keep Dimitri's soul, and may God help his family find comfort in the nobility and valor of his deeds.

COAL-POWERED ENERGY

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, we are in an historic heat wave in this country, and I'm not talking about the debate on the debt limit, I'm actually talking about the temperature outside. And what's noted is that many leaders throughout this country—whether they're local Mayors or Governors—are saying, if you're poor, get to a cooling shelter, stay inside, stay in the air conditioning.

Well, we're fortunate in this country to have low-cost power generated by coal. In rural Illinois, the average salary is $58,000 a year, the average utility bill is $121 a month, which means they pay about $1,500 a year for the utility cost. However, in France, they pay 20 cents per kilowatt hour. Just think what the cost would be here if we had to double our electricity rates.

Talk about a burden on the poor and rural Americans when, instead of $1,500 a year, they would have to pay $3,000 a year just to seek relief from these hot summers.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, as we are dealing with this debate over the debt limit, I think one thing that's become clear as people have followed over the last few weeks is that Washington has a spending problem. And regardless of the resolution of today's action in the House and Senate, I hope nobody thinks that this is the end of this debate. Frankly, this is just the beginning of the debate to finally cut spending in Washington and put real controls in place.

I think as we look over the next few months, we need to continue to push for a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution because ultimately that's the kind of accountability that we need to ensure that we change the culture of spending in Washington. Clearly, tax cuts will not solve this problem, that will only make matters worse; but if the problem is spending, why would you want to send even more money up to Washington to let them spend even more?

We've got to control spending; we've got to start making cuts today; but we ultimately need that accountability that comes with a balanced budget amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

SUSPENDING IMMIGRATION STATUS PETITION AND INTERVIEW TIME REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 398) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to toll, during active-duty service abroad in the

Armed Forces, the periods of time to file a petition and appear for an interview to remove the conditional basis for permanent resident status, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 398

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

SECTION 1. TOLLING PERIODS OF TIME TO FILE PETITION AND HAVE INTERVIEW FOR REMOVAL OF CONDITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 216 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1186a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g) SERVICE IN ARMED FORCES.—

''(1) FILING PETITION.—The 90-day period described in subsection (d)(2)(A) shall be tolled during any period of time in which the alien spouse or petitioning spouse is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States and serving abroad in an active-duty status in the Armed Forces, except that, at the option of the petitioners, the petition may be filed during such active-duty service at any time after the commencement of such 90-day period.

''(2) PERSONAL INTERVIEW.—The 90-day period described in the first sentence of subsection (d)(3) shall be tolled during any period of time in which the alien spouse or petitioning spouse is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States and serving abroad in an active-duty status in the Armed Forces, except that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from waiving the requirement for an interview under subsection (c)(1)(B) pursuant to the Secretary's authority under the second sentence of subsection (d)(3).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 216(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1186a(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(g)(1))'' and inserting ''(h)(1))''; and

(B) by striking ''(g)(2))'' and inserting ''(h)(2))''.

(2) REFERENCES.—Section 216 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1186a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)(3), by striking ''Attorney General's'' and inserting ''Secretary's'';

(B) by striking ''Attorney General'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security''; and

(C) in subsections (c)(1)(B) and (d)(3), by striking ''Service'' and inserting ''Department of Homeland Security''.

SEC. 2. COMPLIANCE WITH PAYGO.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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 materials on H.R. 398, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill, which provides relief to military servicemembers serving overseas who marry foreign spouses.

Our Nation's military should not have to worry about red tape while they are abroad protecting our freedoms. When a U.S. citizen or a permanent resident marries a foreign spouse, that spouse becomes a conditional permanent resident. After 2 years, the couple files a petition with the Department of Homeland Security for the removal of the conditional status. If the petition is successful, the immigrant becomes a permanent resident.

The petition generally must be filed before the second anniversary of the spouse's becoming a conditional permanent resident.

Upon the filing of the petition, DHS interviews the couple to determine whether there was any marriage fraud. The interview must be conducted unless DHS waives the deadline for the interview or the requirement for the interview.

This timetable is reasonable under normal circumstances. However, what happens when the U.S. citizen or permanent resident spouse is serving overseas in active duty status in the Armed Forces?

It would certainly be a disruption to the military to have a member of the Armed Forces deployed overseas travel for a personal interview with DHS. Our military's focus should be on defending freedom, not bureaucracy.

While it is true that DHS can choose to delay this process in appropriate circumstances, this bill's provision should be standard policy while the spouse is serving abroad. Of course, the petition and interview would still take place when the spouse is no longer on active duty.

This bill is good for our military, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the author of H.R. 398, I support this bill. It's a small measure to help support members of our Armed Forces who are serving overseas and their families here at home.

Our troops, who take up our country's call to service and volunteer to place themselves in harm's way, face uncertainties every day. For countless soldiers, the peace of mind that they get from family back home helps to keep them focused on the important job at hand. For that reason, it is critical that we not add to their burdens and instead seize the opportunity to alleviate even a small amount of the anxiety they feel.

As the chairman has indicated, there is a conditionality placed on residents gained through marriage. Couples are given a 90-day period just before the second anniversary of the grant to file to remove the conditions, and then they get only 90 days to appear in person for an interview. Now, only after this is done are the conditions removed. And if the conditional status is not removed in this way, the residence is terminated and the foreign national spouse could be deported. That means that either the spouse of one of our soldiers could be deported or the soldier himself could be deported.

Now, it's pretty hard to appear for the interview if you're serving in Iraq, and we certainly don't want our soldiers or their spouses to be deported. So I support this measure.

In 2008, as chairwoman of the House Immigration Subcommittee, I convened a hearing on the immigration needs of America's fighting men and women. At the hearing, we heard from members of the Armed Forces about countless challenges that they face because of our rigid and unyielding immigration system.

□ 1230

This bill will help to resolve just one of those challenges. It will not excuse military families from the requirements. It will simply allow them to put off those requirements if they choose during overseas deployments.

Of course, there are many problems with our country's immigration laws that this bill does not address, too many to count. And as we know from our 2008 hearing, those problems will continue to unnecessarily tear military families apart, distract from our mission abroad, and betray the fundamental values that we claim to hold dear.

But despite this great need, it is only this small bill, a bill that should help a few dozen servicemembers a year, that is on the floor for action.

I commend my colleagues LAMAR SMITH, ELTON GALLEGLY, and JOHN CONYERS for joining me in introducing this very modest measure.

Our men and women on the front lines are standing in defense of our country, and their loved ones back home stand in defense of them. As Members of Congress, it's both a responsibility and an honor to provide whatever support we can. And while this bill may be small, it is important for the few dozen soldiers it may help each year. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 398.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

NON-IMMIGRANT NURSES VISA REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1933) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the requirements for admission of non-immigrant nurses in health professional shortage areas, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1933

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

SECTION 1. REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION OF NONIMMIGRANT NURSES IN HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SHORTAGE AREAS.

(a) EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF AUTHORIZED ADMISSION.—Section 212(m)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(m)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) The initial period of authorized admission as a nonimmigrant under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c) shall be 3 years, and may be extended once for an additional 3-year period.''.

(b) NUMBER OF VISAS.—Section 212(m)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(m)(4)) is amended by striking ''500.'' and inserting ''300.''.

(c) PORTABILITY.—Section 214(n) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(n)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3)(A) A nonimmigrant alien described in subparagraph (B) who was previously issued a visa or otherwise provided nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c) is authorized to accept new employment performing services as a registered nurse for a facility described in section 212(m)(6) upon the filing by the prospective employer of a new petition on behalf of such nonimmigrant as provided under subsection (c). Employment authorization shall continue for such alien until the new petition is adjudicated. If the new petition is denied, such authorization shall cease.

''(B) A nonimmigrant alien described in this paragraph is a nonimmigrant alien—

''(i) who has been lawfully admitted into the United States;

''(ii) on whose behalf an employer has filed a nonfrivolous petition for new employment before the date of expiration of the period of stay authorized by the Secretary of Homeland Security, except that, if a nonimmigrant described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c) is terminated or laid off by the nonimmigrant's employer, or otherwise ceases employment with the employer, such petition for new employment shall be filed during the 45-day period beginning on the date of such termination, lay off, or cessation; and

''(iii) who, subsequent to such lawful admission, has not been employed without authorization in the United States before the filing of such petition.''.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 3-year period beginning on the commencement date described in paragraph (2), the amendments made by section 2 of the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-95), and the amendments made by this section, shall apply to classification petitions filed for nonimmigrant status. This period shall be in addition to the period described in section 2(e) of the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999.

(2) COMMENCEMENT DATE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall determine whether regulations are necessary to implement the amendments made by this section. If the Secretary determines that no such regulations are necessary, the commencement date described in this paragraph shall be the date of such determination. If the Secretary determines that regulations are necessary to implement any amendment made by this section, the commencement date described in this paragraph shall be the date on which such regulations (in final form) take effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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 H.R. 1933, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I offer this legislation on behalf of myself and Representatives CUELLAR, HINOJOSA, ROSKAM, and RUSH.

A number of American hospitals have great difficulty attracting nurses. These include hospitals that serve mostly poor patients in inner-city neighborhoods and some hospitals in rural areas. For example, St. Bernard Hospital in Chicago is the only remaining hospital in an area of over 100,000 people and almost all of its patients live in poverty. St. Bernard almost closed its doors in 1992 primarily because of its inability to attract registered nurses.

Congress passed the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act in 1999 to help hospitals like St. Bernard. It created a new H–1C temporary registered nurse visa program with 500 visas available each year that allowed nurses to stay for 3 years.

To be able to petition for a foreign nurse, an employer had to meet four conditions. First, the employer had to be located in a health professional shortage area; second, the employer had to have at least 190 acute care beds; third, a certain percentage of the employer's patients had to be Medicare patients; and fourth, a certain percentage of patients had to be Medicaid patients.

The H–1C program adopted the protections for American nurses contained in the expired H–1A nursing visa program. For instance, a hospital had to agree to take timely and significant steps to recruit American nurses. Also, hospitals had to pay the prevailing wage.

The H–1C program contained new protections such as requirements that foreign nurses could not comprise more than one-third of a hospital's registered nurses. The H–1C program was extended in 2006 but expired in December of 2009, though many nurses still remain on 3-year visas issued before that date.

Sister Elizabeth Van Straten, president of St. Bernard Hospital, wrote to me last December that ''because of the sunset, in combination with the extended approval period for green cards, nurses are now forced to leave our institution, and the rate of loss continues to increase. This loss cannot be sustained. As the only hospital serving one of the most difficult sections of Chicago, and perhaps the entire country, we need the extension of the visa program to survive.''

I introduced H.R. 1933 to help St. Bernard and other, similar hospitals. The bill reauthorizes the H–1C program for another 3 years. The number of visas that may be issued in each fiscal year cannot exceed 300. An alien may be admitted for 3 years, and this stay may be extended once for an additional 3 years.

The H–1C program ensures continued care for patients in inner-city and rural communities. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will not repeat the information provided by Chairman SMITH. I will simply state that the H–1C program was first created in 1999 to address shortages in both rural and inner-city hospitals. The 500 visas per year actually only go to 14 hospitals in the United States spread out across America. And of course the program has now expired.

As Chairman SMITH has indicated, this bill would reauthorize but reduce the number from 500 to 300, create certain other protections as mentioned by the chairman, and allow the maximum stay to go to 6 years. Because the bill would double the duration of H–1C status, I offered an amendment in committee, which was accepted by all, to make the H–1C visas portable among the 14 hospitals authorized to employ H–1C nurses. Right now, the nurses are entirely dependent on their employers to provide them their immigration status, and visa portability would level the playing field and allow a nurse to switch employers if something was wrong.

I appreciate the Chairman's willingness to accept that, and I thank the chairman for introducing this bill and working with me to ensure that H–1C

nurses are better protected against exploitive situations.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1933, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2011

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2480) to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Administrative Conference of the United States for fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2480

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 ''Administrative Conference of the United States Reauthorization Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 596 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 596. Authorization of appropriations

''There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subchapter not more than $2,900,000 for fiscal year 2012, $2,900,000 for fiscal year 2013, and $2,900,000 for fiscal year 2014. Of any amounts appropriated under this section, not more than $2,500 may be made available in each fiscal year for official representation and entertainment expenses for foreign dignitaries.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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 materials on H.R. 2480, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1240

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

Mr. Speaker, I offer this bill on behalf of myself, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Lately, the need to reform Federal administrative law has become urgent. Every day the long promised economic recovery seems more like a mirage. Our top priority should be to create jobs. Protecting job creators from overregulation will help create jobs. According to the Small Business Administration, regulations impose a $1.75 trillion burden annually on the American economy. Reducing this burden will hasten our economic recovery.

The Administrative Conference of the United States is a small but important institution. It is a narrowly focused, nonpartisan body that offers an outstanding forum to reform Federal administrative law. Regulatory agencies must be efficient, effective, and accountable. This is the heart of the Conference's historical mission. Over the years, its recommendations have saved taxpayers tens of millions of dollars. For example, the Social Security Administration saved $85 million by adopting a recommendation to eliminate an unnecessary step in its appeals process. The Conference's budget was $1.8 million at the time. And the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation saved more than $9 million in the first 18 months of a pilot program implementing an ACUS recommendation to make greater use of alternative dispute resolution. ACUS currently is urging agencies to expand their use of video hearings. The Social Security Administration already has saved $59 million by doing more hearings by video conference. This ACUS recommendation has the potential to save millions more across the Federal Government.

Due to a lack of funding, the Conference went dormant in 1996. It was revived in the 111th Congress, and I am glad that once again it is able to contribute to administrative law reform. The Conference is uniquely positioned to generate much savings for very little cost. Recommendations from the Conference save taxpayer dollars by helping agencies work more effectively. The Conference also helps agencies adopt better and less burdensome regulations to reduce that $1.75 trillion regulatory burden on the economy. Additionally, the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law's December 2006 interim report on regulatory reform contains numerous suggested reforms that ACUS could examine and help agencies implement.

During these difficult economic times, everyone has to tighten their belts, including Federal agencies. If American families have to make tough economic choices, so should Congress. The amount authorized by this bill, $2.9 million annually for the next three fiscal years, was a bipartisan compromise. It reduces the Conference's authorization level by almost 10 percent while enabling the Conference to perform its most critical work. The Conference's past successes raise the prospect for a high return on the taxpayers' investment. It is a reasonable authorization level in light of the current need to reduce Federal spending, and I recommend it to my colleagues.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

It's been a pleasure working with Chairman SMITH, who yields the time, never as much as I may consume, but yields the time, which I'm always appreciative of, and we've worked in a bipartisan manner on this, and I appreciate his working with me on that.

The Federal administrative law and rulemaking processes are among the most important ways by which our Nation implements public policy. Each year, agencies issue regulations to ensure that the food we eat, the air we breathe, and the cars we drive are safe. Although regulations play a critical role in virtually every aspect of our daily lives, there is only one independent, nonpartisan Federal entity that Congress can rely on to ensure that these regulations work as intended. The Administrative Conference of the United States, known as ACUS, is that critical entity.

First established by President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the Conference is a nonpartisan, public-private resource that provides invaluable guidance to Congress about how to improve the administrative and regulatory processes. ACUS is charged with making recommendations for the improvement of administrative agencies and their procedures, particularly with respect to efficiency and fairness. Over the years, the Conference has helped agencies implement many cost-saving procedures and made numerous recommendations to eliminate excessive litigation costs and long delays.

Just one agency alone, the Social Security Administration, estimates that the Conference's recommendations to change that agency's appeals process yielded approximately $85 million in savings. Another recommendation by the Conference, namely, that agencies use alternative dispute resolution methods to avoid costly and time-consuming litigation, resulted in more than $100 million in savings government-wide. Several other ACUS recommendations have greatly increased the efficiency of other administrative procedures by eliminating duplicative hearings and streamlining appeals from agency action, thereby also resulting in cost savings in the millions of dollars.

In what is truly a rare and historic example of agreement, Supreme Court Justices Stephen Breyer and Antonin Scalia have jointly testified before our committee in strong support of the Conference, not once but on two occasions, and I must say I enjoyed both of

their comments and their friendship. Justice Breyer extolled the ''huge'' savings to the public resulting from the Conference's recommendations, while Justice Scalia likewise agreed that ACUS is ''an enormous bargain.'' Perhaps most importantly, ACUS can play a major role in helping agencies become even more efficient and effective, especially given the present budgetary constraints.

As reported by the Judiciary Committee, H.R. 2480, the Administrative Conference of the United States Reauthorization Act of 2011, authorizes $2.9 million to be appropriated to the Conference for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2014. With this modest reauthorization, we will ensure that the Conference will continue to return to American taxpayers many multiples of that investment in the form of recommendations that will make Federal agencies more effective.

H.R. 2480 reflects a long history of bipartisan support for ACUS. Once again, I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, LAMAR SMITH, a gentleman and a scholar, and the Courts, Commercial and Administrative Law Subcommittee Chairman HOWARD COBLE, a gentleman and a scholar as well, for working with me on this legislation, and I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to secure final passage of H.R. 2480 by the other body. Accordingly, I urge all of my colleagues to support the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2480, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING GREATER AUTHORITY AND DISCRETION TO CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2715) to provide the Consumer Product Safety Commission with greater authority and discretion in enforcing the consumer product safety laws, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2715

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

SECTION 1. LIMITATION ON LEAD IN CHILDREN'S PRODUCTS.

(a) PROSPECTIVE APPLICATION OF LEAD LIMIT FOR CHILDREN'S PRODUCTS.—Section 101(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 1278a(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) APPLICATION.—Each limit set forth in paragraph (2) (except for the limit set forth in subparagraphs (A) and (B)) shall apply only to a children's product (as defined in section 3(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2052(a))) that is manufactured after the effective date of such respective limit.''.

(b) ALTERNATIVE LIMITS AND EXCEPTIONS.—Section 101(b) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1278a(b)(1)) is amended—

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

''(1) FUNCTIONAL PURPOSE EXCEPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission, on its own initiative or upon petition by an interested party, shall grant an exception to the limit in subsection (a) for a specific product, class of product, material, or component part if the Commission, after notice and a hearing, determines that—

''(i) the product, class of product, material, or component part requires the inclusion of lead because it is not practicable or not technologically feasible to manufacture such product, class of product, material, or component part, as the case may be, in accordance with subsection (a) by removing the excessive lead or by making the lead inaccessible;

''(ii) the product, class of product, material, or component part is not likely to be placed in the mouth or ingested, taking into account normal and reasonably foreseeable use and abuse of such product, class of product, material, or component part by a child; and

''(iii) an exception for the product, class of product, material, or component part will have no measurable adverse effect on public health or safety, taking into account normal and reasonably foreseeable use and abuse.

''(B) MEASUREMENT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(iii), there is no measurable adverse effect on public health or safety if the exception described in subparagraph (A) will result in no measurable increase in blood lead levels of a child. The Commission may adopt an alternative method of measurement other than blood lead levels if it determines, after notice and a hearing, that such alternative method is a better scientific method for measuring adverse effect on public health and safety.

''(C) PROCEDURES FOR GRANTING EXCEPTION.—

''(i) BURDEN OF PROOF.—A party seeking an exception under subparagraph (A) has the burden of demonstrating that it meets the requirements of such subparagraph.

''(ii) GROUNDS FOR DECISION.—In the case where a party has petitioned for an exception, in determining whether to grant the exception, the Commission may base its decision solely on the materials presented by the party seeking the exception and any materials received through notice and a hearing.

''(iii) ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE.—In demonstrating that it meets the requirements of subparagraph (A), a party seeking an exception under such subparagraph may rely on any nonproprietary information submitted by any other party seeking such an exception and such information shall be considered part of the record presented by the party that relies on that information.

''(iv) SCOPE OF EXCEPTION.—If an exception is sought for an entire product, the burden is on the petitioning party to demonstrate that the criteria in subparagraph (A) are met with respect to every accessible component or accessible material of the product.

''(D) LIMITATION ON EXCEPTION.—If the Commission grants an exception for a product, class of product, material, or component part under subparagraph (A), the Commission may, as necessary to protect public health or safety—

''(i) establish a lead limit that such product, class of product, material, or component part may not exceed; or

''(ii) place a manufacturing expiration date on such exception or establish a schedule after which the manufacturer of such product, class of product, material, or component part shall be in full compliance with the limit established under clause (i) or the limit set forth in subsection (a).

''(E) APPLICATION OF EXCEPTION.—An exception under subparagraph (A) for a product, class of product, material, or component part shall apply regardless of the date of manufacture unless the Commission expressly provides otherwise.

''(F) PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED PETITIONS.—A party seeking an exception under this paragraph may rely on materials previously submitted in connection with a petition for exclusion under this section. In such cases, petitioners must notify the Commission of their intent to rely on materials previously submitted. Such reliance does not affect petitioners' obligation to demonstrate that they meet all requirements of this paragraph as required by subparagraph (C)(i).'';

(2) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''include to,'' and inserting ''include''; and

(3) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (8) and inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) EXCEPTION FOR OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to an off-highway vehicle.

''(B) OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'off-highway vehicle'—

''(i) means any motorized vehicle—

''(I) that is manufactured primarily for use off public streets, roads, and highways;

''(II) designed to travel on 2, 3, or 4 wheels; and

''(III) that has either—

''(aa) a seat designed to be straddled by the operator and handlebars for steering control; or

''(bb) a nonstraddle seat, steering wheel, seat belts, and roll-over protective structure; and

''(ii) includes a snowmobile.

''(6) BICYCLES AND RELATED PRODUCTS.—In lieu of the lead limits established in subsection (a)(2), the limits set forth for each respective material in the notice of the Commission entitled 'Notice of Stay of Enforcement Pertaining to Bicycles and Related Products', published June 30, 2009 (74 Fed. Reg. 31254), shall apply to any metal component part of the products to which the stay of enforcement described in such notice applies, except that after December 31, 2011, the limits set forth in such notice shall not be more than 300 parts per million total lead content by weight for any metal component part of the products to which such stay pertains.

''(7) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN USED CHILDREN'S PRODUCTS.—

''(A) GENERAL EXCLUSION.—The lead limits established under subsection (a) shall not apply to a used children's product.

''(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term 'used children's product' means a children's product (as defined in section 3(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2052(a)) that was obtained by the seller for use and not for the purpose of resale or was

obtained by the seller, either directly or indirectly, from a person who obtained such children's product for use and not for the purpose of resale. Such term also includes a children's product that was donated to the seller for charitable distribution or resale to support charitable purposes. Such term shall not include—

''(i) children's metal jewelry;

''(ii) any children's product for which the donating party or the seller has actual knowledge that the product is in violation of the lead limits in this section; or

''(iii) any other children's product or product category that the Commission determines, after notice and a hearing.

For purposes of this definition, the term 'seller' includes a person who lends or donates a used children's product.''.

SEC. 2. APPLICATION OF THIRD PARTY TESTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 14(d) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2063(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(B)(ii), by striking ''random'' and inserting ''representative''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) REDUCING THIRD PARTY TESTING BURDENS.—

''(A) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Commission shall seek public comment on opportunities to reduce the cost of third party testing requirements consistent with assuring compliance with any applicable consumer product safety rule, ban, standard, or regulation. The request for public comment shall include the following:

''(i) The extent to which the use of materials subject to regulations of another government agency that requires third party testing of those materials may provide sufficient assurance of conformity with an applicable consumer product safety rule, ban, standard, or regulation without further third party testing.

''(ii) The extent to which modification of the certification requirements may have the effect of reducing redundant third party testing by or on behalf of 2 or more importers of a product that is substantially similar or identical in all material respects.

''(iii) The extent to which products with a substantial number of different components subject to third party testing may be evaluated to show compliance with an applicable rule, ban, standard, or regulation by third party testing of a subset of such components selected by a third party conformity assessment body.

''(iv) The extent to which manufacturers with a substantial number of substantially similar products subject to third party testing may reasonably make use of sampling procedures that reduce the overall test burden without compromising the benefits of third party testing.

''(v) The extent to which evidence of conformity with other national or international governmental standards may provide assurance of conformity to consumer product safety rules, bans, standards, or regulations applicable under this Act.

''(vi) The extent to which technology, other than the technology already approved by the Commission, exists for third party conformity assessment bodies to test or to screen for testing consumer products subject to a third party testing requirement.

''(vii) Other techniques for lowering the cost of third party testing consistent with assuring compliance with the applicable consumer product safety rules, bans, standards, and regulations.

''(B) REGULATIONS.—Following the public comment period described in subparagraph (A), but not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Commission shall review the public comments and may prescribe new or revised third party testing regulations if it determines that such regulations will reduce third party testing costs consistent with assuring compliance with the applicable consumer product safety rules, bans, standards, and regulations.

''(C) REPORT.—If the Commission determines that it lacks authority to implement an opportunity for reducing the costs of third-party testing consistent with assuring compliance with the applicable consumer product safety rules, bans, standards, and regulations, it shall transmit a report to Congress reviewing those opportunities, along with any recommendations for any legislation to permit such implementation.

''(4) SPECIAL RULES FOR SMALL BATCH MANUFACTURERS.—

''(A) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION; EXEMPTION.—

''(i) CONSIDERATION; ALTERNATIVE REQUIREMENTS.—Subject to subparagraph (C), in implementing third party testing requirements under this section, the Commission shall take into consideration any economic, administrative, or other limits on the ability of small batch manufacturers to comply with such requirements and shall, after notice and a hearing, provide alternative testing requirements for covered products manufactured by small batch manufacturers in lieu of those required under subsection (a) or (b). Any such alternative requirements shall provide for reasonable methods to assure compliance with any applicable consumer product safety rule, ban, standard, or regulation. The Commission may allow such alternative testing requirements for small batch manufacturers with respect to a specific product or product class or with respect to a specific safety rule, ban, standard, or regulation, or portion thereof.

''(ii) EXEMPTION.—If the Commission determines that no alternative testing requirement is available or economically practicable, it shall exempt small batch manufacturers from third party testing requirements under subsections (a) and (b).

''(iii) CERTIFICATION.—In lieu of or as part of any alternative testing requirements provided under clause (i), the Commission may allow certification of a product to an applicable consumer product safety rule, ban, standard, or regulation, or portion thereof, based on documentation that the product complies with another national or international governmental standard or safety requirement that the Commission determines is the same or more stringent than the consumer product safety rule, ban, standard, or regulation, or portion thereof. Any such certification shall only be allowed to the extent of the equivalency with a consumer product safety rule, ban, standard, or regulation and not to any other part of the consumer product safety rule, ban, standard, or regulation.

''(iv) RESTRICTION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), and except where the Commission determines that the manufacturer does not meet the definition of a small batch manufacturer, for any small batch manufacturer registered pursuant to subparagraph (B), the Commission may not require third party testing of a covered product by a third party conformity assessment body until the Commission has provided either an alternative testing requirement or an exemption in accordance with clause (i) or (ii), respectively.

''(B) REGISTRATION.—Any small batch manufacturer that utilizes alternative requirements or an exemption under this paragraph shall register with the Commission prior to using such alternative requirements or exemptions pursuant to any guidelines issued by the Commission to carry out this requirement.

''(C) LIMITATION.—The Commission shall not provide or permit to continue in effect any alternative requirements or exemption from third party testing requirements under this paragraph where it determines, based on notice and a hearing, that full compliance with subsection (a) or (b) is reasonably necessary to protect public health or safety. The Commission shall not provide any alternative requirements or exemption for—

''(i) any of the third party testing requirements described in clauses (i) through (v) of subsection (a)(3)(B); or

''(ii) durable infant or toddler products, as defined in section 104(f) of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 2056a(f)).

''(D) SUBSEQUENT MANUFACTURER.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect third party testing or any other requirements with respect to a subsequent manufacturer or other entity that uses components provided by one or more small batch manufacturers.

''(E) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph—

''(i) the term 'covered product' means a consumer product manufactured by a small batch manufacturer where no more than 7,500 units of the same product were manufactured in the previous calendar year; and

''(ii) the term 'small batch manufacturer' means a manufacturer that had no more than $1,000,000 in total gross revenue from sales of all consumer products in the previous calendar year. The dollar amount contained in this paragraph shall be adjusted annually by the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers published by the Department of Labor.

For purposes of determining the total gross revenue for all sales of all consumer products of a manufacturer under this subparagraph, such total gross revenue shall be considered to include all gross revenue from all sales of all consumer products of each entity that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such manufacturer. The Commission shall take steps to ensure that all relevant business affiliations are considered in determining whether or not a manufacturer meets this definition.

''(5) EXCLUSION FROM THIRD PARTY TESTING.—

''(A) CERTAIN PRINTED MATERIALS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The third party testing requirements established under subsection (a) shall not apply to ordinary books or ordinary paper-based printed materials.

''(ii) DEFINITIONS.—

''(I) ORDINARY BOOK.—The term 'ordinary book' means a book printed on paper or cardboard, printed with inks or toners, and bound and finished using a conventional method, and that is intended to be read or has educational value. Such term does not include books with inherent play value, books designed or intended for a child 3 years of age or younger, and does not include any toy or other article that is not a book that is sold or packaged with an ordinary book.

''(II) ORDINARY PAPER-BASED PRINTED MATERIALS.—The term 'ordinary paper-based printed materials' means materials printed on paper or cardboard, such as magazines, posters, greeting cards, and similar products, that are printed with inks or toners and bound and finished using a conventional method.

''(III) EXCLUSIONS.—Such terms do not include books or printed materials that contain components that are printed on material other than paper or cardboard or contain nonpaper-based components such as metal or plastic parts or accessories that are not part of the binding and finishing materials used in a conventional method.

''(B) METAL COMPONENT PARTS OF BICYCLES.—The third party testing requirements established under subsection (a) shall not apply to metal component parts of bicycles with respect to compliance with the lead content limits in place pursuant to section 101(b)(6) of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008.''.

(b) PROHIBITED ACT.—Section 19(a)(14) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2068(a)(14)) is amended by striking the period and inserting '', or to subdivide the production of any children's product into small quantities that have the effect of evading any third party testing requirements under section 14(a)(2);''.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF AND PROCESS FOR UPDATING DURABLE NURSERY PRODUCTS STANDARDS.

(a) UPDATING STANDARD.—Section 104(b) of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 2056a(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) PROCESS FOR CONSIDERING SUBSEQUENT REVISIONS TO VOLUNTARY STANDARD.—

''(A) NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF VOLUNTARY STANDARD.—When the Commission promulgates a consumer product safety standard under this subsection that is based, in whole or in part, on a voluntary standard, the Commission shall notify the organization that issued the voluntary standard of the Commission's action and shall provide a copy of the consumer product safety standard to the organization.

''(B) COMMISSION ACTION ON REVISED VOLUNTARY STANDARD.—If an organization revises a standard that has been adopted, in whole or in part, as a consumer product safety standard under this subsection, it shall notify the Commission. The revised voluntary standard shall be considered to be a consumer product safety standard issued by the Commission under section 9 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2058), effective 180 days after the date on which the organization notifies the Commission (or such later date specified by the Commission in the Federal Register) unless, within 90 days after receiving that notice, the Commission notifies the organization that it has determined that the proposed revision does not improve the safety of the consumer product covered by the standard and that the Commission is retaining the existing consumer product safety standard.''.

(b) APPLICATION OF STANDARD.—Section 104(c) of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 2056a(c)) is amended by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4) and inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) APPLICATION OF ANY REVISION.—With respect to any revision of the standard promulgated under subsection (b)(1)(B) subsequent to the initial promulgation of a standard under such subsection, paragraph (1) shall apply only to a person that manufactures or imports cribs, unless the Commission determines that application to any other person described in paragraph (2) is necessary to protect against an unreasonable risk to health or safety. If the Commission determines that application to a person described in paragraph (2) is necessary, it shall provide not less than 12 months for such person to come into compliance.''.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION OF SECTION 106 TO FDA-REGULATED PRODUCTS.

Section 106(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 2056b(a)) is amended by inserting ''or any provision that restates or incorporates a regulation promulgated by the Food and Drug Administration or any statute administered by the Food and Drug Administration'' after ''or by statute''.

SEC. 5. APPLICATION OF PHTHALATES LIMIT.

(a) ACCESSIBLE, PLASTICIZED COMPONENT PARTS.—Section 108 of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 2057c) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (e) as subsections (e) through (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) APPLICATION.—Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, subsections (a) and (b)(1) and any rule promulgated under subsection (b)(3) shall apply to any plasticized component part of a children's toy or child care article or any other component part of a children's toy or child care article that is made of other materials that may contain phthalates.

''(d) EXCLUSION FOR INACCESSIBLE COMPONENT PARTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The prohibitions established under subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to any component part of a children's toy or child care article that is not accessible to a child through normal and reasonably foreseeable use and abuse of such product, as determined by the Commission. A component part is not accessible under this paragraph if such component part is not physically exposed by reason of a sealed covering or casing and does not become physically exposed through reasonably foreseeable use and abuse of the product. Reasonably foreseeable use and abuse shall include swallowing, mouthing, breaking, or other children's activities, and the aging of the product.

''(2) LIMITATION.—The Commission may revoke an exclusion or all exclusions granted under paragraph (1) at any time and require that any or all component parts manufactured after such exclusion is revoked comply with the prohibitions established under subsections (a) and (b) if the Commission finds, based on scientific evidence, that such compliance is necessary to protect the public health or safety.

''(3) INACCESSIBILITY PROCEEDING.—Within 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall—

''(A) promulgate a rule providing guidance with respect to what product components, or classes of components, will be considered to be inaccessible for purposes of paragraph (1); or

''(B) adopt the same guidance with respect to inaccessibility that was adopted by the Commission with regards to accessibility of lead under section 101(b)(2)(B), with additional consideration, as appropriate, of whether such component can be placed in a child's mouth.

''(4) APPLICATION PENDING COMMISSION GUIDANCE.—Until the Commission promulgates a rule pursuant to paragraph (3), the determination of whether a product component is inaccessible to a child shall be made in accordance with the requirements laid out in paragraph (1) for considering a component to be inaccessible to a child.''.

SEC. 6. AUTHORITY TO MODIFY TRACKING LABELS REQUIREMENT.

Section 14(a)(5) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2063(a)(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Effective 1 year'' and inserting ''(A) Effective 1 year'';

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) The Commission may, by regulation, exclude a specific product or class of products from the requirements in subparagraph (A) if the Commission determines that it is not practicable for such product or class of products to bear the marks required by such subparagraph. The Commission may establish alternative requirements for any product or class of products excluded under the preceding sentence consistent with the purposes described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A).''.

SEC. 7. IMPROVED PRODUCT IDENTIFICATION FOR PUBLIC DATABASE.

Section 6A(c) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2055a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(A), by inserting ''or paragraph (5)'' after ''paragraph (4)(A)'';

(2) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking ''determines that the information in such report or comment is materially inaccurate, the Commission shall—'' and inserting ''receives notice that the information in such report or comment is materially inaccurate, the Commission shall stay the publication of the report on the database as required under paragraph (3) for a period of no more than 5 additional days. If the Commission determines that the information in such report or comment is materially inaccurate, the Commission shall—''; and

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

''(5) OBTAINING CERTAIN PRODUCT IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Commission receives a report described in subsection (b)(1)(A) that does not include the model or serial number of the consumer product concerned, the Commission shall seek from the individual or entity submitting the report such model or serial number or, if such model or serial number is not available, a photograph of the product. If the Commission obtains information relating to the serial or model number of the product or a photograph of the product, it shall immediately forward such information to the manufacturer of the product. The Commission shall make the report available in the database on the 15th business day after the date on which the Commission transmits the report under paragraph (1) and shall include in the database any additional information about the product obtained under this paragraph.

''(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to—

''(i) permit the Commission to delay transmission of the report under paragraph (1) until the Commission has obtained the model or serial number or a photograph of the consumer product concerned; or

''(ii) make inclusion in the database of a report described in subsection (b)(1)(A) contingent on the availability of the model or serial number or a photograph of the consumer product concerned.''.

SEC. 8. SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.

Section 27(b) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2076(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''and physical'' after ''documentary'';

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking ''and'';

(3) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (10) and inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

''(9) to delegate to the general counsel of the Commission the authority to issue subpoenas solely to Federal, State, or local government agencies for evidence described in paragraph (3); and''; and

(4) in paragraph (10) (as so redesignated), by inserting ''(except as provided in paragraph (9))'' after ''paragraph (3)''.

SEC. 9. DEADLINE FOR RULE BY CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION ON STANDARDS FOR ALL TERRAIN VEHICLES.

The Commission shall issue the final rule described in section 42(d) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2089(d)) not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 10. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) CPSA.—Section 14 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2063) is further amended by redesignating the second subsection (d) as subsection (i).

(b) CPSIA.—Section 101(a)(1) of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 1278a(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''(as defined in section 3(a)(16) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2052(a)(16)))'' and inserting ''(as defined in section 3(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2052(a)))''.

SEC. 11. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as provided otherwise, the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO MACK) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1250

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 2715, a bill that modifies the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008, also called CPSIA, and provides relief to address a number of unintended consequences that arose after CPSIA became law.

This bill is a win-win. It is good for American consumers and American businesses as well. It is also a bipartisan bill. And I want to thank Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman UPTON, as well as Ranking Member WAXMAN and my counterpart, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, for all of their hard work in getting this important bill to the floor today.

We passed CPSIA almost unanimously in 2008, and many of its features have advanced the cause of children's safety. But there also have been unintended consequences for many businesses, small and large alike. For 3 years now, we have heard the pleas of these businesses, asking for relief from the CPSIA mandates. We have also heard from the CPSC that it lacks the authority and flexibility to grant relief where needed.

On August 14, the last deadline looms, the final drop-down to the 0.01 percent lead content limit. Without swift action, we face empty store shelves that have been cleared of perfectly safe products because of what I believe was simply a drafting oversight. The bill makes the August 14 limit prospective in nature, permitting retailers to sell their existing inventory so long as it was made prior to August 14 and is compliant with the current lead limit of 0.03 percent, which was specifically approved by Congress for the last 2 years.

In a true spirit of bipartisanship, Ranking Members WAXMAN and BUTTERFIELD agreed to act swiftly to address this situation. While we don't necessarily agree on the best way to address all of the unintended consequences of CPSIA, we move the bill in response to the enormous threat facing stakeholders in the children's product industry in just less than 2 weeks.

In addition to addressing the immediate deadline, this bill goes a little farther to address the pain so many of our constituents are facing. ATVs, bikes, books, things that were never intended to be covered by the law but were ensnared by its wide reach nonetheless, will no longer face an uncertain future and are exempted from testing requirements.

Used children's products were also banned for sale as a result of the 2008 law. Thrift stores and charity retail outlets such as Goodwill Industries and even the local church bazaars were forced to toss anything made for a child under the age of 12 because it is impossible to tell whether an item was made in compliance with the law without its original packing or a dated sales receipt. As a result, the law essentially made all used children's products contraband. This wasteful result removed perfectly safe products from the reach of individuals who rely on the value and savings such stores provide in order to provide decent clothing for their children.

Manufacturers of other products will also see some relief from the most costly mandate of the CPSIA—third-party testing and the continuing compliance testing. This bill directs CPSC to seek comments within 60 days on how the current third-party testing regime can be altered to reduce costs.

Small batch manufacturers, who were among the hardest hit by CPSIA, will also find some relief in this bill. These manufacturers are generally stay-at-home moms with an entrepreneurial spirit or mom-and-pop retail outlets that handpick unique toys and other items for sale in their community. Almost universally, these small businesses got into business because they wanted to ensure their own children had safe toys. Almost universally, these small businesses have either closed shop or are on the verge of closing shop because of the onerous requirements of the CPSIA and the costs imposed.

The bill directs the Consumer Product Safety Commission to address the special situation of these businesses by finding alternative, more affordable testing methods or by exempting these businesses from testing altogether if no such alternative exists.

The bill creates a functional purpose exception process that we hope will give the CPSC more flexibility to exempt products from lead limits where there is no health risk. The exception process created in the original CPSIA has failed to permit a single exception for any children's product from the statutory lead limits established in the CPSIA, even in cases where the CPSC determined that such products pose no risk to children.

We have a narrow window of opportunity to address those mandates that threaten the survival of scores of businesses and the livelihoods of the individuals and families those businesses support. And I would like to thank the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, as well as the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. WAXMAN, as well as their staffs for working throughout the weekend to find a compromise that we both can support.

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

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

I rise today in strong support of this very important bill. Almost 3 years ago, President Bush signed H.R. 4040, the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act, into law. While that bill passed this House by a vote of 424 to 1, it soon became evident to all of us that providing some of the extraordinary protections for children in that bill would be a challenge for some businesses, especially our smallest manufacturers. Many of them testified before our subcommittee, and we heard their concerns.

So I have worked very closely with Chairman BONO MACK in crafting this compromise to provide targeted and sensible relief for businesses from some of CPSIA's requirements without sacrificing the health and safety of our children. I am pleased that we are able to present it to the House today for immediate consideration. The bill is a marked change from where we started with H.R. 1939, and I am pleased with the bipartisan changes reflected in today's bill.

Businesses are provided with relief through prospective application of the 100 parts per million lead content limits. That means, Mr. Speaker, businesses won't have to pull products from store shelves that meet the current legal limit of 300 parts per million on the effective date of the 100 parts per million limit. We also include an exemption for off-road vehicles, like ATVs, snowmobiles, and dirt bikes, from meeting the lead content limit. The safety of our young people is paramount when designing and building off-road vehicles, and constructing strong, rigid parts for these vehicles often requires more lead than CPSIA would otherwise allow.

Further, the bill codifies a stay of enforcement by the CPSC with respect to the lead content limit of bicycles until

December 31, 2011, and relaxes the ultimate lead content of bicycles to 300 parts per million.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, provides significant relief for small batch manufacturers. I have a tremendous amount of respect for America's small businesses and believe we must do all we can to protect them from overly burdensome regulations. At the same time, though, we have an obligation to protect America's children from potentially dangerous products. The only way to know if those products are safe is to test them.

Taking the unique circumstances of small batch manufacturers, the bill requires CPSC, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, to consider potential economic and administrative burdens to small batch manufacturers when developing third-party testing requirements. It further permits the CPSC to provide alternative testing requirements. After notice and a hearing, if the commission determines there is no economically practicable alternative, they can exempt the product from third-party testing altogether.

I am pleased that this bill provides specific relief from testing for ordinary books and magazines. Our colleague, Mr. EDOLPHUS TOWNS from New York, has been concerned about ordinary books becoming an unintended consequence of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act. Manufacturers of ordinary books and magazines should not be subject to third-party testing. Still subject to testing will be books that have plastic parts, like pop-up books, those with nonpaper-based accessories, or anything else that has inherent play value.

I strongly support the consumer product safety information database created by H.R. 4040, and that has been somewhat controversial. But I support the database creation. It went live earlier this year and has been extremely successful in helping to educate the public about potentially unsafe products. This bill takes some sensible steps to make the database even more effective.

The bill requires the commission, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, to seek out more information about the products reported by consumers to the database, like a product's serial number, a model number, or a photograph of the product in question. I think the more information that is provided, the better and more effective the database will be for consumers and businesses alike.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I support this bill. I believe it provides a strong compromise that will reduce burdens on businesses and continue to protect American consumers.

□ 1300

Again, I want to thank our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Chairwoman BONO MACK, for working with me in a bipartisan fashion to find solutions, commonsense, practical solutions for the American people.

I thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the chairman of the full committee, the ranking member of the full committee, all of the stakeholders who had a part in crafting this compromise.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG).

Mr. REHBERG. First of all, Madam Chairman, thank you for the fine work on this piece of legislation, something that's truly overdue.

Mr. Speaker, the difficulty we had was a number of years ago, a piece of legislation went through this Congress with all the right things attached. We wanted to address lead in children's toys. True to Washington, D.C., form, the bureaucrats carried it to the extent that no longer made any kind of a common sense.

When it came to time for the regulations to be crafted, I started receiving phone calls from my motorized vehicle dealers around the State of Montana, those that sold youth motorcycles, snowmobiles and ATVs, and they were being told that they had to take those units out of their showroom, eat the inventory, and could no longer sell their parts for repairs. Why? Because there was lead in some of the repair parts or on the units themselves.

Now, I don't know if there is anybody in America that allows their children to chew on battery cables and valve stems, but they were determined to be toys, and it doesn't make sense. I come from a ranching family, and on my place we allow our children the opportunity to be trained on the smaller units to herd our livestock for the specific purpose that we don't want them on the larger vehicles. Try as we might to get the administration to change their regulations, they were not willing to do that.

Today we are dealing with H.R. 2715, and it addresses a very important issue, kids just want to ride. They want the opportunity to ride the motorized vehicles, whether it is a snowmobile, a 4-wheeler or an ATV, for the specific purpose not just of recreation, but in a work setting as well.

Because we could not make this change, we had to do it legislatively. We were successful in putting on riders on the appropriations bill year after year that said no money could be spent on the enforcement of this particular piece of legislation and the rules and regulations that were crafted thereafter. We will no longer have to do that with the passage of this bill.

So it's with a great deal of appreciation that I say to Mrs. BONO MACK, thank you for bringing this piece of legislation forward; for the minority, thank you for your kind support as well in helping to move this forward and ultimately we can make the right commonsense decision, and that is to remove this aspect of this onerous regulation so once again, a kid, children, can ride the right vehicles so they won't be on the larger 4-wheel units, the larger snowmobiles and the larger motorcycles.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I want to thank the gentleman from Montana for working with us in crafting this compromise, and I hope he is satisfied with the ATV component. He has worked very hard and his staff has worked very hard to bring it to our attention.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member of our full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008.

The 2008 act was a historic piece of legislation, both because of the landmark health and safety protections in that bill for young children and because of the near unanimous support for that legislation from Democrats and Republicans. And it has been a success.

Because of the Consumer Product Safety Act, we now have in place basic safety standards for keeping toxic lead and phthalates out of children's products. The CPSC has made long overdue revisions to safety standards for cribs. Manufacturers and retailers have begun the process of testing to make sure children's products are proven safe before they have been put on the store shelves and into the hands of children.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission, after years of atrophy due to budget cuts and neglect, has been reinvigorated and become proactive, rather than reactive. As a result, we have seen a decline in the number of children's products that have to be pulled from homes and store shelves. The agency is intercepting more dangerous products at the border.

And, finally, the American public has since March had access to consumer product safety information in a database that they can review about injuries from consumer products. Consumers now have free and open access to information that for too long remained hidden inside the CPSC.

But like any law, the 2008 act had some rough edges that needed to be smoothed out.

For example, there are some products that require a small amount of lead to maintain their strength and durability and don't pose a serious threat to public health or safety. ATVs and bicycles are examples of these.

Some businesses expressed concern that they could find themselves with inventory that meets the current legal limit of 300 parts per million that can no longer be sold when the limit drops to 100 parts per million on August 14, just 2 weeks away.

The smallest of small businesses are worried that they can't bear the cost of complying with these requirements in the way that larger businesses can.

This bill addresses these concerns without jeopardizing our children's

safety. It is a compromise bill in the best sense.

Some Members on the other side wanted bigger changes to the 2008 act and some Members on our side do not believe every provision in the bill is needed. But thanks to the hard work of my colleagues, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BARTON and Mr. DINGELL, and the leadership of Chairman UPTON, we have arrived at a bill that I can support and urge my colleagues to join in supporting as well.

I think we have struck the right balance. We have fixed valid problems and keep in place valuable health and safety protections for children. That has been my primary goal throughout this process.

It was a long road to get to this place and after many hours and many months of tough negotiating, what we have here is a compromise that epitomizes bipartisanship. Neither side got everything it wanted, but both sides gave up enough that we were able to come up with something that was sensible and reasonable and that we can move quickly through this body. I hope the Senate sees it that way and can move quickly on this bill.

We all share the belief that American businesses should be able to grow and flourish. I also think we all share the belief that consumers, especially children, deserve safe products.

Again, I commend Chairwoman BONO MACK and Chairman UPTON for their willingness to hear us out and to work with us. I thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD for fighting for a balanced approach that keeps large and small businesses competitive and continues to keep our children safe from potentially dangerous products.

I also want to thank the other members of the Energy and Commerce Committee that have been active and helped us to get to today, including Mr. DINGELL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. ESHOO.

Mrs. BONO MACK. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't appear that I have any other speakers on this side. I think their attention might be directed in another direction today; so I am prepared to close.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of the individuals, all of the Members, all of the staff who have played a part in crafting this compromise. It's a good bipartisan compromise that we can all live with. I look forward to the President signing it into law after the Senate passes it, hopefully very soon, and hopefully our small businesses will be able to continue to be profitable.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, I also just want to echo the sentiments of both my colleagues who just spoke about the importance of this bill and thank them for their cooperation and the hard work that they put into this over the weekend. Again, I would like to thank the staffs of both the minority and the majority side.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise as an original co-sponsor and in strong support of H.R. 2715, a bill that will fix many of the unintended consequences of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act (CPSIA) of 2008. I, along with my colleagues, Messrs. RUSH, BARTON, WHITFIELD, and WAXMAN, helped write CPSIA in response to the massive influx of dangerous and tainted Chinese imports during what some have termed ''the summer of recalls'' in 2007. The House's bill was negotiated in a bipartisan manner. It was reported favorably by the Committee on Energy and Commerce through a unanimous vote and then passed by the full House, 407–1. Then our dear friends in the Senate got hold of the bill, and we have been trying to fix the mess ever since.

Although this process has taken over two-and-a-half years, I am pleased that H.R. 2715 will solve in great measure the problems CPSIA has caused. This bill will ensure that CPSIA's lead limits are prospective. It will put in place a waiver process to exempt from CPSIA's lead limits products that do not pose a danger to children's health and safety. H.R. 2715 will make the common-sense clarification that CPSIA's lead limits do not apply to bicycles, all-terrain vehicles (ATVs), and books. Finally, the bill will allow the Commission discretion to prescribe alternative third-party testing requirements with a view toward helping smaller businesses with more finite resources comply with the law. It bears mentioning that all of these changes will not undo the strict protections built into CPSIA to keep kids safe from dangerous products.

H.R. 2715's significant improvements to CPSIA come as a result of bipartisan negotiation and cooperation. Despite the turmoil and rancor in Congress over the past few months, this bill shows that the House of Representatives can still legislate and do so in a manner befitting our Founding Fathers' vision of representative government. I would like to thank my friends and colleagues, Messrs. UPTON, WAXMAN, and BUTTERFIELD for their fine work on H.R. 2715. Mrs. BONO MACK, in particular, deserves praise and congratulations for her success on this bill, her first as Chairman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade. Although often overlooked, the work of staff on H.R. 2715 demands deserved recognition, especially that of Gib Mullan and Michelle Ash, Republican and Democratic counsels, respectively. Their steadfast determination and hard work have made this bill a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 2715 and in so doing help put CPSIA's long and storied legislative sage to rest. We should all support this bill with the knowledge that it—in a manner pleasing to Hippocrates—will do no harm. I pray our colleagues in the other body will adhere to this principle in their expeditious consideration of H.R. 2715.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this bi-partisan legislation that will help protect consumers against dangerous products that may do them harm. This legislation affects a broad spectrum of our economy, from the manufacturers of toys to the children that play with them. I am truly delighted that Democrats and Republicans were able to come together to support a plan to increase the safety of all children's products manufactured in this country. I am also pleased that this bipartisan agreement addresses some of the unintended consequences of the original legislation without sacrificing the safety requirements that I believe are necessary to protect our children.

Our committee has had several months of consultation with industry officials to alleviate the burden placed on them by the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act's (CPSIA) new standards and regulations. These common sense reforms such as allowing flexibility for the CPSC to exempt specific products and exclude certain used children's products were supported by many of the stakeholders that will be affected by the legislation we are considering today.

I again want to commend Chairman BONO MACK and Ranking Member BUTTERFIELD for coming together and bringing this improved legislation to the floor. I encourage my colleagues to vote yes on this legislation, I also urge my colleagues to continue to work together in the spirit of bi-partisanship to protect the standards of safety that our constituents demand of us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO MACK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2715.

The question was taken.

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

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2715, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 398, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1933, by the yeas and nays.

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

PROVIDING GREATER AUTHORITY AND DISCRETION TO CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2715) to provide the Consumer Product Safety Commission with greater authority and discretion in enforcing the consumer product safety laws, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO MACK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 2, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 683]

YEAS—421

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—2

Kucinich

NOT VOTING—9

Baca
Bachmann
Giffords
Gohmert
Green, Gene
Hinchey
Landry
Moore
Olver

□ 1428

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENDING IMMIGRATION STATUS PETITION AND INTERVIEW TIME REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 398) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to toll, during active-duty service abroad in the Armed Forces, the periods of time to file a petition and appear for an interview to remove the conditional basis for permanent resident status, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 426, nays 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 684]

YEAS—426

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)

Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Baca
Bachmann
Giffords
Green, Gene
Hinchey
Olver

□ 1446

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NON-IMMIGRANT NURSES VISA REAUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1933) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the requirements for admission of non-immigrant nurses in health professional shortage areas, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 17, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 685]

YEAS—407

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—17

Amash
Blackburn
Broun (GA)
DeFazio
DesJarlais
Duncan (TN)
Gohmert
Gosar
Graves (GA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Nugent
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Rohrabacher
Walsh (IL)
Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—8

Baca
Bachmann
Duffy
Giffords
Green, Gene
Hinchey
Moore
Posey

□ 1454

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 365, BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–190) on the resolution (H. Res. 384) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 365) to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 365, BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 384 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 384

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 365) to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, 15 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 15 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend, the gentlewoman from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. DREIER. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, after months and months of debate, we have arrived at the ultimate goal to which we are all committed: a bipartisan agreement to avert the debt ceiling crisis looming right before us. Even more importantly, we have crafted a plan that addresses the real underlying challenge of our ballooning national debt.

The bipartisan agreement before us today is an historic achievement. Mr. Speaker, this is the 76th time that we have raised the debt ceiling since 1962. Seventy-five times it has been raised. This is the 76th time. Yet, Mr. Speaker, it is the very first time that we have done so while making corresponding cuts in spending that exceed the ceiling increase. To most of us, this is just good common sense. It's the only responsible thing to do. Yet 75 times before, no connection was made between the debt ceiling and efforts to tackle our debt.

With today's underlying legislation, we are fundamentally changing the way business is done here in Washington. We are setting a new precedent for fiscal discipline and accountability. This is a tremendous achievement that will have a profound and lasting impact on our budget and our economy in both the short, medium and long term. This is an especially critical point to focus on.

□ 1500

Today's legislation has dramatic implications for both the budget and our economy. Mr. Speaker, as you know very well, the two are inextricably linked. This is why our fiscal situation is so important. We don't need a balanced budget for the sake of a balanced budget, we need to balance our budget because job creation and economic growth depend on it.

There is a reason why the major credit agencies have said that our AAA credit rating is in jeopardy if we don't dramatically cut spending. Multitrillion-dollar deficits and a national debt that approaches 100 percent of GDP are not sustainable. Democrats and Republicans alike recognize that. If we want to inspire confidence in the U.S. economy, create jobs, and restore our position as the world's most vital and dynamic economy, we absolutely must chart a new fiscal course.

The bipartisan agreement that we will consider today does just that. It makes meaningful, immediate spending cuts. It sets up a process that guarantees votes in both Chambers by Thanksgiving on an even bigger package. This will give us the time necessary to go beyond cuts to significant new reforms. That includes reforming entitlement programs to keep them solvent and ensure that they don't force us back onto a path of spiraling deficits and debt.

Mr. Speaker, by setting up this process, we can responsibly make the hard but essential choices that will restore our economy and unleash its power to create new opportunities for Americans. The underlying legislation will also impose additional automatic cuts, should Congress fail to continue on a path to real reform.

Mr. Speaker, we are all in this together, Democrat and Republican alike. We all stand to suffer tremendously if we fail to either raise the debt ceiling or take this opportunity to fundamentally change course. We will all suffer if we fail to continue the process of meaningful reform. But by coming together and enacting real reform, by remaining committed to this joint effort into the future, we can all share in the benefits of a surging economy and job market. We can't approach a challenge of this magnitude as Republicans and Democrats first, but as fellow Americans who share a commitment to our prosperity as a Nation now and into the future.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman from California, my good friend, Mr. DREIER, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, after a tense standoff over a self-inflicted crisis, I'm extremely disappointed with the solution that is being proposed today.

It's important that we raise the debt ceiling; in fact, it is the duty of every Member of Congress to ensure we pay our bills. Unfortunately, we have reached this point because some on the other side see paying our bills as optional and have asked a king's ransom for doing so. In the process, the majority has shown the world that our democracy is currently dysfunctional. Even if we avoid default, the process that got us to this point has already shown the world that the greatest nation on Earth can barely keep the lights on.

Recently, IMF Chief Christine Lagarde told CNN in not so many words that we are destroying the world's faith in our ability to be the most powerful economy on Earth and our ability to pay our bills. This dysfunction is only highlighted further by the proposed creation of a so-called ''Super Committee,'' a closed-door committee that will determine how to cut another $1 trillion in government spending while 523 elected Representatives are told to sit on the sidelines and vote up and down when all is said and done. I repeat what I said last week, my constituents did not send me to Congress to sit on sidelines while the most important issues of our time are being decided.

The crumbling faith in our democracy is already having an effect on our

economy. Just last week, Roll Call reported that the prolonged debate over raising the debt ceiling resulted in an increase in Federal borrowing costs—a fancy way to say that interest rates for car loans and home mortgages are higher now than they should have or would have been.

Furthermore, today's agreement does nothing to create jobs for the 25 million Americans who failed to find full-time jobs last month. On Friday, we will receive a jobs report that will provide even more evidence that while Congress has shrugged aside the urgent need to create jobs, millions of Americans continue to suffer. This bill does nothing to serve them.

The majority has steadfastly refused to consider a balanced approach to reducing our deficit, rejecting attempts to close tax loopholes for the rich and extend unemployment benefits for those unable to find work. Instead, they have decided to only consider the draconian cuts that threaten to reverse whatever fragile economic recovery is underway.

On Sunday, Mohamed El-Erian, the CEO of a major financial firm, spoke of the damage that proposed cuts will inflict on our economy. While speaking on ABC, he said, ''Unemployment will be higher than it would have been otherwise, growth will be lower than it would have been otherwise, and inequality will be worse than it would have been otherwise.'' He added, ''We have a very weak economy. Withdrawing more spending at this stage is going to make it even weaker.''

Today's agreement will endanger the potential for new jobs while asking absolutely nothing of those in our country who are the most well off.

Democrats will continue to vigorously fight for Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare to ensure that not a penny is cut from the checks of seniors and working people who rely on these programs every day. It is a contract.

We believe that ultimately we must take a balanced approach to reducing our deficit. Tax loopholes must be closed, and those who have benefited the most in this country must be asked to pay their fair share. And regardless of the outcome of today's bill, these are the priorities for which I will continue to fight.

Especially as the debt debate continues, I urge my colleagues to look towards a balanced approach and return this country to its rightful place as a shining example of democracy and equality for which we should once again aspire.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that this is a very unique moment for us. We have the ability to come together at a time when we are faced with a deadline. That deadline, as we all know, is midnight tomorrow.

The commitment that has been made to Social Security, Medicare, our veterans, and other programs is one which we, as Republicans, clearly stand by. And I've got to say that we know that since those programs have been put into place, when it comes to Social Security and Medicare, every working American has been forced to pay into the Medicare and Social Security funds through their FICA tax. By virtue of that contract that we have, we stand here strongly committed—contrary to what many people may say—to ensuring the solvency and the strength of Social Security for today's retirees and future generations as well. And I believe that this package that we have here today, that will enjoy bipartisan support, reaffirms that exact commitment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. RANGEL. My colleagues, I'm voting against the rule because, in the later years in this Congress, I've seen a whole lot of things, but it's never been this polarized, it's never been in terms of attacking a President, and it's never been risking the whole fiscal credibility of the great United States of America in order to make political gains.

Clearly, when everyone talks about everyone must make a sacrifice, I assume that we're talking about a sacrifice in cutting the budget, not receiving the benefits; the protections of some programs and not others. And then on the other side, I have to pause because I don't see any sacrifice. It's assumed by the general public that the sacrifice means that maybe if you became wealthy under the great support that you received from this country, that you'll make some small sacrifice; or maybe that sacrifice could be interpreted as that when you received preferential treatment in the Tax Code for all of these years, that you're willing to say I don't need it now, you were there when I needed you.

□ 1510

But I think it's safe to say that the American people will be making sacrifices, and they're making it for a crisis that they're so far away from.

The people that enjoyed the crisis in terms of financial gain are not asked even to say ''I'm sorry.'' And the people that really love, respect, and hope, and dream, that lost their homes and their jobs, their self-esteem, these are the ones that will make further sacrifices. Only this time it won't be the executive branch. It certainly won't be the courts. It would be our own colleagues, from the Senate and from the House. A group of ''super members'' will go into a room to decide for us what the next trillions of dollars is going to be cut from a budget.

And if they can't succeed, then there would be an automatic cut right across the board regardless of whether or not some programs should survive and others should be abolished.

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

Mr. DREIER. May I yield my friend an additional 30 seconds, Mr. Speaker, and I ask him to yield to me.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the distinguished chairman of this great committee. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the patriotism that you have shown not only to the committee and the Republican Party but to this great country over the years.

I'm just so sorry on this great occasion that you would take your chairmanship to produce a rule like this that Americans cannot see their way clear to say this has been fair and this has been equal.

I yield back the balance of my time. Thank you so much.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to my friend, and I would like to have a discussion with him, if I might. I would yield an additional 30 seconds and ask him to yield to me, especially if he wants to continue.

Mr. RANGEL. I'm so sorry.

Mr. DREIER. I yielded time to my friend and then asked him to yield to me.

Mr. RANGEL. Oh, yes, I didn't understand you had made that request.

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

Mr. DREIER. I will yield an additional 30 seconds, and I would hope that he would continue what he was saying in the first half of his presentation about me rather than the last half.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that it is very clear that what we have before us is in fact a bipartisan agreement to do exactly what my friend at the end of his statement was saying. We want very much to ensure that people are able to keep their homes. We want to ensure that people are able to see their businesses thrive. We want job opportunities to be created for every American.

I know my friend agrees that getting our fiscal house in order, it is going to be critically important to do that.

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

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

I would say to my friend that frankly we're in a position where 75 times since 1962 we've increased the debt ceiling without focusing on the challenge of the debt itself.

Mr. RANGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you.

The answer to this problem is three things: jobs, jobs, and more jobs.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I totally associate myself

with the remarks of my very good friend from New York and say that jobs, jobs, jobs continue to be our top priority. And I believe that this legislation before us is going to go a long way towards doing just that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I think that my friend from California, the chairman, my friend from New York, the chairman emeritus, have it exactly right. The issue is jobs. And that's really what this bill on the floor today is about.

One of the reasons, but for sure not the only reason, that our companies aren't hiring and our economy is not growing is uncertainty about interest rates. If you're thinking about adding on a new store or hiring more people to do more R&D and you think the interest rates are going to rise, you don't to it. If you're not sure what they're going to do, you don't do it. And we've been living under a period of uncertainty for two reasons with respect to interest rates.

The first is are we going to default on our national obligations? The House today will and should emphatically say no, we will not. And then the second question is will Uncle Sam continue to eat up too much of the entrepreneurial capital in this country to finance ever-growing Federal deficits?

The House today will and should, in my view, approve the bill before us that will begin to make a reduction in that deficit. This bill will reduce our projected deficit by anywhere from 25 to 35 percent. And it's important to understand what history tells us about sincere and legitimate deficit reduction.

In 1993, President Bill Clinton's plan was supposed to reduce the deficit by 28 percent. It did not. It reduced the deficit entirely. That bill was supposed to generate $500 billion in deficit reduction. In fact, it generated $1.6 trillion in deficit reduction. That's the elixir that the American economy needs now.

And I do not, my colleagues, believe that this is the only step that we need to accomplish in order to reduce unemployment. But it is an essential step. And for that reason, I am pleased to join with both Republicans and Democrats in voting ''yes'' for this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I would like to thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my friend for his very thoughtful statement.

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

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

I would say to my friend, Mr. Speaker, that if we look back on the juxtaposition of that projected $500 billion in deficit reduction and the $1.6 trillion that we attained, we know why it is that that came about. It was gross domestic product growth. And my friend and I have been working together for many years focused on how it is that we can get our economy growing.

In so doing, I believe as we continue to focus on that, that we will be able to see benefits beyond those anticipated today when it comes to deficit reduction if we're able to generate—unfortunately, we have had 1.3 percent GDP growth reported from the last quarter. If we can get to 3, 4, 5 percent GDP growth, my friend knows very well that we're going to be in a position where we will be able to see an even greater reduction of the deficits in years to come.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. I agree with him, and I think that we owe it to the country to find common ground on economic growth.

The best deficit reduction plan is full employment. And the best full employment plan will be one that we could come together on. I think today is an important first step. It came too late, it was ugly getting here, but I'm glad we got here.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for his very thoughtful remarks.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank the gentlelady, my good friend from New York.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the rules of the House. The Sergeant of Arms is to remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The Sergeant of Arms will restore order to the gallery.

The Sergeant at Arms will remove the disturbance from the gallery.

□ 1520

The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had no idea that my pending remarks would lead to such a wellspring of apparent support.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that in the last rejoinder between the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from California, spending cuts at this level are not going to create any jobs. The idea that spending cuts and deficit reduction will lead to unprecedented economic prosperity is absolutely a false economic premise. Getting control of our fiscal house to make sure that we make productive investments and create jobs will create jobs.

With respect to the proposal underlying this rule, Mr. Speaker, there's plenty for members of both parties to find objectionable, and they might be right, but the choice before us is not that between this proposal and some platonic ideal. It is between this proposal and catastrophic default tomorrow.

Unlike the cynical bill this Chamber passed on a party-line vote last week, this bill commits America to meeting its obligations for the longer term, it leaves all options on the table, including revenue for the bipartisan committee this fall to further reduce the deficit, and having triggers, painful for both parties, adds real accountability and strict enforcement.

The American people understand we need a balance to restore fiscal responsibility and grow our economy. Recent GDP and manufacturing numbers are painful reminders, Mr. Speaker, of the fragility of our economy and its recovery, and the actions of House Republicans, sadly, have only exacerbated that by pulling back on key investments in infrastructure and innovation.

It's time to end the reckless game of chicken being waged here in this House. I commend President Obama and other leadership for leading the adult conversation to bring about this compromise. It is now time for us to do the responsible thing and bring to heel the wolf at the door.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that it is very interesting that as we have come together in a bipartisan way to address the crisis of increasing our debt ceiling, tackling the challenge of reducing the $14.3 trillion national debt that we have, we had this disruption in the gallery.

Now I turned around, Mr. Speaker, and looked up there, and I will tell you—I don't know if you saw the placard that they were carrying—it had in great big letters across it, Create Jobs. Create Jobs is the message that they had. And, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what we are doing, again working very diligently in a bipartisan way to ensure that we do just that.

With that, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to a hardworking member of the Committee on Rules, my good friend from Grandfather Community, North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from California, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding.

I just did an interview with the TV station in my district. One of the questions that the interviewer asked is, ''What does this mean to the average person in your district? People are paying attention to what's going on in D.C.''

And I said, ''That's probably the best thing that's happened out of this whole debate, that people are paying attention. Had they been paying attention

the last 40 years, we wouldn't be in the situation that we're in.''

I then pointed out to her that in today's dollars, Federal spending per U.S. household went from $11,431 in 1965 to $29,401 in 2010. That tells us all that we need to know. The Federal Government is addicted to spending. We need to cut spending, not raise taxes, and this compromise bill does that.

Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from California said, we want to create jobs, and the best way to do that is to stop taking money out of the private sector, stop overtaxing the people in this country, leave that money in the private sector and allow it to be used to create jobs.

This is not a perfect bill. We all say it's not a perfect bill, both sides of the aisle. That generally means that it's a good bill because it's not perfect, and when people want compromise and they hear that, then they know that's right.

But the change in direction is historic. We're going from seeing how much money we can spend to how much can we cut. I am intrigued at a lot of my colleagues across the aisle, they've obviously been on the road to Damascus, because their whole language has changed in response to this bill, but I am glad they have finally seen the light and I hope in the future they're going to join us in more efforts like this.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Tea Party for extorting a deal made in their image and their image alone. The cuts will be deep, they will be lasting, and they will weaken an already depressed economy. What's clear is that the Tea Party is so ideologically driven to kill government that they're willing to kill the private sector, kill jobs, and kill growth in the process.

What's more, these cuts will be loaded onto the backs of seniors and the American middle class, all while asking the wealthiest among us to sacrifice nothing. Once again, the rich will feel no pain and the vulnerable will pay for their spoils.

Mr. Speaker, the process in which we got here has undermined our democratic system. While Democrats and the President negotiated in good faith, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle demonstrated a craven willingness to risk financial collapse for their extreme demands. As Democrats conceded time after time and provision after provision on this deal, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle just continued to issue new demands, all the while compromising nothing. Moreover, I am very concerned with the precedent set by this ''super committee'' whose establishment threatens our democratic process with its unconstitutional structure.

Mr. Speaker, I can honestly say if this bill passes, it may be the single worst piece of public policy to ever come out of this institution. I cannot support this rule, and I urge my Democratic colleagues not to be complicit in a Republican plan to eventually cut Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid and investment in our future, all while asking the rich to sacrifice nothing.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to say to my fellow Angeleno that, while I've associated myself with the remarks of most of my other colleagues, I'm hard-pressed to associate myself with her remarks.

With that, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to another hardworking member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Lawrenceville, Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I was excited to come down here today, because when I ran for Congress, there was just a short list of things that I wanted to do when I got here. I'm one of the new guys, one of this crowd of 96 new freshmen.

Two things among those: Number one, folks back home said we're spending too much. $1.091 trillion is how much we spent in discretionary spending in 2010. This bill that the Rules Committee brings to the floor today brings it down to $1.043 trillion, a $50 billion cut from 2 years ago, not decreasing the rate of growth but actually changing the trajectory of spending in this country. That's what folks back home said they wanted me to do.

Number two, I hold in my hand the United States Constitution. I turn to the back; conveniently enough in my edition, there's a little blank space after Amendment 27. There is space for Amendment 28, and for the first time in 15 years, this bill guarantees us a vote on a balanced budget amendment. If you don't trust your Members of Congress, trust your United States Constitution, and trust that this bill gives the American people a vote that they have not had in far too long.

□ 1530

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Collinsville, Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I am not coming down here to blame one side or the other for the financial position that we are in because we all have a part to play in the story, but this is a great day. I was also asked earlier about how I felt about today, and I told them I felt relieved.

I was afraid of the credit markets. I was afraid of rising interest rates. Whatever recovery we are having, I was afraid that it could stem that tide. So I do feel a great relief. This is one of the few times, in the 103 times that we have actually cut spending, when we tried in attempting to raise the debt limit. We can no longer continue to spend and borrow 42 cents of every dollar that we spend. It's ridiculous, and this is starting to change that process.

We are going to have discretionary cuts. We are going to have entitlement reforms.

I do like the supercommittee: bicameral, bipartisan, equally divided. When have we had a committee where we have equally divided the decision-making not upon majority and minority side, but equally divided, three Republicans, three Democrats in the House; three Republicans, three Democrats in the Senate? If this committee can't start addressing our entitlement reforms, then I am afraid we are never going to do it.

So I have great faith in my colleagues who will be put on this committee. We really have to make the great choices.

I appreciate the Rules Committee for bringing this to the floor, and my good friend, DAVID DREIER. And I hope that we will continue to move forward, pass the rule, and pass the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself 30 seconds to comment on the supercommittee.

When was the last time we had a bipartisan group like that? Simpson-Bowles, which got absolutely nowhere; the Gang of Six in the Senate, again which got absolutely nowhere. And six and six, I can imagine what it is going to be like to get somebody to be the seventh vote on the other side.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that there is a great big difference between the commissions that have been established in the past and the fact that this is a congressional committee, for the first time made up of our colleagues from the House and the Senate.

The gentlewoman is absolutely right. These outside commissions that have been there have made recommendations and they have gone virtually nowhere.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. If I may respond to the gentleman, I don't think the Gang of Six was any outside committee.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend from New York for yielding to me.

I rise today in opposition to the Budget Control Act amendment. Over the past months, I have been urging for a clean vote to raise the debt ceiling, a vote that has taken place 75 times since FDR was President, 18 times under Reagan, eight times under Bush. And I think that's what we should have done, and then put our heads together.

You see, I disagree with my friends on the other side of the aisle. It isn't just entitlement reform that we need;

although, we do need entitlement reform. It isn't just for government to spend less that we need; although, we do need government to spend less.

But what happened to fairness? Why are we asking this bill to balance our budget on the backs of the middle class and poor people? Why do we not have anything in this bill that makes millionaires and billionaires, who can afford to pay a little bit more, pay a little bit more? Why don't we close tax loopholes so that Big Oil and gas and other corporations pay their fair share? Why don't we do any of that whatsoever?

So this bill is unbalanced to begin with. Now we are talking about some supercommittee, even amounts of Democrats and Republicans, even amounts from the Senate and the House. To me, that's a recipe for gridlock. And I guarantee you, my colleagues, we're going to be here at that point after Thanksgiving when nothing is going to happen, and we are going to wind up with entitlement cuts that are going to hurt my seniors and your seniors with Medicare and graduate medical education in New York, which is so important. Hurt that, hurt the providers.

Who are we kidding? We're going to cut from the providers, the hospitals and think it's not going to impact on patient quality and patient care? What about the doc fix, when our doctors say, We're not taking Medicare patients anymore?

This bill, to me, is a pig in a poke, and I'm not willing to buy a pig in a poke.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I first yield myself 30 seconds.

I was engaging in a colloquy with my good friend from Rochester, the distinguished ranking minority member, and I would be happy to yield to her in just a moment, Mr. Speaker. But back to this issue of this joint select committee that is going to be charged with coming up with $1.5 trillion in proposed cuts, and their recommendations will be sent to both Houses of Congress for an up or down vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is unprecedented, because unlike the commissions that have been put together, the Bowles-Simpson Commission, unlike this little caucus of Senators that my friend just mentioned, this Gang of Six, there is no legislative authority or power.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

There is no legislative authority or power. This time this demonstrates that Members of the House and Senate will, in fact, come together and work in a bipartisan way to ensure that we bring about meaningful spending cuts to the tune of $1.5 trillion. That's the difference that exists with this proposal that is before us.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Moore, Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question this isn't a perfect bill. There's a lot of things that I would have liked and I know that other Members on my side of the aisle would have liked. We would have liked deeper spending cuts. We would have certainly liked some entitlement reform in this. We would have preferred to mandate that this House and the other body take up a balanced budget amendment and give the people in the States an opportunity to render a decision on that. Those things aren't in this bill.

I know there's things that some of my friends on the other side wanted: higher taxes, no changes in entitlements. They didn't get everything they wanted either.

But this bill does adhere to the principles our Speaker laid out at the very beginning of the negotiations.

First, most importantly, and both sides agree on this, it avoids default. It avoids the United States not paying its obligations for the first time in 235 years. I am glad both sides cooperated and got that done.

Secondly, it actually cuts spending and links those spending cuts to the raising of the debt ceiling. There's more spending cuts than there is increased borrowing going forward. That's a good thing.

Third, no new taxes, something that would be a killer on the new economy.

And, finally, while we don't get a guarantee of a balanced budget amendment, we do get a guaranteed vote.

This is exactly what the American people have asked us to do: come together, compromise, work together on their behalf, and let them get about their business without creating additional problems for them.

With this bill, we put the American people first. We're going to continue to work on their problems. So I urge that we pass the rule and the underlying legislation.

I thank my friend for giving me the time to speak.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a challenging day. It's a difficult day, but it's a day that we're making a decision, a big decision, an important decision that the United States of America will not default on its obligations. This sends stability to the financial markets all around the world, and it really embellishes our stature as the gold standard. And that is very important.

It also gives us until 2013 for us to be able to revisit this again, as the President of the United States asked. And I think another important thing that it does is it helps us to hurry up and get this all-consuming issue of the debt and the deficit and the raising of the debt ceiling off the front burner so we can immediately put jobs back on the front burner.

So, ladies and gentlemen, we must focus our attention now on jobs. That's what the American people want us to do. On this Friday, we're going to have a jobs report. And I want us to carefully look at that jobs report, and especially look at that side of the jobs report that shows the number of jobs we're losing in the public sector.

□ 1540

So as we are here engaging, and some of my friends are celebrating, the whole issue of us cutting $2.5 trillion out of our budget over the 10-year period, it is important to know that there is a cost for this, my friends, and that cost is a loss of public jobs.

So as we set this new commission up, this new committee, we have got to make sure that as these cuts go forward that we understand the sensitivity of trying to make these cuts away from putting more of our people on the jobless rolls. Right now, the greatest contribution that the Federal Government is making to jobs is putting more people out of jobs.

So I ask that we take time now, now that we are going to put this issue behind us, to focus like a laser beam on jobs.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to one of our diligent new members of the freshman class, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

Mr. DOLD. I want to thank the distinguished chairman from San Dimas, California.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, our getting our fiscal house in order is one of the most important things that we can do in this body to jump-start our economy.

Just recently our economy has seen weak economic growth, especially over the last two quarters. Just today we find out that manufacturing is at its lowest level in the last 2 years. In my district, the 10th District of Illinois, we have one of the largest manufacturing districts in the country, and there is no doubt that families—not only in the 10th District, but across the land—are struggling.

Today I am optimistic that Washington is finally coming together in a bipartisan way to find some common ground on this debt ceiling debate. We must, we must move forward. Hard-working taxpayers have had enough, and I get it. We have spending discipline here in Washington, no more budget gimmicks, no more accounting tricks, no more empty promises. American families have had to tighten their belts all across the land. American businesses had to do the same. They should expect the Federal Government should follow suit. Now is the time to move forward and focus on jobs.

If we were serious about paying down our debt and increasing revenue, then we must empower job creators. Small businesses in our Nation are overburdened by economic uncertainty, government regulations, and redtape. We need to implement commonsense solutions and create jobs to get our economy moving again.

As a small business owner, Mr. Speaker, I employ just under 100 families, and for me that's an enormous responsibility. We have to move forward. We have to empower job creators. We have to talk about getting 9.2 percent unemployment down so that we can get our economy going and bring additional revenues into the Federal coffers by putting more people back to work.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a member of the Budget and Ways and Means Committees.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy.

Well, we are facing an artificial Republican debt crisis that was a crisis of choice, of their choice. Remember, we have repeatedly increased the debt ceiling for Republican and Democratic administrations and congresses year in and year out.

This proposal moving forward is very troubling on several levels. First, it empowers the most reckless and extreme elements, not just in the House Republican Caucus today, but it is a blueprint for mischief for either party in the future.

Next we are starting down a path of more budget cuts at a time when all the experts assure us this will weaken the economy, when, instead, we should be strengthening, dealing with economic growth, not reducing demand. It's all the more frustrating because there is a path going forward that is clear.

The public strongly supports a balanced approach, which should include tax reform that would raise money while make the Tax Code more fair and simple. Do we need a commission to implement suggestions, to right-size the military, both its mission and its budget? Absolutely not.

There are lots of ideas and support on both sides of the aisle that could be enacted to achieve this goal. But the magnitude of the trigger actually invites mischief. Again, when we have seen the Republican ''take no prisoners'' attitude, what leads anybody to believe they won't do it in this case?

Most important, we should be revitalizing the economy by rebuilding and renewing America, financed by modest increases in user fees. This has support all across the business community, labor, environment, local government, even some of my Republican friends, but they take this off the table.

And, last but not least, one of the most simple things we could do would be to implement agricultural reform to save money and help people who farm and people who eat, rather than lavish subsidies for large agribusiness. These are things that we should be doing. These are things that actually could have bipartisan support.

Unfortunately, this agreement, if it goes forward, will delay that important work of reform and fiscal responsibility while it weakens both the economy and the decisionmaking process for years to come. Government on autopilot in a slow, downward spiral is not a victory in anybody's book.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I would say to my very good friend that I agree with some of the remarks that he made on doing things like eliminating agricultural subsidies. I would say to my friend from Oregon, who is still in the Chamber here and now walking off the floor, I would say to my friend that I agree with his remarks about the need for us to focus on agriculture subsidies and bringing about a reduction there.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

I would say that we are trying to work this out with a spirit of bipartisanship. My friend began his statement by saying that this was a crisis developed by Republican policies.

Since we are working in a bipartisan way, I think the notion that recognizing that an 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending over the past 4 years clearly played a role in getting us exactly where we are.

I yield 1½ minutes to another one of our hardworking new Members of Congress, the gentleman from Little Rock, Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN).

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, when I announced and wanted to run for Congress, my focus primarily was on the debt, on the issue of the debt and the impact that the debt was going to have on my daughter and my little boy. My daughter, Mary Katherine, is sitting with me right here today for this historic day. It's critically important to me. And a lot of the folks back home that I hear from, when they contact me, they contact me about the debt and about spending.

Now I came up here to do something about it, and I have been watching this debate closely, and I have been a supporter of the Speaker both on the plan last week, and I am a supporter of the agreement that is going to come before us today. Is it perfect? Absolutely not. Is it great? Absolutely not. It is good? It's a good first step.

I would say this: If a President and a Senate that I agreed with put this type of plan forward, I would reject it out of hand.

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

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. If a deal, an agreement like this, came from a President with which I generally agree, and a Senate with which I generally agreed, I would reject it out of hand. But that's not what we have. We have divided government. We have this Chamber controlled by a different vision for America.

So I believe this is about as good as we are going to get, and I am supporting it because it is consistent with my principles. There are no tax increases. It controls spending now, controls spending in the future, and allows us to vote on a balanced budget amendment.

These are all things that I can support. These are the principles that we have been fighting for over the last few months. And I would say this: If this were the only step ever in dealing with the debt, I would vote ''no,'' but it's not.

□ 1550

It's only the beginning. We didn't get in this mess with one bill or one piece of legislation. It took a long time and a lot of votes, and it's going to take a long time and a lot of battles to get out of it. And this is a good first step.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from references to guests on the floor of the House.

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

Mr. DREIER. At this point I'm very happy to yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, my good friend from St. Joseph, Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. I appreciate the minute.

My constituents are saying get the job done. Vote for the rule and vote for the bill. The President said about a year ago, I want to say it was the State of the Union Address, the debt today is unsustainable. He's right. And for the first time, we are coupling an increase in the debt ceiling with real reductions in spending. No, this is not reducing the rate of growth in spending. This is actually reducing spending. In fact, at the end of the day, when we look at fiscal year 2012 versus fiscal year 2011, we are going to be spending less money in 2012 than we did in the 2011.

Nobody—nobody—is coming to our offices and saying cut our spending. But, in fact, the American public is saying, Federal Government, cut your spending. That's what this bill will do. It's going to reduce spending. Yes, it's going to increase the ceiling on the debt, but it's coupled with real reforms that I think the American public want, and that's why it's going to have some bipartisan support when we deal with this issue a little bit later on this afternoon.

So I commend the leadership on both sides of the aisle. Let's get the job done. Let's get it over with so we can get to the business of running the rest of the government and the country.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to another one of our thoughtful new Members, the gentleman from Drexel Hill, Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank you for the opportunity to address the Chamber this morning.

I am pleased to speak on behalf of this bill, a bill that will address the

terrible uncertainty that has been taking place over the course of these last few weeks—the seniors, the taxpayers, the small business people who have been speaking to me as I have been making the phone calls and talked with them about the concerns that they have in this era of uncertainty.

I've heard commentary that this is identified as a crisis caused by Republicans when, in fact, the crisis has been the business as usual which has been taking place in Washington, D.C. This is finally a time in which we looked at the issues that are before us and made the tough decisions to address the long-term unsustainability of this debt; $14.2 trillion in debt is going to be facing the next generation. I note that there are arguments that somehow it was policies of Big Oil and health care, the things that have been Republican policies when, in fact, if you look just at the beginnings of this administration, there was the commitment to Medicare, there were the subsidies to Big Oil, we were in with the subsidies, not just to Big Oil, but also involved in two wars and the debt was $162 billion. Now it's 1.2 trillion.

We must take these kinds of steps and work together. This is a solution that will allow a genuine bipartisan opportunity to address this for the future generations, create predictability, and allow us to get back to creating jobs. I urge Members from both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the era of debts and deficits must come to an end. However, in addressing this problem, we must look at what got us here. It wasn't overspending on low-income housing, job training or education—which all stand at historically low levels. It was two unfunded wars and the Bush tax cuts which keep on giving to America's wealthiest.

Unfortunately, the legislation before us today keeps every tax break for the wealthy and means billions more in resources will be used to fund these two wars.

We keep hearing how critical this bill is to getting our economy back on track. It is hard to imagine how this legislation will do so. I cannot support any proposal with such big cuts in education, economic development and job training that will hamper our recovery. In the weeks leading up to today there was a lot of rhetoric for shared sacrifice. Unfortunately, what we are considering today places the burden of the fiscal mess squarely on our Nation's working families, and that is something I cannot support.

I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule and vote ''no'' on this ill-conceived legislation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say that your superb presiding over this House is only exceeded by the gentlewoman from Hinsdale, Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), and I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it's been a long road and one with more uncertainty than the American people should have to put up with. Fortunately, the ugly part of the process is behind us, and it's time to come together behind a realistic deal that will restore strength to the economy and deliver peace of mind to the American public.

I believe that this is that deal. It's not perfect, but with a majority in just one Chamber, House Republicans negotiated a compromise that will be part of the debt solution, not part of the debt problem. It will stop a job-killing default, but cut spending even more. And it will hold Congress and the President accountable with automatic spending cuts and a guaranteed vote on the balanced budget amendment. Most importantly, it doesn't raise taxes—something that would damage our recovery.

We have changed the conversation. The President is no longer asking for a blank check; he is negotiating with us to cut spending. This is how we'll end this spiral of debt that is draining our economy of capital, competence and jobs.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have contributed to this discussion, and I urge them to support this bipartisan deal. Let's get the job done.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'm very happy to yield 1½ minutes to my good friend from Clinton Township, New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Thank you, Chairman DREIER, for your leadership on this extremely important issue.

I rise in support of the rule, and I rise in support the underlying legislation which is, by its nature, bipartisan, bicameral and a compromise that avoids default, adds certainty to our economic recovery, and puts our Nation on a sustainable path towards fiscal responsibility. What we need in America is jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs, and this will help that effort forward.

This support is consistent with my longstanding efforts to bring fiscal sanity to New Jersey and to be among those attempting to bring it here to Washington. The main portions of the compromise have been outlined, but for the first time the narrative on Capitol Hill is no longer how much can government spend, but how we can best reduce spending. This new awakening to fiscal prudence is in the best interests of the Nation and, indeed, I believe is the critical issue of our generation.

I commend Speaker BOEHNER for his superb leadership on this issue, and I shall vote for the rule and the underlying legislation in the belief that it will help move our Nation forward.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 9 minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, we should never have found ourselves where we are today, facing a self-inflicted crisis and being asked to vote for a bill that has so many flaws. The prolonged debate that led us here has caused the world to question our Nation's credibility and already inflicted harm on the U.S. economy.

□ 1600

The irony of our situation is the other side claims to be bringing certainty to the market, but the reality is they have undermined faith in the United States Government's ability to lead the global economy. Throughout this debate, Congress has gotten lost in the crisis created instead of the true crisis of unemployment that faces our constituents. Nobody, even Members of Congress, especially Members of Congress, should have the ability to bring the faith in the American Government to its knees.

It's high time we address the crisis of jobs in our country and resolve the self-inflicted crisis we are facing today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, 224 years ago this summer, the framers of our Constitution were in Philadelphia at Constitution Hall, and they were working very hard to put together what ended up being this inspired document authored by James Madison.

On July 16, 1787, they actually completed a compromise. It was known as the Connecticut Compromise. The Connecticut Compromise is what established a bicameral legislature—two Houses of Congress. That Connecticut Compromise was also called the Great Compromise.

I know that the word ''compromise'' is seen as a pejorative in the eyes of many, but what we have before us is a compromise. It hasn't been easy getting here. When James Madison was asked often about the first branch of government, putting together the process of lawmaking, he said that the process of lawmaking is an ugly, messy, difficult process. Over the last several months, we've seen, as we have been pursuing this day, we've seen an ugly, messy, difficult process.

I am reminded that a couple of summers ago, I was talking with this amazing woman, Ellen Johnson Sirleaf. She is the first woman to ever be President of any country on the continent of Africa. She is the President of Liberia. And we were talking about the development of the parliament in Liberia through this great commission called the House Democracy Partnership that

Mr. PRICE and I are privileged to lead. When we talked about the ugly, messy, difficult process of lawmaking, the President looked to me and she said: Ah, DAVID, you've forgotten one thing. Yes, it is an ugly, messy, difficult process, but it works.

So while we have so much time and energy and effort expended on partisan bickering, at the end of the day, this for me is a much, much more enjoyable time, when we are able to come together, tackling the serious problems that we as a Nation face and for the first time ever taking this issue of increasing the debt ceiling and actually dealing with the root cause of it.

I like to say that we don't have a debt ceiling problem; we have a debt problem. We have a $14.3 trillion national debt. We all know that, fingers pointed from both sides of the aisle at the other on a regular basis.

Yet today, today is a time for us to recognize that we have come together to deal with it. And, for the first time in that 75 times since 1962 that the debt ceiling has increased, we're actually going to, with the establishment of this joint select committee, see our colleagues, in a bipartisan way, from the House and Senate come together and recommend $1.5 trillion in proposed cuts. And there are mechanisms put into place, sequestration, which will actually force across-the-board cuts if they don't come up with recommendations.

So we are looking at a very, very good proposal that will help us do that. We are increasing the debt ceiling to pay our past obligations. I don't like the fact that we went through an 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending over the past 4 years. Even though I voted against almost all of it, I have to say, those bills have to be paid. And that's why it is we're increasing our debt ceiling.

I want to join in extending congratulations to all those who have been involved in this process in a bipartisan way.

So I will say again, it has, over the past several months, been an ugly, messy, difficult process. But with the vote that we are about to have on this rule—and I look forward to working on the underlying legislation itself, and I'm convinced we will have a strong bipartisan vote for it—we will prove, as President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf reminded me, even though it is an ugly, messy, difficult process, it works.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by a 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 384, if ordered; and a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 184, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 686]

YEAS—242

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Carney
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
Eshoo
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)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—184

Ackerman
Altmire
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
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
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)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
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—6

Andrews
Baca
Cantor
Giffords
Green, Gene
Hinchey

□ 1632

Ms. EDWARDS and Mrs. MALONEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. FORTENBERRY and KINGSTON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 178, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 687]

YEAS—249

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

NAYS—178

Ackerman
Altmire
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
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—5

Baca
Boren
Giffords
Green, Gene
Hinchey

□ 1648

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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 304, nays 115, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 688]

YEAS—304

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack

Woolsey	Yoder	Young (FL)
Yarmuth	Young (AK)	Young (IN)

NAYS—115

Adams	Graves (MO)	Pallone
Altmire	Grimm	Pascrell
Andrews	Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)
Baldwin	Hanna	Pearce
Bishop (NY)	Harris	Peters
Boswell	Hastings (FL)	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Heck	Pitts
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)
Capuano	Himes	Price (NC)
Cardoza	Honda	Rahall
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Renacci
Chandler	Jackson (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Jackson Lee (TX)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Sanchez, Loretta
Conaway	Jones	Sarbanes
Costa	Kind	Schakowsky
Costello	Kucinich	Schilling
Courtney	Lance	Schock
Cravaack	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Sires
Davis (KY)	Latham	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lee (CA)	Stivers
Dent	Lewis (GA)	Sutton
Dold	LoBiondo	Terry
Donnelly (IN)	Lowey	Thompson (CA)
Duffy	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	Maloney	Tiberi
Eshoo	Markey	Tierney
Farenthold	Matheson	Tipton
Filner	Matsui	Towns
Fitzpatrick	McGovern	Turner
Foxx	McKinley	Velázquez
Frank (MA)	Miller (FL)	Visclosky
Fudge	Miller, George	Walden
Garamendi	Moore	Waters
Gardner	Napolitano	Watt
Garrett	Neal	Woodall
Gerlach	Olver	Wu
Gibson		

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—12

Baca	Conyers	Grijalva
Bachmann	Giffords	Hinchey
Bass (CA)	Gohmert	Kinzinger (IL)
Cohen	Green, Gene	McDermott

□ 1700

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 384, I call up the bill (S. 365) to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 384, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 112–190 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

S. 365

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Budget Control Act of 2011''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Severability.

TITLE I—TEN-YEAR DISCRETIONARY CAPS WITH SEQUESTER

Sec. 101. Enforcing discretionary spending limits.
Sec. 102. Definitions.
Sec. 103. Reports and orders.
Sec. 104. Expiration.
Sec. 105. Amendments to the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.
Sec. 106. Senate budget enforcement.

TITLE II—VOTE ON THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Sec. 201. Vote on the balanced budget amendment.
Sec. 202. Consideration by the other House.

TITLE III—DEBT CEILING DISAPPROVAL PROCESS

Sec. 301. Debt ceiling disapproval process.
Sec. 302. Enforcement of budget goal.

TITLE IV—JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON DEFICIT REDUCTION

Sec. 401. Establishment of Joint Select Committee.
Sec. 402. Expedited consideration of joint committee recommendations.
Sec. 403. Funding.
Sec. 404. Rulemaking.

TITLE V—PELL GRANT AND STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM CHANGES

Sec. 501. Federal Pell grants.
Sec. 502. Termination of authority to make interest subsidized loans to graduate and professional students.
Sec. 503. Termination of direct loan repayment incentives.
Sec. 504. Inapplicability of title IV negotiated rulemaking and master calendar exception.

SEC. 2. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or any application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and the application of this Act to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected.

TITLE I—TEN-YEAR DISCRETIONARY CAPS WITH SEQUESTER

SEC. 101. ENFORCING DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

Section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 251. ENFORCING DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

''(a) ENFORCEMENT.—

''(1) SEQUESTRATION.—Within 15 calendar days after Congress adjourns to end a session there shall be a sequestration to eliminate a budget-year breach, if any, within any category.

''(2) ELIMINATING A BREACH.—Each non-exempt account within a category shall be reduced by a dollar amount calculated by multiplying the enacted level of sequestrable budgetary resources in that account at that time by the uniform percentage necessary to eliminate a breach within that category.

''(3) MILITARY PERSONNEL.—If the President uses the authority to exempt any personnel account from sequestration under section 255(f), each account within subfunctional category 051 (other than those military personnel accounts for which the authority provided under section 255(f) has been exercised) shall be further reduced by a dollar amount calculated by multiplying the enacted level of non-exempt budgetary resources in that account at that time by the uniform percentage necessary to offset the total dollar amount by which outlays are not reduced in military personnel accounts by reason of the use of such authority.

''(4) PART-YEAR APPROPRIATIONS.—If, on the date specified in paragraph (1), there is in effect an Act making or continuing appropriations for part of a fiscal year for any budget account, then the dollar sequestration calculated for that account under paragraphs (2) and (3) shall be subtracted from—

''(A) the annualized amount otherwise available by law in that account under that or a subsequent part-year appropriation; and

''(B) when a full-year appropriation for that account is enacted, from the amount otherwise provided by the full-year appropriation for that account.

''(5) LOOK-BACK.—If, after June 30, an appropriation for the fiscal year in progress is enacted that causes a breach within a category for that year (after taking into account any sequestration of amounts within that category), the discretionary spending limits for that category for the next fiscal year shall be reduced by the amount or amounts of that breach.

''(6) WITHIN-SESSION SEQUESTRATION.—If an appropriation for a fiscal year in progress is enacted (after Congress adjourns to end the session for that budget year and before July 1 of that fiscal year) that causes a breach within a category for that year (after taking into account any prior sequestration of amounts within that category), 15 days later there shall be a sequestration to eliminate that breach within that category following the procedures set forth in paragraphs (2) through (4).

''(7) ESTIMATES.—

''(A) CBO ESTIMATES.—As soon as practicable after Congress completes action on any discretionary appropriation, CBO, after consultation with the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall provide OMB with an estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority and outlays for the current year, if any, and the budget year provided by that legislation.

''(B) OMB ESTIMATES AND EXPLANATION OF DIFFERENCES.—Not later than 7 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) after the date of enactment of any discretionary appropriation, OMB shall transmit a report to the House of Representatives and to the Senate containing the CBO estimate of that legislation, an OMB estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority and outlays for the current year, if any, and the budget year provided by that legislation, and an explanation of any difference between the 2 estimates. If during the preparation of the report OMB determines that there is a significant difference between OMB and CBO, OMB shall consult with the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate regarding that difference and that consultation shall include, to the extent practicable, written communication to those committees that affords such committees the opportunity to comment before the issuance of the report.

''(C) ASSUMPTIONS AND GUIDELINES.—OMB estimates under this paragraph shall be made using current economic and technical assumptions. OMB shall use the OMB estimates transmitted to the Congress under this paragraph. OMB and CBO shall prepare estimates under this paragraph in conformance with scorekeeping guidelines determined after consultation among the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, CBO, and OMB.

''(D) ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph, amounts provided by annual appropriations shall include any discretionary appropriations for the current year, if any, and the budget year in accounts for which funding is provided in that legislation that result from previously enacted legislation.

''(b) ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—

''(1) CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.—When the President submits the budget under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, OMB shall calculate and the budget shall include adjustments to discretionary spending limits (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the budget year and each outyear to reflect changes in concepts and definitions. Such changes shall equal the baseline levels of new budget authority and outlays using up-to-date concepts and definitions,

minus those levels using the concepts and definitions in effect before such changes. Such changes may only be made after consultation with the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and that consultation shall include written communication to such committees that affords such committees the opportunity to comment before official action is taken with respect to such changes.

''(2) SEQUESTRATION REPORTS.—When OMB submits a sequestration report under section 254(e), (f), or (g) for a fiscal year, OMB shall calculate, and the sequestration report and subsequent budgets submitted by the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, shall include adjustments to discretionary spending limits (and those limits as adjusted) for the fiscal year and each succeeding year, as follows:

''(A) EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS; OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—If, for any fiscal year, appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted that—

''(i) the Congress designates as emergency requirements in statute on an account by account basis and the President subsequently so designates, or

''(ii) the Congress designates for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism in statute on an account by account basis and the President subsequently so designates,

the adjustment shall be the total of such appropriations in discretionary accounts designated as emergency requirements or for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, as applicable.

''(B) CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND REDETERMINATIONS.—(i) If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies an amount for continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and for the cost associated with conducting redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act, then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the additional new budget authority provided in that Act for such expenses for that fiscal year, but shall not exceed—

''(I) for fiscal year 2012, $623,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(II) for fiscal year 2013, $751,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(III) for fiscal year 2014, $924,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(IV) for fiscal year 2015, $1,123,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(V) for fiscal year 2016, $1,166,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(VI) for fiscal year 2017, $1,309,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(VII) for fiscal year 2018, $1,309,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(VIII) for fiscal year 2019, $1,309,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(IX) for fiscal year 2020, $1,309,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

''(X) for fiscal year 2021, $1,309,000,000 in additional new budget authority.

''(ii) As used in this subparagraph—

''(I) the term 'continuing disability reviews' means continuing disability reviews under sections 221(i) and 1614(a)(4) of the Social Security Act;

''(II) the term 'redetermination' means redetermination of eligibility under sections 1611(c)(1) and 1614(a)(3)(H) of the Social Security Act; and

''(III) the term 'additional new budget authority' means the amount provided for a fiscal year, in excess of $273,000,000, in an appropriation Act and specified to pay for the costs of continuing disability reviews and redeterminations under the heading 'Limitation on Administrative Expenses' for the Social Security Administration.

''(C) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL.—(i) If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies an amount for the health care fraud abuse control program at the Department of Health and Human Services (75–8393–0–7–571), then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the amount of additional new budget authority provided in that Act for such program for that fiscal year, but shall not exceed—

''(I) for fiscal year 2012, $270,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(II) for fiscal year 2013, $299,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(III) for fiscal year 2014, $329,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(IV) for fiscal year 2015, $361,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(V) for fiscal year 2016, $395,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(VI) for fiscal year 2017, $414,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(VII) for fiscal year 2018, $434,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(VIII) for fiscal year 2019, $454,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(IX) for fiscal year 2020, $475,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

''(X) for fiscal year 2021, $496,000,000 in additional new budget authority.

''(ii) As used in this subparagraph, the term 'additional new budget authority' means the amount provided for a fiscal year, in excess of $311,000,000, in an appropriation Act and specified to pay for the costs of the health care fraud and abuse control program.

''(D) DISASTER FUNDING.—

''(i) If, for fiscal years 2012 through 2021, appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted that Congress designates as being for disaster relief in statute, the adjustment for a fiscal year shall be the total of such appropriations for the fiscal year in discretionary accounts designated as being for disaster relief, but not to exceed the total of—

''(I) the average funding provided for disaster relief over the previous 10 years, excluding the highest and lowest years; and

''(II) the amount, for years when the enacted new discretionary budget authority designated as being for disaster relief for the preceding fiscal year was less than the average as calculated in subclause (I) for that fiscal year, that is the difference between the enacted amount and the allowable adjustment as calculated in such subclause for that fiscal year.

''(ii) OMB shall report to the Committees on Appropriations and Budget in each House the average calculated pursuant to clause (i)(II), not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Budget Control Act of 2011.

''(iii) For the purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'disaster relief' means activities carried out pursuant to a determination under section 102(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)).

''(iv) Appropriations considered disaster relief under this subparagraph in a fiscal year shall not be eligible for adjustments under subparagraph (A) for the fiscal year.

''(c) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMIT.—As used in this part, the term 'discretionary spending limit' means—

''(1) with respect to fiscal year 2012—

''(A) for the security category, $684,000,000,000 in new budget authority; and

''(B) for the nonsecurity category, $359,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(2) with respect to fiscal year 2013—

''(A) for the security category, $686,000,000,000 in new budget authority; and

''(B) for the nonsecurity category, $361,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(3) with respect to fiscal year 2014, for the discretionary category, $1,066,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(4) with respect to fiscal year 2015, for the discretionary category, $1,086,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(5) with respect to fiscal year 2016, for the discretionary category, $1,107,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(6) with respect to fiscal year 2017, for the discretionary category, $1,131,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(7) with respect to fiscal year 2018, for the discretionary category, $1,156,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(8) with respect to fiscal year 2019, for the discretionary category, $1,182,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(9) with respect to fiscal year 2020, for the discretionary category, $1,208,000,000,000 in new budget authority; and

''(10) with respect to fiscal year 2021, for the discretionary category, $1,234,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

as adjusted in strict conformance with subsection (b).''.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

Section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended as follows:

(1) Strike paragraph (4) and insert the following new paragraph:

''(4)(A) The term 'nonsecurity category' means all discretionary appropriations not included in the security category defined in subparagraph (B).

''(B) The term 'security category' includes discretionary appropriations associated with agency budgets for the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the National Nuclear Security Administration, the intelligence community management account (95–0401–0–1–054), and all budget accounts in budget function 150 (international affairs).

''(C) The term 'discretionary category' includes all discretionary appropriations.''.

(2) In paragraph (8)(C), strike ''the food stamp program'' and insert ''the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program''.

(3) Strike paragraph (14) and insert the following new paragraph:

''(14) The term 'outyear' means a fiscal year one or more years after the budget year.''.

(4) At the end, add the following new paragraphs:

''(20) The term 'emergency' means a situation that—

''(A) requires new budget authority and outlays (or new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom) for the prevention or mitigation of, or response to, loss of life or property, or a threat to national security; and

''(B) is unanticipated.

''(21) The term 'unanticipated' means that the underlying situation is—

''(A) sudden, which means quickly coming into being or not building up over time;

''(B) urgent, which means a pressing and compelling need requiring immediate action;

''(C) unforeseen, which means not predicted or anticipated as an emerging need; and

''(D) temporary, which means not of a permanent duration.''.

SEC. 103. REPORTS AND ORDERS.

Section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (c)(2), strike ''2002'' and insert ''2021''.

(2) At the end of subsection (e), insert ''This report shall also contain a preview estimate of the adjustment for disaster funding for the upcoming fiscal year.''.

(3) In subsection (f)(2)(A), strike ''2002'' and insert ''2021''; before the concluding period insert '', including a final estimate of the adjustment for disaster funding''.

SEC. 104. EXPIRATION.

(a) REPEALER.—Section 275 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING CHANGE.—Sections 252(d)(1), 254(c), 254(f)(3), and 254(i) of the Balanced

Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not apply to the Congressional Budget Office.

SEC. 105. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET AND IMPOUNDMENT CONTROL ACT OF 1974.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—Section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended as follows:

(1) Strike subsection (a) and insert the following:

''(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution or the offering of an amendment thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate may make appropriate budgetary adjustments of new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom in the same amount as required by section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.''.

(2) Strike subsections (b) and (e) and redesignate subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

(3) At the end, add the following new subsections:

''(d) EMERGENCIES IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.— (1) In the House of Representatives, if a reported bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, contains a provision providing new budget authority and outlays or reducing revenue, and a designation of such provision as an emergency requirement pursuant to 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall not count the budgetary effects of such provision for purposes of title III and title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Rules of the House of Representatives.

''(2)(A) In the House of Representatives, if a reported bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, contains a provision providing new budget authority and outlays or reducing revenue, and a designation of such provision as an emergency pursuant to paragraph (1), the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall not count the budgetary effects of such provision for purposes of this title and title IV and the Rules of the House of Representatives.

''(B) In the House of Representatives, a proposal to strike a designation under subparagraph (A) shall be excluded from an evaluation of budgetary effects for purposes of this title and title IV and the Rules of the House of Representatives.

''(C) An amendment offered under subparagraph (B) that also proposes to reduce each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by the pending measure that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available shall be in order at any point in the reading of the pending measure.

''(e) ENFORCEMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would cause the discretionary spending limits as set forth in section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act to be exceeded.''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(11) The terms 'emergency' and 'unanticipated' have the meanings given to such terms in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.''.

(c) APPEALS FOR DISCRETIONARY CAPS.—Section 904(c)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by striking ''and 312(c)'' and inserting ''312(c), and 314(e)''.

SEC. 106. SENATE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) For the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 through April 15, 2012, including section 300 of that Act, and enforcing budgetary points of order in prior concurrent resolutions on the budget, the allocations, aggregates, and levels set in subsection (b)(1) shall apply in the Senate in the same manner as for a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012 with appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2011 and 2013 through 2021.

(2) For the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 after April 15, 2012, including section 300 of that Act, and enforcing budgetary points of order in prior concurrent resolutions on the budget, the allocations, aggregates, and levels set in subsection (b)(2) shall apply in the Senate in the same manner as for a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013 with appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2012 and 2014 through 2022.

(b) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND LEVELS.—

(1) As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this section, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall file—

(A) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2011 and 2012 consistent with the discretionary spending limits set forth in this Act for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(B) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2011, 2012, 2012 through 2016, and 2012 through 2021 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline adjusted to account for the budgetary effects of this Act and legislation enacted prior to this Act but not included in the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(C) aggregate spending levels for fiscal years 2011 and 2012 and aggregate revenue levels for fiscal years 2011, 2012, 2012 through 2016, 2012 through 2021 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline adjusted to account for the budgetary effects of this Act and legislation enacted prior to this Act but not included in the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline, and the discretionary spending limits set forth in this Act for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(D) levels of Social Security revenues and outlays for fiscal years 2011, 2012, 2012 through 2016, and 2012 through 2021 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline adjusted to account for the budgetary effects of this Act and legislation enacted prior to this Act but not included in the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline, for the purpose of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) Not later than April 15, 2012, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall file—

(A) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2012 and 2013 consistent with the discretionary spending limits set forth in this Act for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(B) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2012, 2013, 2013 through 2017, and 2013 through 2022 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2012 baseline for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(C) aggregate spending levels for fiscal years 2012 and 2013 and aggregate revenue levels for fiscal years 2012, 2013, 2013–2017, and 2013–2022 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2012 baseline and the discretionary spending limits set forth in this Act for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(D) levels of Social Security revenues and outlays for fiscal years 2012 and 2013, 2013–2017, and 2013–2022 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2012 baseline budget for the purpose of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(c) SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD.—

(1) Effective on the date of enactment of this section, for the purpose of enforcing section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget shall reduce any balances of direct spending and revenues for any fiscal year to 0 (zero).

(2) Not later than April 15, 2012, for the purpose of enforcing section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget shall reduce any balances of direct spending and revenues for any fiscal year to 0 (zero).

(3) Upon resetting the Senate paygo scorecard pursuant to paragraph (2), the Chairman shall publish a notification of such action in the Congressional Record.

(d) FURTHER ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise any allocations, aggregates, or levels set pursuant to this section to account for any subsequent adjustments to discretionary spending limits made pursuant to this Act.

(2) With respect to any allocations, aggregates, or levels set or adjustments made pursuant to this section, sections 412 through 414 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress) shall remain in effect.

(e) EXPIRATION.—

(1) Subsections (a)(1), (b)(1), and (c)(1) shall expire if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012 is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) Subsections (a)(2), (b)(2), and (c)(2) shall expire if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013 is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE II—VOTE ON THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

SEC. 201. VOTE ON THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.

After September 30, 2011, and not later than December 31, 2011, the House of Representatives and Senate, respectively, shall vote on passage of a joint resolution, the title of which is as follows: ''Joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.''.

SEC. 202. CONSIDERATION BY THE OTHER HOUSE.

(a) HOUSE CONSIDERATION.—

(1) REFERRAL.—If the House receives a joint resolution described in section 201 from the Senate, such joint resolution shall be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. If the committee fails to report the joint resolution within five legislative days, it shall be in order to move that the House discharge the committee from further consideration of the joint resolution. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to discharge the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except twenty minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. If such a motion is adopted, the House shall proceed immediately to consider the joint resolution in accordance with paragraph (3). A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(2) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After the joint resolution has been referred to the appropriate calendar or the committee has been discharged (other than by motion) from its consideration, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed with respect to the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the

motion to its adoption without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and one motion to limit debate on the joint resolution. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(b) SENATE CONSIDERATION.—(1) If the Senate receives a joint resolution described in section 201 from the House of Representatives, such joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate. If such committee has not reported the joint resolution at the close of the fifth session day after its receipt by the Senate, such committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(2) Consideration of the joint resolution and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 20 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order. Any debatable motion or appeal is debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the motion or appeal. All time used for consideration of the joint resolution, including time used for quorum calls and voting, shall be counted against the total 20 hours of consideration.

(3) If the Senate has voted to proceed to a joint resolution, the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the seventh session day after such joint resolution has been reported or discharged or immediately following the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

TITLE III—DEBT CEILING DISAPPROVAL PROCESS

SEC. 301. DEBT CEILING DISAPPROVAL PROCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 31 of subtitle III of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 3101(b), by striking ''or otherwise'' and inserting ''or as provided by section 3101A or otherwise''; and

(2) by inserting after section 3101 the following:

''§ 3101A. Presidential modification of the debt ceiling

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) $900 BILLION.—

''(A) CERTIFICATION.—If, not later than December 31, 2011, the President submits a written certification to Congress that the President has determined that the debt subject to limit is within $100,000,000,000 of the limit in section 3101(b) and that further borrowing is required to meet existing commitments, the Secretary of the Treasury may exercise authority to borrow an additional $900,000,000,000, subject to the enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval enacted pursuant to this section. Upon submission of such certification, the limit on debt provided in section 3101(b) (referred to in this section as the 'debt limit') is increased by $400,000,000,000.

''(B) RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Congress may consider a joint resolution of disapproval of the authority under subparagraph (A) as provided in subsections (b) through (f). The joint resolution of disapproval considered under this section shall contain only the language provided in subsection (b)(2). If the time for disapproval has lapsed without enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval under this section, the debt limit is increased by an additional $500,000,000,000.

''(2) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.—

''(A) CERTIFICATION.—If, after the debt limit is increased by $900,000,000,000 under paragraph (1), the President submits a written certification to Congress that the President has determined that the debt subject to limit is within $100,000,000,000 of the limit in section 3101(b) and that further borrowing is required to meet existing commitments, the Secretary of the Treasury may, subject to the enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval enacted pursuant to this section, exercise authority to borrow an additional amount equal to—

''(i) $1,200,000,000,000, unless clause (ii) or (iii) applies;

''(ii) $1,500,000,000,000 if the Archivist of the United States has submitted to the States for their ratification a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States pursuant to a joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States'; or

''(iii) if a joint committee bill to achieve an amount greater than $1,200,000,000,000 in deficit reduction as provided in section 401(b)(3)(B)(i)(II) of the Budget Control Act of 2011 is enacted, an amount equal to the amount of that deficit reduction, but not greater than $1,500,000,000,000, unless clause (ii) applies.

''(B) RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Congress may consider a joint resolution of disapproval of the authority under subparagraph (A) as provided in subsections (b) through (f). The joint resolution of disapproval considered under this section shall contain only the language provided in subsection (b)(2). If the time for disapproval has lapsed without enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval under this section, the debt limit is increased by the amount authorized under subparagraph (A).

''(b) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except for the $400,000,000,000 increase in the debt limit provided by subsection (a)(1)(A), the debt limit may not be raised under this section if, within 50 calendar days after the date on which Congress receives a certification described in subsection (a)(1) or within 15 calendar days after Congress receives the certification described in subsection (a)(2) (regardless of whether Congress is in session), there is enacted into law a joint resolution disapproving the President's exercise of authority with respect to such additional amount.

''(2) CONTENTS OF JOINT RESOLUTION.—For the purpose of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution—

''(A)(i) for the certification described in subsection (a)(1), that is introduced on September 6, 7, 8, or 9, 2011 (or, if the Senate was not in session, the next calendar day on which the Senate is in session); and

''(ii) for the certification described in subsection (a)(2), that is introduced between the date the certification is received and 3 calendar days after that date;

''(B) which does not have a preamble;

''(C) the title of which is only as follows: 'Joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as submitted under section 3101A of title 31, United States Code, on _____' (with the blank containing the date of such submission); and

''(D) the matter after the resolving clause of which is only as follows: 'That Congress disapproves of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as exercised pursuant to the certification under section 3101A(a) of title 31, United States Code.'.

''(c) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(1) RECONVENING.—Upon receipt of a certification described in subsection (a)(2), the Speaker, if the House would otherwise be adjourned, shall notify the Members of the House that, pursuant to this section, the House shall convene not later than the second calendar day after receipt of such certification.

''(2) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution is referred shall report it to the House without amendment not later than 5 calendar days after the date of introduction of a joint resolution described in subsection (a). If a committee fails to report the joint resolution within that period, the committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate calendar.

''(3) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After each committee authorized to consider a joint resolution reports it to the House or has been discharged from its consideration, it shall be in order, not later than the sixth day after introduction of a joint resolution under subsection (a), to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on a joint resolution addressing a particular submission. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

''(4) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

''(d) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE IN SENATE.—

''(1) RECONVENING.—Upon receipt of a certification under subsection (a)(2), if the Senate has adjourned or recessed for more than 2 days, the majority leader of the Senate, after consultation with the minority leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate that, pursuant to this section, the Senate shall convene not later than the second calendar day after receipt of such message.

''(2) PLACEMENT ON CALENDAR.—Upon introduction in the Senate, the joint resolution shall be immediately placed on the calendar.

''(3) FLOOR CONSIDERATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time during the period beginning on the day after the date on which Congress receives a certification under subsection (a) and, for the certification described in subsection (a)(1), ending on September 14, 2011, and for the certification described in subsection (a)(2), on the 6th day after the date on which Congress receives a certification under subsection (a) (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

''(B) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration of the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone,

or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(C) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—If the Senate has voted to proceed to a joint resolution, the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall occur immediately following the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

''(D) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution shall be decided without debate.

''(e) AMENDMENT NOT IN ORDER.—A joint resolution of disapproval considered pursuant to this section shall not be subject to amendment in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

''(f) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If, before passing the joint resolution, one House receives from the other a joint resolution—

''(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

''(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

''(2) TREATMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION OF OTHER HOUSE.—If the Senate fails to introduce or consider a joint resolution under this section, the joint resolution of the House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

''(3) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.—If, following passage of the joint resolution in the Senate, the Senate then receives the companion measure from the House of Representatives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

''(4) CONSIDERATION AFTER PASSAGE.—(A) If Congress passes a joint resolution, the period beginning on the date the President is presented with the joint resolution and ending on the date the President signs, allows to become law without his signature, or vetoes and returns the joint resolution (but excluding days when either House is not in session) shall be disregarded in computing the appropriate calendar day period described in subsection (b)(1).

''(B) Debate on a veto message in the Senate under this section shall be 1 hour equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees.

''(5) VETO OVERRIDE.—If within the appropriate calendar day period described in subsection (b)(1), Congress overrides a veto of the joint resolution with respect to authority exercised pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), the limit on debt provided in section 3101(b) shall not be raised, except for the $400,000,000,000 increase in the limit provided by subsection (a)(1)(A).

''(6) SEQUESTRATION.—(A) If within the 50-calendar day period described in subsection (b)(1), the President signs the joint resolution, the President allows the joint resolution to become law without his signature, or Congress overrides a veto of the joint resolution with respect to authority exercised pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (a), there shall be a sequestration to reduce spending by $400,000,000,000. OMB shall implement the sequestration forthwith.

''(B) OMB shall implement each half of such sequestration in accordance with section 255, section 256, and subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 253 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and for the purpose of such implementation the term 'excess deficit' means the amount specified in subparagraph (A).

''(g) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection and subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) (other than paragraph (6)) are enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

''(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3101 the following new item:

''3101A. Presidential modification of the debt ceiling.''.

SEC. 302. ENFORCEMENT OF BUDGET GOAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after section 251 the following new section:

''SEC. 251A. ENFORCEMENT OF BUDGET GOAL.

''Unless a joint committee bill achieving an amount greater than $1,200,000,000,000 in deficit reduction as provided in section 401(b)(3)(B)(i)(II) of the Budget Control Act of 2011 is enacted by January 15, 2012, the discretionary spending limits listed in section 251(c) shall be revised, and discretionary appropriations and direct spending shall be reduced, as follows:

''(1) REVISED SECURITY CATEGORY; REVISED NONSECURITY CATEGORY.— (A) The term 'revised security category' means discretionary appropriations in budget function 050.

''(B) The term 'revised nonsecurity category' means discretionary appropriations other than in budget function 050.

''(2) REVISED DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—The discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 2013 through 2021 under section 251(c) shall be replaced with the following:

''(A) For fiscal year 2013—

''(i) for the security category, $546,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $501,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(B) For fiscal year 2014—

''(i) for the security category, $556,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $510,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(C) For fiscal year 2015—

''(i) for the security category, $566,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $520,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(D) For fiscal year 2016—

''(i) for the security category, $577,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $530,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(E) For fiscal year 2017—

''(i) for the security category, $590,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $541,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(F) For fiscal year 2018—

''(i) for the security category, $603,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $553,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(G) For fiscal year 2019—

''(i) for the security category, $616,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $566,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(H) For fiscal year 2020—

''(i) for the security category, $630,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $578,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(I) For fiscal year 2021—

''(i) for the security category, $644,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $590,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(3) CALCULATION OF TOTAL DEFICIT REDUCTION.—OMB shall calculate the amount of the deficit reduction required by this section for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2021 by—

''(A) starting with $1,200,000,000,000;

''(B) subtracting the amount of deficit reduction achieved by the enactment of a joint committee bill, as provided in section 401(b)(3)(B)(i)(II) of the Budget Control Act of 2011;

''(C) reducing the difference by 18 percent to account for debt service; and

''(D) dividing the result by 9.

''(4) ALLOCATION TO FUNCTIONS.—On January 2, 2013, for fiscal year 2013, and in its sequestration preview report for fiscal years 2014 through 2021 pursuant to section 254(c), OMB shall allocate half of the total reduction calculated pursuant to paragraph (3) for that year to discretionary appropriations and direct spending accounts within function 050 (defense function) and half to accounts in all other functions (nondefense functions).

''(5) DEFENSE FUNCTION REDUCTION.—OMB shall calculate the reductions to discretionary appropriations and direct spending for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2021 for defense function spending as follows:

''(A) DISCRETIONARY.—OMB shall calculate the reduction to discretionary appropriations by—

''(i) taking the total reduction for the defense function allocated for that year under paragraph (4);

''(ii) multiplying by the discretionary spending limit for the revised security category for that year; and

''(iii) dividing by the sum of the discretionary spending limit for the security category and OMB's baseline estimate of nonexempt outlays for direct spending programs within the defense function for that year.

''(B) DIRECT SPENDING.—OMB shall calculate the reduction to direct spending by taking the total reduction for the defense function required for that year under paragraph (4) and subtracting the discretionary reduction calculated pursuant to subparagraph (A).

''(6) NONDEFENSE FUNCTION REDUCTION.—OMB shall calculate the reduction to discretionary appropriations and to direct spending for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2021 for programs in nondefense functions as follows:

''(A) DISCRETIONARY.—OMB shall calculate the reduction to discretionary appropriations by—

''(i) taking the total reduction for nondefense functions allocated for that year under paragraph (4);

''(ii) multiplying by the discretionary spending limit for the revised nonsecurity category for that year; and

''(iii) dividing by the sum of the discretionary spending limit for the revised nonsecurity category and OMB's baseline estimate of nonexempt outlays for direct spending programs in nondefense functions for that year.

''(B) DIRECT SPENDING.—OMB shall calculate the reduction to direct spending programs by taking the total reduction for nondefense functions required for that year under paragraph (4) and subtracting the discretionary reduction calculated pursuant to subparagraph (A).

''(7) IMPLEMENTING DISCRETIONARY REDUCTIONS.—

''(A) FISCAL YEAR 2013.—On January 2, 2013, for fiscal year 2013, OMB shall calculate and the President shall order a sequestration, effective upon issuance and under the procedures set forth in section 253(f), to reduce each account within the security category or nonsecurity category by a dollar amount calculated by multiplying the baseline level of budgetary resources

in that account at that time by a uniform percentage necessary to achieve—

''(i) for the revised security category, an amount equal to the defense function discretionary reduction calculated pursuant to paragraph (5); and

''(ii) for the revised nonsecurity category, an amount equal to the nondefense function discretionary reduction calculated pursuant to paragraph (6).

''(B) FISCAL YEARS 2014-2021.—On the date of the submission of its sequestration preview report for fiscal years 2014 through 2021 pursuant to section 254(c) for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2021, OMB shall reduce the discretionary spending limit—

''(i) for the revised security category by the amount of the defense function discretionary reduction calculated pursuant to paragraph (5); and

''(ii) for the revised nonsecurity category by the amount of the nondefense function discretionary reduction calculated pursuant to paragraph (6).

''(8) IMPLEMENTING DIRECT SPENDING REDUCTIONS.—On the date specified in paragraph (4) during each applicable year, OMB shall prepare and the President shall order a sequestration, effective upon issuance, of nonexempt direct spending to achieve the direct spending reduction calculated pursuant to paragraphs (5) and (6). When implementing the sequestration of direct spending pursuant to this paragraph, OMB shall follow the procedures specified in section 6 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, the exemptions specified in section 255, and the special rules specified in section 256, except that the percentage reduction for the Medicare programs specified in section 256(d) shall not be more than 2 percent for a fiscal year.

''(9) ADJUSTMENT FOR MEDICARE.—If the percentage reduction for the Medicare programs would exceed 2 percent for a fiscal year in the absence of paragraph (8), OMB shall increase the reduction for all other discretionary appropriations and direct spending under paragraph (6) by a uniform percentage to a level sufficient to achieve the reduction required by paragraph (6) in the non-defense function.

''(10) IMPLEMENTATION OF REDUCTIONS.—Any reductions imposed under this section shall be implemented in accordance with section 256(k).

''(11) REPORT.—On the dates specified in paragraph (4), OMB shall submit a report to Congress containing information about the calculations required under this section, the adjusted discretionary spending limits, a listing of the reductions required for each nonexempt direct spending account, and any other data and explanations that enhance public understanding of this title and actions taken under it.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents set forth in section 250(a) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 251 the following:

''Sec. 251A. Enforcement of budget goal.''.

TITLE IV—JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON DEFICIT REDUCTION

SEC. 401. ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this title:

(1) JOINT COMMITTEE.—The term ''joint committee'' means the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction established under subsection (b)(1).

(2) JOINT COMMITTEE BILL.—The term ''joint committee bill'' means a bill consisting of the proposed legislative language of the joint committee recommended under subsection (b)(3)(B) and introduced under section 402(a).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a joint select committee of Congress to be known as the ''Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction''.

(2) GOAL.—The goal of the joint committee shall be to reduce the deficit by at least $1,500,000,000,000 over the period of fiscal years 2012 to 2021.

(3) DUTIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) IMPROVING THE SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM FISCAL IMBALANCE.—The joint committee shall provide recommendations and legislative language that will significantly improve the short-term and long-term fiscal imbalance of the Federal Government.

(ii) RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEES.—Not later than October 14, 2011, each committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate may transmit to the joint committee its recommendations for changes in law to reduce the deficit consistent with the goal described in paragraph (2) for the joint committee's consideration.

(B) REPORT, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 23, 2011, the joint committee shall vote on—

(I) a report that contains a detailed statement of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the joint committee and the estimate of the Congressional Budget Office required by paragraph (5)(D)(ii); and

(II) proposed legislative language to carry out such recommendations as described in subclause (I), which shall include a statement of the deficit reduction achieved by the legislation over the period of fiscal years 2012 to 2021.

Any change to the Rules of the House of Representatives or the Standing Rules of the Senate included in the report or legislative language shall be considered to be merely advisory.

(ii) APPROVAL OF REPORT AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE.—The report of the joint committee and the proposed legislative language described in clause (i) shall require the approval of a majority of the members of the joint committee.

(iii) ADDITIONAL VIEWS.—A member of the joint committee who gives notice of an intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views at the time of final joint committee vote on the approval of the report and legislative language under clause (ii) shall be entitled to 3 calendar days in which to file such views in writing with the staff director of the joint committee. Such views shall then be included in the joint committee report and printed in the same volume, or part thereof, and their inclusion shall be noted on the cover of the report. In the absence of timely notice, the joint committee report may be printed and transmitted immediately without such views.

(iv) TRANSMISSION OF REPORT AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE.—If the report and legislative language are approved by the joint committee pursuant to clause (ii), then not later than December 2, 2011, the joint committee shall submit the joint committee report and legislative language described in clause (i) to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the majority and minority Leaders of each House of Congress.

(v) REPORT AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE TO BE MADE PUBLIC.—Upon the approval or disapproval of the joint committee report and legislative language pursuant to clause (ii), the joint committee shall promptly make the full report and legislative language, and a record of the vote, available to the public.

(4) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The joint committee shall be composed of 12 members appointed pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(B) APPOINTMENT.—Members of the joint committee shall be appointed as follows:

(i) The majority leader of the Senate shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the Senate.

(ii) The minority leader of the Senate shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the Senate.

(iii) The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the House of Representatives.

(iv) The minority leader of the House of Representatives shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the House of Representatives.

(C) CO-CHAIRS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—There shall be 2 Co-Chairs of the joint committee. The majority leader of the Senate shall appoint one Co-Chair from among the members of the joint committee. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint the second Co-Chair from among the members of the joint committee. The Co-Chairs shall be appointed not later than 14 calendar days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(ii) STAFF DIRECTOR.—The Co-Chairs, acting jointly, shall hire the staff director of the joint committee.

(D) DATE.—Members of the joint committee shall be appointed not later than 14 calendar days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(E) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the joint committee. Any vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled not later than 14 calendar days after the date on which the vacancy occurs, in the same manner as the original designation was made. If a member of the joint committee ceases to be a Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as the case may be, the member is no longer a member of the joint committee and a vacancy shall exist.

(5) ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To enable the joint committee to exercise its powers, functions, and duties, there are authorized to be disbursed by the Senate the actual and necessary expenses of the joint committee approved by the co-chairs, subject to the rules and regulations of the Senate.

(B) EXPENSES.—In carrying out its functions, the joint committee is authorized to incur expenses in the same manner and under the same conditions as the Joint Economic Committee is authorized by section 11 of Public Law 79µ09304 (15 U.S.C. 1024 (d)).

(C) QUORUM.—Seven members of the joint committee shall constitute a quorum for purposes of voting, meeting, and holding hearings.

(D) VOTING.—

(i) PROXY VOTING.—No proxy voting shall be allowed on behalf of the members of the joint committee.

(ii) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.—The Congressional Budget Office shall provide estimates of the legislation (as described in paragraph (3)(B)) in accordance with sections 308(a) and 201(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 639(a) and 601(f))(including estimates of the effect of interest payment on the debt). In addition, the Congressional Budget Office shall provide information on the budgetary effect of the legislation beyond the year 2021. The joint committee may not vote on any version of the report, recommendations, or legislative language unless such estimates are available for consideration by all members of the joint committee at least 48 hours prior to the vote as certified by the Co-Chairs.

(E) MEETINGS.—

(i) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 45 calendar days after the date of enactment of this Act, the joint committee shall hold its first meeting.

(ii) AGENDA.—The Co-Chairs of the joint committee shall provide an agenda to the joint committee members not less than 48 hours in advance of any meeting.

(F) HEARINGS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The joint committee may, for the purpose of carrying out this section, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, require attendance of witnesses and production of books, papers, and documents, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths as the joint committee considers advisable.

(ii) HEARING PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CO-CHAIRS.—

(I) ANNOUNCEMENT.—The Co-Chairs of the joint committee shall make a public announcement of the date, place, time, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted, not less than 7 days in advance of such hearing, unless the Co-Chairs determine that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date.

(II) WRITTEN STATEMENT.—A witness appearing before the joint committee shall file a written statement of proposed testimony at least 2 calendar days before the appearance of the witness, unless the requirement is waived by the Co-Chairs, following their determination that there is good cause for failure to comply with such requirement.

(G) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Upon written request of the Co-Chairs, a Federal agency shall provide technical assistance to the joint committee in order for the joint committee to carry out its duties.

(c) STAFF OF JOINT COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Co-Chairs of the joint committee may jointly appoint and fix the compensation of staff as they deem necessary, within the guidelines for employees of the Senate and following all applicable rules and employment requirements of the Senate.

(2) ETHICAL STANDARDS.—Members on the joint committee who serve in the House of Representatives shall be governed by the ethics rules and requirements of the House. Members of the Senate who serve on the joint committee and staff of the joint committee shall comply with the ethics rules of the Senate.

(d) TERMINATION.—The joint committee shall terminate on January 31, 2012.

SEC. 402. EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) INTRODUCTION.—If approved by the majority required by section 401(b)(3)(B)(ii), the proposed legislative language submitted pursuant to section 401(b)(3)(B)(iv) shall be introduced in the Senate (by request) on the next day on which the Senate is in session by the majority leader of the Senate or by a Member of the Senate designated by the majority leader of the Senate and shall be introduced in the House of Representatives (by request) on the next legislative day by the majority leader of the House or by a Member of the House designated by the majority leader of the House.

(b) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) REFERRAL AND REPORTING.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which the joint committee bill is referred shall report it to the House without amendment not later than December 9, 2011. If a committee fails to report the joint committee bill within that period, it shall be in order to move that the House discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill. Such a motion shall not be in order after the last committee authorized to consider the bill reports it to the House or after the House has disposed of a motion to discharge the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except 20 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. If such a motion is adopted, the House shall proceed immediately to consider the joint committee bill in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3). A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(2) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After the last committee authorized to consider a joint committee bill reports it to the House or has been discharged (other than by motion) from its consideration, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint committee bill in the House. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed with respect to the joint committee bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—The joint committee bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint committee bill and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint committee bill to its passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and one motion to limit debate on the joint committee bill. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall not be in order.

(4) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—The vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur not later than December 23, 2011.

(c) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE IN THE SENATE.—

(1) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.—A joint committee bill introduced in the Senate under subsection (a) shall be jointly referred to the committee or committees of jurisdiction, which committees shall report the bill without any revision and with a favorable recommendation, an unfavorable recommendation, or without recommendation, not later than December 9, 2011. If any committee fails to report the bill within that period, that committee shall be automatically discharged from consideration of the bill, and the bill shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(2) MOTION TO PROCEED.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order, not later than 2 days of session after the date on which a joint committee bill is reported or discharged from all committees to which it was referred, for the majority leader of the Senate or the majority leader's designee to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill. It shall also be in order for any Member of the Senate to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill at any time after the conclusion of such 2-day period. A motion to proceed is in order even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to. All points of order against the motion to proceed to the joint committee bill are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill is agreed to, the joint committee bill shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—All points of order against the joint committee bill and against consideration of the joint committee bill are waived. Consideration of the joint committee bill and of all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith shall not exceed a total of 30 hours which shall be divided equally between the Majority and Minority Leaders or their designees. A motion further to limit debate on the joint committee bill is in order, shall require an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members duly chosen and sworn, and is not debatable. Any debatable motion or appeal is debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the motion or appeal. All time used for consideration of the joint committee bill, including time used for quorum calls and voting, shall be counted against the total 30 hours of consideration.

(4) NO AMENDMENTS.—An amendment to the joint committee bill, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint committee bill, is not in order.

(5) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—If the Senate has voted to proceed to the joint committee bill, the vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint committee bill, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested. The vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur not later than December 23, 2011.

(6) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint committee bill shall be decided without debate.

(d) AMENDMENT.—The joint committee bill shall not be subject to amendment in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

(e) CONSIDERATION BY THE OTHER HOUSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, before passing the joint committee bill, one House receives from the other a joint committee bill—

(A) the joint committee bill of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint committee bill had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint committee bill received from the other House shall supplant the joint committee bill of the receiving House.

(2) REVENUE MEASURE.—This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint committee bill received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

(f) RULES TO COORDINATE ACTION WITH OTHER HOUSE.—

(1) TREATMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE BILL OF OTHER HOUSE.—If the Senate fails to introduce or consider a joint committee bill under this section, the joint committee bill of the House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

(2) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES IN THE SENATE.—If following passage of the joint committee bill in the Senate, the Senate then receives the joint committee bill from the House of Representatives, the House-passed joint committee bill shall not be debatable. The vote on passage of the joint committee bill in the Senate shall be considered to be the vote on passage of the joint committee bill received from the House of Representatives.

(3) VETOES.—If the President vetoes the joint committee bill, debate on a veto message in the Senate under this section shall be 1 hour equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees.

(g) LOSS OF PRIVILEGE.—The provisions of this section shall cease to apply to the joint committee bill if—

(1) the joint committee fails to vote on the report or proposed legislative language required under section 401(b)(3)(B)(i) not later than November 23, 2011; or

(2) the joint committee bill does not pass both Houses not later than December 23, 2011.

SEC. 403. FUNDING.

Funding for the joint committee shall be derived in equal portions from—

(1) the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the contingent fund of the Senate from the appropriations account ''Miscellaneous Items'', subject to the rules and regulations of the Senate.

SEC. 404. RULEMAKING.

The provisions of this title are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

TITLE V—PELL GRANT AND STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM CHANGES

SEC. 501. FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.

Section 401(b)(7)(A)(iv) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a(b)(7)(A)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (II), by striking ''$3,183,000,000'' and inserting ''$13,183,000,000''; and

(2) in subclause (III), by striking ''$0'' and inserting ''$7,000,000,000''.

SEC. 502. TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE INTEREST SUBSIDIZED LOANS TO GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS.

Section 455(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE INTEREST SUBSIDIZED LOANS TO GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B) and notwithstanding any provision of this part or part B, for any period of instruction beginning on or after July 1, 2012—

''(i) a graduate or professional student shall not be eligible to receive a Federal Direct Stafford loan under this part; and

''(ii) the maximum annual amount of Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford loans such a student may borrow in any academic year (as defined in section 481(a)(2)) or its equivalent shall be the maximum annual amount for such student determined under section 428H, plus an amount equal to the amount of Federal Direct Stafford loans the student would have received in the absence of this subparagraph.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an individual enrolled in course work specified in paragraph (3)(B) or (4)(B) of section 484(b).''.

SEC. 503. TERMINATION OF DIRECT LOAN REPAYMENT INCENTIVES.

Section 455(b)(8) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(b)(8)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by amending the header to read as follows: ''(A) INCENTIVES FOR LOANS DISBURSED BEFORE JULY 1, 2012.—''; and

(B) by inserting ''with respect to loans for which the first disbursement of principal is made before July 1, 2012,'' after ''of this part'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''with respect to loans for which the first disbursement of principal is made before July 1, 2012'' after ''repayment incentives''; and

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

''(C) NO REPAYMENT INCENTIVES FOR NEW LOANS DISBURSED ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 2012.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, the Secretary is prohibited from authorizing or providing any repayment incentive not otherwise authorized under this part to encourage on-time repayment of a loan under this part for which the first disbursement of principal is made on or after July 1, 2012, including any reduction in the interest or origination fee rate paid by a borrower of such a loan, except that the Secretary may provide for an interest rate reduction for a borrower who agrees to have payments on such a loan automatically electronically debited from a bank account.''.

SEC. 504. INAPPLICABILITY OF TITLE IV NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING AND MASTER CALENDAR EXCEPTION.

Sections 482(c) and 492 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1089(c), 1098a) shall not apply to the amendments made by this title, or to any regulations promulgated under those amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, 15 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 15 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the measure before us.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this moment we are beginning debate on a measure which I believe will finally send a signal to job creators in this country and in the global marketplace that we are finally, finally getting serious about getting our fiscal house in order.

We know that we are dealing with a very sad 9.2 percent unemployment rate in this country. We know that there are people hurting.

We all have constituents who have lost their homes, people who have lost their jobs, people who have lost their businesses, people are hurting.

It is absolutely imperative that we do everything that we can to get our economy back on track. We have just gotten the report, this downward report of the GDP growth rate down to 1.3 percent. We need to get back to robust, dynamic, strong, gross domestic product growth. We need to get to 4, 5, 6 percent GDP growth.

And, Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons that we have not done that is we have seen this dramatic increase in spending. And over the past half century, on 75 different occasions, 75 different occasions, we have seen our debt ceiling increased without any effort whatsoever to get at the root cause of why it is that we have had to increase the debt ceiling.

I argue, Mr. Speaker, that we don't have a debt ceiling problem; we have a debt problem.

That's why we're here today, and that's why I believe that after months and months and months of partisan bickering, finger-pointing, we have at this moment begun a debate that will allow us in a bipartisan way to increase the debt ceiling, which we all know needs to be done. It simply is meeting the obligation of paying for past spending. Many of us have been opponents of much of that spending, but we recognize that the bill has to be paid.

Speaker BOEHNER, when just days after we took the oath of office in the 112th Congress, received the request from the President of the United States, through his Treasury Secretary, Mr. Geithner, that we increase the debt ceiling. The Speaker said then that he would agree that it's essential for us to increase the debt ceiling but we were not going to proceed with business as usual. We are not going to continue increasing the debt without getting to the root cause of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have got to tell you that through all of the debate that's taken place, we have gotten to the point where we have a measure. It's a bipartisan compromise. It's a bipartisan agreement that I believe will, as I have said, send a signal to those who are seeking to create jobs for our fellow Americans that we now are going to have the kind of fiscal restraint and responsibility from Washington, D.C., the likes of which we haven't seen in a long, long period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that I strongly support this measure. As everyone has said, it's far from perfect, but I strongly support it, and I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to join together in support of it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, after a month-long standoff over raising the debt ceiling, Congress is now forced to take action on a bill that by all accounts is deeply flawed. I think everybody today has agreed with that.

Why are we doing a flawed bill? Because we waited until the last minute. Instead of reducing the Nation's debt by closing tax loopholes for oil companies and private jet owners, today's bill instead creates a supercommittee that will decide how to take over a trillion dollars in cuts. And this supercommittee will serve as a mock Congress, leaving 523 Members of Congress sitting on the sidelines while a group of 12 decides the shape of the country for a decade to come.

Paying our debt should be a no brainer. Indeed the debt ceiling itself is an antiquated solution to a problem we no longer face and should be eliminated. It was originally created to pay for World War I, to provide our country with economic stability while at war. Today we are again in the midst of war, but instead of protecting the stability of our economy, some in Congress have decided to question the necessity of paying our bills. As we all know by now, they have taken our economy hostage and demanded draconian cuts in exchange for not leading our Nation into default.

The actions have caused real and significant damage. Roll Call reports that because of the prolonged debt ceiling crisis, the interest rate the United States Government must pay has already increased, which means the interest rates for car loans and home mortgages are also increasing.

The stock market has responded as expected. According to DealBook, as of July 29, big banks and companies withdrew $37.5 billion from money market funds that are described as a key artery for our economy. The Dow Jones Industrial Average lost nearly 5 percent of its value last week, which meant 401(k)s, pension plans, retirement plans of all Americans were put at risk and much of it lost. Baby boomers across the United States watched nervously as all those things were happening.

As I mentioned earlier, this type of crisis has become the new normal in

this Congress. Under the Republican rule, the House of Representatives has repeatedly led our country to the brink of unthinkable situations.

First, the majority led the country to the brink of a government shutdown, threatening the jobs of hundreds of thousands of workers and endangering vital government services relied on by Americans every day. As we speak, the Federal Aviation Administration is shuttered, costing the United States Government hundreds of millions of dollars in lost revenue because the majority refuses to pass a clean legislation that does not include measures that threaten rural communities and the future of airline unions.

□ 1710

Now the majority has brought us to the edge of a cliff in order to see how much they can get for not throwing the country into default. In January, Speaker BOEHNER promised the American people the debt ceiling debate would be an example of an ''adult moment'' in Washington. Is this what he had in mind?

Just this morning, my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER, went on National Public Radio saying his party has ''not threatened to torpedo the economy by defaulting.'' This statement defies reality. We've been brought to this point precisely because the leadership in his party has walked out of negotiations and demanded that they get ideologically driven cuts before they will vote to protect the stability of our economy.

Last, but certainly not least, the crisis of the last few months has come at the expense of addressing the true crisis in our country—the jobs crisis that is facing millions of our fellow citizens. Last month, over 25 million Americans failed to find full-time work. Many have been out of work for so long that their unemployment benefits have expired as their skills erode and they are living on savings or charity from loved ones and friends. In response, we have not introduced a single bill in this House designed to invest significant government resources into creating jobs.

Instead, we have repeatedly proposed cutting funding to investments in green technology and transportation infrastructure, destroying the promise of putting thousands of Americans back to work in the jobs that can't be outsourced overseas. They have refused to extend unemployment benefits for those who can't find jobs and are moving nowhere fast to extend a payroll tax break that has helped create the small number of jobs that we added in recent months.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that serious responsibilities are taken here, the responsibilities of leadership, and in doing so, put an end to this self-inflicted crisis and focus on getting Americans back to work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to my colleague for her great spirit of bipartisanship.

With that, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to my good friend from Staten Island, New York (Mr. GRIMM).

Mr. GRIMM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise today to ensure that the voices of those that I represent in Staten Island and Brooklyn are heard, and what they have to say is actually quite simple. They expect of us to use common sense to bring solutions to the problems that this Nation faces. And the problem that we face is not a debt ceiling problem; it's a debt problem. And the people in Staten Island and Brooklyn, every day, they go home and they have to figure out how to manage their households. They go to work and they have to figure out how to manage their small businesses, and to do that with common sense. That's what they ask of us.

You cannot spend money you don't have. You cannot continue to rack up debt with no plan to pay it off. Today, this debate is about moving America forward, together, in a bipartisan way, because this is not a Democratic debt or a Republican debt. It's an American debt, which means that Americans must come together to solve the problems.

Today is about solving problems. So I proudly stand here and say that I will support this bill, I will support Speaker BOEHNER, and I will bring solutions to the problem, not just bickering.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts will control the time of the gentlewoman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, we have never cut our way out of an economic recession. We have always grown our way out. But we have never grown our way out by investing less than 15 percent of our GDP in our people's potential. In fact, the last time we cut back in the way we are about to do today was in 1937, and that sent us right back into an economic depression. But this time, we're not going to have World War II to rescue our economy.

It's interesting to note that the Federal investment in homeownership and higher education for our returning GIs and the subsequent infrastructure investments and interstate highway system and the like created a permanent middle class after the war that lasted for two generations. But the middle class has never been more threatened than it is today, and this will condemn those struggling to make it into the middle class to years of struggle without the help that we could, and should be providing them.

And it's not because we're a poor country. Our largest corporations are experiencing record profits. The top 25 hedge fund managers are making more than a billion a year. Our corporations are sitting on more than $2 trillion of cash.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 20 additional seconds.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, the point is I understand that this train is leaving the station, but it's going in the wrong direction. We need to be investing in this country, not taking away the resources that will enable it to grow, it is through education, training, research and development and infrastructure investment that has made our country great but this agreement will make us smaller, weaker and far less able to tap our most valuable resource, the potential of all the American people.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 1 minute to my very good friend from Ashland, Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I have had a chance to watch this floor debate over the last week or so, and to say the least, I think we can say tempers have flared and there's been a lot of rhetoric on both sides. And as we come together today with a proposal that has been negotiated with both sides—with Speaker BOEHNER, the President, and HARRY REID—it's a deal that not everyone is pleased with. It's a deal that doesn't have in everything that I want, and I'm sure that it doesn't have everything in the deal that my friends across the aisle would want. And that's why I think so many of us are hearing from our constituents, a lot on the far right and a lot on the far left, saying, We don't like it.

But the bottom line is I think this is one of the greatest moments of the House where two sides come together and figure out how they are going to find a solution that doesn't work for their parties; it's a solution that works for the American people.

And at this point in our history we owe $14.5 trillion.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DUFFY. It's about time this Congress comes together and figures out a way to live within our means. This bill is going to start that process, though it doesn't go far enough.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. I rise in support of this proposal, but as with many of our greatest capers in history, this is an inside job.

I want to offer just in evidence that we had in the words of the Treasury Secretary for Reagan and for Bush an admittance that they were running up deficits, and that that was one of the ways to starve the government. And then we had the Republican Party at the height of its power, the Presidency, the House, the Senate, saying, no, we weren't going to have any tax increases. Even though we were running

up these high deficits, we are going to cut taxes. We're going to hemorrhage trillions of dollars in revenue, and we're going to go into two wars. We're going to put a $7 trillion prescription drug plan on the financial pile of our debt.

Alan Greenspan testified before the Congress in the first weeks of the Bush administration. He said Bush can leave office with our country being entirely debt-free. What happened then was the reverse. He doubled the debt and walked out with 8 million Americans losing their jobs. But as Solomon, in his wisdom, said to those who wanted to cut the baby in half, we choose not to default but to agree to this proposal.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield 2 minutes to, as I've said, the next Governor of Indiana, my good friend from Columbus, Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a challenging time in the life of our country. Our economy is struggling; millions are out of work; and now, with a more than $14 trillion national debt, America is on the verge of having its debts exceed our statutory borrowing limit.

Now, I recognize that if you owe debts, pay debts. Congress has an obligation to defend the full faith and credit of the United States. But this Congress also has an obligation to keep faith with this and future generations of Americans by restoring fiscal responsibility and discipline to our National Treasury.

The bipartisan Budget Control Act that we will consider today will make it possible for the Nation's bills to be paid with no new taxes, dollar-for-dollar cuts in spending for every increase in the debt ceiling, and it will give the American people a fighting chance to consider a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

Now, let me be clear. The Budget Control Act is not so much a good deal as it is a good start. I really believe this bipartisan compromise is a modest but meaningful step in the direction of fiscal discipline and reform, and I welcome it.

□ 1720

Now, while this bill doesn't go nearly far enough, it does move us in the right direction. You know, leadership means knowing when to say yes and knowing when to say no. I believe the time has come to get something done so this Congress can move our national government back in the direction of fiscal responsibility and reform, and begin to advance policies that will put Americans back to work.

Last thought. There is a lot of credit taking on a day like today, a lot of bipartisanship, back patting, as we say. But let me say from my heart, this day, where we see the ship of state turning ever so slightly toward that lode star of fiscal responsibility, this day does not belong so much to any one political leader, to any one political party, or to any one branch of government. This day belongs to the American people who have stood, who have clamored, who have come to town halls and who have demanded this government live within its means and said: Enough is enough. This is your day.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Ladies and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, this, of course, is a very important day, a momentous decision, a difficult decision for all of us. I am going to vote for this in the best interest of our country and putting us in the stature where we need to be.

But I do want to point out one area of weakness that we're going to have to look at carefully as we go forward, and that is in the application of this 12-member committee, and especially as it relates to the areas of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

My understanding is, and I think this is understanding that we certainly need to make clear, that Social Security and Medicaid, veterans, Pell Grants, are all protected fully under this bill. But when it comes to Medicare, my understanding is that there will be an opportunity in here where they will look at Medicare on the provider side. The question becomes how can you basically separate benefits of Medicare patients when you have the patient, the doctors, and the hospital, and you can't adequately separate that. So I say, we must be very mindful of the Medicare apparatus here.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I did not come to Washington to dismantle the New Deal or the Great Society, and I did not come to Washington to force more people into poverty. I agree that we need to avoid default and confront our long-term fiscal challenges. That is why on Saturday I voted in support of the Reid proposal which would have reduced our debt by hundreds of billions of dollars.

But the bill before us today is unfair in so many ways. It disproportionately places the burden of dealing with our debt issue on the backs of those who can least afford it, while it spares the wealthiest from contributing anything.

There is something fundamentally wrong when a billionaire hedge fund manager pays a lower tax rate than his secretary; when Big Oil can make tens of billions in profits every quarter, but still get sweetheart deals from the taxpayer; and when we are slashing funding for roads and bridges, but allowing tax breaks for corporate jet owners to continue.

There are no new revenues in the bill before us today, only massive cuts in what is called domestic discretionary spending. But what does that actually mean? It means less investment in our transportation and infrastructure. It means less investment in medical research and education and food security.

To put it simply, it means less jobs and higher unemployment at a time when millions of Americans are struggling to find work. And despite the rhetoric of its supporters, the bill puts Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid on the chopping block.

We all know how we got into this mess: two huge tax cuts, mostly for the wealthy, that weren't paid for; two wars that weren't paid for; and a massive prescription drug bill that wasn't paid for. Now, there are certainly places to cut.

Right now we are borrowing $10 billion every single month—$10 billion every single month—for military operations in Afghanistan to prop up a corrupt and incompetent Karzai regime. But according to the Congressional Budget Office, the spending caps contained in this legislation do not apply to ending that misguided war. That makes no sense to me.

The truth is that the best way to deal with our long-term fiscal situation is to grow our economy. That means creating jobs and putting people back to work. This bill goes exactly in the wrong direction.

I have two children who I love more than anything, and I don't want them to grow up in a country where the gap between the very rich and poor grows wider and wider each year. We can do better, Mr. Speaker. We must do better, and we can do so in a way that does not abandon the principles of economic justice and fairness that have made our Nation so great. I will vote ''no'' on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say to my good friend and Rules Committee colleague, time and time again he criticizes the tax cuts that have been put into place. They really are the Bush-Obama tax cuts because, as we all know, last December, President Obama signed an extension of those. But I think it is important for us to look at the 2003 revenue flow and look at what happened just a few short years later in 2007.

In 2003, Mr. Speaker, we had $1.782 trillion in revenues to the Federal Treasury. In 2007, after those tax cuts went into place, we had $2.567 trillion in revenues. That was a $785 billion increase, a 44 percent increase in the take that the Federal Government had because of the implementation of those cuts.

It is important to recognize that if we can grow the economy, we can generate an increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Bainbridge Township, Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, this moment in time on the floor reminds

me exactly of a period during the 1990s. You know, there is a lot of publicity given to the new freshmen class, and we from the revolutionary class of 1994 are feeling a little neglected these days, but welfare reform was the discussion. We endured overheated rhetoric on this floor about how our proposals were mean to pregnant women and children and old people and young people and poor people until one day the President of the United States, President Clinton, decided that he wasn't going to be the protector of overheated rhetoric, he was going to be the President of the United States, and he signed the welfare reform bill.

I happened to walk on the floor, and you would have thought that my friends who were here on the other side of the aisle at that time that their dogs had all died because they looked so depressed. But the fact of the matter is that President Clinton decided to lead.

Now, I don't know what's going on in all of the other offices, but we've taken a lot of phone calls over the last 4 or 5 weeks. Some people call in and tell me to hold the line; some people call in and tell me I'm an idiot. But the overwhelming sentiment of the calls is: You guys have got to work this out.

So to the President of the United States' credit, President Obama, he had the Speaker, Mr. BOEHNER; the minority leader, Ms. PELOSI; the Vice President; Senator REID; Senator MCCONNELL down to the White House, and they worked this out.

I don't think I'm going to stand here and listen to this continued harangue about how we are being mean to people because I don't think anybody on that side of the aisle believes that President Barack Obama would do the horrible things that the people are indicating he would do. I just don't believe it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I hear a lot about the Bush tax cuts, but if they are so great, where are the jobs? I think it is simply wrong to have the middle class in this country bear the burden of balancing the budget when the Donald Trumps of the world get their tax cuts protected. There is something inherently wrong about that.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a very tough place to put America. Not Members of Congress; we are paid to come here and do our job. But it is a very tough place to put America.

So I have a simple state of facts to present today and listen to my other colleagues, which I will, because it is a tough decision to in actuality support legislation that seems to be driven by thoughts that the only way to get something done is to hold a whole country hostage and to hold Congress hostage.

□ 1730

That is simply what we have.

On the brink of August 2, we are now throwing something on the floor that is arguably supposed to be helpful. I am concerned that there are nuances in this legislation that will hurt people we all care about, but it's a tough decision not to say ''yes'' to having America pay her bills. I hope, for once, that once we get past today that we will not in any way yield again to the voices of 87 Members who care nothing about America but who simply care about their way or the highway.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I am upset, and we should not do this anymore.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my views on ''The Budget Control Act of 2011,'' which, is a final hour compromise on raising our debt-ceiling. This plan differs from the previous debt-ceiling bills introduced by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Those measures attempted to resolve our budget ceiling crisis on the backs of seniors, children, and the working poor. Those measures demanded sharp cuts to domestic programs that ask average Americans to make life-altering sacrifices while not asking America's wealthiest individuals and most profitable corporations to contribute their fair share. Today's compromise has arrived just in time to prevent our country from risking the financial collapse of our great nation. Yet, this bill is not perfect

In less than 24 hours our nation's clock would have run out to raise our debt limit. This final hour compromise will allow our nation to continue to operate and prevent our country from failing to meet our financial obligations. I have steadfastly stood before this body demanding a raise to our debt limit. I have spoken on the behalf of the average American by making it clear that we should not wait until the last minute.

As a country, we have been held hostage by a small fringe group of people, who were narrowly elected. In many ways this plan feels like we have been given a ransom note and now at the last minute we have limited choices, none of which are appetizing. I believe this election was not a mandate to overthrow the American government. It was a mandate to find real solutions and not temporary fixes. Waiting to the final hour, waiting to the last minute, has placed our country in a terrible dilemma. We have not been given the adequate amount of time to review this plan. I will do what is right for my constituents. So that we may live to fight another day and let there be no mistake, we will fight another day.

I believe that it is time that we all have come together to find a compromise; however, this bill does not have a perfect solution and there are areas in which I have strong reservation. This is a two phased plan. The first part of the plan includes approximately $1.2 trillion of deficit reduction through the establishment of ten-year discretionary caps. In the first two years, there would be a firewall separating security and non-security spending. Total discretionary spending in Fiscal Year 2012 and 2013 will be limited to $1.o43 trillion and $1.047 trillion, respectively, about $7 billion and $3 billion below Fiscal Year 2011. The security savings would represent roughly $5 billion of the total $10 billion in reductions over this two year period.

The plan provides for debt ceiling increases in two stages. The President may request a $900 billion increase now, of which $400 billion is immediately available. This $900 billion is subject to a resolution of disapproval in both the House and Senate. The disapproval measure would be subject to Presidential Veto. Once the debt comes within $100 billion of the debt ceiling, the President may ask for at least an additional $1.2 trillion, which could rise to $1.5 trillion if a Balanced Budget Amendment is sent to the states or the Joint Committee process described below enacts more than $1.5 trillion in savings. This increase is also subject to a resolution of disapproval.

I must emphasize that I particularly have strong concerns about the formation of a Joint Committee. As I believe we should not hand over the power of these decisions of this magnitude to a handful of Members of Congress. A Joint Committee that will be given the duty of finding ways to achieve $1.5 trillion in deficit reduction. I hope there will be structure and reason when these decisions are made, but again this is just a hope.

We should have been able as a body to come to this decision, and because we are at the last minute, this measure is a stop gap way to find further consensus. This Committee will be a joint, bipartisan committee, made up of 12 members, with 6 from each Chamber of Congress, equally divided between Democrats and Republicans.

This Committee has been charged with finding major cuts in a short time frame with little oversight. There is the challenge where will they find $1.5 trillion in future deficit before we cut our turkeys on Thanksgiving.

I will continue to sound the alarm if programs that impact the lives and welfare of the poorest among us are cut by drastic amounts. If the Committee is successful and achieves cuts of at least $1.5 trillion, then the debt ceiling will be raised by $1.5 trillion. If the committee's bill is enacted and produces between $1.2 trillion and $1.5 trillion, the debt ceiling limit will be raised dollar for dollar. This plan at the very least attempting to do something that I have been calling for from the very beginning, for now, protects Social Security and Medicaid, but leaves Medicare and other programs that serve the most in need amongst us.

Another portion of the agreement will provide additional time for Congress to conduct its due diligence prior to considering an amendment to the Constitution. As unlike other bills that have come before this body this plan is not contingent upon the passage of the balanced budget amendment. The amendment can now be properly considered and a vote on the measure will occur by the end of the year, which will allot about four months of additional review.

In the end, it appears that cooler heads have appeared and instead of political rhetoric we have come together to protect our nation. We must continue to work together to save the American people and do what's right for our nation. Instead of injecting ideological spending cuts into the traditionally non-political business of raising the debt ceiling, we must work quickly to pass a bill that makes good on our debt obligations and restores confidence in American credit.

Before us is an example of acting in unison to resolve our conflicts. This is the reason the American people placed us in these positions

to ensure that we act in their best interest. They have been calling for a resolution and what is before us today represents a long and at times lively debate on how best to serve the citizens of this fine country. Today, we are working under one flag and one nation; we are working in unison to ensure that every American can benefit from this debt-limit increase.

There are times in which we are 50 states, and times when we exist as a single, united, Nation. One single state did not defend the Nation after the attacks on Pearl Harbor. One state, on its own, did not end segregation and establish Civil Rights. There are times when the stakes are too high, when we simply must unite as states and act as one. We must continue to work under one flag and one Nation to protect our economy and to our people.

We should not have waited until the final hour to come to this conclusion. I along with many colleagues demanded that we protect the interest of our Nation. Namely, reading the President to utilize his rights under the Constitution to raise the debt limit through executive order if Congress remained grid locked.

We need to change the tone here in Congress. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke said it best when he stated before the House Committee on Financial Services. "We really don't want to just cut, cut, cut," Chairman Bernanke further stated "You need to be a little bit cautious about sharp cuts in the very near term because of the potential impact on the recovery. That doesn't at all preclude—in fact, I believe it's entirely consistent with—a longer-term program that will bring our budget into a sustainable position." The plan before the House today offers the compromise that the American people want, demand and need.

I will continue to fight to for Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and other programs that protect the interests of the American people. In my lifetime, I have never seen such a concerted effort to ransom the American economy in order to extort the American public. Finally, we arrive at a conclusion that will not result in the poorest among us bearing the majority of the costs.

I support this bill and future efforts to increase the debt limit and to resolve our differences over budgetary revenue and spending issues. I will only support bills that increase jobs for average Americans. We must work together to ensure their economic security and ability to provide for their families while constraining the ability of Congress to deal effectively with America's economic, fiscal, and job creation troubles.

My home state of Texas ranks 43rd in education, and last (50th) in the Nation in people over 25 who only have a high school education. This bill will protect the hopes and dreams of people who are striving to improve those numbers. I have fought wholeheartedly to safeguard Pell grants and I will continue this fight. Some groups have estimated there will be a shortfall of more than $1 billion in fiscal year 2012, but again with the last minute nature of this bill, this remains unclear. There is yet another attack on students by eliminating Direct Loan Repayment incentives on all loans disbursed on or after July 1, 2012. The elimination of both of these provisions will increase the cost of loan repayment and thus the cost of college attendance. The in-school interest exemption for neither graduate nor professional students and the prohibition of financial incentives to students who repay their loans on a timely basis. We should not increase the cost of education for students.

The founders of our Nation understood the importance of advancing our Nation. For decades, we have provided free education to all minor residence of the United States from kindergarten through high school. After, having provided free education to all students until the 12th grade I recognize that financial disparities prevent many aspiring students from attaining a higher education.

I believe that the plan is a temporary solution to a long term problem. It removes, for the moment, the entire burden of resolving our debt crisis off the backs of seniors, the middle class and our Nation's most vulnerable citizens. The bill will not immediately result in dramatic reductions in safety net programs for vulnerable Americans, such as food stamps and unemployment and disability insurance. Any major cuts to these programs would be and should be unacceptable, and each is avoidable if corporations and the wealthy are required to shoulder their fair share of this burden.

There has been a theme this Congress of focusing on cutting both programs that benefit the public good and programs that provide assistance to those who are most in need, while ignoring the need to focus on job creation and economic recovery. This bill places us between a rock and a hard place as we fight to get back on the right track. We should be focused on paying our Nation's bills and resolving our differences.

I represent the 18th Congressional District in Houston, Texas. In my District, more than 190,000 people live below the poverty line. We cannot make draconian cuts to vital social services at a time when the Census Bureau places the number of Americans living in poverty at the highest rate in over 50 years.

Finally, we must come to a place where as a body we recognize that cuts to social programs do not reflect that we are still in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis. There continues to be persistent unemployment. When any measure comes before this body, the first questions that must be asked is who will it help and who will it hurt.

A raise in the debt-ceiling must include assistance to small businesses which are the true job creators in our country. It must include Pell Grants that will aid students who will join the workforce of the future, by receiving an advanced education today. Just 6 months ago there were members of the Republican Party who would not sit down with us to discuss these matters and now here we are in the final hour. I have worked diligently to ensure that something was done to protect our Nation.

I ask my colleagues to look at the facts and consider what will happen to the hard-working Americans who rely on these benefits. Think of programs like the Supplemental Nutrition Access Program, SNAP, that fed 3.9 million residents of Texas in April 2011, or the Women, Infants, and Children, WIC, Program that provides nutritious food to more than 990,000 mothers and children in my home state.

These programs are needed across our nation. According to the 2010 Federal poverty threshold, determined by the U.S. Census, a family of four is considered impoverished if they are living on less than $22,314 per year. In 2009, there were 43.6 million Americans living in poverty nationwide. Children represent a disproportionate amount of the United States' poor population. In 2008, there were 15.45 million impoverished children in the Nation, 20.7 percent of America's youth. Further, the Kaiser Family Foundation estimates that there are currently 5.6 million Texans living in poverty, 2.2 million of them children, and that 17.4 percent of households in the state struggle with food insecurity.

Childhood hunger continues to be a real and persistent problem in the Houston/Harris County area. The number of people participating in the Food Stamp Program in Texas has increased by 82 percent since 2000. However, only 60 percent of those eligible for food stamps in Texas participate in the program.

In Harris County, only 75 percent of children approved to receive free lunch participated, and only 39 percent of children approved to receive free breakfast took advantage of the benefit. Participation numbers are similarly low for those students approved to receive reduced-price lunch and breakfast. During summer months, participation in these federal nutrition programs drops significantly. In Texas the summer participation rate was only 8.1 percent of low income children.

In 2008, when the recession first hit, 22.9 percent of Texas children were living in poverty, the fifth worst rate in the Nation. As a result of the economic downturn that began in late 2008 in Texas, and parents losing their jobs, the child poverty rate increased to 24.4 percent in 2009. That is 163,000 more children falling into poverty, or 1.6 million Texas children overall.

Many people assume that Texas was not hit as hard by the recession as other states because our unemployment rate is still below the national average. While our unemployment rate is low compared to the U.S. (8.2 versus 9.8 percent, respectively, in November 2010), it is still nearly double where it stood in November 2007 (4.4 percent). In fact, Texas' unemployment rate has been around 8 percent for the last 16 months, which is extremely high given Texas' recent history.

Nearly one in three Texas children has no parent with a full-time, year-round job, making them particularly vulnerable.

When a household falls into poverty, children are exposed to increased parental distress, inadequate childcare arrangements, and poor nutrition. In past recessions, it took many years for employment and incomes to rebound, and low-income families rebound more slowly than others.

Public benefits such as health care or nutrition assistance help families bridge the gaps in difficult economic times and are critical in reducing the effects of a recession. Cutting these supports will hurt child and family well-being and damage the Texas economy by taking money out of the private economy for critical local businesses such as grocery stores and medical providers.

Programs like Women, Infants and Children, WIC, are targeted to help low-income pregnant women, new mothers, infants, and young children to eat well and stay healthy. These programs ensure that poverty will not be a reason that a baby does not receive adequate nutrition. WIC provides nutrition education, nutritious foods, referrals to health and human services, breastfeeding support, and immunizations (at some clinics).

More than 802,000 Texas children ages 0–4 (40 percent) received support through WIC.

When you look at infants alone, 67 percent received WIC supplements, compared to only 35 percent of children aged 1–4.

The program has grown by more than 176,000 kids between 2000 and 2009, with an increase of 66,000 children from 2007 to 2009 alone.

The dramatic rise in applications for SNAP initially overwhelmed the already beleaguered state workers who enroll families in these federal benefits. In November of 2009, 43 percent of SNAP applications were not being processed within the federally mandated 30-day time period, leaving hundreds of thousands of families each month waiting for food assistance.

More than 2.8 million Texas children participate in the school lunch program, and close to half of them also receive breakfast. More than $1.3 billion of federal funding is used to support these programs during the school year. Many counties in Texas also run summer nutrition programs so that kids who depend on school lunches have access to good nutrition when school is closed for the summer.

During the recession, more families needed greater assistance with basic expenses. SNAP (formerly Food Stamps) provided benefits to over 3 million Texans, more than half of which are children (ages 0–17).

In January 2011, more than 2 million Texas children received assistance from SNAP, an increase of nearly 700,000 kids since January 2008. Furthermore, because of added funds from the ARRA, monthly benefits rose 13.6 percent, giving added assistance to families at a time when they needed it most.

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

Texas has the unfortunate distinction of leading the Nation as the highest percentage of residents uninsured. More than 5.8 million Texans—including 1.5 million children—lack health insurance. Texas' uninsured rates, 1.5 to 2 times the national average, create significant problems in the financing and delivery of health care to all Texans. One in every four Texans lacks health insurance coverage, and that number is one in every three in large cities like Houston and Dallas. According to the Gallup poll, an average of 26.8 percent of Texas residents was uninsured.

Currently, one in four residents within the state of Texas is uninsured and would be in financial stress in case of a major medical emergency. The percentage of uninsured is extremely high and has become one of the greatest challenges faced by the Texas Department of Insurance and Department of Health.

Here's an idea that wouldn't cost Texas a dime but would save millions of dollars every year: Remove all barriers restraining nurses from practicing to the full extent of their education and training. No state needs primary care providers more than Texas, which has a severe shortage. Texas ranks last in access to health care and in the percentage of residents without health insurance. Of Texas' 254 counties, 188 are designated by the Federal Government as having acute shortages of primary care physicians. Of that number, 16 counties have one and 23 have zero. If every nurse practitioner and family doctor were deployed, we still couldn't meet the need. Texans are desperate for health care.

I have worked tirelessly with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to gain bipartisan support for successful passage of an amendment to the landmark healthcare reform bill that made sure no hospital is forced to shut its doors or turn away Medicare or Medicaid patients. Existing physician-owned hospitals employ approximately 51,700 individuals, have over 27,000 physicians on staff, pay approximately $2,421,579,312 in payroll taxes and $512,889,516 in other federal taxes, and have approximately $1.9 billion in trade payables. With approximately 50 physician-owned hospitals, Texas leads the Nation in the number of physician-owned hospitals. The Texas economy could lose more than $2.3 billion and more than 22,000 jobs without these important hospitals.

American families spend almost twice as much on health care—through premiums, paycheck deductions and out-of-pocket expenses—as families in any other country. In exchange, we receive quality specialty care in many areas. Yet on the whole, Americans do not get much better care than countries that spend far less. Americans do not live as long as people in Canada, Japan, and most of Western Europe. This should clearly indicate that health care reform was needed. The landmark bill signed by President Obama will provide coverage to millions of people who currently lack it.

Protecting Medicare represents the basic values of fairness and respect for our seniors, including the 2.9 million Texans who received Medicare in 2010.

Any cuts to Medicaid would be just as damaging. Harris County has one of the highest Medicaid enrollment records in Texas. Limits and cuts to Medicaid funds would significantly hurt the citizens of Texas's 18th District. Harris County averages between 500,000 and 600,000 Medicaid recipients monthly, thousands of people who may not have access to healthcare should Congress sacrifice Medicaid to cut spending.

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

As we continue to discuss the long term necessity of increasing out debt ceiling, I have heard the concerns of many of my constituents and the American people regarding the size of our national debt and the care with which taxpayer money is spent. I, too, am concerned about these issues; for to burden future generations of Americans with tremendous amounts of debt should not be a way to avoid our fiscal responsibilities to the American people. However, the task of resolving our debt ceiling crisis must take precedence over other concerns, including political ideology. The game is up, and the American people understand that increasing the debt ceiling has nothing to do with any new spending and everything to do with paying off the obligations that we have already agreed to and promised to pay.

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

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

Since the debt limit was first put in place, Congress has increased it over 100 times; in fact, it was raised 10 times within the past decade. Congress last came together and raised the debt ceiling in February 2010. Today, the debt ceiling currently stands at $14.3 trillion dollars. In reality, that limit has already been eclipsed, but due to accounting procedures by Treasury Secretary Geithner, the debt limit can be artificially avoided until August 2.

We must be clear on what this issue means for our country. America has earned a reputation as the world's most trusted borrower. United States Treasury bonds have traditionally been one of the safest investments another country or investor could make. For investors around the world, purchasing a U.S. Treasury bond meant that they held something virtually as safe as cash, backed by the full faith and credit of the United States government.

If we allow the United States to default on its debt obligations, the financial crisis that began in 2008 would pale in comparison, according to economic experts. The ensuing economic catastrophe would not only place the U.S. economy in a tailspin, but the world economy as well.

The fact that Congress, a body that typically has its fair share of political battles, has never played political chicken when it came to raising the debt ceiling should give us all pause, and is a testament to the seriousness with which we must approach this issue. However, this time around, my Republican colleagues have created an impasse based upon an ideological commitment to spending cuts. While I understand and share the concern of my Republican colleagues with respect to deficit spending, and will continue to work with them in order to find reductions, now is not the time to put ideology over pragmatism. The reality is that, on August 3, the United States will begin to default on its debt obligations if the debt ceiling is not raised.

This unnecessarily places the American public and the economy between a rock and a hard place. Either Congress sides completely with the radical agenda of the Tea Party, which in the irresponsibly pulls the chair out from under the average American while polishing the throne of the wealthiest.

This detour into a spending debate is as unnecessary as it is perilous, as increasing the debt ceiling does not obligate the undertaking of any new spending by the Federal Government. Rather, raising the debt limit simply allows the government to pay existing legal obligations promised to debt holders that were already agreed to by Presidents and Congresses, both past and present.

If the United States defaults on its obligations on August 3, the stock market will react

violently to the news that for the first time in history, America is unable to keep its promises to pay. Not once in American history has the country's full faith and credit been called into question.

Once America defaults, investors who purchase U.S. bonds and finance our government will be less likely to lend to America in the future. Just as a person who defaults on a loan will find it harder to convince banks to lend them money in the future, a country that defaults on its debt obligations will find it harder to convince investors to lend money to a government that did not pay.

Showing the world that the United States does not pay its debts makes the purchasing of that debt less desirable because it requires the assumption of more risk on the part of the investors. The opponents of this bill are putting the country at serious risk of losing its status as the world's economic superpower. Our allies will lose faith in our ability to manage global economic affairs. Our status in the world will be diminished, which will undermine our leverage on the world stage that allows us to command the respect and compliance of other nations when it comes to decision-making. This bill will allow America to compete with a surging China.

Furthermore, any investors that do continue to purchase U.S. Treasury bonds will demand much higher interest rates in order to cover the increased risk. Once a default occurs, investors figure that the chance of the United States defaulting again is much greater, and will require the government to pay higher rates of interest in order to make the loan worth the risk for investors to take on.

Imagine the impact on our stock market if we do not pay our debts. As we have seen throughout the recent financial crisis, a bad stock market hurts not only big businesses and large investors on Wall Street, but small businesses and small investors as well. Families with investments tied to the stock market, such as 401(k)s, pension plans, and savings, will once again see the value of their investments drop. The American people are tired of the uncertainty of the value of their retirement accounts. We must not allow another wild fluctuation to occur due to default and add to the uncertainty still lingering the minds of citizens.

Increasing the debt ceiling is the responsible thing to do. Congress has already debated and approved the debt that an increased ceiling makes room for. However, my Republican colleagues have chose to use this as an opportunity to hold the American people hostage to their extreme agenda.

They live in a world that is not the world that the American people live in. In their world, they believe that taxes are always too high, even on people making over a billion a year in a struggling economy; that any increase in revenue is fundamentally wrong, even if it comes from large corporations who use tax loopholes at the expense of our job-creating small businesses; that investing anything in our economic future above tax revenues is impermissible, even in the midst of an economic downturn; and that tax cuts for the wealthy are always the nation's top priority, even at the expense of people that depend on Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Veterans benefits to survive.

These beliefs place them on the fringe of American society, and yet due to the nature our political process, they have held up the entire government and placed our economy on the precipice of a turbulent second recession.

If Congress cannot find a resolution then Congress will open the possibility that the President may invoke the Fourteenth Amendment to United States Constitution, Section Four, which states "the validity of the public debt of the United States . . . shall not be questioned." The argument must be made that if Congress will not resolve our nation's pending default then the President to protect the interests of our nation must act. We should act, however, so the vulnerable are protected.

The President would have to consider his powers under the Fourteenth Amendment which may grant him the authority to raise the debt ceiling, through executive order if Congress fails to act by the August 2, 2011 deadline. If the President has to use his presidential authority, he should to avoid a collapse—but Republicans should cease the hostage-taking—and adults have to stand up for America and vote to pay America's bills.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to consider the constituents in their home districts who need the protection of an America that pays the bills. I urge my Republican colleagues to return to the world in which the vast majority of Americans live in; a world in which our shared destiny is determined by reasonable minds and good faith efforts to compromise. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke warned that defaulting could "throw the financial system into chaos", and "destroy the trust and confidence that global investors have in Treasury securities as being the safest liquid assets in the world".

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise all Members to respect the gavel.

The gentlewoman from Texas was out of order.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to my good friend from Hopkinsville, Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. I rise in support of this legislation, and I think that President Obama and the leaders in the House and the Senate should be given a warm congratulations on being able to come to some agreement to prevent America from defaulting on its debt.

We all know that this is not a perfect piece of legislation, but one of the real positives of this legislation is the joint commission that's going to be established by six Members from the House and six Members from the Senate who will come up with recommendations to reduce Federal spending. We do know that exempt from that is Social Security, veterans' benefits as well as Medicaid, for those who really need health care the most.

Yet I've heard a lot of discussion today about "this is not about jobs"; so I would just point out that getting our financial house in order is very important. If you've read any newspaper recently, you will find out that, in this administration, the excess of regulations coming out, particularly from the EPA, have been a real hindrance to job creation in America as well as the uncertainty of the health care bill that was adopted last year.

So this is an important first step in getting our financial house in order. Next, we need to start working on removing uncertainty on the regulatory side of the government. So I would urge everyone to support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We have missed, in my opinion, a wonderful opportunity, an opportunity to make a grand bargain, as the Speaker wanted to do, as Leader PELOSI wanted to do, as Leader REID wanted to do, as the President wanted to do, and as the Vice President wanted to do.

For months now, the world has looked to America and has asked whether we are still a Nation that pays its bills or whether, thanks to the ideological intransigents of a few, we would do the unthinkable and default on our obligations. We are a more responsible and honorable Nation than that. We are only at this point because the far right wing, for the first time in American history, has chosen to hold our economy hostage in order to enact a radical ideological agenda far out of step for the majority of Americans. If nothing else, these months have shown the American people who puts our country's welfare first and who would rather have ideological purity at all costs.

I am voting for this bill, not because I like this bill, although it does do some things that I think need to be done, but because we need to bring down the deficit; we need to address the debt; we need to return to fiscal responsibility. Default for the United States of America is not an option. This would affect all of the people I represent and all of the people of this country if we defaulted.

At the very least, this bill averts this outcome by paying our bills through 2013, which will bring certainty to a struggling economy that badly needs it. This bill cuts spending by $1.2 trillion, and also establishes a process to arrive at additional spending cuts.

The second set of deficit reductions will be entrusted to a bipartisan committee. Hopefully, that committee will accurately reflect the priorities of this Nation.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. We are here because we missed, as I said, a great opportunity, a chance to pass now a truly balanced agreement that relies on both spending cuts and revenue. We're not there, but I have said many times during the course of this debate that to govern is

to compromise, not to sell out. Some people think on this floor that voting for a compromise is somehow a sellout. We cannot run America on that theory, and that is not what democracy is all about.

I urge my colleagues to ensure that America, in fact, pays its bills.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield? I will yield my friend additional time if he would like.

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I would just like to compliment him on pointing to compromise. I don't know if he heard, but I closed the rule debate in my closing remarks by talking about the Connecticut compromise, which established a bicameral legislature on July 16, 1787. It was called the Great Compromise. My friend is absolutely right. We're at that point today in dealing with an issue, not of that magnitude, but clearly of a very important one.

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

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield an additional 45 seconds to my friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Ladies and gentlemen, I have said numerous times during the course of this debate about whether America was going to pay its bills and that we need to vote, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans: Americans concerned about the fiscal posture of their country, concerned about the confidence that people around the world have in the American dollar, which is, after all, the standard of the world. That is what I think this vote is about.

It should not be about partisan politics, and very frankly, it should not be about ideological extremes. It ought to be about responsibility. It ought to be about understanding that our oath of office is to preserve and protect the United States of America.

This bill does that. Vote ''yes.''

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

I feel very honored to follow my good friend and classmate, the distinguished Democratic whip, as we talk about this compromise and where we are.

Now, Mr. Speaker, saving Social Security and Medicare is a priority that I believe both political parties share. Contrary to much of what has been put out there, this is something that is addressed in this measure. We are going to be able to save Social Security and Medicare—again, working together in a bipartisan way.

Creating jobs, Democrats and Republicans alike talk about that. How is it that we're going to be able to do that? Getting our fiscal house in order is a very, very important step in our quest to ensure that the people who are hurting and looking for jobs will have an opportunity to get them.

We are sending a positive signal to the global market that we are the world's economic, military and geopolitical leader. By increasing the debt ceiling, we are sending a positive signal that we are going to continue meeting our obligations and our responsibility but, at the same time, dramatically reducing spending.

The problem that has gotten us to this point is what we're doing for the first time ever. After 75 times of increasing the debt ceiling, we are finally getting to the root cause. The problem, as has been said over and over again, is our debt, and we're going to turn the corner on that in a thoughtful and balanced way.

I want to compliment the President of the United States. I want to compliment the two leaders of the United States Senate, HARRY REID and MITCH MCCONNELL. I want to congratulate Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, who has done an absolutely phenomenal job in ensuring that we wouldn't continue business as usual. I also want to congratulate Minority Leader PELOSI for her effort that she has put in to getting us to the point where we are today.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes Members from the Committee on Ways and Means: the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), chairman; and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), ranking minority member.

□ 1740

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

Mr. Speaker, if the Congress does not act—and act now—America will default. That would wreak havoc on our economy and make it harder for Americans to find and keep a job in an already weak economy. Default cannot be an option, and I am pleased that the bill before us ensures that will not occur.

Just as a default would threaten the economic health of this country, so would increasing taxes. Raising taxes on families and job creators would hinder investment, increase the cost of doing business, and result in even less hiring and fewer jobs. That is the wrong direction when we are struggling with an unemployment rate of 9.2 percent and 14 million Americans looking for work. The good news is that the legislation before us recognizes these basic facts. It avoids a default, it makes sure the government pays our bills, and it does not increase taxes.

And though some have argued that the new Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction could pave the way for tax increases, that is not going to happen. The committee's structure, the baseline it will work off of, and the fact that Republicans are in the majority in the House virtually guarantees that tax rates will not go up.

Furthermore, this legislation finally forces Washington to make serious changes to the way it spends taxpayer dollars. There are real budget reforms, there is a path to a balanced budget amendment, and there are automatic spending cuts if Congress does not rein in spending on its own.

I applaud the efforts of all of those who helped craft this agreement, especially Speaker BOEHNER and Leader CANTOR.

I urge my colleagues to recognize this opportunity to fix what is broken in Washington and use this occasion to significantly cut runaway spending.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, a most distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee for a long time, Mr. CHARLES RANGEL of New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, while I stand on this floor as an American and a person that loves this Congress so much, I'm embarrassed also as a Member that a President of the United States would have his domestic and foreign policy actually held hostage, because with him and only him and no other President have we decided that we would almost put in jeopardy the faith and the fiscal responsibility of this country paying its debts.

You know, a lot of people have said that we got to a $14.4 trillion debt because we got drunk and spent money like a drunken sailor. If that is so, the people having the hangover certainly aren't the wealthy people in this country. And this decision was decided without any consideration of the people that are longing for jobs in our great country. If the Republicans had to hold the President hostage, I wish that they would have held him hostage on the questions that my constituents wake up in the morning and ask, not whether or not the debt ceiling has risen, but how can I get a job? How can I really get back my dignity? How can I put food on the table? These are issues that you certainly don't resolve by cutting spending, causing people to lose their jobs and to lose their hope.

So, indeed, I'm glad that we are not going to default, but in the days ahead we ought to be spending some time talking about what most Americans want, and that is a fair tax system—while the wealthy have gained so much during this spree that we've had—and not allow a hangover to be with the people that are jobless.

We still have time to close this responsibility that we have, to close the debt that we have, not by laying off people, not by just cutting programs during a recession, but by thinking about how we can train people, how we can research, and how we can get our people back to work.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, $14.4 trillion; $1.6 trillion every year added onto that national debt.

The people in November, 2010, spoke loudly. We are listening. It is time that we in this Chamber accept the fact that D.C. has to and will change because the American people have spoken loudly. They want us to get our fiscal house in order. They want us to bring certainty to the American market so that we can invest in this great country again and put people back to work, not only for this generation, but for generations to come.

I rise in support of this legislation. It is not the cure-all, it is not the one battle that will win this war on our national debt, but it opens us up on a path to where we need to be firmly dedicated and disciplined to carry on this battle and the battles to come.

So I ask all my colleagues, let us govern responsibly, let us avoid default, but continue on this battle—and continue on we will, as a new class, as a freshman Member of this great Chamber.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this agreement, but this is a lousy way to run our great country or to rebuild a world-class economy. I support it because the alternative is unacceptable, defaulting on our Nation's obligations for the first time in our Nation's history. Doing so would be the greatest unforced error ever committed in the history of our country. And it's all political.

The performance of this Congress the last couple of months has a lot to be desired. And if King Solomon were alive today, I think his metaphorical solution to all this would be to kill both women and spare the child. But if we are to achieve true fiscal solvency for our country, there are three things I think that need to happen:

We need to invest in our future, grow the economy. You do that by investing in education and job training and scientific research. And the infrastructure upgrade our Nation needs in broadband expansion, that's not happening right now, and it won't, I fear, under this agreement.

We need to also look for smart savings in the budget, starting with changing the way we pay for health care in this country so it's based on the value and no longer the volume of care that's given. By getting rid of outdated weapons programs the Pentagon keeps telling Congress to stop appropriating money for, because they're not asking for it, and they don't need it. It's ending taxpayer subsidies going to large agribusiness with mailing addresses in New York, Chicago, and San Francisco, not even to working families.

And finally, we need tax reform, to simplify a code that has acted like an anchor on economic growth and job creation, but that is fair, asking the most wealthy to contribute their fair share as well.

I support the agreement, and I encourage my colleagues to do so as well.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I have voted twice to raise the debt ceiling. In May, I voted with about 90 other people for a clear debt ceiling raise. I voted this past weekend for Leader REID's program, which had cuts.

But I can't vote for this program because the first series of cuts we know, the second series of cuts we don't know. I fear it's a Trojan horse. And if you look inside that Trojan horse it's Scylla and Charybdis inside, the whirlpools and the shoals. And that's an odyssey and journey that this country should not have to traverse.

This country has been taken to this point by a group of ideologues that don't like government, want to reduce it, are reducing it, want to hurt employment figures to hurt the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, and I don't want to hurt him.

Justice Louis Brandeis said, ''The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding.'' Justice Brandeis is with us today.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it's important we know, as we try to change this government, that we're actually making changes in the direction it's going.

Without the Budget Control Act, our government will be over 23 percent of the size of our economy by the end of this decade. The Budget Control Act changes that. By the end of the decade, it will be about 21.5 percent of the size of our economy. It is comparable, coming close to the shrinkage of the economy under President Reagan in his 8 years in the White House.

The truth of the matter is this doesn't go far enough for conservatives. You can't cut far enough or soon enough for Members of Congress like myself because we just believe this country is so deep, so dangerously deep in debt.

□ 1750

But with this vote today, tonight we cut out the same amount of spending the President put in this government in that ill-fated failed stimulus bill. And later this year, we get a chance to vote another cut in this government equivalent to the size of ObamaCare. So we start with two strong cuts reversing and shrinking the size of government.

In this bill, we achieve two-thirds of the discretionary cuts included in the Ryan Budget, in the Path to Prosperity that the Republican House Members believe in. Now, a few months ago, if someone said the Senate passed a budget and they've agreed to two-thirds of your cuts in discretionary spending, we would have celebrated. We're not celebrating today because we know there's so much more work to be done.

But we know also that this cuts spending today. It puts controls on future Congresses in the way they spend. That's important. And it holds Congress and the White House both accountable for getting the size of this government back in control without increasing taxes on families like you, on our job creators back home along Main Street, and it does so today.

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

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I support this bill as a first step, anxious to get to more spending and savings and getting this wasteful, bloated government down to size. And I know, too, any vote, my principle is tax cuts and spending cuts. If I can change the direction of this country with bigger spending cuts, my vote will be a ''yes.''

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

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

Mr. LEVIN. The Republicans in this House have taken this Nation to a dangerous and unnecessary brink. I definitely do not want our Nation to default on its full faith and credit, but I also don't want our Nation to default on our solemn obligations as a Nation, as a community to all of our citizens. That's why we need a balanced approach to keep us on an even keel as we move ahead. This means savings and revenues.

So as I vote today as the ranking member on the Ways and Means Committee, I will keep in mind how we must not let down our citizens who need programs.

One example is unemployment insurance. It's set to expire at the end of this year as millions desperately look for work. And I just now have received a report that this year's extension and the next year's extension would cost $45 billion. We need to get those resources. If we're not on a balanced path, we will not be able to address critical needs of our fellow and sister citizens such as unemployment insurance. We need balance to be true to ourselves.

I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility, or Debt Commission, we received testimony from experts in economic policy research; and they said that when debt loads of a country reach above or at 90 percent of their

economy or GDP, that results in the reduction in economic growth in that country by about 1 percentage point. And using the administration's economic model, that 1 percentage point increase in our GDP or decrease in our GDP costs about a million jobs. That's why this debate is so important. It is so important to get us on a path to fiscal responsibility, to begin to bring down our national debt.

The plan before us today does that. It does that with spending reductions. It does it with the sort of structural reforms in terms of spending caps that are there. But it also does it with an automatic reduction in spending if, for some reason, this select committee set up in this bill fails to come to some sort of agreement on how to reduce spending. That automatic reduction, I think, is an important backstop so the select committee will take its work seriously and do everything to come to a bipartisan solution.

Also, there is a path forward on a balanced budget amendment in this legislation that is absolutely critical I think for not just today, because we know it is impossible to bind future Congresses, but to put in place a structure and a mechanism well into the future so that we don't find ourselves continuing to deal with the fundamentals of this problem. We begin to deal with the problem; we make progress on the problem; and that progress will mean job creation, and that's something we're all looking forward to.

I thank the Speaker and urge a ''yes'' vote on the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes members from the Committee on the Budget: the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), chairman; and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), ranking minority member.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3½ minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. I tell you, I would love for people to be able to come to Oklahoma City anytime they have the opportunity to do that.

But to be able to talk to the great folks in my district, I can tell you the one thing that comes up again and again is they are really frustrated and they are looking for things to really be able to change here in Washington. They see how broken our system is. They see the way that we interact. They are really legitimately frustrated, and I can tell you they have lost trust in what we're doing and how we're doing it.

We, quite frankly, as the Federal Government, are trying to do too many things, and we can't afford all of the things that we're doing.

So in some very simple way, this whole process has united the Nation to be able to look simply at $14.3 trillion in debt and to say, as a Nation, we have a problem. That is a good first step.

Now, the conversation that's been happening around Congress over the past several months now is now dealing with how do we resolve the problem and what is the core of the problem. Is the problem the debt ceiling vote? Is the problem tomorrow? Or is the problem $14 trillion in debt?

And I feel like sometimes we have been trying to either figure out how to get past tomorrow or how to get past solving this issue of $14.3 trillion in debt. That has created 7 months of debate and 7 months of conversation that I fear has made an unrealistic expectation of how much we can really do in one piece of legislation.

Quite frankly, no piece of legislation can solve $14.3 trillion in debt all in one moment. No piece of legislation can be a perfect solution. There is no perfect ideal piece of legislation that's going to solve it all. Are there major issues that I think that are in every piece of legislation? I'm sure there are in every one of them. But in this one, I would look at it and say it is not perfect, but it takes us down that first step to start getting out of this.

If there is a perception that we can solve it all in one piece, I think everyone has underestimated the size and the scope of what it really means to deal with this large of a debt and this large of a deficit. It is a single step on a very long journey.

Does it solve all of the problems? No. Does it cure cancer? No. Does it get us out of all of the wars? No. Does it locate Amelia Earhart's body? No. Does it find us the Ark of the Covenant? No.

It doesn't solve everything we would like to do with it, but it does begin to put a framework around the Federal Government for the next 10 years to set spending caps in place to say we're going to stop the growth of government. We've grown very quickly very fast. We've got to first stop that growth of government and put some boundaries around it. That's a good first step on that.

□ 1800

It puts a square focus on the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, which 80 percent of the American people say they want some version of the balanced budget amendment. Quite frankly, this creates a moment for Republicans and Democrats to be able to have an honest conversation about what should that text be for a balanced budget amendment? How can we work together? The Constitution is not owned by one party but is owned by the people of the United States of America, so that is both parties coming together to have a very frank conversation about if we're going to have a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, how do we get that done? What is the text of that? And how do we do what is best for our Nation?

But the key thing of this piece of legislation today is focused on not just getting us past tomorrow but starting us down a process, that single first step of starting us down a process that in the days ahead our children will not live in the shadow of this kind of debt, of this kind of deficit, and we as a Nation can get back to doing the things we love to do rather than worrying about what creditor we're going to pay and which one we're not.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we should never have gotten to the point where our troops in Afghanistan had to ask whether they were going to be paid. That's a scandal. And it's scandalous that our Republican colleagues would threaten for the first time in American history to torpedo America's creditworthiness and American jobs unless they succeeded in enacting a budget plan to end the Medicare guarantee, slash Medicaid, and slash critical investments in education and our future.

That was the plan. They wanted to do that now, and they wanted to have this whole debate again 6 months from now. Why? Not to reduce the deficit. If the goal was to reduce the deficit, why refuse to end taxpayer subsidies for the oil companies? If reducing the deficit was the purpose, why refuse to end special breaks for corporate jets and the folks at the very high end of the income scale? That wasn't the plan. The plan was to use this moment to threaten the economy, to try and slash the social safety net and those critical investments in education and innovation in our future.

And guess what: They failed. They failed to do that. They failed to end the Medicare guarantee. They failed to slash Medicaid. They failed to slash education. In this measure, we succeeded in protecting Medicare and Social Security beneficiaries. We succeeded in protecting seniors in nursing homes, individuals with disabilities and poor kids who depend on Medicaid for their health care. And we succeeded in providing room for critical investments in education and America's future.

Don't get me wrong, Mr. Speaker, there's much in this plan I don't like. We did not succeed in shutting down special interest tax loopholes that add hundreds of billions of dollars to our deficits. Our Republican colleagues refused to cut those subsidies for big oil companies. They refused to cut the others. And now we're going to have a great debate. We're going to have a great debate about how to grow the economy and reduce our long-term deficit. It will be a debate about our national priorities. I hope we will support the balanced approach that the President has called for, one that refuses to

put greater burdens on Medicare beneficiaries in order to provide greater tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans.

In the coming months, our Republican colleagues will be given the following test: Will they choose to protect special interest tax breaks over investments necessary to keep our Nation strong and secure? Will they finally demonstrate a willingness to pay for our national defense rather than put it on the credit card? Mr. Speaker, let's get on with that big national debate, and let's finally focus on jobs and getting the economy going as we reduce our long-term deficit.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Wisconsin, a member of the Budget Committee, Ms. MOORE.

Ms. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

So many of my colleagues have said that it was necessary to storm the White House and take the country hostage in the name of their grandchildren, so I wanted to go on record talking about what I want for my grandchildren.

I want Head Start for my grandchildren. I want WIC programs and early childhood education programs for my grandchildren. I want my kids to go to a school where they can participate in the science fair. I want immunizations for them. I want research done for food safety to make sure that the chicken nuggets are safe. I want clean air and clean water for them. I want jobs where they invent things, like new energy sources. And, yes, I want them to be contributing citizens and pay taxes. And I want a safety net for them in case they are disabled, and when they become elderly, and if they get cold in the cold winters of Wisconsin, that they'll have some energy assistance.

I want my grandchildren to have the American Dream.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding and also for his very bold and effective leadership.

I rise in strong opposition to this unbalanced debt ceiling bill. This is an unbalanced approach. We all know that. We've heard that. Furthermore, this debt ceiling bill should have never been an option in terms of having to come to this floor to debate this and to do this. Like we have done for Democratic and Republican Presidents in the past, we should have lifted the debt ceiling.

Rightfully so, many of us are concerned about these discretionary cuts. What are these cuts going to do as it relates to our senior citizens, low income individuals and the poor? This debt ceiling bill does nothing to address the real crises in our country, the lack of jobs and economic growth. At a time when investments are needed to jump-start our economy and put people back to work, this deal and its cuts-only approach, which it is, it's the wrong approach. It's an outrage that as we stand here today that we could not raise the debt ceiling by voting for that.

I intend to vote ''no'' on the bill.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey, who's been a fighter in this battle, Mr. ANDREWS.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, what brings us together is a need to create jobs for the American people, and I think people would agree there's three things we have to do to create jobs:

The first is not fall off a cliff and have a default on our national obligations. This bill accomplishes that.

The second thing is to make sure we have an interest rate environment so that our businesses and entrepreneurs can create jobs, so they have some predictability. By making a 25 to 30 percent down payment on reducing our deficit in a fair and equitable way, this bill does that.

Finally, I think most of us agree that we need investments in our education, research and development, infrastructure, other activities to create jobs in our private sector for our people. By making sure that at least in the first 2 years of this agreement that the reductions in those areas are either nonexistent or moderate, I think that we give ourselves the freedom so our appropriators can put valuable investments forward in that way. This is a well-reasoned bipartisan agreement to create jobs for the American people. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, we should never have reached this point in our country. We should never have reached the point when our troops wondered whether they were going to get paid or individuals on Social Security wondered whether they were going to see their earned benefits. That should never have happened.

This is the first time in history, the first time in history, that we've seen Members of this Congress threaten to close down the American economy unless they got their particular budget plan through, one that ends the Medicare guarantee, slashes Medicaid and would deeply cut our investments in education and innovation. We protected those investments in this bill. The plan did not work. It didn't work now, and the plan to do it again 6 months from now didn't work.

□ 1810

So now we will have that great debate over our priorities. We are looking forward to it. Let's get on to talking about jobs and the economy.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished Democratic leader, who has been a fighter for America's priorities, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And every chance I get, I want to salute him for his tremendous leadership as the top Democrat on the Budget Committee, for the work he did with Mr. CLYBURN in the bipartisan talks, as they strove to have what the American people want: a balanced, bipartisan, fair agreement to lift the debt ceiling and take America forward.

Unfortunately, that did not happen. What did happen, and it brings to mind the existential question, why are we here? And I would divide, as we say in legislation, I would divide that question into why are we here, and why are we here today? We are here because all of us in this body care about our country, have decided that public service is a noble pursuit, and that we have come here to make the future better for future generations. That is what our Founding Fathers visualized for America, that every generation would take responsibility to make the future better for the next.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, our Founders, in addition to writing our founding documents, the Declaration, the great Declaration, which embodies fairness in it and equality, then the Constitution, they declared independence, they fought the greatest naval power in the world, they won, they wrote the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, making us the freest, greatest Nation in the world, founded on a principle of respect that all people are created equal. That had never been done in the history of the world.

And when they did that, as I have told you before, because I love it so much, they also created the Great Seal of the United States. And that Great Seal of the United States has on it ''Novus Ordo Seclorum,'' a new order for the centuries, for the ages, forever.

So confident were our Founders in their idea about generational responsibility, one to the next, that they were confident that our country, that what they were putting forth, would exist for the ages. For the ages. That was the challenge they gave us. That is the responsibility that we have. And for a couple of hundred years or more, that has always been the case.

Every generation has always believed that it would make the future better

for the next, for their children and for their grandchildren. We are here today because we believe that, and we believe that the public policy that we put forth, the legislation we put forth, should result in public policy that makes the future better for our children and our grandchildren. That we are committed to their education, the economic security of our families, the dignified retirement of our seniors, including my being a senior, and also safety and security of our neighborhoods and of our country, and that we would do it in a fiscally sound way that did not give our kids any bills, public or personal.

So if we believe all of that, and that's why we are here in Congress, it's hard to believe that we are putting our best foot forward with the legislation that comes before us today. I am not happy with it, but I am proud of some of the accomplishments contained in it. And that's why I am voting for it.

That takes me to the second question: Why are we here today? Why are we here today, within 24 hours of our Nation going into default, after months of conversation about how we would address the debt ceiling? Not to have future spending, but to pay our past obligations. And I won't go into it again, how we got here. But I will say that time is one of the most important commodities any of us have, the most precious, the most finite. And during that period of time, when our country could have been more productive, more optimistic, more confident in the tradition of our Founders, instead, a cloud of doubt was placed on it because of the delay, the delay, the delay in lifting the debt ceiling.

As my distinguished colleague Mr. VAN HOLLEN said, this has never happened before. We have never, never tied the hands of a President of the United States. We never placed any doubt in the public markets as to whether this would happen. We never had people around the boardroom tables all wondering if we even knew the consequences of our inaction. But I am concerned about the boardroom table. I am more concerned also about the kitchen table.

Because this delay and uncertainty has a tremendous impact on America's families as they sit around the table and talk about how they're going to make ends meet, how they're going to pay their bills. Is Social Security going to be intact for them? Will their checks arrive this week or next week, whenever they're due? Is Medicare and Medicaid something that they can count on?

Well, after months and months and months to reach an agreement that could have been reached a long time ago—it is not so great it took so long to achieve; it could have been accomplished months ago, and at least had the merit of instilling confidence earlier, sooner, rather than at the latest possible moment. So we must make sure that we are, as we say why are we here today, that we are not here some other day to go through these motions.

That's another reason why I am supporting this bill, because the President was successful in impressing upon the Congress that we needed the full time, the 18 months so that we can have Americans' kitchen table—people sitting around that table and sitting around the boardroom table would all know that you can rely on the United States of America to meet its obligations. Okay?

Another reason to support this bill, even though there are plenty of reasons not to, is that it stops cuts in Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. This is the most important assignment given to the Democratic leadership going to the table: Make sure there are no cuts in benefits in Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. That was achieved.

Another issue of importance to us is that as we protect and defend our country, we also measure our strength in the health, education, and well-being of the American people. And so we have a 50–50 split between our expenditures for defense and our expenditures for strength defined in other ways for our country.

So these are some reasons. While those who may have the luxury of not wanting to vote for the bill, I feel a responsibility to do so. We cannot, because of certain objections in the bill—and one of the main ones is that there is not one red cent coming from America's wealthiest families, the most successful people, and God bless them for their success, and I know that they are willing to do more, but not one red cent coming to help reduce the deficit while we are willing to cut Title I education for the poorest children in America. And that's too bad for those children. It's terrible for our country.

So, again, you can make a list of things in the bill that we do not like and things that are not in the bill, like revenue, but I urge my colleagues to think about our seniors and to think about the 18 months and what that means in terms of confidence in our society and what it means also to have the 50–50 in terms of defining the strength of America.

We cannot, despite our reluctance to vote for this bill for some of us, allow America's seniors and veterans, who are depending on receiving their check from the government or their security over time—we cannot allow our seniors and veterans to be caught in the collateral damage of the assault on the middle class that is being waged in this Congress.

□ 1820

This is one manifestation of making it harder for the future, for the great middle class which is, and those who aspire to it, which is the backbone of our democracy. So if we are going to honor the vows of our Founders and carry on the great legacy and tradition of their optimism, their determination, their hope for the future that we would last for ages, we would last for ages as a democracy, not an ever broadening disparity of income and equity in our country that undermines that democracy.

So, please, my colleagues, if you are on the fence about this—I certainly am and have been, even though I worked very hard to support the President in preserving what I said about no cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, about the 18 months and about the 50/50 split—please think of what could happen if we defaulted. Please, please, please come down in favor of, again, preventing the collateral damage from reaching our seniors and our veterans.

I urge you to consider voting ''yes,'' but I completely respect the hesitation that Members have about this.

Again, I want to commend our distinguished colleagues, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CLYBURN, the President of the United States, and, really, those who tried to work in a bipartisan way to try to accomplish something.

Now, I hear that our Republican colleagues have said they got 98 percent of what they want in the bill. I hope that their votes will reflect that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the House Republican Conference, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, the American people want more jobs and they want less debt. The American people are telling Washington, you have got to quit spending money you don't have. You have got to quit borrowing 42 cents on the dollar, much of it from the Chinese, and then send the bill to our children and our grandchildren.

Our crisis today is not the debt ceiling, it is our debt, and it is a spending-driven debt. That is why we are here today, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to say that this bill solves our problem. It doesn't. It's a solid first step. Nobody, nobody on our side of the aisle wants to increase this debt ceiling. It's not in our DNA.

But we do believe that ultimately you ought to stay current on your bills, and you have got to quit spending money you don't have. And in this bill, although the sums are very, very small, when we pass this bill, if the President signs it into law, it will be the first time in my lifetime, the first time in my lifetime that for 2 years in a row we have actually cut discretionary spending in Washington, D.C., and made a very slight directional change in the right direction.

The numbers are small, the directional change is huge, but more importantly, Mr. Speaker, the seeds of the ultimate solution are planted in this bill, and that is the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. The American people aren't looking for a

balanced approach; they are looking for a balanced budget. To have it work, it needs to be enshrined in our Constitution.

This bill will assure, for the first time in 15 years, both the House and the Senate vote on a balanced budget. Those are the seeds of the solution to save this country for the next generation.

I urge adoption of this bill.

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

Let me just start by saying this, Mr. Speaker, from this debate it's very clear that we have a difference of opinions. We have different philosophies on how to address these issues, but we are coming up to a deadline that we all must recognize: default.

So what this has done is it has brought our two parties together. So I would just like to take a second to reflect for a moment that we have a bipartisan compromise here. That doesn't happen all that often around here; so I think that's worth noting. That's a good thing.

First off, as my colleague from Texas has just said, this is a down payment on the problem. It's a good step in the right direction, and it is a huge cultural change to this institution.

Both parties got us in this mess. Both parties are going to have to work together to get us out of this mess, and the real problem, I would add, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that we spend way more money than we take in. We have to address that.

To my friends on the left, I think they would like to take comfort in the fact the way these spending cuts are designed and the way the sequester is designed.

To my friends on the right, we are cutting spending. We have been trying to get discretionary caps in law for years. I have been here 13 years trying for it every year, this is the first time.

When we ran Congress the last time we were in the majority we couldn't even get it with the Republican Congress. Now we are getting discretionary caps. That's a big achievement.

Number two, we used to just rubber stamp these debt limit increases. We used to sneak these debt limit increases in budget resolutions. Now it's out here in plain sight.

And what are we doing? We are actually cutting spending while we do this. That's cultural. That's significant. That's a big step in the right direction. We are getting two-thirds of the cuts we wanted in our budget, and, as far as I am concerned, 66 percent in the right direction is a whole lot better than going in the wrong direction.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we should never have reached this point. Under Democratic and Republican presidents alike, Congress has always fulfilled its responsibility to pay our nation's bills when they come due. We have disagreed vehemently about matters of fiscal policy, but we have always recognized that the full faith and credit of the United States should remain above the partisan fray.

Until now, that is. Make no mistake, this is a manufactured crisis. For the last several weeks, Republicans have held our nation's economy hostage to their narrow and extreme ideological agenda, demanding a ransom of devastating cuts to critical domestic programs while protecting tax breaks for oil companies and other special interests. No matter that Social Security benefits, military pay, and the credit rating of our country have all been hanging in the balance—apparently, economic calamity is a small price to pay for ideological purity.

I voted months ago for a clean debt ceiling increase. I voted days ago for an alternative, bipartisan Senate plan to increase the debt ceiling and cut spending in carefully targeted ways. That the House and Senate are just now considering legislation to stave off default is a tremendous failure by House Republicans, who could not bring the most extreme elements of their caucus to a more balanced legislative solution.

The result is an agreement which could have been worse but is still not good enough. From the beginning, I have said that any serious approach to deficit reduction must do two things: protect the fragile recovery, because the best cure for a budget deficit is a growing economy, and take a balanced approach to finding savings by putting all types of spending and revenues on the table. This agreement meets neither of these tests.

The President deserves credit for negotiating a package that rejects some of the worst Republican demands. It immediately moves us past this artificially created crisis by extending the debt limit through 2013, and it protects Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid against cuts from Republicans who have signaled a willingness to savage these middle class benefits as a part of deficit reduction. I am also encouraged that defense spending has finally been subjected to the same pressures as the rest of the budget.

However, these positive aspects offer limited consolation. Instead of charting a responsible path to deficit reduction while continuing to invest in economic recovery, the bill imposes severe spending caps that will become even more severe if the deficit commission created by the bill fails to achieve consensus. Instead of taking a balanced approach that includes new sources of revenue, such as an end to special-interest tax breaks, the bill asks the elderly and working-class Americans to bear the brunt of the sacrifice. Why are we not asking the wealthiest Americans to make the same sacrifices other Americans have already been asked to make?

Finally, I also vote no because I refuse to legitimize the demands of ideologues who have recklessly held the national economy hostage to their extreme agenda. Governance by brinksmanship is not worthy of being called governance. The American people deserve better than a House of Representatives that forces the entire country to lurch from one artificially created crisis to the next. We are United States Congress, not the Tea Party's Congress, and it's time we started acting like it.''

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the Budget Control Act Agreement (S. 365) is a terrible bill that I strongly oppose. This legislation is the product of the most disturbing political process I have witnessed during my time in Congress. For the first time ever, one of America's political parties showed themselves willing to throw the nation into default on our debt obligations for the sake of politics. By holding an increase in the debt ceiling hostage as a negotiating strategy, the Tea Party Republican majority in the U.S. House of Representatives imperiled millions of jobs, businesses, and the economic well-being of every American. A nonpartisan publication, the National Journal, declared that America has ''entered a new era of government at gunpoint.''

I find myself agreeing with Wall Street Journal editors who criticized the House majority's conduct during this process by saying, ''Republicans are not looking like adults to whom voters can entrust the government.''

The legislation that House Republicans are forcing on the country will slash trillions of dollars of investments at exactly the moment when more investment is needed to prevent our economy from sliding back into recession. Education, infrastructure, health research, public safety, clean energy and every other middle class priority will see cuts as a result of this bill.

An editorial in today's New York Times argues this deal will ''hinder an economic recovery.'' At a time when 14 million Americans are unemployed and economic growth has slowed to a crawl, why is Congress passing legislation that will ''hinder an economic recovery?'' Tying massive cuts to a debt ceiling increase is completely unnecessary, totally counterproductive, and it will make America's job crisis even worse. And, with this bill, the Republicans are tossing the heavy burden of deficit reduction onto America's middle class without asking even one penny from the nation's wealthiest individuals and corporations.

While I cannot support this agreement, President Obama and Democratic leaders deserve tremendous credit for their perseverance and determination in solving this manufactured debt crisis. Their efforts succeeded in protecting the economy from the unthinkable consequences of default and shielded Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid from Republican cuts.

President Obama was forced to negotiate this agreement with radical Republicans who proved all to willing to send the economy into default. He was in a nearly impossible position. One would expect irrational, dangerous, and irresponsible negotiating tactics from North Korea's Kim Jong-il, but not from the Republican congressional leaders. President Obama did what the nation required in order to avert economic disaster.

Still, I cannot support this legislation. This is a bad bill on many levels, most of all because it forces a broken bargain that avoids economic collapse at the cost of an even slower and more painful economic recovery. It may even return the nation to recession.

This is bill is bad for America and I strongly oppose it.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following:

''BIG DEAL'' IS FOUNDATION FOR ''LONG-TERM AUSTERITY''

WHY I VOTED ''NO'' ON THE BUDGET DEAL

(Statement By Congressman Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.)

As a result of the ''Big Deal'' that House Speaker John Boehner, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid and Senate Minority

Leader Mitch McConnell negotiated—and approved by the House and Senate—welcome to ''Austere America.'' The era of austerity has begun!

Democrats were faced with two draconian choices: (1) vote ''against'' the package and the result would be a job killing default according to House Speaker Boehner; or (2) vote ''for'' the package and, from my perspective, the result will be a job killing austerity.

The budget negotiators absolutely concluded a ''Big Deal.'' It's a ''game changer.'' The United States is about to become the austere Japan of the 1990s and the austere Great Britain of 2011. Budget deficits and debt will go up—not down. Unemployment will go up—not down. Suffering by the American people will go up—not down. Economic growth will remain stagnant or slow at best and will not address the need for jobs for the unemployed. In short, I predict the result of this agreement will be the opposite of the current spin.

While all Democrats agree that reducing the deficits and taming the debt is something that must be dealt with in the future, the immediate issue is not ''deficit reductions'' but ''job reductions'' (i.e., creating enough jobs for 17 million unemployed Americans). Reducing federal spending in a weak economy is the exact opposite of what is needed now.

Republicans and conservative Democrats preposterously argue ''tax and budget cuts will equal more jobs and more tax revenues''—the ''Laugher'' Curve. The biggest tax cuts in history in 2001 and 2003 resulted in the loss of 600,000 private jobs over eight years. To stimulate the economy, the Congress passed and the President signed a $757 billion stimulus package that kept us out of another Great Depression, but it was unable to rescue unemployed workers from the current Great Recession. The Republican argument reminds me of the man whose house caught on fire and when he couldn't put it out with a garden hose he concluded, ''Water doesn't put out fire.'' Water does put out fire, but you have to have enough of it to fit the size of the fire, and you have to put it in the right place.

Some argue—because of the possibility of default—the President and Democrats had no alternative. I disagree. First, even the threat of using Section 4 of the 14th Amendment by the President (which he took off the table) would have strengthened his negotiating hand. Second, he could have fought for an alternative strategy of invest, grow and build which would have put Democrats on our turf and on the offense instead of on the Republicans turf and on the defense—and such a plan would create jobs, reduce deficits and debt.

The most vulnerable Americans will again suffer the most under this agreement. This is a very bad and sad day for America.

TREAT PRESIDENT OBAMA LIKE ALL OTHER PRESIDENTS!

RAISE THE DEBT CEILING WITHOUT CONDITIONS

(Statement by Congressman Jesse L. Jackson, Jr. (D–IL–2))

According to the Congressional Research Service, since March of 1962 a ''clean'' debt ceiling bill has been passed by Congress 74 times—including 18 times under President Ronald Reagan and 7 times under President George W. Bush; and raising the debt ceiling has never been used by a political party to ''stickup,'' ''shake-down'' or ''hold hostage'' the President of the United States, the American people and the world economy for narrow domestic political gain.

President Obama should be treated like all other Presidents! Republicans didn't like President Bill Clinton either—because of his political ideology—but they never hijacked the economy over passing a clean debt ceiling bill. So don't change anything just because Barack Obama is the President and Republicans don't like his ideology! Raise the debt ceiling without conditions! Pass a ''clean'' debt ceiling bill! Treating President Obama differently than all past Presidents reflects an ''institutional bias'' against the Southside of Chicago!

Rep. Joe Wilson reflected the same institutional bias when, in an unprecedented manner, he called President Obama a ''liar'' in the middle of his State of the Union address. Speaker John Boehner reflected a similar institutional bias when he said he and the President had the same responsibility—equating his job as Speaker of the House (a legislative function) with the job of the President of the United States (an executive function). Doubting the birthplace of Barack Obama, doubting his Christian faith and experience, calling him a Muslim and a socialist reflects this same institutional bias. The Republican's proposed Balanced Budget Amendment (BBA) reflects a similar institutional bias—the only other place where there's a BBA is in the Constitution of the Confederate States of America. With a BBA, the Southside of Chicago can never be made equal to the Northside of Chicago.

What are the alternatives for President Obama? First, he can either sign or veto whatever bill Congress passes and sends up to him—assuming Congress is able to pass something. Or, second, since no other President has been treated like he is being treated, he may have to use something no other President has had to use—i.e., Section 4 of the 14th Amendment. Section 4 of the 14th Amendment was included because the Union did not want to pay the past war debt of the seceded Confederate states. Therefore it is appropriate that in the year of the sesquicentennial start of the Civil War that he use a tool given to him at the conclusion of the Civil War (1868) to save Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, the U.S. and the world economy.

The previous administration started two wars. We have men and women who are presently fighting on foreign battlefields and we should not abandon them. This government has an obligation to them and their families to pay them for risking their lives and protecting the country. This President should exercise the 14th Amendment's extraordinary authority in defense of these men and woman at war.

Use of the 14th Amendment is appropriate and justified when the current advocates of states' rights are again asserting themselves. As Section 4 of the 14th Amendment was being debated, Sen. Benjamin Wade (R–OH) argued that ''it puts the debt incurred in the Civil War on our part under the guardianship of the Constitution of the United States, so that a Congress cannot repudiate it. I believe that to do this will give great confidence to capitalists and will be of incalculable pecuniary benefit to the United States, for I have no doubt that every man who has property in the public funds will feel safer when he sees that the national debt is withdrawn from the power of a Congress to repudiate it and placed under the guardianship of the Constitution than he would feel if it were left at loose ends and subject to the varying majorities which may arise in Congress.'' President Obama should not allow the ''current majority'' in the House and the filibuster prone minority of Republicans in the Senate to hold the economy hostage.

So in the spirit of Senator Benjamin Wade (R–OH), Representative Thaddeus Stevens (R–PA) and Senator Charles Sumner (R–MA), President Barack Obama should use Section 4 of the 14th Amendment to protect the full faith and credit of the United States and avoid an economic catastrophe that will damage the United States and the world economy.

Mr. Speaker, I have given several Special Order speeches about my view of the Constitution, making the argument for why I think it should be amended to include certain basic rights that the American people currently lack. These include the right to a high-quality education, the right to health care, and equal rights for women. This afternoon, my special order time will be used to discuss the Continuing Resolution for FY 2011, the Republican Proposed FY 2012 Budget, and the Balanced Budget Amendment or what I've taken to calling the ''ImBalanced Budget Amendment''.

Not too long ago, the House passed H.R. 1, a continuing resolution that would have forced middle and working class Americans to carry the heavy burden or spending cuts. My colleagues across the aisle simplified the impacts of this measure by describing it as ''tightening our belts''. They seem to be oblivious to the fact that these cuts went deep for those Americans who could least afford them.

H.R. 1 ''tightened our belts'', slashing programs like Community Health Centers, specifically designed to provide access to basic health and dental services to underserved communities that may not otherwise be able to get the care they need.

HR. 1 ''tightened our belts'' through cuts to the National Institutes of Health, setting back development of cancer treatments and cures for other diseases, the impact of which we will feel for years to come, as medical professionals are forced to shut down promising research projects.

HR. 1 ''tightened our belts'' by hacking away at training for Health Professions, reducing this funding by more than 23%. Cuts to Title VII and VIII programs that help to train primary health professionals for underserved areas, would limit the access of low income individuals to quality doctors, nurses and physicians assistants in their areas.

H.R. 1 ''tightened our belts'' by severing Title X family planning programs. In doing so, we stepped back in time, preventing life saving care from being offered to our nation's women, specifically women who wouldn't otherwise have access to this kind of care.

The programs I've listed so far provide health services to our nation, and especially our most underprivileged populations. H.R. 1 also 2 tightened our belts with cuts to job training programs, Head Start and after-school programs, Pell Grants, Hope VI Housing programs, and high speed rail.

These programs were systematically sent to the guillotine. The people that they serve are not the millionaires, to whom we generously extended tax cuts. They are not the corporations who eagerly navigate tax loopholes, every year, costing our nation billions in revenue. They are the everyday, hard working, middle class, public school educated, check book balancing, minimum wage earning, mothers and fathers and grandparents that elected each of us, hoping we'd find a way to decrease unemployment, and bring America back from the brink.

Mr. Speaker, thankfully, our colleagues across the Capitol thought we went a few notches too tight in our belt with H.R. 1. As the Senate refused to take up these cuts,

much of our future long term budget discussions to reduce our deficit and get America back on track remain in limbo.

Recently this discussion had reached a fever pitch.

After multiple short term extensions of the FY 2011 Appropriations legislation, the negotiations between Speaker BOEHNER, Leader REID and the President had broken down many times throughout the week.

We were faced with the threat of the first government shutdown since 1996. Agencies were planning which workers to furlough, National Parks and Museums were prepared to shut their doors for the weekend, and the brave women and men in the active-duty of our Armed forces were prepared to continue to work without pay.

Then, at the eleventh hour, there was a breakthrough. The five and a half month Continuing Resolution, agreed to by the leadership of House and Senate, included a total of $39 billion worth of cuts.

But these cuts that were agreed to late into Friday, have real consequences. There are significant cuts to programs like WIC, the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women Infants and Children, Community Health Centers, the Low Income Heating and Energy Assistance Program, international disaster assistance and Head Start.

After the President and Congressional leadership agreed to giving $800 billion in tax cuts to America's top wage earners last December, we turned around and cut programs that working families and seniors depend on. It just doesn't make sense, Mr. Speaker.

Again, while I was relieved that the federal government did not shut down, I am deeply disappointed in the process that has brought us to this ''compromise'', if you can even call it that.

Like the negotiations that held up tax cuts for the middle class at the end of last year to hold out for tax cuts for the wealthy, our leadership has again demonstrated that they are willing to hold up programs that provide for the most vulnerable Americans. And this Congress is only just beginning.

As for the next fiscal year's budget, there are a variety of solutions that have been presented, some with potential to succeed, others destined to fail. Among the proposals lie Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN's recent offering. Looking at the facts, his proposal will reduce our nation's deficit, but leaves us asking the question, at what cost?

First and foremost, Mr. RYAN intends to place the burden of ending our nation's debt on the citizens least capable of caring for themselves, those most reliant on the help of others: our seniors.

The Budget Committee's proposal would end the Medicare our senior citizens have come to know and rely on, replacing it with what can only be described as a coupon—a voucher that, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, would leave our eldest Americans shouldering 68% of their healthcare costs in the next 20 years.

Who else pays the cost of balancing our budget within the Ryan proposal? The burden falls next to working American families. The Ryan proposal will lower the tax rates for individuals with the highest income as well as corporations, relying on raising taxes for the average American to pay for it.

If it sounds familiar, it's because this is the same standby, trickle down, failure that we have placed our faith in for the past decade.

Despite what Majority Leader CANTOR says, during an economic downturn, decreasing the deficit does not create jobs. Also, cutting taxes does not create jobs. Both Presidents Bush and Obama have cut taxes so much that if ERIC CANTOR's theory were correct, we should have zero unemployment, which we DO NOT HAVE. This is what the Ryan plan aims to do.

For ten years our economy has stagnated. The gap between the median wage and average wage is growing, because the highest earners are the only ones receiving wage increases.

Unfortunately, balancing our nation's budget on the backs of the middle class does NOT end there.

Where else will the burden of balancing the budget fall under the Ryan plan? Education. Cuts to K–12 education are just the starting point in disadvantaging the future of America. The proposal also makes significant cuts to Pell Grants. These cuts will prevent the educated generation of young Americans our country needs to compete in a global economy.

The proposed cuts to Pell Grants would return the maximum award allowable to prestimulus levels, impacting millions of young Americans depending on financial assistance to attend college.

This will stretch the time it will take for them to earn their degrees and enter the workforce.

Finally, Ryan's budget continues to provide tax loopholes to big oil companies, and cuts all federal support for clean energy, short sighting our economic investments in the future of energy.

Mr. Speaker, I am not promoting constant federal debt. I am not advocating against hoping or trying for a balanced budget. But when you look through the history of our nation, we see that when Americans were in the most need, during war or recession, during the Great Depression, we focused on solving those problems, not just reducing our debt.

Mr. Speaker, we are currently engaged in two wars and fighting our way out of the worst recession of the modern era. The Ryan budget is a new attempt at an age old ploy to mandate a balanced budget for the Federal Government.

Ending our Nation's deficit and returning our country to prosperity, should of course be the goal. But we must also ask the question, at what cost? Where do our priorities lie?

The Ryan proposal, like the myriad constitutional amendments before it, attempts to balance our budget on the backs of those Americans who can least bear the burden.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in heavy-hearted support of S. 365, an imperfect, bipartisan compromise to raise the debt ceiling and rein in federal spending. House and Senate leaders have been bickering for months over this issue, and we have waited until the 59th minute of the 11th hour to reach an agreement. If we do not raise the debt ceiling by tomorrow, our economy will be deeply shaken, resulting not only in massive losses to Wall Street, but also in increased costs and interest rates for American families. With the severe threat of default upon us, it is time to come together for our Nation's best interests.

This is not the bill I would have written, and I do not know a single Member of Congress who believes this bill is perfect. I agreed with President Obama's sentiments today when he said that ''as with any compromise, the outcome is far from satisfying.'' However, as a Member of Congress, there are times when you must hold your nose and vote for a compromise that, while imperfect, is necessary. I believe this is one of those times. The grave threat of default is far too near and too serious not to vote for this agreement.

I am happy to see that this compromise provides long-term economic certainty, raising the debt ceiling until 2013. This will give our markets, investors, and economic partners abroad confidence in the U.S. economy and our ability to pay our bills. It also takes a bold step toward fiscal responsibility, resulting in over $2.1 trillion in deficit reduction, as recently scored by the Congressional Budget Office. I believe it is important to seriously address our national debt so as not to burden future generations.

The bill will immediately enact strict ten-year spending caps on both defense and non-defense programs, resulting in $917 billion in savings. It also creates a bipartisan congressional committee which will identify an additional $1.5 trillion in deficit reduction by November 23, 2011, including from entitlement and tax reform. Both the House and Senate will hold an up or down vote on the committee's proposal.

I believe this compromise cuts too far into many important government programs and that these spending reductions will not be easy to swallow. Discretionary spending will be brought to its lowest levels since the Eisenhower Administration. I am reassured, however, that cuts will not be made to Social Security, Medicaid, unemployment insurance, programs for low-income families, Pell Grants for low-income college students, or civilian and military retirement programs.

I am greatly disappointed that this compromise does not immediately include revenue increases for the wealthiest Americans, and I believe it places the brunt of the burden of deficit reduction on low-income and middle-class families. I am optimistic, however, that the future plan set forth by the bipartisan congressional committee on deficit reduction will include such revenue increases. Instead of protecting tax breaks for Big Oil, corporations that ship jobs overseas, and the very richest among us, these groups should share in the sacrifice.

We could each sit here refusing to support a bill that does not mirror our individual priorities, allowing the U.S. to default on its loans and permitting an economic catastrophe. Or we could come together and support a compromise that, while imperfect, gets the job done. We were elected to be mature civic leaders who could put public interests before self interests. I urge my colleagues to serve that purpose by supporting this bill.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the default debate is, at its heart, a debate between two visions for America. One side envisions rebuilding our country, investing in jobs and education and infrastructure, and rising from the Great Recession as a stronger and more resilient Nation. The other side accepts a pessimistic vision of a weakened America with a shrunken government—a Nation hampered by deep cuts to the safety net and hobbled by a refusal to invest in our future.

I have no doubt that, in a fair debate, a hopeful vision for America would win out. But the default debate has not been held on fair terms. The Tea Party and their enablers have held America hostage. They have insisted

that, unless Congress enacted their radical, ideological agenda, they would force an unprecedented default on America's obligations and thus trigger an economic collapse.

From the beginning of this debate, I rejected the notion that America's creditworthiness should be used as a bargaining chip. Yet I was willing to support a balanced, fair deal if that was what was required to prevent a default. Unfortunately, today's deal is not balanced. It is not fair. Most of all, it is not right.

The House has voted for vast cuts in government services that ordinary Americans depend on: student loans, unemployment insurance, food safety inspections, highway safety programs, and more. These cuts will force layoffs among teachers, public safety officers, construction workers, and more. These laid-off workers will, in turn, be forced to pare back their spending at their local grocery stores, drug stores, and small businesses, forcing still more layoffs—a vicious circle that threatens to destabilize our fragile economy. We saw in last week's economic reports that job growth has been choked back by cuts in state and local governments. This deal does not help the situation. It hurts the economy.

The deal lays the groundwork for another $1.5 trillion in cuts to come, to be negotiated behind closed doors by an unelected supercommittee. Given that the first round of cuts will have decimated discretionary programs, these later cuts will very likely focus on Social Security and Medicare. The citizens who will be hurt most are those who have the least voice in our democracy. After all, when a handful of politicians gather in the proverbial smoke-filled room, the interests of ordinary Americans are nearly always left out.

Yet although most Americans will sacrifice greatly, the most privileged among us will be immune. Favored corporate interests, millionaires, and billionaires will continue to receive special tax breaks as far as the eye can see. That is not the sort of fair, balanced deal that Americans asked for and expected.

As poor as this deal is on its merits, I am even more troubled by the precedent it sets. The Tea Party and their enablers have, by taking the American economy hostage, transformed a routine budgetary authorization into the most dramatic reshaping of government in decades. Today's deal establishes that government by hostage negotiation is a legitimate, effective way to achieve one's political ends. I am frightened by what this means for the future of our democracy.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan, bicameral Budget Control Act.

While imperfect, this is an historic agreement. With this compromise, we are taking another step in the long and difficult, yet vital, process of forcing our government to live within its means.

Total government spending at all levels has risen to 37% of gross domestic product today from 27% in 1960—and is set to reach 50% by 2038.

To sustain the operations of the government, we borrow over 42-cents of every federal dollar we spend. As a result, our national debt has now increased to 100% of the size of our economy today, up from just 42% in 1980.

The implications for future generations of Americans of this dangerous spending spree are obvious. Enough is enough!

While far from perfect, this realistic approach finally begins to turn back the tide of federal red ink in several important ways: (1) it cuts spending by $917 billion and does not raise taxes that would fuel additional spending; (2) it creates a process that keeps our underlying fiscal policy problems front-and-center for the foreseeable future.

The bill we have before us today would extend the debt limit in two phases and avoid a default on the obligations of the United States. The first phase would provide for $917 billion in discretionary spending cuts and an immediate increase of up to $900 billion in the debt limit.

The legislation would allow for a subsequent debt limit increase of up to $1.5 trillion only if a bipartisan, bicameral committee provides, and the full Congress approves by an ''up or down'' vote, additional spending cuts in excess of the requested debt limit increase, or a Balanced Budget Amendment to the Constitution is passed by Congress and sent to the states for ratification by the end of the year.

Is this bill perfect. Absolutely not.

Granted, some well-meaning Americans have opposed the Budget Control Act because they think it does not cut enough. I would remind my Colleagues that the Committee on Appropriations has already started making tough decisions on spending. In this year's appropriations bills, we have sheared billions of dollars and imposed strict spending reductions and will complete our work and pass responsible, sustainable, and timely funding legislation.

I completely agree that the Budget Control Act is far from sufficient to solve our underlying budget problems. In that respect, it is a step in the right direction, nothing more.

I, too, wanted deeper spending cuts and greater deficit and debt reduction. However, given the stubborn insistence of the President and his Congressional allies on new taxes and still more spending, I cannot see how we achieve greater savings at this time.

I also fear that we may come to regret proposed cuts to our national security infrastructure. Our Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines are already stressed and strained by ten years of multiple deployments. Future reductions in end strength and operations and maintenance will undoubtedly lead to the ''hollow force'' that our experienced military leaders have warned us to avoid.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to put progress before partisanship and support this measure.

My constituents in New Jersey want our government to live within its means. But they also continue to ask ''where are the jobs?'' So, they want Congress to make economic growth and private-sector job creation its top priority.

This is about our country, our way of life and restoring confidence in the American Dream. Let's get on with it.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this so-called debt limit compromise, S. 365. A compromise is when the two sides each make concessions. This bill fails to meet that definition because all concessions come from Democrats. This debt ceiling legislation protects special interests at the expense of America's working families, children, senior citizens, people who've lost their jobs, and people with disabilities.

It punts the difficult decisions to a ''super committee'' of twelve Members of Congress who will be tasked with finding another $1.5 trillion in savings. Those twelve people will have the power to cut Social Security benefits, turn Medicare into a voucher, and gut the Medicaid program into oblivion. The rest of Congress will have only the right to vote yes or no on the entire proposal. Unlike the vast majority of legislation, no amendments will be allowed.

If the super committee fails, there will be automatic cuts to Medicare and additional draconian cuts on top of the draconian cuts that will be made when this bill is signed into law.

Default is a dangerous proposition. But there is only one reason that our country has been pushed to the brink of default: the Republican Tea Party fringe. We are in the midst of a completely manufactured crisis that was orchestrated by this extreme faction of the Republican Party. They are a minority in Congress and in our nation, yet they are holding our nation's economy hostage because Republican leadership continues to pander to them at the detriment of our country and its future.

Democrats and Republicans alike have lifted the debt ceiling some 75 times in our history. Paying our bills is a necessary part of responsible governing.

This year, I've voted twice to raise the debt limit ceiling. I first did so on May 31, 2011 when Republicans brought a clean debt ceiling bill to the floor. Because of uniform Republican opposition, that vote failed.

I next voted this past Saturday to raise the debt ceiling in conjunction with significant spending cuts when the House considered Senator REID's compromise package. It was far from perfect, but it was much more balanced than the package before us today.

Today, the radical wing of the Republican Party has forced a no-win situation. Vote yes on today's ''debt-limit compromise,'' and we limit our ability to grow our economy, create jobs, and protect the most vulnerable members of our society. Vote no and we risk an unprecedented default that would further deteriorate our sputtering economy.

We should never have gotten to this point and it is up to those who got us into this mess to get the votes to end this crisis. However I will not allow my vehement opposition to this deal to put our country into default. If my vote is needed to prevent default, I will hold my nose and change my vote to yes. I will do that because governing requires tough choices. If Tea Party Republicans refuse to govern, it is up to the rest of us to do so for them.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, although I have voted seven times in the past under President Bush to raise the debt ceiling, all of those votes in the past were clean debt ceiling bills, unlike the bill before the House today, which imposes $1 trillion in spending cuts on the working people and the poor, and decimates our social safety net.

In this round of debt ceiling discussions, the Tea Party Republicans have tied the President's hands to couple a raise in the debt ceiling with billions of billions of dollars in cuts to our nation's safety net programs, bringing cuts across the board to WIC (Women, Infant and Children), programs to protect our nation's senior citizens, Pell Grants, education programs, community health care, and numerous other federal programs that assist middle and working class Americans. It is also important to take note of what isn't in this agreement:

funding directed towards job creation. Indisputably, job production is essential to lifting our nation out of the economic downturn since consumer spending is the key driver of our economy.

Just last December, the Republicans forced a vote on extending the Bush Tax Cuts for millionaires and billionaires, adding $70 billion to our nation's deficit. And this suicidal economic plan came right after eight years of horribly reckless spending and excessive tax cuts for the rich under President Bush and the Republican Congress, who left America trillions of dollars in debt. What was particularly troubling about this situation is that President Clinton had left the White House not only with a balanced budget but with a surplus!

Yet the Republican Party has remained steadfast in implementing Reverse Robin Hood economic policies: cutting programs and services for the working and middle class, while maintaining tax cuts for the millionaires, billionaires and the Big Oil companies like EXXON Mobil, who just reported last week that their second quarter profits rose 41%!

Indeed, the Republican Party has shown they will stop at nothing to pursue deficit reduction exclusively through deep spending cuts to critical social services, while taking our nation to the brink of economic default. And again, while cutting this safety net, they have successfully fought to preserve tax breaks for Big Oil (even though the big five oil companies earned nearly $1 trillion in profits during the last decade), corporations that ship American jobs overseas, and tax breaks for the wealthiest .5% of Americans, while leaving what's left over in available resources to be divided among the rest of us.

Beyond a doubt, job production is essential to lifting our nation out of the dire economic situation we're in, and one way to create jobs is through transportation and infrastructure investment: in fact, for every $1 billion in transportation funding, approximately 34,000 jobs are created. Yet the Republican leadership remains inflexible, unwilling to compromise on even reauthorizing the FAA. And what has this led to?

Four thousand Americans throughout the nation who are paid out of the FAA trust fund that will not be paid, and nearly 90,000 others are affected by the cancellation of airport construction projects: and for my state of Florida, this includes over 3,000 airport construction jobs lost, and 27 FAA employee jobs, 19 of them at Orlando International Airport, 3 in Miami, 4 in Melbourne and 1 in Hilliard.

Just like the Republican Party's lack of leadership over the debt ceiling debate, they absolutely refuse to compromise to extend funding for the FAA. So yes, this is yet another example of the Republican Party being entirely ill prepared and completely irresponsible in their attempt to act as House leaders.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this vote is a close call.

Like the vast majority of our colleagues, I do not want to see the federal government fail to meet its obligations. And if the government cannot borrow, the fact that President Obama would decide which bills to pay with the money that is available is not reassuring. He could well refuse to pay Social Security benefits in order to build the maximum amount of political pressure for his agenda.

But I am equally disturbed by the prospect of continuing to spend and borrow as usual. The United States simply cannot continue down this path of fiscal irresponsibility and meet our duty to our children and to future generations. We must cut some spending now, and we must change the system that allows or even encourages such fiscal recklessness.

This bill cuts some spending, although not nearly as much as I would like. The spending it cuts directly is discretionary spending, which is the easiest to cut because it is subject to the annual appropriations process. The bill does not touch mandatory spending, which is well over half of the budget. That is a lost opportunity.

The special congressional committee could recommend changes in mandatory spending and hopefully an overhaul of our tax code, which is a drag on our economy and a burden to all taxpayers. The recommendations of that committee will receive a vote in the House and Senate before the end of the year. That is a potential opportunity.

Significantly, the bill does cut a dollar of spending for every dollar of additional borrowing authority. No more money can be added to the debt without an equivalent or greater cut in spending. That is an important first for our country and an important precedent to set.

The bill also requires a vote on a Balanced Budget Amendment to the Constitution. It will be the first such vote in the Senate in 15 years. There is, of course, no guarantee that it will pass, but there is a real opportunity for the American people to let their Senators and Representatives know how they feel. If the polls are correct that over 70% of the people support a Balanced Budget Amendment and if they let Congress know of their support, it should pass.

I am concerned about the way this measure treats defense. The Department of Defense, like any large organization, can be more efficient. Our national security would be devastated, however, if the sequestration cuts were allowed to occur. Every member of the House and Senate, as well as the President, must ensure that they do not.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is always the question that must be asked when making a difficult decision on how to vote on a bill: If this bill does not pass, what happens then? There is much about this bill with which I am not satisfied, but I have absolutely no doubt that if this bill is rejected, the next one will be worse. The next bill may come after Social Security checks are not received or after the markets plummet, but there would be another bill, and it will not have the cuts or reforms that are in this one. And it would most likely make even greater cuts to defense.

The bottom line is that this bill is one step in the right direction. I would rather take two, or three, or five steps, but I cannot reject a bill that cuts spending as much as it increases borrowing and that provides the opportunity for greater cuts as well as for real reforms in budgeting and spending. There is much more work ahead, and I will keep pushing for more steps in the direction of fiscal responsibility in the weeks and months to come.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, the House passed unprecedented legislation tonight.

We passed a bill that put unprecedented limits on our President to act to protect our nation, to invest in our futures and to safeguard our poor and our vulnerable.

I opposed this bill because it fails to take a balanced approach to how we set our nation's priorities.

This bill totally fails to address the urgent and most pressing crisis in the country: the lack of jobs and economic growth. At a time when investments are needed to jump start our economy and put people back to work, I believe this deal and its cuts-only approach is the wrong approach.

Should we, as Members of Congress, closely guard our nation's tax dollars and work hard to cut waste and to make sure that every program that we fund is necessary and helps the most Americans possible?

Of course we should and I believe that we all work hard to do so.

But, let me be clear, what we have is a revenue problem.

We would not have needed to raise the debt ceiling if Republican's did not ram the Bush tax cuts down the throats of the American People.

Let me be very clear.

Tax cuts do not pay for themselves and they do not create jobs.

The Bush tax cuts created the deficits that my Republican colleagues decry and there were no new private industry jobs created during the entire Bush Administration.

Let me be crystal clear.

The Democratic Clinton Administration had higher tax rates and created millions more jobs than the Bush Republicans and we had a robust and growing economy. The Democratic Clinton Administration left George Bush a revenue surplus, which he promptly squandered and drove the economy into a ditch, twice.

We have a revenue problem.

When we do not ask the super rich and the corporations who make billions of dollars in profits off of the engine of the American economy, we will not have the funds to keep that engine running.

We must have the revenue to invest in our schools and high tech industries; we must have the funds to rebuild our nation's manufacturing base that Republicans shipped overseas, we must have the revenues to take care of our seniors and provide world class healthcare for every American, we must have the critical revenue to keep the United States the strongest, smartest and most democratic nation on earth.

We have a money problem, but it is not about how this body budgets for our nation.

The money problem is the one that plagues our politics. There is too much influence of the rich on our politics.

Despite the catastrophic failures of Republican financial policies, we are still the strongest and wealthiest nation in the world and our Treasury's debt is still the world's safest investment and continues to sell at historically low rates.

But this bill that tied our budget to the passing of debt ceiling is a huge step in the wrong direction for our nation.

Is it critical for us to prevent an unprecedented default? Of course it is.

Is it just as critical to make sure that we can meet our nation's obligations to our seniors, our children and our poor? Of course it is.

But this back room deal-making on preventing a national default is not a way forward for our nation.

We must not be making critical decisions about who and what we are as a nation while

we are held hostage to the debt ceiling and the extortionist threats of the extreme Tea Party wing of the Republican party.

This should not be the process by which we decide how we budget and set our nation's priorities into the future.

The debt ceiling plan is deeply flawed. The only thing it succeeds in doing is enacting a short-term reprieve from a catastrophic default on our debts.

It fails in almost every other way.

It fails because it is not a balanced approach that insures that we have the resources necessary to protect our most vulnerable seniors, children, the disabled and the poor.

It fails because it opens the door to deep cuts to Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

If fails because it does not make sure that we actually reduce the deficit.

Making cuts in federal spending during the middle of the worst economic downturn in a generation will only make the economy worse and will reduce future revenue and end up increasing long-term deficits.

This is not a sound way to reduce our deficits or our debt. The only way to reduce our deficits long-term is to invest in a strong and growing economy that creates millions of new jobs just like we did during the Clinton Administration.

The only sound long-term deficit plan is a strong jobs plan that puts Americans back to work in jobs that pay a livable wages and provide American benefits.

Finally, it fails because it undermines that proper functioning of the American democracy and restricts our ability to react to future crises and economic downturns.

Tying the hands of future Congresses is not the way to strengthen the United States. This bill will severely limit what we can do as a nation.

The Tea Party Republican's vision of America is one with a powerless government that cannot stand up to the big banks, big oil and multinational corporations that want to keep shipping U.S. jobs overseas. The Republican's vision of America is one where you are completely on your own, without access to health care, Social Security, or unemployment protections. The Republican's vision of America is one without any safeguards for clean air, clean water or access to safe and clean food and drugs.

I don't believe that this is a vision that the American people believe in.

I believe in a strong America with a functioning democracy that is able invest in the future of our nation and create jobs to grow our economy.

That is why I join my colleagues here today—because the Congressional Black Caucus is focused on helping the American people get jobs by hitting the streets during August. Across the country, from Cleveland, Miami, Atlanta, Detroit and L.A., the Congressional Black Caucus is doing both town halls and job fairs.

The Congressional Black Caucus knows that people need jobs and so the CBC is bringing employers that have jobs together with people that need jobs.

Also, the CBC is bringing in experts to run job training sessions including how to write a resume, how to interview, and how to network to improve your chances on getting a job.

We will be working hard in Washington to create jobs for the people, but we must do more which is why we have put together these events.

The town hall will give Members of the CBC a chance to interact directly with those people struggling to get a job, so that we can bring their words, their frustrations, and their worries to Washington to share with our colleagues and be the voice of our nation's most vulnerable population here in the halls of Congress.

Our nation's average unemployment rate is 9.2 percent, but for African Americans it is 16.2 percent and for Latinos it is 11.6 percent.

Worse than this drastic gap between the national average and the unemployment rate between people of color, a recent Pew Research Center study shows the drastic impact that the economic downturn has had on minority communities, pushing the wealth gap to record high numbers.

Unfortunately, the daunting statistics speak for themselves—the median wealth of white households is 20 times that of Black households and 18 times that of Hispanic households.

When I was a Member of the Financial Services Committee, my colleagues and I warned about the dangers that deregulating financial services would pose on minority communities.

I am sad to say that our fears were well founded. Unscrupulous banks and completely unregulated mortgage brokers targeted vulnerable minority communities with predatory loans and often engaged in outright fraud.

We must commit to strengthening the safeguards in place that protect consumers from unfair and predatory practices that strip our communities of what little wealth they have.

It is clear that this 'recession' has been nothing short of a depression for communities of color with disproportionate loss of wealth, housing, increased unemployment and poverty rates that are on the rise.

It is time we begin to allow our economy to grow and invest in the needs of our nation's most vulnerable communities. We do this by creating jobs for the people.

The House Republicans have been in charge for well over 200 days now and have yet to bring a single jobs bill to the Floor for a vote.

I have urged Speaker BOEHNER for months to bring H.R. 589 The Emergency Unemployment Compensation Expansion Act to the Floor for a vote.

This bill is important because those people who have been unemployed for over 99 weeks can no longer receive unemployment benefits—how are they surviving?

H.R. 589 would give 14 more weeks of benefits to those who have reached the end of their rope and are still struggling to find work.

This will stimulate our economy—they will immediately spend this money to buy the necessities of life that you and I take for granted, like food, water, shelter, and maybe some form of medical attention.

But these 99ers are not the only people facing hardship across the country. Americans want to work and Americans need to work, and Congress needs to create jobs, and since Congress is moving slow, the Congressional Black Caucus is hitting the streets in cities across the nation, bringing employers that have jobs together with people who need jobs.

I am pleased to be a part of the Congressional Black Caucus For the People Jobs Initiative, and I applaud the hard work of the CBC Members and staff, including staff across the country, who are making these events happen.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S. 365, the Budget Control Act of 2011. It defers decisions we should make today until tomorrow. It is abjectly inadequate. It eliminates dollars from our economic infrastructure at a time when our economy is again faltering. It provides continued funding for two wars leaving the defense industrial complex untouched. It is unjust to the next generation by not taking action now to ensure the long term continued solvency of Social Security and Medicare.

When President Bill Clinton left office in January 2001, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projected that we would pay off our national debt by Fiscal Year (FY) 2006 and that by 2011, the Federal Government would have a $2.3 trillion surplus. Today, we have a projected FY 2011 deficit of nearly $1.5 trillion and a massive $14.3 trillion national debt. Something happened and our nation has not faced a national debt of this magnitude since 1950.

Unmistakably, the economic recession played a role in leading us to our current predicament but I want to emphasize that this unprecedented and vast expansion in our debt has largely been the result of a series of decisions made by this body. A study conducted by the Pew Charitable Trusts, an independent, non-profit organization, concluded that new legislation enacted since January 2001 has been responsible for over two-thirds of the growth in our debt. The majority of the contributing legislation was enacted by President Bush, including his tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 and the war in Iraq, measures which I vehemently opposed.

As many are well aware, our debt has now grown so large that we must raise the current $14.3 trillion debt limit by tomorrow, in order to avoid defaulting on our loans. Failure to do so would be irresponsible, calling into question the full faith and credit of the United States government unduly harming every American. Should the limit not be raised, the government would have to stop, limit, or delay payments on a broad range of legal obligations, including Social Security and Medicare benefits, military salaries, interest on the national debt, and many other commitments. Further, financial firms estimate that default could cause interest rates on Treasury bonds to rise .006–.01% causing the cost of owning a home, filling a gas tank, sending children to college and buying a car to become even more expensive, squeezing already tight family budgets.

The need to address this crisis also brings with it an opportunity to make serious, long-lasting policy changes, providing a comprehensive solution that will put our country on the road to a strong, fiscally-sustainable economic future. However, there is no simple or painless solution to our current predicament. For example, if we eliminated the entire federal government this fiscal year—no federal courts or prisons, no border security, no care for veterans, no White House, no Congress, nothing—and only kept the Department of Defense, entitlement programs such as Social Security, Medicare, and interest on the national debt, and did not touch taxes, our deficit for FY 2011 would still be $817 billion.

We must make substantive and balanced decisions taking our cue from recent history.

When our budget was balanced in 1969 and for four years from 1998 to 2001, tax revenues and federal spending represented around 20 percent of our gross domestic product (GDP), the overall size of the economy. Today, revenues are around 14.8 percent and spending is nearly 24.7 of GDP. These two extremes cannot continue if we are to balance the budget and provide for a sound economy for future generations.

That is why any serious proposal to reduce the deficit must be comprehensive, and address all spending programs, including domestic discretionary spending, defense spending, as well as entitlement spending, such as Social Security and Medicare, and the other half of the equation, taxes and the inequalities in the tax code.

We have already begun to take steps to reduce domestic discretionary spending. For example, as Ranking Member of the Energy and Water Subcommittee, I worked long and hard with my Chairman, RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN, to reduce spending in the FY 2012 Energy and Water Appropriations Act by $2.826 billion below the FY 2010 funding level. Our subcommittee looked at each program and made a myriad of decisions, some to increase spending and some to reduce it, given the purpose and value of each program. Previously, I supported the Department of Defense and Full Year Continuing Appropriations Act of 2011, which reduced spending by $38 billion below the previous year's budget.

Our fiscal crisis, however, cannot be solved by only addressing the discretionary spending. We must also make thoughtful decisions about our entitlement programs, such as Social Security and Medicare, not only to rein in their growth but also to preserve their solvency for future generations.

There are many options that would extend the long term solvency of the Social Security program past 2036, its current estimated solvency date. For example, raising the so-called ''tax cap'' on employees would extend the solvency of the program past 2057. For 2011, Social Security taxable earnings are limited to $106,800. I do not believe that the Social Security tax rate should be raised. However, as a wage tax, I believe the Social Security tax should be paid on all wages. This would create a more equitable system without changing any benefits. If the tax is good enough for every dollar earned by someone waiting tables at a local diner or working in the mill then it is good enough for every dollar earned by someone working on Wall Street.

Similar changes can be made to Medicare to ensure its long-term solvency and its existence for future generations. For example, the Secretary of Health and Human Services is prohibited by law from negotiating drug prices on behalf of Medicare Part D beneficiaries. I believe that this law should be repealed, as it would save the federal government an estimated $156 billion over ten years and lower drug costs for seniors.

Which brings me to the most contentious side of the equation, taxes. Let me first remind my colleagues that currently, tax revenues are around 14.8 percent of GDP, the lowest it has been since 1950. But what makes our current tax code so abhorrent is not the fact that it is unsustainable, but the fact that it is disparately unequal. For example, from 2008 to 2010, 12 corporations, including Wells Fargo and General Electric, made a combined $171 billion in profits, but paid no federal corporate tax as a result of a convoluted tax code, while my constituents were paying their income taxes. Further, last year the top 25 hedge fund managers alone had combined incomes of $22 billion yet they paid a lower tax rate than a fire fighter from Crown Point, Indiana. Where is the outrage that over a tax code that allows Wall Street to pay a lower tax rate than a person risking his or her life for our safety?

At a time when our country faces its biggest financial crisis in decades, it is reprehensible that our tax code allows companies, including some of the most profitable in the nation, are able to exploit loopholes and credits in the tax code to eliminate their tax liabilities. Currently, the U.S. tax code contains over 200 tax loopholes or credits amounting to approximately $1.2 trillion in forgone revenue each year. These loopholes have the same effect on the federal budget as spending programs without being subject to the same public debate and annual evaluation as part of the appropriations process. If we are to address our growing national debt, this spending through the tax code must be reined in. All Americans and American companies should make a contribution to our shared society.

We owe it to the next generation to solve this crisis, and swiftly. As our nation remains consumed by the ongoing deficit discussion, this body continues to avoid taking action on its most basic duties. For example, funding for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) expired in 2007. Since then, this body has temporarily extended the Administration's authorization 20 times. Earlier this year, both the House and the Senate finally passed separate FAA reauthorization legislation. Over 100 days have passed and we have yet to take action to resolve differences between the two versions and last week, funding for the FAA expired, causing 4,000 employees to be sent home without pay, 219 construction projects to be halted and $200 million to be lost in tax revenue. I fear that this measure, which even if enacted today will mandate votes down the road and prolong our single-minded focus on the debt ceiling. I urge my colleagues to work together to compromise budget options so that we can continue the work we were sent here to do.

The key to confronting our fiscal challenge must be balancing cuts in spending and raising revenue while making the necessary investments in our nation's infrastructure and future. The road to fiscal solvency will be difficult, and tough decisions will need to be made. These decisions are not made in this bill and I am opposed to it.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 384, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question being ordered, the Chair notes the absence of a quorum in accord with clause 7(c) of rule XX and chooses to entertain the motion for a call of the House pursuant to clause 7(b) of rule XX.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 689]

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers

McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

□ 1851

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 419 Members have recorded their presence.

A quorum is present.

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 269, noes 161, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 690]

AYES—269

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Giffords
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stivers
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Webster
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—161

Ackerman
Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Baldwin
Becerra
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Chaffetz
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Cravaack
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DesJarlais
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Filner
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Hahn
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
King (IA)
Kingston
Kissell
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Roby
Rokita
Ross (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Serrano
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder

NOT VOTING—3

Baca
Hinchey
Moore

□ 1909

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms MOORE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 690, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on rollcall 690 due to the fact that I had reconstructive ankle surgery this morning. I needed to be put under general anesthesia for the procedure. Had I been able to attend today's floor proceedings, I would have voted "yes" on S. 365, the Budget Control Act of 2011.

FAREWELL TO PAGES

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, we don't very often get these opportunities. The kids who are at the back that you can't see because you're standing in front of them, this is the first time that we have ever had pages here not in two small groups but one summer group. These pages are going home this week, and they have had a chance to be here to see history in the making on several different fronts.

The Page Board consists of Representative FOXX of North Carolina, Representative DEGETTE, and Representative KILDEE, and me.

I yield to the gentlelady from Colorado.

Ms. DEGETTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank all of the wonderful pages who are in the back of the room. You have really seen history the last 6 weeks in this Congress, and we are so honored and proud to have all of you here with us.

And this may not be my place, but we all want to welcome back our wonderful colleague Congresswoman GIFFORDS here.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude to all the pages for what they have done here in the 112th Congress.

To become a page, Mr. Speaker, these young people have proven themselves to be academically qualified.

As we all know, the job of a congressional page is not an easy one. Along with being away from home, the pages must possess the maturity to balance competing demands for their time and their energy.

You pages have witnessed the House debate issues of war and peace, hunger and poverty, justice and civil rights. You have lived through history.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the members of the House Page Board who provided such fantastic service to this institution. The chairman, Congressman ROB BISHOP; the vice chairman, Congresswoman DIANA DEGETTE; Congresswoman VIRGINIA FOXX; Clerk of the House, Karen Haas; Sergeant at Arms; Bill Livingood; and Ms. Lynn Silversmith Klein.

I want to thank them for the service on the House Page Board, and I thank the departing pages. And you've seen a wonderful bit of history take place today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the official RECORD the page summer class.

I ask this body to please recognize the pages for the services they have rendered.

2011 SUMMER PAGE CLASS

Alexa Abbott, MI, Garrett Adair, CA, Eric Applegate, IN, Sara Ballou, NY, Caitlin Belcher, WV, Eyvana Bengochea, FL, Michael Berkowitz, FL, Cameron Bias, VA, Elizabeth Birkman, TX, Grant Bradley, MI, Sophia Bucci, MA, Jasmine Sky Burnett, GA, Clark Cali, CA, Thomas Cirone, NJ, Briyana Coleman, VA, David Crane, NJ, Christina Cuellar, TX, Collin Czilli, IN, Leesa Danzek, CA, Mary DeStefano, OH, Hannah Eaton, KY, Sydney Everett, MO, Zachariah Frederic Ewen, VA, Christina Fischer, VA, Jordan Fox, IL, BreAnna Fraser, NV, Joseph Geiger III, PA, Taylor Gillespie, NY, Meredith Godfrey, VA, Jessica Going, CA, Kevin Goshorn, NY, Austin Heckemeyer, MO, Peyton Hilford, FL, Savana Hodge, TN, Elijah Jatovsky, CA, Reid Jeffries, OH, Heber ''Nathan'' Johnson, UT, Mary Gray Johnson, VA, Charlotte Kanyuh, WI, Caleb Markward, OH, Erik Martin, MD, Jake Mattox, OK, Claiborne McCrery, LA, Brian McKeon, OR, Grant McKown, GA, Grace Mehta, CA, Adam Mittman, NY, Thomas Moakley, MA, James Park, FL, Elisabeth Parker, SC, Jenna Pickering, AL, Caroline Schube, OH, Arthur Sellers, AL, Paarth Shah, NY, Abigail Shriver, MD, Nicholas Pritzker, CA, Michael-Joseph Richardson, OH, Amelia Santiago, TX, Michelle Sauer, TX, Samantha Smith, MI, Stetson Spencer, AR, Michael Stocker, PA, Benjamin Strawbridge, MA, Samantha Swartz, IL, Genevieve Gray Taylor, NV, Ashley Tomasello, MI, Matthew Ullman, NY, Andrea Walton, IN, Grayson Westmoreland, TN, Sarai Whittington, NC, and Victoria Wilbur, IL.

WELCOMING BACK REPRESENTATIVE GABRIELLE GIFFORDS

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

Ms. PELOSI. I too want to join our colleagues in recognizing the contribution of the pages to the conduct of the House of Representatives. I thank them, and they have, as Mr. KILDEE said and others have mentioned, borne witness to many important historical occasions here.

But I can't think of any that is more special and means so much to our country than to witness the return of our colleague who is the personification of courage, of sincerity, of admiration throughout the country. Congresswoman GABBY GIFFORDS brings us here.

Her presence today will make sure that we honor the obligations of our great country; it is important and symbolic. Her presence here in the Chamber as well as her service throughout her entire service in Congress brings honor to this Chamber.

We are all privileged to call her ''colleague''; some of us are very privileged to call her ''friend.'' Throughout America, there isn't a name that stirs more love, more admiration, more respect, more wishing for our daughters to be like her than the name of Congresswoman GABBY GIFFORDS.

Thank you, GABBY.

CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 365

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 70

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of S. 365, the Secretary of the Senate shall amend the title so as to read: ''An Act to provide for budget control.''.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2480) to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Administrative Conference of the United States for fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 382, nays 23, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 691]

YEAS—382

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott

McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—23

Amash
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Chaffetz
Flake
Garrett
Graves (GA)
Griffith (VA)
Harris
Hartzler
Huelskamp
Hurt
Kingston
Lummis
McCotter
Paul
Pearce
Schilling
Stutzman
Tipton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—27

Baca
Calvert
Carter
Cohen
Davis (CA)
Diaz-Balart
Gallegly
Giffords
Gohmert
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Hayworth
Hinchey
Keating
Latham
Long
Marchant
Meeks
Moran
Pingree (ME)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rush
Schweikert
Sullivan
Terry
Waters

□ 1933

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was absent earlier today due to a prior commitment scheduled before we knew the House would be in session. On the votes I missed, on H.R. 2715, to provide greater authority and discretion to the CPSC in enforcement of product safety laws, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

On H.R. 398, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to toll during national and active duty service abroad in the Armed Forces, I would have voted ''yes.''

On H.R. 1933, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify requirements, I would have voted ''yes.'' While I do recognize the shortage of nurses in our country, I would hope that we should focus on providing more incentives to students here to become nurses.

On the motion on ordering the previous question on the rule for S. 365, I would have voted ''no.''

On H. Res. 384, the rule providing for consideration of S. 365, I would have voted ''no.''

On the Journal vote, I would have voted ''yes.''

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROOKS). Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Chairman.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

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

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize for special-order speeches without prejudice to the possibility of further legislative business.

GABBY'S BACK

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this was a good day. And one of the reasons it's a good day is because GABBY GIFFORDS is back.

Mr. Speaker, she is one of the best things in this Congress. To me, she came back tonight, cast her vote, the first vote since she was attacked. And she is a perfect example of bipartisanship. I have had the privilege to work with her on the issue of border security. And while she was in the hospital recovering in my hometown of Houston, Texas, her staff in Arizona hosted me so I could go down to the border and see firsthand the problems of border security in Arizona.

I think she is a model for the attitude that we should all have. She is tenacious and she is relentless in her love for America and her desire to do what's right and represent the people in Arizona that elected her here.

So welcome back, GABBY GIFFORDS. You were missed, and we're glad you're back.

And that's just the way it is.

URGING CLEMENCY FOR JONATHAN POLLARD

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year a group of Members sent a letter to President Obama urging him to grant clemency at this point and commute the sentence for Jonathan Pollard.

Jonathan Pollard spied on the United States on behalf of Israel. He should not have done that, and he was punished. But the punishment for that espionage has gone on longer than anything comparable.

I believe that there is a personal argument for the clemency, and there is also the fact that American-Israeli relations are always important, and are particularly important now. We are asking the Israelis to take some steps towards a negotiated peace that may or may not be possible for them to take. Knowing that America recognizes the strength of that friendship is a very important factor in our persuading them of that.

And I believe that in addition to the arguments based on the excessive length of the sentence, I think, the fact that Mr. Pollard has served for so long, clearly the deterrent effect is there, we are not asking that he be pardoned, we are not condoning his crime, we are saying that in addition to the personal argument, it would be a sign of U.S.-Israeli relations that I think would help strengthen the climate for peace. I will be submitting a copy of the letter at a later time that we sent to the President for inclusion.

RECOGNIZING PAST AND PRESENT JUDICIARY OF COMMONWEALTH OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

(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, I rise today to pay tribute to the many individuals who founded, developed and stewarded the judicial system in the Northern Mariana Islands, where American jurisprudence was rooted in the liberation of our islands in 1944.

The World War II-era naval military government established a three-tiered

organization of Exceptional Military Courts. The later-established Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands judiciary was also a three-tiered court system.

When the Commonwealth was formed in 1978, a Commonwealth Trial Court, later renamed the Commonwealth Superior Court, was established. During the trial court's infancy, the Federal district court for the Northern Mariana Islands retained limited original and appellate jurisdiction over local matters.

In 1989, a Commonwealth Supreme Court with local appellate jurisdiction was created. Finally, in 2004, Ninth Circuit appellate jurisdiction over Commonwealth Supreme Court decisions ended, and those decisions are now appealable only to the United States Supreme Court.

The history of our court system is colorful and is as unique as our islands and our people. Please join me in paying tribute to the many judges and justices who have served our islands with distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the many individuals who founded, developed, and stewarded the judicial system in the Northern Mariana Islands. American jurisprudence in the Northern Marianas is rooted in the American invasion and liberation of the islands in 1944.

The earliest American laws in this World War II period were proclamations from the Naval Military Government, which exercised control over the islands for three years following the initial invasion. A three-tiered organization of Exceptional Military Courts was established by Admiral Chester Nimitz. Under this system, Summary Provost Courts, with one military officer sitting as judge, were established as courts of limited jurisdiction to hear cases for which the punishment was less than one year in prison or a fine of less than two thousand dollars. Superior Provost Courts—comprised of one or more military officers—were convened on an ad hoc basis to consider cases in which the potential punishment ranged to ten years in prison. The Military Commission was the highest court of the land, and could hear cases of any nature. This tribunal was convened by the Military Governor and the three military officers who comprised the Commission could mete out any punishment up to, and including, a death sentence—although any execution could not be carried out without the confirmation of the Secretary of the Navy. The Naval Military Government did not establish any military courts with jurisdiction over civil matters—during this period, local disputes that were not informally resolved among the native islanders were resolved with the assistance of a military officer acting as a ''higher authority,'' but not sitting as a court. Records indicate that a Village Magistrate Court may have been established in 1947, shortly before the advent of the United Nations' Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in July of that year.

The judiciary established in the Trust Territory, as in Naval Military Government days, was a three-tiered system of community courts, district courts, and a High Court. Community court judges, appointed by the district administrator, could hear civil matters in which the amount in dispute did not exceed one hundred dollars and criminal matters in which the punishment did not exceed six months in jail, a one hundred dollar fine, or both. District courts had jurisdiction over civil matters in which the amount in dispute did not exceed one thousand dollars and criminal matters in which the punishment did not exceed two years in jail, a two thousand dollar fine, or both. District courts were staffed by a presiding judge and one or more associate judges, appointed by the High Commissioner, and also had appellate jurisdiction over community court actions. The High Court, which consisted of a chief justice and a number of associate justices and temporary judges, had appellate review over district court decisions and also had general jurisdiction over all civil and criminal cases in the Trust Territory.

Upon the formation of the Commonwealth in 1978, a Commonwealth Trial Court was established by our local legislature pursuant to the Commonwealth Constitution. The first judge of the court was confirmed in February 1979, and was joined by additional judges over the following few years. During the trial court's infancy, the federal district court for the Northern Marianas retained jurisdiction over civil cases involving amounts in controversy over five thousand dollars, criminal cases in which the potential penalty exceeded five years' imprisonment, and all jury trials. The district court also maintained appellate jurisdiction over Commonwealth Trial Court decisions.

In 1989, a public law renamed the Commonwealth Trial Court as the Commonwealth Superior Court, and established a Commonwealth Supreme Court with local appellate jurisdiction.

Perhaps the most significant event in the history of the Commonwealth judiciary occurred in 1997, when voters in the Commonwealth approved a House Legislative Initiative which established the Commonwealth Supreme and Superior Courts as constitutional entities under a unified judiciary system.

In May 2004, the Commonwealth court system achieved status akin to that of all other state judiciaries, when Ninth Circuit appellate jurisdiction over Commonwealth Supreme Court decisions ended. Now, Commonwealth Supreme Court decisions are final unless the United States Supreme Court grants certiorari review.

Recently, our community celebrated the culmination of a multiyear project with the publication of The Northern Mariana Islands Judiciary: A Historical Overview, authored by past and present members of our judiciary, law clerks, and others, and which provides a comprehensive view of the evolution of law and legal systems in the Commonwealth from 1521 to the present. The book was published by the Northern Marianas Judiciary Historical Society, and was funded by a National Endowment for the Humanities grant administered by the NMI Council for the Humanities.

The Commonwealth judiciary has evolved from its original roots in military necessity to a full-fledged branch of government, coequal with the local executive and legislative branches. Today, there are three Supreme Court justices and five Superior Court judges, the majority of whom were born and raised in our community. And, in addition, there is a United States District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands to which the President has nominated and the U.S. Senate has confirmed a native of the Northern Mariana Islands. The history of our court system is colorful and as unique as our islands and our people.

I ask you to join me in paying tribute to the many judges and justices who have served our islands with distinction over the course of nearly 70 years since the Battle of Saipan.

Current Commonwealth Supreme Court justices: Miguel S. Demapan, Chief Justice; Alexandro C. Castro, Associate Justice; and John A. Manglona, Associate Justice.

Current Commonwealth Superior Court judges: Robert C. Naraja, Presiding Judge; David A. Wiseman, Associate Judge; Ramona V. Manglona, Associate Judge; Kenneth L. Govendo, Associate Judge; and Perry B. Inos, Associate Judge.

Former Commonwealth Supreme Court justices: Jose S. Dela Cruz, Chief Justice; Marty W.K. Taylor, Chief Justice; Pedro M. Atalig, Associate Justice; Jesus C. Borja, Associate Justice; and Ramon G. Villagomez, Associate Justice.

Former Commonwealth Superior Court judges: Edward Manibusan, Presiding Judge; Timothy H. Bellas, Associate Judge; Virginia S. Sablan-Onerheim, Associate Judge; and Juan T. Lizama, Associate Judge.

Former Commonwealth Trial Court judges: Robert E. Moore, Associate Judge; Robert A. Hefner, Presiding Judge; and Herbert D. Soll, Associate Judge.

Current and former pro tem justices: Arthur R. Barcinas, Associate Judge, Guam Superior Court; Timothy H. Bellas, former Associate Judge, CNMI Superior Court; Richard H. Benson, former Associate Justice, Federated States of Micronesia Supreme Court; Michael J. Bordallo, Associate Judge, Guam Superior Court; Jesus C. Borja, former Associate Justice, CNMI Supreme Court; F. Philip Carbullido, Chief Justice, Guam Supreme Court; Benjamin J.F. Cruz, former Chief Justice, Guam Supreme Court; Alberto C. Lamorena III, Presiding Judge, Guam Superior Court; Edward Manibusan, former Presiding Judge, CNMI Superior Court; Joaquin V.E. Manibusan, Jr., former Associate Judge, Guam Superior Court; Katherine A. Maraman, Associate Justice, Guam Supreme Court; Virginia S. Sablan-Onerheim, former Associate Judge, CNMI Superior Court; Vernon P. Perez, Associate Judge, Guam Superior Court; Kathleen M. Salii, Associate Justice, Republic of Palau Supreme Court; Peter C. Siguenza, Jr., former Chief Justice, Guam Supreme Court; Herbert D. Soil, former Associate Judge, CNMI Trial Court; Anita A. Sukola, Associate Judge, Guam Superior Court; Robert J. Torres, Jr., Associate Justice, Guam Supreme Court; Frances M. Tydingco-Gatewood, former Associate Justice, Guam Supreme Court; and Steven S. Unpingco, Associate Judge, Guam Superior Court.

Former special judges: Pedro M. Atalig, Timothy H. Bellas, Benjamin J.F. Cruz, Larry L. Hillblom, Edward C. King, Rexford C. Kosack, Alberto C. Lamorena III, Juan T. Lizama, Jane E. Mack, Vicente T. Salas, Michael A. White, and David A. Wiseman.

Former Mariana Islands District Court and Community Courts justices and judges: in Saipan, Juan M. Ada, Ignacio V. Benavente, Olympio T. Borja, Francisco R. Cruz, Vicente E.D. Deleon Guerrero, Elias P. Sablan, Felipe A. Salas, and Jose A. Sonoda; in Rota, Andres C. Atalig, Jose A. Calvo, Fortunato T. Manglona, Santiago M. Manglona, Thomas C.

Mendiola, and Melchor S. Mendiola; and in Tinian, Joaquin C. Aldan, Freddy V. Hofschneider, Sr., and Henry V. Hofschneider.

Former Trust Territory High Court judges and justices: Edward P. Furber, Chief Justice and Temporary Judge; Robert K. Shoecraft, Chief Justice; Harold W. Burnett, Chief Justice and Associate Judge; Alex R. Munson, Chief Justice; James R. Nichols, Associate Judge; Pleaz William Mobley, Associate Judge; Philip R. Toomin, Associate Judge; Arthur J. McCormick, Associate Judge; Paul F. Kinnare, Associate Judge; Joseph W. Goss, Associate Judge and Temporary Judge; D. Kelley Turner, Associate Judge; Arvin H. Brown, Jr., Associate Judge; Robert A. Hefner, Associate Judge; Donald C. Williams, Associate Judge; Mamoru Nakamura, Associate Judge; Ernest F. Gianotti, Associate Judge; and Richard I. Miyamoto, Associate Judge.

Former Trust Territory High Court temporary judges: Richard H. Benson, Robert Clifton, E. Avery Crary, P. Drucker, Christobal C. Duenas, Eugene R. Gilmartin, Anthony M. Kennedy, Alex Kozinski, Alfred Laureta, Jose C. Manibusan, Carl A. Muecke, Joaquin C. Perez, Paul D. Shriver, J.M. Spivey, and Dickran M. Tevrizian.

Current and former U.S. District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands judges: Ramona Villagomez Manglona, Chief Judge; Alex R. Munson, former Chief Judge; Alfred Laureta, former Chief Judge.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this moment to just thank God that GABBY GIFFORDS has returned to this floor. You know, it so happens that just a few feet from here was the last time I had seen GABBY, when she left the floor prior to this tragic attack on her.

It just occurs to me that once in a while in this life we find an example where tragedy is transcended by the human spirit and triumph and the grace of God, and this is one of those days. I just congratulate her with everything in me that she has come back. She has the prayers of the entire delegation, and I know the entire Congress, as she goes forward to complete recovery.

We are all very, very grateful today. This is a wonderful celebration for every Member of this Congress. It is a celebration for just the cause of this Republic, because we believe that everyone has the right to have the freedom of speech and to peaceably assemble, and this is what she was doing when she was attacked. For her to come back this way as she has is a triumph of the first magnitude, and we are all so very, very proud of her, and welcome her back with all of our hearts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have another subject tonight that I want to talk about, and that is the recent challenges that we have faced over the debt limit raising and the effort on the part of many of us to place a balanced budget into the bill that went across to the Senate that would have required a balanced budget to be in our Constitution, because, Mr. Speaker, some of us believe that it is the only way that we are going to finally, in this country, deal with the challenges of deficit spending and with the burgeoning debt that threatens to crush this country in a way that no military power has ever been able to do.

□ 1940

Mr. Speaker, some of us have talked about this difficult problem for a very long time, and it seems that over and over again history repeats itself, and we never really deal with it like we should.

But this time, Mr. Speaker, we have placed something before the American people that I think they are going to hang on to, and I believe that there is great hope in the coming months that we will continue to strive for this balanced budget amendment, and I hope that the people of America are paying attention because we cannot repeal the laws of mathematics. This challenge will damage this country in the most profound way if we don't deal with it while we can.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say this: That all financial budgets will eventually balance, that's a fact. No individual, no family, no business, and no government can indefinitely continue to spend more money than they take in without someone having to make up the difference, Mr. Speaker, and that includes the budget of the United States Government.

Neither Mr. Obama nor congressional Democrats can repeal this law of mathematics. The Federal budget of the United States Government will eventually balance, as all of them do, whether it's a person or a government or a business, when they continue to spend money that they don't have, someone, sooner or later, has to make up the difference. The question with our Federal budget is whether the White House and those of us in this body will balance this budget ourselves by wise policy or national bankruptcy and financial ruin will do it for us.

From the day Barack Obama has walked into the White House he has, with breathtaking arrogance, Mr. Speaker, absolutely ignored economic and financial reality. It took America the first 216 years of its existence to accumulate the debt that Barack Obama has accumulated in the short 2½-year span of his presidency.

During this short time in office he has increased our Federal debt by nearly $4 trillion, Mr. Speaker. And just to put that nearly $4 trillion in new debt in perspective, let me just put it this way. If all of a sudden a wave of responsibility swept through this Chamber and we stopped all deficit spending and began to pay installments of $1 million per day to pay down the nearly $4 trillion debt that Barack Obama has created in just 2½ years, it would take us more than 10,000 years to pay off just Mr. Obama's accumulated debt in 2½ years. It would take us more than 10,000 years, Mr. Speaker, to do that if we paid it off in a million dollars a day, and that's if we don't have to pay one dime in interest in the process.

But you see, Mr. Speaker, we are not paying Mr. Obama's debt down at $1 million per day; we are going deeper into debt, more than 4,000 times that much every day, and that's under Mr. Obama's own projected deficit and deficit projections. And then when speaking of the effort to reduce the deficit, the President has the hubris to tell conservative Republicans to take a balanced approach and to eat our peas.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if there's anything more catastrophically out of balance in our Federal budget it is the arrogance to competency ratio of this White House. We have watched as President Obama ran up a trillion-dollar deficit for the first time in history and then broke that record the very next year, and then say that we would have, according to his own projections, a trillion dollar-plus deficit for ''years to come.''

We have watched as the Obama administration promised that if we would just allow them to spend $800 million on their stimulus package, the economy would rebound and unemployment would never reach 8 percent. Well, of course, that didn't happen, and then we watched this administration bring us ObamaCare, or the health care takeover by government.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me just suggest to you that at the time of that debate there was a lot of discussion over what private employers would do to their own insurance plans in the face of this government takeover of health care. Some people thought well, 5 percent, maybe 10 percent of the health care plans in the private sector would be dropped by corporations, would be dropped by employers.

But, Mr. Speaker, that projection is a little bit further off than we thought. The polled people that have answered the question of whether or not they would drop their health care plans, being employers, they have said that as many as half of them would do that now. Mr. Speaker, the reason I mention that is because if that's true, the cost of doing that, the cost of absorbing that to the Federal Government will be another $2 trillion on top of the trillion dollars that was already in the bill. So ObamaCare itself could cost us $3 trillion and, Mr. Speaker, that's just in the next 10 years.

So I would just say to you, Mr. Speaker, this administration has really done for deficits and debt what Stonehenge did for rocks. There is no one that has pressed this deficit spending more than the Obama administration. Mr. Speaker, the people have awakened, and they are tired of Mr. Obama telling them that 2 plus 2 equals 13.

So as we now find ourselves raising this debt ceiling yet again, in the process, some of us as conservative Republicans wanted so badly to give the American people and the States of this Nation the historic opportunity to adopt a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution to put this country back on the track of fiscal sanity once again.

So we placed a balanced budget amendment requirement in two separate pieces of legislation and passed them through this body and sent them over to the Senate only to have Mr. Obama and Senate Democrats refuse to even allow them to come up for a vote, either one of them. They simply refused to vote on it.

In both instances, Mr. Speaker, President Obama's contributions to the process were threats to veto both plans sight unseen.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could just get this one question answered, if nothing else that they would answer, I just wish the administration would answer this one question: What is it, what is it that the President and Democrats find so radical about a balanced budget amendment?

This is something that 49 States have and every family in America has to have sooner or later, a simple balanced budget amendment that says we cannot go into debt in an infinite way that threatens not only our children's future—you know, we used to talk about how this threatened our children's future, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell you, being the father of two little twins that are going to have their third birthday before long, that has great pull in my soul, that I don't want to see this crushing debt placed on their shoulders.

But I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that now we are starting to face a challenge that is going to come in this generation and this time, and it may not be so far off. Greece has set an example for the world as to what can happen when people simply don't pay attention to their fiscal challenges.

But the failure of both, and the failure of cooperation and the failure of leadership from Democrats on this issue, has been baffling to me, Mr. Speaker. Unbelievably, it has been 822 days since Senate Democrats proposed, not passed, but merely even proposed a budget. An individual practicing such irresponsibility, living without a budget while paying for everything with borrowed money, would meet certain financial ruin. Why do we believe our Nation will fare any better under the same preposterous policy?

Now Mr. Obama and the Democrats have falsely said that the balanced budget amendment is a Republican plan to destroy Social Security and Medicare. What a false, terrible, despicable thing to say. The truth is the balanced budget amendment is the only honest chance of reforming and saving those programs and our country from bankruptcy and economic failure in the future, Mr. Speaker.

And throughout this process, Mr. Obama and the liberal media have sought to force tax increases upon the people and the job creators of this Nation by suggesting that Republicans were not willing to address the revenue side of this equation. That isn't true either, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1950

Just because Republicans are not willing to increase job-killing tax rates in this country doesn't mean we don't understand the revenue side of this equation. We just know that increasing the rate of taxes will decrease the productivity of this Nation and we will ultimately decrease the revenue that comes into this government.

It is the economic equivalent of putting dirt in ice cream. It is a disastrous recipe to embrace in the name of balance. But I hear it over and over again—balance, balance. There is nothing more balanced, Mr. Speaker, than a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution.

History and experience has demonstrated time and again that the best way to increase the amount of revenue coming in to this government is to get out of the way and let the people and the private sector increase the number of quality jobs for the American people. This has always resulted in the increased productivity and the broadening of the tax base in this amazing Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we don't need higher taxes, we need more jobs and more taxpayers. Mr. Obama and the Democrats have constantly said that we need to take, again, this ''balanced'' approach, which is a code for increased taxes. But, Mr. Speaker, again, the truly balanced approach to this problem is a balanced budget to the Constitution, and by passing a balanced budget amendment we can restore hope and confidence in capital markets inside the United States and all over the world because they will see that in the long run America is going to make it.

It may take the States 6 or 7 years to fully ratify this Constitutional amendment to balance the budget. But we owe it to the States and to the people to give them this chance to save their Nation. In the meantime, we can work here to expand the economy and balance this budget so when the amendment finally is ratified, we will all be ready to go forward as a nation to embrace greater days than we have ever seen. And we have a rare opportunity, Mr. Speaker, that may never come again of doing something truly historic that will save this Nation and its people from economic ruin.

This battle is not over. The American people are beginning to realize that they are already paying a very high price for electing Barack Obama to the presidency. If they make the profound error of reelecting him in the next election, our families and all Americans will face an economic, a constitutional and a national security crisis that will dwarf the challenges that we face in these moments. If Democrats and the President are not willing to give the people this chance by helping Republicans pass a balanced budget amendment in the Congress, the resulting consequences will be theirs alone, Mr. Speaker, and I believe the people will hold them accountable for whatever financial disaster may follow.

Now long ago, Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson said, ''I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to our Constitution. I would be willing to depend on that alone for the reduction of the administration of our government; I mean an additional article taking from the Federal Government the power of borrowing.''

He said that right after the Constitution itself had been finished. He just wanted one more amendment. And, unfortunately, as you know, he turned out to be right. But his contemporaries failed to listen to him about the balanced budget amendment.

I will just say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is not too late for those of us in these moments to listen to his words. I believe the American people are listening today, and I believe that they call upon their leaders now to do something truly historic and pass a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution in the days ahead. And God help us to do it, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that I know that this has been a challenging week, and I believe our leadership on the Republican side of this House has done everything possible to try to work with the President and to work with the majority leader of the U.S. Senate. And they have had an extremely significant challenge. We sent twice to the other body bills that would have raised the debt limit but in the process also have required a balanced budget amendment to be inserted into the Constitution, or at least sent to the people so that they could decide. But this is the one thing that they took from us in the process. And, Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that we had a golden opportunity to truly change the way that America goes forward, and we failed that opportunity. But I would also say that I think there is still hope to do it in the next few months. Part of the equation that we have under this legislation is to require a balanced budget amendment vote in both this Chamber, in the House of Representatives, and in the U.S. Senate. And I hope so much that we do that while we can and that the people of this country will let their Representatives and Senators know that they are tired of this deficit spending and tired of this fiscal irresponsibility and saying, in our lifetime, we will have a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and we will make sure that our children can walk in the light of freedom and economic hope as we have. I hope that happens, Mr. Speaker.

With that, I would yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my good friend for yielding and for taking time on this truly historic day, an opportunity for this Nation to begin—just begin—to move things in the right direction from a fiscal standpoint here in our great country.

The debate over the last, oh, 3 to 4 months has been very loud, sometimes it has been acrimonious. There are many people across this great country who just are confounded by the laborious nature with which it takes to make any changes here in Washington at all, and I share that frustration and share that anger and share that concern because we've been moving in the wrong direction for a long, long time as it relates to spending at the Federal level.

And so, as the gentleman from Arizona so appropriately said, what we need to do is decrease spending in the short term, we need to put some controls on spending in the mid term, but in the long term, as we have discovered and as the American people know so well, it's going to take structural, fundamental change of the way that Washington does business in order to get our fiscal house in order and get us on that path to a balanced budget and pay off our debt.

And the best way that I believe that that can occur is through a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States. And I don't say that lightly, understanding that there have been really very few times in which the Constitution has been amended. But I believe now in my fourth term that having recognized early on in my Congressional career that all of the inertia here in Washington is to spend money, everything, it all points towards spending money. The budget process that we go through, the folks through the Congressional Budget Office that try their best to do the work but the rules under which they determine whether or not something costs the Federal Government and this Nation something or whether it saves are so distorted that you can't get to the right answer. One cannot get to the right answer without structural change. And that's where the balanced budget amendment comes in.

Today, what we did in the Budget Control Act is not all that any of us would have liked. In fact, the numbers are relatively paltry when you look at them compared to how much money this government spends. But what is true about this act is that it will allow us in this House of Representatives and in the Senate right down the hallway to say to the American people, we hear you, we want this government to be held accountable, and the best way to do that is by passing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

And so my friend from Arizona comes down this evening to highlight that wonderful change that we have the prospect for making in this Congress. This isn't 4 years down the road, 5 years down the road, this is in this Congress right now. And I know that if he could, he would urge the folks listening to this and Members of Congress to encourage all of their constituents and all the people across this land who so firmly believe, as I do, and as I know Mr. FRANKS does, that we need to put some controls, significant controls on how Washington spends money and that the balanced budget amendment is the best way to do that.

I know that what you would do, what he would do, is to urge all Members to communicate to their constituents and to every single American to call their Representatives, to call their United States Senators and say, some time, because of the bill that we just passed, some time between October 1 of this year and December 31 of this year, every single American will have the opportunity to communicate to their Representative and their United States State Senator the urging that they would to encourage them to support a balanced budget amendment.

□ 2000

That's when this vote is going to occur. It's not going to occur tomorrow or in the month of August or September. But what the bill provides is for the wonderful enthusiasm and the heartfelt patriotism and concern that the American people feel about this great country.

Now is the time to communicate to their Representatives, to support a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States. If we are able to get this to happen, if we are able to make this become an amendment to the Constitution, frankly, the problem itself will begin to take care of itself because the rules will begin to say we cannot spend more than we take in. Just like every family in this country does and every business in this country must do, and that is to say we cannot spend more than we take in.

I just had to come down and commend my good friend from Arizona, in a time when there is a lot of calamity around this town, to take the time to say this must be highlighted on this day because this is the beginning of the next 61 days that the American people must act to let their Representatives know, support a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman so much. Mr. PRICE is the chairman of our Policy Committee, and no one has written more cogently and with more commitment on the balanced budget amendment than this man. I am so grateful that he is here and has been such a voice on this.

I ask the gentleman, do you think the American people know that we passed two pieces of legislation over to the Senate with requirements for a balanced budget amendment, and the first thing they did, the Democrat leader there, just took those out or simply refused to vote on them? Do you think they know that?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I don't believe so, because I think if the American people knew that, they would be loudly protesting the lack of leadership and responsibility that the Senate has taken its job. That's the importance of this vote today, because the majority leader in the United States Senate cannot turn this vote away. This vote will happen. It will happen sometime between October 1 and December 31 of this year. Not next year or 2013 or 2014—this year.

We have the opportunity to be able to send to the States a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution in this calendar year, and I'm so proud of the work that the gentleman from Arizona has done, and our colleagues have done, to highlight this issue and ensure that it was included in this piece of legislation. And I look forward to a very positive vote come October, November, or December of this year. But it won't happen without the engagement of the American people.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman so much.

Let me yield to the gentleman from South Carolina. I am glad that you came to the floor, sir.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I want to thank my colleague from Arizona for taking on this very important issue. What a great evening to talk about America living within its means. We are $14.3 trillion in debt, and we're spending $1.5 trillion more than we are bringing in as a Nation. The piece of legislation that we passed this evening and is now residing over in the Senate includes what I think is the most important language within that legislation, and that is a vote on a balanced budget amendment.

I was a small business owner for 16 years. When I did my budget every year, I had to think about what my revenues were for the past year and what my revenues were going to be for the coming year, and I had to set a budget based on that. I couldn't just hope that there was a money tree out in the backyard and continue spending money that I didn't have.

Americans have been engaged in this process of the debt ceiling debate, and we are urging them to get involved in this process of a balanced budget amendment. Once that requirement and that amendment does pass both the House of Representatives and the United States Senate, it will be sent to the States to be ratified. At that point in time, Americans from all across the land will be able to rally their State legislatures, their general assemblies, to take up and ratify this important amendment to the United States Constitution.

Many of my constituents—the gentleman from Arizona doesn't know this. Many of my constituents know that I carry a United States Constitution with me in my pocket. In fact, I read from that very podium in the well. On the second day as a Member of this 112th Congress, I read from the United

States Constitution, something I don't take lightly. But in order for this government to survive, and survive fiscally, is to get our fiscal house in order. And the secret to doing that is really to pass a balanced budget amendment, to require Washington to live within its means the way families and small businesses and large businesses have to do all across this great land.

You know, when I was a small business owner, occasionally I had to go borrow money. But I had to put a plan together for that banker on how I was going to pay that back. Hopefully, we have begun to do that through this week of debate. But a balanced budget amendment, a requirement for the United States Government to balance its checkbook. The most, I guess, simplest thing that American families and small businesses do is sit down with that checkbook register and make sure that they haven't spent too much money, to make sure that they live within their means.

So we have got that opportunity. I am proud that this was included. I am proud that I stand with 87 members of our freshman class that really helped, I think, leadership see that this was a vital component to this piece of legislation. I commend the House leadership for including it. I commend the House leadership for making sure that its inclusion in this bill that we sent over to the Senate this evening was there.

So I want to urge the American people to get behind this, to contact your Senators, contact your House Members. As we heard recently from the gentleman from the Atlanta area of Georgia say, this vote will take place sometime between October and the end of the year. So during that process and leading up to that process, contact your Senators and contact your House Members and say: Government should have to live the way I operate my household, the way my wife and I have to sit down at our kitchen table and balance our budget. Balance Washington's budget. Let's get our spending under control. The time is now.

I brought my little boy, Parker Duncan, who is 10 years old. He is sitting on the House floor with me today because I teach them, my children, the value of not spending more than you bring in. And they say: Dad, can we have that baseball? Can we have that item? I say: Son, we don't have the money in our budget this week or this month to purchase that. But let me make plans so that we can purchase that in the future.

We live within our means. Am I perfect? No. I have debt, but we have a plan to pay back that debt.

The future of our children and our grandchildren is at stake. America knows. America got engaged in this, they got engaged in the last election cycle, and they know that Washington cannot keep spending more than it has.

So I commend my colleague from Arizona for taking on this very, very important issue to make Washington live within its means, to live within its means, not to spend money that it doesn't have. Let's rein in our fiscal house. Let's get our house in order, and let's create a way to start paying back that enormous debt. We can do that with a balanced budget amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and to not refer to guests on the floor of the House.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the Speaker, and I understand that the gentleman from Illinois would like me to yield to him for a question.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me for a question, but first, I just want to indicate to Mr. DUNCAN's son that we're going to do everything we can to get him a baseball even if his dad is a little slow this month.

My question is about the balanced budget amendment, if the gentleman from Arizona would share with us how that would work. I have heard a number of Members come down and talk about the idea that we are going to vote on it, that it needs to happen. But at least as I understand it, the interpreter of the Constitution, obviously, would be the Federal courts in that if Congress were unable to achieve a balanced budget in any fiscal year, a lawsuit could be brought under the balanced budget amendment that would throw the process into the Federal judiciary, allowing Federal judges then to determine what constitutes balance or imbalance.

If the gentleman would take some time to share with us how, from his perspective, that would work.

□ 2010

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman, and I'll take a shot at that.

First of all, as the gentleman knows, there are many different kinds of balanced budget amendments that have been proposed. One of the commonalities of most of those is that they require that our projected spending meet our projected revenues, what we believe is going to be our receipts for the coming year. Now, it is true, as in all areas of the Constitution, that the Federal courts have exhibited great arrogance in coming into the area of legislation and trying to legislate from the bench by dealing with these issues under the pretense of considering the constitutionality of these issues. The good news with a balanced budget amendment is that there would be obvious language there that the courts would have before them that simply says that the Congress is required by the Constitution to balance our budget so that we don't deficit-spend.

It is true that we are required in this body to have equal protection, for instance. We can't say that this one group deserves one protection and that this one group doesn't. Every once in a while, the Supreme Court injects themselves into that debate like they did in Roe vs. Wade, let's say. They simply said, when it comes to protecting the unborn, that they weren't persons under the Constitution and that we not only didn't have to protect them but that we couldn't protect them. That was arrogance beyond words. This is every time across the history of humanity. When the German High Tribunal injected itself even into the tragedy of the German system, they said that the German was ''untermenschen,'' subhuman, and they took away their personhood; and the tragedy that followed is still one of the darkest stains that I know of on the human soul.

So, yes, it is possible that the courts could try to intervene in this process and try to distort it, but ultimately, the ''balanced budget amendment'' concept is very simple. It would say, like Thomas Jefferson said, that the Federal Government simply would take from them the power of borrowing.

Now, there was a balanced budget amendment that came before this floor about 15 years ago, and it received over 300 votes on the floor, many of them Democrat votes. I don't know how the gentleman from Illinois voted on that. That's not a question. I don't know. Yet that particular balanced budget amendment simply said that you could not deficit-spend without a super majority of votes that declared that there was either an emergency in dealing with our national security or that there was an act of war on the table to where we were having to do things to make sure that we protected the national security of this country, which is priority one.

I'll let the gentleman ask me one more question, and then I'm going to yield to these other folks. I would just say this: Oftentimes, my friends on the Democrat side of the aisle say that a balanced budget amendment will require us to cut Medicare and cut Social Security and all of these things, and that presupposes that a balanced budget amendment will bring in less revenue to this government because of its constraints. First of all, when we deficit-spend, we're really just throwing the log up the trail. We're really not doing anyone any good in the long run because these programs become unsustainable over time.

Here's the thing that I wish I could express and wish that my Democrat friends would do their own research on and ascertain whether they think it's true empirically in history, which is: When we have a balanced budget amendment, when people believe that they can project forward and know that this government is going to be secure, when they believe that we're not going to deficit-spend and take a lot of the capital out of the private markets and that we're not going to put burdens on the interest rates, one thing happens very clearly—it drags more people off the sidelines; it drags more entrepreneurs into the system; it causes

more people to put their capital at risk; it causes more people to put their lives and endeavors into an enterprise that results in productivity.

The fundamentals of all economy is productivity, productivity, productivity, productivity. When we produce as a Nation, we raise the number of taxpayers, not the rate of taxes. We raise the number of taxpayers, and money from all corners comes into the coffers. That has happened many times. Even when we decrease taxes, that happens.

So I am convinced that a balanced budget amendment is the surest way, not only to have the additional moneys necessary to make sure that we have all of the constitutional mandated and allowed activities of this Federal Government to do, including that it gives us more money for things like Medicare and that it gives us more money for things like Social Security, but to also put us on a fiscal path to security so that those programs won't eventually come into question and even bankruptcy.

With that, I'd let the gentleman ask one more question.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for allowing me to ask him one final question.

Is there any concern that a balanced budget amendment would be legalizing the legislative process and politicizing the judiciary?

What I mean by that is all Federal judges are, obviously, appointed by the President of the United States, and they go through a process in the Senate. Is there any concern that those Federal judges could be queried over what programs they support and what programs they don't support, and therefore, it would stand as a basis for their own, if you will, politicizing of the judicial process, which presently is not involved in the political process? Then, if you don't mind sharing with us, what are the ramifications?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

There are always these times when Democrats and Republicans can find common ground, and I think this is one of those moments when I take the gentleman's point and believe that he has a very good point.

The truth is, as of late, in the last several decades, the courts have politicized, and they have brought into sort of the legalization process a lot of the activities that belong in this Chamber. I am convinced that, yes, there is every possibility that they may try to do that with a balanced budget amendment of the Constitution or with any other element of the Constitution because that's where things are headed.

The answer to that is not to say, well then, we're just going to give up the Constitution to the judges. The answer is for us to fight back and say that they are not going to politicize our Constitution, that they are there to apply the Constitution as written, not to have a Constitutional Convention every time they sit down to a case where they rewrite the Constitution like they did with Roe vs. Wade, like they did with the Kelo case. The judges simply should interpret the law as written and not try to do our job as legislators.

It is a serious problem, I would say to the gentleman, that concerns me greatly, but I will say this: We are seeing judges do these things anyway in States. Apart from a balanced budget amendment, they're saying, You're not equally applying your appropriations in a particular area, and we hereby order you to appropriate funds to this or that particular issue or cause or department. So I say to the gentleman that there is nothing that frightens me more than turning this entire Constitution, this entire Republic, over to an unelected judicial oligarchy. It's the most dangerous thing that we face because it abrogates the Constitution. I would say this President has put people in the courts who have no fealty or no respect for the Constitution whatsoever.

I just had a case that I've been fighting for 14 years, and it went before the courts. It should have been a 9–0 case, but it was 5–4 because these four justices were willing to say that every dollar in your pocket before you filled out a tax return was public money. Now, there was nothing constitutionally accurate about that, but they were willing to do it.

So the gentleman is correct in being afraid of judicial activism and of the judiciary injecting itself into the Constitution, but they've done that with all amendments. At least with a constitutionally balanced budget amendment, we'll have the words clearly that we have at least the ability to fight back and to say to the judges that they have no right to abrogate these words.

I hope that that makes a difference.

With that, I thank the gentleman for his questions, and I would yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma such time as he may consume.

Mr. LANKFORD. Thank you. I'm honored to get a chance to join in this conversation, which is really a conversation about a topic that's a very big deal to a lot of people.

I was 18 years old, and I remember sitting down with my mom, working through how to be able to fill out the register on a checkbook and how to be able to balance it because I'm getting ready to leave for college, and it becomes an essential characteristic of people to be able to handle their finances when they walk away to school. I can remember well sitting there and walking through money in/money out, all of that process.

It's such a simple process for us, so simple that, when I talk to people back home in my district in Oklahoma—Republicans or Democrats—and I say, ''What is your opinion on a balanced budget amendment?'' it's that this is not at partisan issue. Just flat out, when we get away from programs, when we get away from all the ideas and say, ''Should we balance our budget every year? Should we live in balance?'' I run into people who say, ''Yes, we need to balance our budget.'' When we get into conversations about the language, about exclusions, about all those things, those are legitimate conversations that I think we should have with the American people; but in reality, they come back to the same thing, that we should balance our budget.

Now, I've seen statistics. As high as 80 percent of the American people are interested in having a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and I think there are multiple reasons for that. Some of them are fiscal. If I went to the American people and I said, ''I could provide to the American people in our budget for social programs, for tasks, for agencies, for all of our entitlement programs $220 billion more a year immediately into our Federal budget,'' everyone would say, ''Great. How do we do that?''

□ 2020

I would say, we catch up on our budget and stop paying interest. Currently, we're paying $220 billion a year just in interest payments. Can you imagine what we could do with $220 billion more in our budget if we didn't have such a large debt that we're having to maintain with so much interest?

The other side of that is, this debt is not forever. I interact with people all the time, and they will say words like sustainable, the debt is not sustainable, the debt is not sustainable. When I ask people, what does that mean to you to say the debt is not sustainable, very often they will just hesitate, and they will say, I think it just means we can't do this forever. And I would smile and say, I completely agree, we can't just keep borrowing this forever.

But let me tell you what it means to me in this. At any given time in the world, there is only so much money at that exact moment—now, we know that wealth shrinks and grows over time as investment happens, but at any one instant in the world there is only so much money. And of that money that's there, there is only so much that is actually invested, whether that be in business or in bonds or in whatever it may be. You take that investment pie worldwide, and you've got a portion of it that's going to growing businesses, starting new businesses, investing in markets, and then you've got another group of sovereign debt that is actually paying for countries and their debt. There is only so much money that can be invested in a moment. And at some point we start, as a country, taking on more and more money, which we're pulling out of the markets, and we're actually slowing down our economy by requiring more and more money to come to us to pay for our debt. So at some point we've got to stand up as a Nation and say, if we continue taking on this debt, we are purposefully killing the worldwide economy because

we're taking money out of circulation, investment and pulling it into us. Forty-nine States have some sort of structure for a balanced budget. We should do that as a Federal Government. It is a commonsense thing.

Now, again, we can come back and talk about what the language is. I'm a firm believer that no party owns the United States Constitution; that is by the American people. So it should be Republicans and Democrats together, sitting down in a commonsense way, both the House and the Senate, and saying we agree, we need to get around this, this is out of hand. So let's start working on the language on it together.

So that becomes a key issue, but it sets up a couple of things that I think are really important. Number one is, it actually sets up deadlines. I have noticed as a freshman in this town that there are very few deadlines that ever occur here. Even when there is a budget requirement that the House and the Senate both have to do a budget each year, we just reject that and don't do it, and we'll do continuing resolutions and things. We don't like doing deadlines because it requires difficult decisions. A balanced budget amendment to the Constitution creates a moment that we have to actually focus in on the fiscal house and force us into those tough decisions.

It also creates a parameter that protects future generations. I am a firm believer that the reason we still have the freedom of religion in the United States is because it is in the United States Constitution. The reason we still have freedom of speech is because it is in the United States Constitution. And we all know that so many people in politics do not like what's written about them in the press, and many times in politics they push back on the press and try to limit the press. But we still have a free press because that is guaranteed in the United States Constitution. If we added in a balanced budget requirement for the Federal Government, it would give to our posterity, for centuries to come, the gift of a parent in the legislative room to say we are going to have a balanced budget, we are going to honor this. And that $220 billion a year that we've been throwing around and wasting on our interest would actually come back to reinvest into our economy. It's the right thing for us to do. It will require difficult decisions, I'm very aware, but it is absolutely the right thing to do.

I am so grateful for the gentleman from Arizona for leading a conversation on the House floor on this very important topic, because in the months to come we're encouraging all of America, around kitchen tables, around the workplace, playing around and watching football—which I'm very grateful is coming in the next couple of weeks to finally start football season again—around these gatherings of people to start having the conversation, do you think our Nation should have a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution? Let's initiate a conversation—I think I know where the American people already are, but let's give it a shot and find out for sure where their legislators are and so we can get that back out to the States and say, where are you, and where are we as a Nation?

And so I appreciate so much the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. And I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say, in listening to the gentleman from Oklahoma's comments, that he is one great encouragement to many of us because he is living proof that the cavalry has arrived, and he is an example of why this debate has changed. I am very grateful for his presence in the United States Congress, and I hope he is here a very long time.

With that, I would seek to yield to the gentleman from Iowa for such time as he might consume, and I might ask the Speaker what the time remaining is at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. So I'm hoping I can yield to the gentleman 8 minutes, or something along those lines.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for leading on this Special Order, and all my colleagues that have come to the floor to raise the issue of the balanced budget amendment.

I wanted to just point a few things out as to where this sits. Now, the chairman of the Constitution Committee standing before me, Mr. FRANKS, has presided over the shaping of a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. And I certainly favor the one that was authored by BOB GOODLATTE and marked up in our full Judiciary Committee. It took three full days, and those days spanned over a couple weeks' period of time trying to find the time to get this to work out.

And I want to express, Mr. Speaker, that a balanced budget amendment that is written by someone who doesn't believe in a balanced budget amendment probably isn't going to yield the result that we all want from that amendment. And the worst case scenario would be the drafting and the passage of a balanced budget amendment that would be the constitutional equivalent of PAYGO. You could draft a balanced budget amendment that would say, Thou shalt balance the budget, and not put provisions in there, such as a cap on GDP, or a supermajority required to raise taxes, or a supermajority required to raise the debt limit, or of course the cap, as I said. And if it were just the barest of bones, the bare minimum of a definition of a balanced budget amendment, then that could be a balanced budget amendment that would allow a majority vote of the House of Representatives and a majority vote of the Senate to waive the balanced budget amendment. That would be the amendment equivalent of PAYGO, pay-as-you-go, waive it or raise taxes in order to calculate that you balanced it. So I would caution that we need to do a prudent job of promoting a balanced budget amendment, continually defining that balanced budget amendment to be something that gives us fiscal responsibility.

I will go more deeply into this perhaps in a half hour or so, but I wanted to also add that this legislation that has passed through the House of Representatives today—and I'm as joyous and delighted that GABBY GIFFORDS was able to cast a vote on this bill today, as perhaps almost anybody in this place, save the folks that are closer friends and relations of hers, but what a day, what a day for this Congress to feel that emotion of her coming in this room and putting that vote up on the board and to hear that cheer go up when that light turned green. We are on opposite sides of the issue, but as I said, it is a deep feeling of just great pleasure and gratitude and thanks that she can come into this place and do that.

But here's the point I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, and that is that, if we do nothing, if we had not addressed this debt ceiling and dialed this spending curve down, in 10 years from now—this is what the lack of a balanced budget amendment will do: In 10 years from now, our national debt, our debt that we addressed today that's about $14.3 trillion, would be $28 trillion in 10 years if we just go along business as usual and the projections of the March baseline are projected out for a decade as we do; $28 trillion in debt. If we accept the—I'll call it the Boehner proposal that passed the House here today, because the numbers in it actually reflect the first Boehner bill of last Friday. Then this bill that passed the House today, our national debt is still, if this bill effectively turns this spending increase down in the way it's supposed to, and the deficit down, we're going to be looking at $26 trillion in our debt anyway in 10 years by 2021, $26 trillion.

So we've gone from, when we got up this morning, projections of $28 trillion in debt in 2021, in 10 years from now, dialed it down to $26 trillion. If we just held the line on the Ryan budget, we would have dialed it down to $23 trillion, and I'm not satisfied with that. When I see a budget that came out that balances in 26 years—now we've backed up some on that—I think we need to be stronger, not weaker. I think we need to step up and advocate and take these next few months and do all we can to sell America on the idea, selling the people that don't believe we should ever live under a balanced budget that we must do so.

And as I sat for those 3 days in the Judiciary Committee while we debated and marked up this balanced budget amendment that does these things that

I said—a three-fifths supermajority to waive the balance, or three-fifths to raise the debt ceiling, or two-thirds to exceed the 18 percent GDP cap, or two-thirds to increase taxes, all of those things—and it requires the President also to offer a balanced budget and allows a balanced budget requirement to be waived if we declare war or a national emergency that is significant—those things, if we don't do those things, then we end up with perpetual debt.

□ 2030

And the people on the other side of the aisle that debated against a balanced budget amendment completely convinced me that they never want to live under a balanced budget amendment unless it is a confiscation of all of the wealth of this land and put it back through the money machine here in Washington. It would suppress the economy, it would starve and eventually kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

So $28 trillion is projected. That's the projected national debt in 10 years. The bill that passed today takes it down to $26 trillion. Ryan took it to 23, so we lost a little bit of leverage here today.

But the people on the other side, and the President has convinced me also, he never wants to live under a balanced budget and certainly doesn't want to have a Constitution that would order that that be so.

So what do the American people have to say about people who are committed to deficit spending in perpetuity, what do they think happens, where do they think America goes if we take our hands off of the ''whoa back'' on the reins and the spending goes on and we borrow the money to fill all of the wants of the American people for now. And what happens to our children and grandchildren when they have to service that debt or when the roof caves in when no one will loan us money anymore and we became mega Greece?

This has been an intense debate here all around this country. It came to a certain head today. It is a long ways from over. This is a start. It's not the end. It is just a start.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa. He happens to be one of my most beloved friends in this institution, and he is a true statesman. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I think it's important for us to examine that word ''statesman.'' It's often said that a politician looks to the next election whereas a statesman looks to the next generation. I so believe that that's important in this place.

We need to realize that, as the older men around here, as it were, that we need to plant shade trees under whose shade we will never sit ourselves. We need to do those things for the next generations that will really make the difference.

I want to, if I could, relate the timeless words of one of our Founding Fathers Samuel Adams. He said, ''Let us contemplate our forefathers and our posterity, and resolve to maintain the rights bequeathed to us from the former for the sake of the latter. The necessity of these times, more than ever, calls for our utmost circumspection, deliberation, fortitude and perseverance.''

I think so much that those words are true, Mr. Speaker, because I truly believe that right now we are about planting trees under whose shade we will never sit ourselves.

But I truly believe that if we work hard in these next few months to pass this balanced budget amendment, that we will do great things for this country and for its people because oftentimes I find people see the balanced budget amendment as a way to constrain our ability to meet the needs of government.

Well, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, a balanced budget amendment will do several things. First of all, it will not only help government meet certain needs, it will help a lot of people no longer need government because it will expand this economy, it will help people gain jobs, it will help people become taxpayers, and as I said in my earlier comments, we don't need more tax increases, we need more taxpayers, and nothing will help this government in terms of the revenue it needs more than that.

But ultimately, a balanced budget amendment will also cause a debate in this country as to what is government's role and what is the private sector's role because oftentimes the difference between this country and many other countries is that our Constitution changed down government, and our Constitution tries to magnify the individual. And, Mr. Speaker, I just think sometimes we forget what it's all about.

I know there is a lot of sincere people on both sides of the issue. But I would just say tonight that we have a chance to move forward from this debate and realize that our eyes are open now, that we see the problem. And sometimes there is a moment in the life of every problem, Mr. Speaker, when it is big enough to be seen and still small enough to be solved. And I'm afraid that that window is closing upon all of us right now and that we have an opportunity to sow the seeds of ultimate success by putting a balanced budget amendment in our Constitution by putting it out to the States.

We can't pass a balanced budget amendment ourselves. What we can do is we can put it out to the States and say you decide. Let the people of this country decide whether we need a balanced budget amendment or not. If we will do our part, they will do theirs.

You know Fred Bastiat said many, many years ago, government is that great fiction through which everyone endeavors to live at the expense of everyone else. And it sounds real good, you know, this idea of deficit spending, this idea of socialized government sounds real good. But the truth is that while maybe free enterprise and market-driven freedom is sometimes the unequal distribution of wealth, socialism has proven time and time again across the centuries to be the equal distribution of poverty.

Nothing has dragged more poor people out of poverty for longer periods of time than freedom and free enterprise, and the balanced budget amendment will reinvigorate that in this country, and it's time that we had it, and by the grace of God I hope that we proceed.

I join with my friends on both sides of the aisle to say it's time to put this country back on track to the greatness that the Founding Fathers dreamed of so long ago and to understand on our parts that if we do what we can, that America's best days are still ahead.

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

I HAVE A DREAM

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tonight or in the very near future, I want everyone within the sound of my voice to read or reread Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s, ''I Have a Dream'' speech, a speech that I usually refer to as his ''insufficient funds or bounced check'' speech.

I've often thought: I wonder what Dr. King's speech would sound like if he were here today to give it. Well, I'm not presumptuous enough to pretend that I know exactly what Dr. King would say. I really don't. But I thought it would be challenging and interesting to go through his speech, change it as little as possible, but insert today's circumstances and my own thoughts on how I think Dr. King's speech might have sounded if it were given today. So that's what I propose to do tonight. After all, on August 27, we will dedicate the King Memorial here in Washington, D.C., the day before his historic anniversary of the ''I Have a Dream'' speech on August 28.

As my colleagues have now departed this institution for the August recess to return to their homes far and near, I thought it would be especially appropriate that the final speech delivered after this very tumultuous debate would give reference and reverence to the extraordinary insight of Martin Luther King, Jr.

I also thought in light of the budget cutting deal and the bounced check and insufficient funds deal that was passed today in the Congress that it would also be appropriate.

So tonight I want to try and give what some might call an updated version of Dr. King's ''I Have a Dream'' speech and what it might have sounded like today.

Again, I make no pretense that my paraphrased version of Dr. King's speech does his original version any justice. But the following is my paraphrased version of that speech after reflecting upon today's budget deal.

Paraphrasing Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s ''I Have a Dream'' speech, and for those of you who are in your offices listening to the sound of my voice, you might want to Google or go on the Internet and actually find the true text of Dr. King's speech and actually compare it to my exercise.

Especially in light of today's budget deficits, cumulative debt, the need to raise the debt limit, and in the context of the need to also fight for jobs, education, health care, housing, equal rights for women, renewable energy, fair taxation and for the fundamental right to vote, Dr. King might have delivered this speech:

I would have been happy today to join with those willing to take a balanced approach to budget cuts and revenue enhancements to bring about the greatest deficit reduction and debt reduction along with the most massive full employment plan in the history of our Nation. But that is not what the President and congressional leaders negotiated.

Nine score and four years ago on September 17, 1787, 39 great Americans signed the U.S. Constitution as witnesses. This momentous decree came as a beacon light of hope to millions of Americans who had been seared in the flames of British injustice.

□ 2040

It came as a joyous daybreak to end the long night of taxation without representation.

But 224 years later, the American people are not free of deficits and debt. Two hundred twenty-four years later, the life of many Americans is still sadly crippled by the manacles of foreclosed homes and the chains of unemployment. Two hundred twenty-four years later, many Americans live on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity. Two hundred twenty-four years later, many Americans still languish in the corners of American society and find themselves as exiles in their own land. And so we were elected as President and as Congresspersons to end this shameful condition.

In a sense, the American people are looking to our Nation's capital, the President and the Congress, to be able to cash a check. When the architects of our Republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all Americans would be guaranteed the ''unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.''

It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as many of her citizens are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, Congress has given many Americans a bad check, a check which has come back marked ''insufficient funds.'' But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this Nation. And so, many Americans are still waiting to cash this check, a check that will give them upon demand the riches of freedom and the security of a job and justice.

They are also looking to this President and this hallowed Congress to remind America of the fierce urgency of Now. This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of unemployment to the sunlit path of full employment. Now is the time to lift our Nation from the quicksands of inequality of income and wealth to the solid rock of economic justice. Now is the time to make full employment and social and economic justice a reality for all of God's children.

It would be fatal for the Nation to overlook the urgency of this moment. This sweltering summer of Americans' legitimate discontent will not pass until there is an invigorating autumn of jobs and equality. 2011 is not an end but a beginning, and those who hope that those who are currently blowing off steam and will soon be content will have a rude awakening if the Nation returns to business as usual, and there will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until Americans are granted their full citizenship rights. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our Nation until the bright day of full employment and economic justice emerges.

But there is something that must be said to those who stand on the warm threshold which leads into the palace of jobs and justice. In the process of gaining our rightful place, we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for jobs by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protests to degenerate into physical violence. Again and again we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting oppressive economic forces with the spiritual force of unrelenting, but disciplined, determination.

This marvelous new militancy which has engulfed many Americans must not lead us into a distrust of all politics and all politicians, for some politics and politicians are committed to full employment, social and economic justice, and some politicians also realize that their destiny is tied up with this larger destiny. Some politicians have come to realize that their jobs as Congresspersons are inextricably bound to Americans also having jobs.

We cannot walk alone, and as we walk we must make a pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back. There are those who are asking the devotees of social and economic justice, ''When will you be satisfied?'' We can never be satisfied as long as the American people are the victim of the unspeakable horrors of home foreclosures. We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain a job at a livable wage. We cannot be satisfied as long as the education of America's children leaves them uncompetitive in a new world market. We can never be satisfied as long as our health care system is ranked 37th in the world. We cannot be satisfied as long as one person in America cannot vote or one American believes they have nothing for which to vote. No, no, we are not satisfied, and we will not be satisfied until ''jobs and justice rolls down like waters, and righteousness like a mighty stream.''

I am not unmindful that many Americans are experiencing great trials and tribulations. Some Americans are fresh from job rejections, and some Americans have been refused an adjustment to their mortgage which has left their family battered by the storms of home foreclosures and staggered by the winds of homelessness. You have become the veterans of unearned suffering. Continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive. Go forward in Mississippi, go forward in Vermont, go forward in Michigan, go forward in Hawaii, go forward in Oregon, go forward in Florida, go forward in the ghettos and barrios of our cities and in rural Appalachia knowing that somehow this situation can and will be changed.

Let us not wallow in the valley of despair, I say to you today, my friends.

And so even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American Dream. I have a dream that one day this Nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.'' I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together around a table of brotherhood where full employment, high quality health care for all Americans, excellence in education for every child, and safe, sanitary and affordable housing for every family is their natural experience.

I have a dream that one day, absent the false excuse of sweltering deficits and debt and the heat of economic injustice, America will be transformed into an oasis of full employment, freedom and economic justice.

I have a dream that my two little children will one day live in a Nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character, and that voting will be as natural as breathing, and no trickery or legal obstacles will be thrown in their path.

I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day over Michigan, over Ohio, Illinois and Indiana, with its wicked unemployment and suffering families, that one day right there in Michigan, Ohio, Illinois and Indiana, all of these families will be able to enjoy full employment, social and economic justice, and all will be able to join hands as brothers and sisters.

I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted and every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain and the crooked places will be made straight ''and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together.''

This is my hope, and this is the faith that I go forward with every day.

With this faith, we will be able to hew out of the mountain of deficits and debt a stone of economic hope and justice for all Americans. With this faith, we will be able to transform the jangling discords of unemployment and home foreclosures into a beautiful symphony of full employment and affordable housing. With this faith, we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free and fully employed one day.

And this will be the day. This will be the day when all of God's children will be able to sing with new meaning:

My country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing.

Land where my fathers died, land of the Pilgrim's pride,

From every mountainside, let freedom ring.

And if America is to be a great Nation, this must become true.

□ 2050

And so let freedom, full employment, and the right of private and public workers to organize into unions to protect their interests ring from the prodigious hilltops of New Hampshire. Let freedom and public education of equal high quality for all of America's children ring from the mighty mountains of New York. Let freedom ring and health care of equal high quality for all Americans ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania. Let freedom and a clean, safe, and sustainable environment ring from the snow-capped Rockies of Colorado. Let freedom ring with safe and sanitary and affordable housing from the curvaceous slopes of California.

But not only that, let freedom and equal rights for women, for gays and lesbians ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia. Let freedom, fair and progressive taxation ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee. Let freedom and the right and the ability to vote ring from every hill and molehill of Mississippi. From every mountainside, let freedom, social and economic justice ring throughout America.

And when this happens, when, my friends, we allow freedom, full employment, social and economic justice to ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every State and every city, we will be able to speed up the day when all of God's children, black men, white men, women, Jews, Gentiles, and Muslims, Protestants and Catholics, gays and straights, those who are whole and those who are handicapped, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual: Free at last, free at last, thank God Almighty, we are free at last.

I want to remind everyone that I just finished giving my paraphrased version of what I thought Dr. King might have said had he been alive today and witnessed this debate, especially in light of the budget cutting, the insufficient funds, the bounced check deal that Congress passed on this day. I tried to remain as faithful as possible to the original speech, simply filling in my own thoughts and ideas in the current context, but I make no pretense to have done justice to the original version.

Again, I urge my friends and my colleagues and all those who can hear my voice to read or reread Dr. King's ''I Have a Dream'' speech at your earliest convenience.

Mr. Speaker, it is in this speech that Dr. King delivered the economic substance of his expectations of Democrats and Republicans in the Congress. America has issued all of us a bad check. It has come back marked ''insufficient funds.'' But we refuse to believe that the great vaults of opportunity of this Nation are bankrupt. If we can spend billions of dollars to put a man on the Moon, if we can spend billions of dollars on a war in Afghanistan, spend billions of dollars on a war in Iraq, spend tens of millions of dollars per week on a war in Libya, then, Mr. Speaker, this Congress can find enough money to put a man on his own two feet right here in America.

I have not given up on America, and I hope we don't give up on America.

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

THE NEED FOR SPENDING CONTROLS

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we took a vote here on this floor, a vote to protect the economy while demonstrating a commitment to reducing our debt—no more budget tricks, no more accounting gimmicks, no more empty promises.

You have the right to know the truth about America's budget. We have the responsibility to deliver it. This debate was done in plain sight. No more automatic deficit or debt balance increases. This was an opportunity for the American people to not only engage, but to cut the size of government. We need spending controls in place.

We were able to accomplish that here today because we believe that Washington isn't the solution; Washington is the problem. Which is why we need not only spending controls, but economic freedom through a balanced budget amendment.

You have heard a lot over the last several weeks about a balanced approach. To people in my district, they understand that a balanced approach increases taxes on those very job creators. I would just say, in conclusion, the economic security that we are looking for is a balanced budget amendment.

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to be addressing you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. It's always interesting for me to sit here and listen to the other Members deliver their impression of what goes on and how they envision the future, and I enjoyed the gentleman from Illinois's presentation, and the gentleman from California, and particularly the gentleman from Arizona, who came here to talk about the balanced budget amendment. And so I take that issue up as we get ready to close out the evening, and I would like to add some of the points that I have to this.

That is, when I was first elected to office, it was in the State senate in 1996, and I believed that if I just simply made a cogent argument on principle that it would sway my colleagues over to my side. I didn't think it was all that complicated. It wouldn't be hard to talk about balancing the budget, keeping the spending within our times. Because, after all, each year government always provides more and more of what people were providing for themselves the years before. So this encroachment of government that is the growth in the nanny state and the decrease in personal responsibility had been going along for years back then. It's been accelerated in the last few years.

But the question I'd ask at this point is: What should government not do? What is it that is too much for government to do? Where should we draw the line? And as now I am halfway into the ninth year in this United States Congress, Mr. Speaker, I have been engaged in so many debates and pushed so many bills and supported and opposed so much legislation that I see the pattern. I see a pattern.

It's over here on this side, they believe the government should do everything and that anybody that is investing their capital and returning an income off of that and making some money is somehow an evil capitalist,

victimizing the proletariats and the workers. I get a little disappointed even with my own colleagues that constantly repeat this message that rings off the walls of the White House and rang off of the walls of the Speaker's office when NANCY PELOSI was the Speaker: Where are the jobs?

Well, okay, it's a legitimate question. But underneath that question is: Where are the profits? Where are the profits? Why would an individual invest their capital and their brainpower and their back power, their sweat equity, if they didn't have an opportunity to take that little pile of capital and build it up a little bit bigger, if they didn't have an opportunity to get a better return on their investment, if they just simply stuck it in U.S. Treasury bills?

People who invest money have to expect to have a profit. And then out of the profit, they pay the wages. And if they're making money off of the people they hire, they hire more people if they can see a model that will do that. That's how this worm turns. But it isn't evil capitalists.

I think Mr. FRANKS said it pretty well, but I will say this, that free enterprise capitalism has done more good for the world than any other system that's out there. It has gotten people out of bed in the morning. It's kept them up late at night. It's caused them to find another way to be more efficient. Competition makes us more efficient. And the desire to do well, sometimes just for the pure sake of the challenge of it all, that desire to do well drives many of us.

So the people that are out there creating jobs are doing so because there is a prospect for profit. That's where the jobs are. If the prospect for profit isn't there, if the degree of risk is not proportional to the potential for profit, they're not going to take the risk. It's that simple, Mr. Speaker.

And over on this side, I hear sometimes this lack of resolve that, yes, we ought to have a balanced budget and we need to get there, but it's just too soon to rush there, the resistance to the idea that we should take a look at this spending now and cut this spending now, get it under control now.

□ 2100

When I first came into this Congress and swore in here on this floor in January of 2003, shortly after that I went over to the chairman of the Budget Committee and said where is the balanced budget, 2003. And he said to me, we can't balance the budget. Why not? It's too hard. Why is it too hard? Because we have too many expenses, too many burdens.

Don't you know, don't you know, green freshman Congressman in 2003, that we have been hit by the enemy on September 11, 2001? Don't you know we had to create an entire TSA and put this huge security system up and merge together the Department of Homeland Security? Don't you know that we had to organize and deploy the military over to places like Afghanistan? Didn't I know that we were mobilizing to go into Iraq at that very time, that our expenses were too high, we couldn't balance the budget, couldn't provide a balanced budget because it was too hard. It was too hard to balance the budget because our financial system had taken a hard hit on September 11, 2001, and because we had a war to fight—actually two wars to fight, and because we had to create all of this billions of dollars worth of security so we could keep ourselves safe.

And didn't I know that that was right on the tail end of the first thing of the dot-com bubble that was a false economy, that bubble that actually was a huge component in getting the budget balanced during those late Clinton years—that dot-com bubble had to burst because it wasn't built on the ability to produce a good or a service and deliver it more efficiently, but it was built on the speculation that we could store information and transfer it more efficiently than ever before, and we could. But that didn't necessarily translate into the efficiencies that come that create the profit. So the dot-com bubble burst, September 11 came, TSA was created, Homeland Security was created, two wars were fought, and through all of that we lost that sight of austerity.

And I wish that President Bush had said to us, tighten your belt, we are going to pay for this conflict, and we are going to pay for this tragedy that happened to the United States of America by all of us sharing the sacrifice by tightening our belt, not by raising taxes on people that are producing jobs. But it didn't happen that way, and I made my arguments, and I made them every year. And I went through a lot to try to produce a balanced budget throughout those years. We never got a balanced budget that we could bring to the floor, not that balanced in a single year.

But I will say, Mr. Speaker, during the height of the Iraq war, when things looked as bad as they could have looked, and about the time that George Bush was preparing to order the surge, about that period of time, we had a budget that came within $160 billion of balancing, $160 billion, Mr. Speaker.

Now that $160 billion, boy, how do I wish we would have found a way to tighten it down so we didn't have that deficit, that we could have balanced that budget in that year. We came very, very close—$160 billion didn't sound close. It's close, it's really close compared to what we have today.

And so the President offers a budget that nobody will pick up and vote for and support, but it's a $1.65 trillion deficit spending budget, $1.65 trillion. And I listen to people that will say to me, Republicans overspent. Yes, we did. I make that confession. But the overspending of $160 billion compared to the overspending of $1.65 trillion is 10–1 Obama administration versus the Bush administration, 10–1.

And here we are now with a number that is greater than $3 trillion, maybe less than $5 trillion, and a deficit that has been created by the Obama administration with no end in sight. And the President insisted that this Congress grant to him $2.4 trillion in unfettered debt ceiling increase, a clean debt ceiling increase bill, no strings attached, $2.4 trillion.

Now, that was irresponsible, and when you find yourself with a divided government like we have, this government would have gone in that direction in a heartbeat if NANCY PELOSI had still been the Speaker. I can tell you if she would have been in charge, if Democrats would have had the majority here in the House of Representatives and HARRY REID would be running the shop down that hallway through there in the Senate, and the President asked for $2.4 trillion there would hardly have been a debate, Mr. Speaker, hardly a debate at all.

They would have brought a bill under a closed rule down here to the floor with a limited amount of debate. And if they thought there was going to be negative publicity, it would have happened at the time of the night that the press was not going to be able to report it so that the American people would pay attention.

And, yes, it would have leaked out, there wouldn't have been a lid on the secret. But neither would it have been with a great deal of fanfare. It would have been $2.4 trillion, rubberstamped by this Congress, House, and Senate and sent to the President for his signature, business as usual, and off we would have gone. And we would have seen ourselves then with a national debt of, oh, let's say, $16.7 trillion, no questions asked, no strings attached. That's what would have happened.

But the American people rose up over the last couple of years, and they formed organizations around this country spontaneously, Project 912 organizations, Tea Party organizations, not by the dozens or the scores—by the hundreds, by the thousands, Mr. Speaker. Organizations by the thousands across this country, some organized, some not, loosely organized, affiliated on each other's email list, paying attention, having meetings, energizing themselves, identifying candidates, running some of their own candidates, becoming candidates themselves, supporting people that will come to this Congress and to the State legislatures all across this land and put our fiscal house in order. That's what's been going on over the last couple of years in this country.

And another thing that mobilized the people in this country was ObamaCare. When the ruling troika at the time, I called it, that would be the Obama-Pelosi-Reid ruling troika, decided that they were going to force-feed ObamaCare down the throat of this country, we saw tens of thousands mobilized to come to this Capitol, to surround this Capitol, to jam the Capitol

to, heck, keep it so packed that people couldn't get in or out, so that they couldn't do business; demand, do not take American liberty, do not nationalize the second-most-sovereign thing we have, which is our health, our skin and everything inside it, but they did.

By legislative shenanigans and unprecedented maneuvering they did force ObamaCare care on us, and we are now hanging in the balance of whether we are able to repeal ObamaCare or whether it becomes the institutionalized roots down deep, permanent and perpetual law of the land.

I thought a wise statement was made a week ago Wednesday morning at a breakfast that I host when the guest speaker said that he believes if Barack Obama is reelected President that ObamaCare gets institutionalized in perpetuity as the law of the land. And if Barack Obama is not reelected, then we will repeal ObamaCare and pull it out by the roots.

That's one of the big things that are at stake, and I have staked a lot of my efforts over the last 23 or so months in working to first defeat and then to repeal ObamaCare. And when we passed the repeal here in the House of Representatives and the language that I drafted went over to the Senate, shortly after that, some weeks after that we took up the defunding of ObamaCare and we passed that legislation with the CR over to the Senate, where it was peeled off and voted down.

But every Republican in the House of Representatives and every Republican in the United States Senate has voted to repeal ObamaCare and has voted to shut off all funding to implement or enforce ObamaCare, every one, and it's been a bipartisan effort also to get those things done.

That's a piece of this large deficit spending that we have, and people said, what does it take for you to vote for this debt ceiling increase that passed the House tonight? And my answer immediately is, just put the repeal of ObamaCare and attach it to the debt ceiling increase, and I will salivate to vote for that.

The first full 10 years and outlays for ObamaCare are $2.6 trillion, according to the chairman of the Budget Committee, $2.6 trillion. So, in comparison, it stays consistent with Speaker BOEHNER's standard for, are we going to have more dollars in cuts than we have in debt ceiling increase; a 2.4 or actually down around a 2.2 debt ceiling increase, compared to a $2.6 trillion repeal of ObamaCare, I think is an okay bargain because we get back our liberty. We get back the chance to manage our health care and purchase a health insurance policy of our choice, one that's created by the market that's produced by the demand of the American people and not one that's managed and defined by the bureaucrats in Washington.

□ 2110

Mr. Speaker, I will just give you an example of what goes on and the oppressive nature of ObamaCare, a socialized medicine proposal that decides what kind of policy we can have and what kind of policy we can't have. Now, that's a constraint that I just can't abide in a free country.

If I want to buy a health insurance policy that has a $10,000 deductible, I want to do that. That's my business. If I want to buy a policy that has a 50 percent copayment for the first million dollars and I want to do that, that's my business. I don't need nanny state telling me what I can and can't buy, but they do.

And now they have concluded, as of a notice that came out today, that every health insurance policy in America that is approved by the Federal Government—that will be every one that you can buy under ObamaCare—shall cover contraceptives—no copayment, no charge, except it gets averaged across everybody else's premium. Contraceptives will become, by edict of the Federal Government, a component of everybody's health insurance policy under ObamaCare.

Now, think about that. We have people that are single, we have people that are past reproductive age, and we have priests that are celibate, all of them paying insurance premiums that cover contraceptives so that somebody else doesn't have to pay the full fare of that? And they have called it preventative medicine—preventative medicine. Well, if you apply that preventative medicine universally, what you end up with is you have prevented a generation.

Preventing babies from being born is not medicine. That's not constructive to our culture and our civilization. If we let our birth rate down below the replacement rate, we are a dying civilization. And right now we are at about 2.1 babies per woman. That is just the replacement rate, that's all it is. And Teddy Roosevelt wrote about that. It isn't committed verbatim to my memory, but he said that any race that doesn't care enough about itself to reproduce itself will essentially become extinct. And he said, I, for one, will not lament their loss, and I shall welcome the advent of a new generation, a new group of people who will care enough to have their own babies.

And now we have a Federal Government that has not just subsidized contraceptives but has written an edict that every health insurance policy will include contraceptives because they consider it to be preventative health care. Now, none of us would have health to worry about if they prevented us, would we, Mr. Speaker?

Now, that is bizarre. It is Orwellian. It is not even counterintuitive. But that's an example of what's going on in this country today, one of the reasons why we have to reverse the political power that is in the White House and in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the $2.6 trillion in the first full 10 years of outlays of the Obama administration is a piece of this irresponsible spending that we have been involved in. And now the administration is driving that 3 to maybe as much as $5 trillion in unnecessary and irresponsible spending and projecting this national debt that goes from $14 trillion on up to $16.7 trillion.

Here are some examples of what we need to do to solve this problem. One, as I said, repeal ObamaCare. Rip it out by the roots, lock, stock and barrel. Pull out all the vestiges of ObamaCare without any particle of DNA left behind so that it can't reproduce and grow back on us. We cannot let that happen. It's an unconstitutional taking of American liberty. It has got to go. It diminishes our vitality, it diminishes our future, and it diminishes our American potential. Pulling ObamaCare out by the roots is one big piece of the solution.

Another big piece of the solution, Mr. Speaker, is to pass the FairTax, the national sales tax, to end the IRS as we know it, and stop punishing people who are producing. We need people in the private sector that are out there creating a profit by their own nature of industriousness, intuitiveness, and entrepreneurialism. And we need to grow the private sector. We need to reward people for doing that. And instead, we punish them.

Uncle Sam has the first lien on all productivity in the country, every bit of it: if you have earnings, savings or investment, if you punch a time clock, if you have a passbook savings, if you have dividends or interest payments that are coming your way or an estate that is coming your way, or if you have capital gains that are coming your way. How about the rent check for an apartment complex that you might have invested in? How about the per acre rent on a farm? How about anything you might sell that you have produced, whether you've got a lemonade stand or whether you are the Donald, Uncle Sam is going to tax your productivity.

He stands there by that time clock day after day. And when you go to work on Monday morning at 8 o'clock and you punch the time clock, you hear that thunk and his hand comes out of his pocket and he holds it out and you go to work. And each dollar you earn goes into his hand until Uncle Sam has enough to satisfy his appetite for the fruits of your labor. When that moment comes in that day—you punch the time card at 8 o'clock—it might be 11 o'clock, it might be 11:30, it might be noon, it might be after lunch that you've finally earned enough that Uncle Sam will put all those dollars you have earned in his pocket and walk away for the day. Then you can go to work for the Governor. It's not as much. He puts that in his pocket. Now you're down to maybe you're doing it for the wife and kids, or the husband and the kids as the case may be. Not a lot is left for us. But the next morning, that wolf is at the door again. And you punch the time clock again, and there

stands Uncle Sam, and out comes his hand, and in goes each dollar you earn until he is satisfied and he puts it in his pocket and he walks away. You do it every single day.

And so why do people go to work when we have over 72 means-tested Federal welfare programs that reward people for not working? Over 72 of them. It can be a heat subsidy, a rent subsidy, SNAP—that's the food stamp program. Now, they had to rename it because ''food stamps'' had a bad image—and the TANF program, and the list goes on and on and on. No one can name all of them from the top of their head, which means no one can analyze how they interrelate or how they motivate people to go to work or not to go to work.

And I will tell you, people will do what you pay them to do. If you pay them to stay home, they'll stay home. If you pay them to have babies, they'll have babies. If you pay them to go to work, they'll go to work. If you give them an unemployment check and you say that you're not going to get this check if you go to work, they're not going to work anymore. Some will out of conscience, yes. We have good, decent people in this country. But by and large, if you pay people not to work, they're not going to show up to work.

So what we need to do is take all that tax off of productivity, put it over on the consumption side, let everybody go to work and earn all they want to earn, save all they want to save, and invest all they want to invest. They get 56 percent more in their paycheck under the FairTax, 56 percent more.

The goods and services that we buy go down in price an average of 22 percent, because in the price of what we're buying is the income tax and the payroll tax of the wages of the people that produced it. Employers have to, companies have to build that price in because they don't pay the tax. Last stop, consumers pay the tax—not corporations, not companies, not producers. They are the collectors. But they are not the payers. They are the tax collectors.

So if we go down that line and cut off and shut off the IRS and repeal and abolish the IRS Tax Code and let people earn all they want to earn and invest all they want to invest and save all they want to save, there will be an incentive there also for savings and investment, and our economy grows dynamically again. And the goods and services that are being produced in foreign countries start to come back here to be produced again.

We, Mr. Speaker, have gotten ourselves in a bad fix. We have exported, because of our tax structure and the bureaucratic burden and the regulatory burden, we have exported a lot of American industry to places like China. And now we buy Chinese goods and we borrow the money from the Chinese to buy the product of the industry that they've created that we've shipped there. And it has been a colossal mistake to turn us in the opposite direction from the industrialized, productive America into the America that sends IOUs to China and brings goods in from China that we used to make while we pay people not to work—$212 billion. Most of it went for unemployment benefits last December.

We pay people not to work. Not just the unemployment benefits; we pay people not to work by the 70-some means-tested welfare programs. And some of those that will work are nudged out of the job because we have a number of 12 million or more illegals in this country, of which about 8 million are statistically working in this economy, every one of them taking a job that an American or a legal immigrant can do.

□ 2120

It is bizarre for us, Mr. Speaker, to pay millions not to work through 70-plus means-tested welfare programs, pay others not to work on unemployment, and accept the idea that illegals come into America and take jobs from Americans, all the while while we shift our industry over to places like China and borrow money from the Chinese and the Saudis to buy things from the Chinese and the Saudis, let alone develop our own energy here domestically where we can, drill in ANWR, the Outer Continental Shelf, more drilling in the Gulf. And yes, I'd trade with Canada and bring that pipeline down here. Let's do business with our best trading partners.

While all of that is going on, and that's a list of some of the things that I lament, Mr. Speaker, but I'd add to that list, we are spending ourselves so deeply into debt that we aren't very many years from not being able to figure out a way to come out. And a constitutional balanced budget amendment is the only solution that I can see that can crack the intransigence of the people over here that believe that we can live in deficit spending in perpetuity, that we can run the debt up in perpetuity, and that we're never going to be held accountable, that we can always borrow and always spend, and we can borrow enough money to buy all of the wants that they have politically so they can pacify their constituents. And yes, it happens over on this side, some, too.

But I want to see a balanced budget amendment come through, and the stage is now set for us to spend the next couple of months marketing the idea of a balanced budget amendment. I want to see the balanced budget amendment that we marked up in the Judiciary Committee. It took 3 days to do so. BOB GOODLATTE drafted and introduced a balanced budget amendment that requires that this Federal Government live under a balanced budget, and it requires that there be a three-fifths majority in both Houses in order to waive that balance.

So if the body here and there decides we have to break that pledge to balance, we have to vote to do so, three-fifths; 60 percent supermajority. If we're going to raise the debt limit, it takes a supermajority of three-fifths to do so under the balanced budget amendment of BOB GOODLATTE. It requires that we spend below the cap of 18 percent of GDP, and we must not exceed an 18 percent gross domestic product cap. That's all the Federal Government can consume. We are up now to 23-something percent. We have to dial it down to a historic average of 18 percent. That is a two-thirds majority to spend above the 18 percent cap of GDP, and it requires a two-thirds majority to increase taxes.

Those are all standards that we need to hold to in this Congress, and it's going to take a two-thirds majority in this Congress to send that balanced budget over to the Senate and on to the States. I will be working to see to it that that happens.

Meanwhile, I just want to speak into the record that I voted no on this bill today that raised the debt ceiling, and I did so for a number of reasons. One of them is the standards that I have just put into the record for a balanced budget amendment are not written into the bill. So a balanced budget amendment might take any form. It might be a form that can simply be waived by a majority of the House and the Senate. That seems a little ridiculous, but I take you to that point because the definition doesn't hold us to any standard. I want to hold to the standard that I have just stated.

Another thing is this bill today does cuts as a condition to increase the debt ceiling; but those cuts are only $17 billion out of discretionary spending for the 1 year that we control, that is 2012 fiscal year. The Ryan budget produced $31 billion in cuts out of the 2012 fiscal year and discretionary; $24 billion less cuts already. It shows we don't have the resolve to do the early cutting, only the promise to do the late cutting. So if you have the late cutting instead of the early cutting, that means we may not be held accountable down the line. Politicians want to push that off on to future Congresses. They don't want to go home and face their constituents in this time.

So I urge that we pass a balanced budget here out of this Congress. We realize that we have taken a small step today. We have to take big steps if we are going to get this country where it belongs. And I look forward to the day I can say to my grandchildren: We did clear a path for you. We did do it right. We did get to a balanced budget, now it's up to you to take this country to the next level of its destiny.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your attention, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 25 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 2, 2011, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2679. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Section 610 Review [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-06-0185; FV06-925-610 Review] received July 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2680. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conditions of Guarantee (RIN: 0570-AA81) received July 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2681. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Emergency Homeowners' Loan Program [Docket No.: FR-5470-I-01] (RIN: 2502-AI97) received July 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2682. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' final rule — Large Trader Reporting (RIN: 3235-AK55) received July 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2683. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Required Warnings for Cigarette Packages and Advertisements [Docket No.: FDA-2010-N-0568] (RIN: 0910-AG41) received July 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2684. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Labeling and Effectiveness Testing; Sunscreen Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use [Docket No.: FDA-1978-N-0018] (Formerly Docket No.: 1978N-0038) (RIN: 0910-AF43) received July 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2685. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-046, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2686. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-051, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2687. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-047, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2688. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-030, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2689. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-045, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2690. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-043, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2691. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-057, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2692. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-034, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2693. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a report entitled, ''Sufficiency Certification for the Washington Convention and Sports Authority's (Trading As Events DC) Projected Revenues and Excess Reserve to Meet Projected Operating and Debt Service Expenditures and Reserve Requirements for Fiscal Year 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2694. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a report entitled, ''Fiscal Year 2010 Annual Report On Advisory Neighborhood Commissions''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2695. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA-365C, SA-365C1, SA-365C2, SA-365N, SA-365N1, AS-365N2, AS-365N3, and SA-366G1 Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0551; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-013-AD; Amendment 39-16714; AD 2011-12-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2696. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Robinson Helicopter Company Model (Robinson) R22, R22 Alpha, R22 Beta, R22 Mariner, R44, and R44 II Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0588; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-074-AD; Amendment 39-16717; AD 2011-12-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2697. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 727, 727C, 727-100, 727-100C, 727-200, and 727-200F Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1272; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-226-AD; Amendment 39-16712; AD 2011-12-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2698. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 737-100, -200, -200C, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0028; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-228-AD; Amendment 39-16716; AD 2011-12-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 384. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 365) to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (Rept. 112–190). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1751. A bill to amend the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 to require that weather radios be installed in all manufactured homes manufactured or sold in the United States (Rept. 112–191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. BONO MACK (for herself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 2715. A bill to provide the Consumer Product Safety Commission with greater authority and discretion in enforcing the consumer product safety laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. considered and passed.

By Mr. KISSELL (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2716. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, impose penalties for failing to report, within a reasonable amount of time, the disappearance or death of a child, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2717. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate one city in the United States each year as an ''American World War II City'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BACHUS, and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 2718. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and expand tax relief for national disasters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 2719. A bill to ensure public access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain in the Hanford Reach National Monument for educational, recreational, historical, scientific, cultural, and other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2720. A bill to clarify the role of the Department of Veterans Affairs in providing a benefit or service related to the interment or funeral of a veteran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 2721. A bill to provide for evidence-based and promising practices related to juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity prevention and intervention to help

build individual, family, and community strength and resiliency to ensure that youth lead productive, safe, healthy, gang-free, and law-abiding lives; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. ADERHOLT):

H.R. 2722. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code, to increase the requirement for American-made content, to strengthen the waiver provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2723. A bill to amend title IV of the Budget Control Act of 2011 to protect the Social Security and SSI programs from budget cuts under such Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2724. A bill to amend title IV of the Budget Control Act of 2011 to protect the Medicaid program from budget cuts under such Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2725. A bill to amend the Budget Control Act of 2011 to protect the Medicare program from budget cuts under such Act; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2726. A bill to amend the Budget Control Act of 2011 to protect education programs from budget cuts under such Act; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2727. A bill to amend title IV of the Budget Control Act of 2011 to protect the Social Security, SSI, Medicare, Medicaid, and education programs from budget cuts under such Act; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 2728. A bill to amend the securities laws to require that registration statements, quarterly and annual reports, and proxy solicitations of public companies include a disclosure to shareholders of any expenditure made by that company in support of or in opposition to any candidate for Federal, State, or local public office; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. BASS of California (for herself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 2729. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend to physician assistants eligibility for Medicaid incentive payments for the adoption and use of certified electronic health records, whether or not such physician assistants practice at a rural health center or Federally qualified health center; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BASS of California (for herself, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas):

H.R. 2730. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to better enable State child welfare agencies to prevent human trafficking of children and serve the needs of children who are victims of human trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERG:

H.R. 2731. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act to provide for demonstration projects designed to expedite the reemployment of unemployed workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 2732. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for temporary student loan debt conversion authority; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2733. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to ensure that the basic allowance for housing in effect for a member of the National Guard is not reduced when the member transitions between active duty and full-time National Guard duty without a break in active service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 2734. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for the participation of the territories in Federal-aid highway discretionary programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2735. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the look-through treatment of payments between related controlled foreign corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 2736. A bill to permit an individual to be treated by a health care practitioner with any method of medical treatment such individual requests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 2737. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make stillborn children eligible for optional life insurance coverage; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 2738. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program of awarding grants to owners or operators of water systems to increase resiliency or adaptability of the systems to any ongoing or forecasted changes to the hydrologic conditions of a region of the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, 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. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 2739. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the increased deduction for start-up expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. CARDOZA):

H.R. 2740. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain population census tracts for which information is not available as low-income communities for purposes of the new markets tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 2741. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the occurrence of diabetes in Medicare beneficiaries by extending coverage under Medicare for medical nutrition therapy services to such beneficiaries with pre-diabetes or with risk factors for developing type 2 diabetes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 2742. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives to employers for providing training programs for jobs specific to the needs of the employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 2743. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of National Forest System land in Pound, Virginia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 2744. A bill to pay personnel compensation and benefits for employees of the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 2745. A bill to amend the Mesquite Lands Act of 1986 to facilitate implementation of a mulitspecies habitat conservation plan for the Virgin River in Clark County, Nevada; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2746. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans to provide for coverage of oral anticancer drugs on terms no less favorable than the coverage provided for intravenously administered anticancer medications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2747. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a cancer center construction loan program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2748. A bill to assess the potential of smart electronics to reduce home and office electricity demand, to incorporate smart electronics into the Energy Star Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2749. A bill to ensure the development and responsible stewardship of nanotechnology; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Homeland Security, 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. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. SUTTON):

H.R. 2750. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the investment tax credit for combined heat and power system property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2751. A bill to authorize a pilot program on enhancements of Department of Defense efforts on mental health in the National Guard and Reserves through community partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 2752. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct onshore oil and gas lease sales through Internet-based live lease sales, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 2753. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide Internet access to Regional Fishery Management Council meetings and meeting records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KISSELL (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. FOXX, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 2754. A bill to provide the Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and the Department of the Treasury with authority to more aggressively enforce trade laws relating to textile and apparel articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KISSELL:

H.R. 2755. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a nonrefundable personal credit to individuals who donate certain life-saving organs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2756. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the 10 percent penalty on distributions from qualified retirement plans for mortgage payments on qualified residences and in respect of unemployment and to increase the age at which distributions from qualified retirement plans are required to begin from 70 1/2 to 75; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2757. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to maintain United States Armed Forces and military contractors in Iraq after December 31, 2011, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. LEE, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 2758. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to protect breastfeeding by new mothers and to provide for reasonable break time for nursing mothers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2759. A bill to require companies to include in their annual reports to the Securities and Exchange Commission a disclosure describing any measures the company has taken during the year to identify and address conditions of forced labor, slavery, human trafficking, and the worst forms of child labor within the company's supply chains; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 2760. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to improve the minting and issuing of coins, to reduce the current excess stockpile of $1 coins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 2761. A bill to amend section 520 of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide flexibility to the definition of rural areas; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 2762. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to reauthorize the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2763. A bill to amend section 402(a)(2)(M) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to extend by two years the special rule relating to eligibility for benefits under the supplemental security income program for certain aliens and victims of trafficking; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MARINO, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 2764. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish weapons of mass destruction intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 2765. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify the requirement that permit applications for the discharge of pollutants be approved by disinterested board members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 2766. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to accelerate the delivery process for highway and public transportation construction projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. OLVER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 2767. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8 West Silver Street in Westfield, Massachusetts, as the ''William T. Trant Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2768. A bill to cancel public debt held by the Federal Reserve System and to lower the public debt limit by an equal amount; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 2769. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for any universal or mandatory mental health screening program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2770. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend for 3 years reasonable cost contracts under Medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RIVERA:

H.R. 2771. A bill to amend Public Law 89-732 to increase to 5 years the period during which a Cuban national must be physically present in the United States in order to qualify for adjustment of status to that of a permanent resident, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUNYAN (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2772. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to permit eligible fishermen to approve certain limited access privilege programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. JONES, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2773. A bill to amend titles 10, 32, and 37 of the United States Code to authorize the establishment of units of the National Guard in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 2774. A bill to repeal the Legal Services Corporation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STARK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SUTTON, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 2775. A bill to repeal a limitation in the Labor-Management Relations Act regarding requirements for labor organization membership as a condition of employment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 2776. A bill to expand geothermal production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 2777. A bill to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor posthumously to Private First Class William P. Fesken of the United States Army for acts of valor during the Vietnam War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 2778. A bill to prevent the overproduction of $1 presidential coins by the United

States Mint in order to efficiently meet collector demand while reducing the surplus of already produced $1 coins in Federal Reserve System vaults, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 2779. A bill to exempt inter-affiliate swaps from certain regulatory requirements put in place by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 2780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the domestic production activities deduction rules relating to allowance of deduction by United States contract manufacturers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2781. A bill to establish a research, development, and technology demonstration program to improve the efficiency of gas turbines used in combined cycle and simple cycle power generation systems; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2782. A bill to provide for a program of wind energy research, development, and demonstration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 2783. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 190-day lifetime limit on inpatient psychiatric hospital services under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 2784. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the deployment of highly efficient combined heat and power property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 2785. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide improved access to physical medicine and rehabilitation services under part B of the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2786. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide social service agencies with the resources to provide services to meet the unique needs of Holocaust survivors to age in place with dignity, comfort, security, and quality of life; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 2787. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by authorizing certified diabetes educators to provide diabetes self-management training services, including as part of telehealth services, under part B of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WOODALL (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 2788. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit a candidate for election to the office of Senator or Member of the House of Representatives from making campaign expenditures for the election from amounts that were not raised during the election cycle for that office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YODER:

H.R. 2789. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to suspend the issuance of $1 coins for a 15-year period, or until excess stockpiles are exhausted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should ensure that the United States does not default on its debt by making every effort to negotiate passage of an increase in the statutory debt ceiling or, all such efforts failing, should use his authority under section 3 of Article II of the United States Constitution to uphold section 4 of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution to pay all debts of the United States as they come due; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution correcting the enrollment of S. 365; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring Wilt Chamberlain and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that any legislative language approved by the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction should not reduce benefits for Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid recipients; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. PEARCE):

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution honoring the service of Sergeant First Class Leroy Arthur Petry, a native of Santa Fe, New Mexico and the second living recipient of the Medal of Honor since the Vietnam War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H. Res. 385. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 12, 2011, as National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MILLER of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. WATT):

H. Res. 386. A resolution recognizing the accomplishments and efforts of John I. Wilson, executive director of the National Education Association, for dedicating his career to education professionals and students, and honoring his retirement; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H. Res. 387. A resolution recognizing that the religious freedom and human rights violations of Kashmiri Pandits has been ongoing since 1989; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. BONO MACK:

H.R. 2715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution the United States Congress shall have power ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''.

By Mr. KISSELL:

H.R. 2716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.''

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 2719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2—The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in the Constitution shall be construed to as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 14 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to promote the general welfare, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H.R. 2728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Ms. BASS of California:

H.R. 2729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. BASS of California:

H.R. 2730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I.

Section 1.

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. BERG:

H.R. 2731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 2732.

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. BORDALLO:

H.R. 2733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to raise and support Armies pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 as well as the power of Congress to organize militias (National Guard) pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 16

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 2734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3, 7 and 18, which grant Congress the authority to regulate commerce among the several states; to establish Post Offices and post roads; and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 2735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7: All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Amendment XVI (16th Amendment): The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 2736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 2737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3, 14 and 18

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 2739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 2740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 2742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 2743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 2744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8, Article 1 of the Constitution, as well as Clause 3, Section 8, Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 2745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitution authority of this legislation lies in the power of congress to regulate commercial activity as described in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitution authority of this legislation lies in the power of congress to regulate commercial activity as described in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. INSLEE:

H.R. 2750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 2751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 2752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 2753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power ''to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.''

By Mr. KISSELL:

H.R. 2754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KISSELL:

H.R. 2755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. LATTA:
H.R. 2756.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Taxation: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. LEE
H.R. 2757.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. MALONEY:
H.R. 2758.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5, which reads: The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which reads: The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. MALONEY:
H.R. 2759.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment 13—Slavery Abolished.

By Mrs. MALONEY:
H.R. 2760.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 5

By Mr. MANZULLO:
H.R. 2761.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate commerce)

By Mr. MANZULLO:
H.R. 2762.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate commerce).

By Mr. McDERMOTT:
H.R. 2763.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution that grants Congress the authority, ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. MEEHAN:
H.R. 2764.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:
H.R. 2765.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:
H.R. 2766.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. OLVER:
H.R. 2767.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution, which empowers Congress ''To establish Post Offices and post Roads''.

By Mr. PAUL:
H.R. 2768.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This legislation is authorized by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution:

By Mr. PAUL:
H.R. 2769.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Parental Consent Act is justified by Article 1, Section 9, which forbids the executive branch from spending money unless it has been appropriated by Congress and Article I, Section I which vest all legislative power in the Congress. These two sections clearly give Congress power to forbid federal funds from being used to support mental health screening programs conducted in public schools without parental consent.

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 2770.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. RIVERA:
H.R. 2771.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 (immigration clause) and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (travel regulation)

By Mr. RUNYAN:
H.R. 2772.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Commerce Clause, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. SABLAN:
H.R. 2773.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:
H.R. 2774.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. SHERMAN:
H.R. 2775.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SIMPSON:
H.R. 2776.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution (''The Congress shall have the Power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . .'').

By Mr. SIRES:
H.R. 2777.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:
H.R. 2778.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clauses 3 and 5 relating to Congress' authority to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among several States, and with the Indian tribes and to coin Money, and regulate the Value thereof

By Mr. STIVERS:
H.R. 2779.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIBERI:
H.R. 2780.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill makes changes to existing law relating to Article 1, Section 7 which provides that ''All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.''

By Mr. TONKO:
H.R. 2781.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1,
All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. TONKO:
H.R. 2782.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1,
All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. TONKO:
H.R. 2783.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1,
All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. TONKO:
H.R. 2784.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. TOWNS:
H.R. 2785.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This Bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, known as the ''General Welfare Clause.'' This provision grants Congress the broad power ''to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 2786.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 2787.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WOODALL:

H.R. 2788.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article. I, Section. 4.

''The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators.''

By Mr. YODER:

H.R. 2789.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8—Powers of Congress

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 49: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 58: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 104: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 181: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 187: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 190: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 198: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 284: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. WU, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 287: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 303: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 361: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 371: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 402: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 420: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 436: Mr. REED, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. CANSECO, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 452: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 458: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 459: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 469: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 488: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 507: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 512: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 531: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 589: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 615: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 642: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 645: Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 687: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 704: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 719: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 724: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 733: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 740: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 820: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 835: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 874: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 883: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 885: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 938: Mr. YODER and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 959: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 997: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 1041: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1057: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1086: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1093: Mr. RIGELL and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
H.R. 1113: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 1154: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1161: Mr. LUJÁN and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 1164: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 1173: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1179: Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. JONES, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1204: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1269: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1327: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. AUSTRIA.
H.R. 1338: Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 1340: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 1342: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 1370: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 1386: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1394: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1418: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 1426: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1464: Mr. FILNER and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 1474: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 1515: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1533: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 1546: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1558: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 1568: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CAPPS, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1574: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 1591: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 1612: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 1620: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1623: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 1625: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 1636: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1639: Mr. COBLE and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1655: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1687: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1697: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1703: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 1704: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1714: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1715: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 1723: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 1742: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1747: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 1754: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1755: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1781: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HIMES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1802: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 1815: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1848: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1852: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1905: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LONG, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1936: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1947: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 1953: Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 1955: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 1987: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1995: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1996: Mr. QUAYLE.
H.R. 1997: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 2005: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 2016: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2086: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RAHALL, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2091: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2104: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2105: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
H.R. 2107: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2140: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2180: Ms. WOOLSEY and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2198: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2215: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 2224: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2229: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2233: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2250: Mr. FORBES and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 2257: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 2267: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2269: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE, and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 2272: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2295: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 2299: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2304: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 2305: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2315: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2324: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 2337: Mr. RIVERA.
H.R. 2346: Mr. FARR and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2353: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2355: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2377: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2412: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2426: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 2433: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 2444: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2447: Mr. KISSELL and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2457: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 2471: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2492: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2497: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 2499: Mr. LANCE and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 2510: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2513: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2514: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2529: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 2541: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
H.R. 2543: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 2575: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2576: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2597: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 2599: Mr. WEST and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2617: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2643: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2644: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2653: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2669: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2671: Mr. DREIER, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2674: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 2677: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 2679: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 2681: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 2698: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2701: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. CRAVAACK.
H.J. Res. 73: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. STUTZMAN.
H. Res. 25: Mr. BURGESS.
H. Res. 60: Ms. WATERS, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. GOSAR.
H. Res. 95: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H. Res. 134: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MARINO, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. ELLISON.
H. Res. 179: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 216: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H. Res. 253: Mr. GARRETT.
H. Res. 271: Mr. HULTGREN.
H. Res. 295: Mr. BURGESS.
H. Res. 296: Mr. HULTGREN.
H. Res. 367: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H. Res. 379: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. Res. 380: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. KLINE.

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 provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce in S. 365 do 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. HOLT

AMENDMENT NO. 92: 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 conduct seismic surveying, oil or natural gas preleasing, or oil or gas leasing activities in the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, or South Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area identified in the Department of the Interior 2012–2017 5-year oil and gas leasing program.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 2011 No. 119

Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable HERB KOHL, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, how majestic is Your name in all the Earth. Long before the birth of the mountains, You have always been God, sustaining the universe with Your commands. Although life's challenges sometimes prompt us to feel that we are rearranging furniture in a burning building, we take comfort in the knowledge that You hear and answer prayer.

We thank You that our lawmakers are striving to find common ground. While work remains to be done, empower them to discover opportunities in this current crisis to build permanent bridges of cooperation as they remember that with many counselors there is safety.

Bless the members of their staffs, who have labored diligently so that we can see the beginnings of a rainbow after the storm. May the sometime unsung heroes and heroines know that You will reward their faithfulness.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable HERB KOHL 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE.)

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable HERB KOHL, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KOHL thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to concur in the House message to accompany S. 627, which is the legislative vehicle for the debt limit increase.

The Senate will recess from 11 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. When the Senate reconvenes at 12:30, the time until 2 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senate expects to vote on the compromise we have reached, hopefully, during today's session. When the vote is scheduled, Senators will be notified.

HISTORICAL REVIEW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want to spend a few minutes with the Senate and the American people to talk to them about this great body in which we serve. I know there are all kinds of pundits and commentators who talk about how the ''system is broken.'' They point to what has been going on in Washington in the last few months and say it shows that we need a complete change in the way we enact laws; that it just doesn't work anymore, and what is going on is terrible, awful.

I want to take a few minutes and historically review what our country is all about.

In the summer of 1787, the Founding Fathers were meeting in Philadelphia, and they were having a very difficult time. They had tried a number of ways in the past to keep the country together. They had the Articles of Confederation. They knew it wasn't appropriate; it wasn't working.

In June of 1787, a delegate from Connecticut came to a conclusion, and he had an idea that he would suggest to other members in the delegation—the Founding Fathers—about how they could come up with a constitution. That is why they were there.

His suggestion was full of merit because they had not been able to solve the problem of the great State of New York, a huge area with millions of people, and the little State of Connecticut, a very small area and a few people—how could those two States be together in the same Union? They had already decided they were going to have three separate branches of government. But the problems they had in Philadelphia those many years ago was how to handle the legislative branch.

The delegate from Connecticut came up with what was called the Great Compromise. His suggestion became part of our Constitution and allowed the Constitution to become real. His suggestion was that we would have one body of the legislature, the House of Representatives, that would be elected every 2 years. If someone died, there would have to be an election. No one in the history of our country has gotten to be a Member of the House without having been elected by their constituents.

The Senate, however, would not be representative of how many people were in the State. Each State would get the same number. That was the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

breakthrough. It was an experiment—a noble experiment. It has worked so well over these many years, where we have the legislative branch consisting of two separate bodies. It is bicameral in nature.

There has been conflict. The Founding Fathers built conflict into the legislative government because they believed that would be enough to offset the power of the judicial and executive branches of government. Over the years, things have been much worse than they have been in Washington in the last 3 months. Our country has been so successful as a result of the Constitution's guidance.

I repeat, the Constitution has been so successful because of the Great Compromise of the legislative branch of government.

In the early days of our country, there was conflict that went on all the time. They were, from the very beginning, thinking: Can this great country survive? Then we had the conflict developing prior to the Civil War. One Congressman and Senator, Henry Clay from Kentucky, was known as the Great Compromiser. He worked for generations to see what he could do to stop the dissolution of the Republic. He was successful in a very difficult time.

One Member of the House was enraged because Charles Sumner was antislavery. He was a fine, extemporaneous speaker. He was so able to express himself, Congressman Brooks came to the Senate floor with his cane and beat Senator Sumner with it. Senator Sumner never really recovered. He was off work for a couple of years, and he had a permanent disability as a result of that beating he took on the Senate floor.

Historic battles have taken place in our country which were much more difficult than what we have just gone through. What we have just gone though has been extremely difficult, but there was never any consideration that the Republic would fall.

In more recent years, we had the civil rights disputes. Mr. President, years before that, the Congress reacted to slavery, and we had the dissolution of slavery. Many years later came the civil rights movement. The debate that took place on the Senate floor was very heated. Filibusters took place that lasted for weeks, not days. There was tremendous acrimony as a result of that issue dealing with civil rights. But we worked through that. It was hard, and people at that time thought Congress was broken.

Congress is not broken. Congress works the way it should. Does that mean it is always a very pleasant, happy place? No. Do I wish it weren't as difficult as it has been in the last few months? I wish it was much better than that. That is where we are.

Through all the years and conflicts we have had, we have been able to come together and reach reasonable conclusions. The great experiment that started in 1787 has been very successful. A number of people have identified our system of government, but I guess the best way to talk about it came from Winston Churchill who said about democracy:

> It has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except for all others that have been tried.

I am not proud of the conflict we have had these last many months, but I am satisfied we have been able to come together to find a solution. It is not over until both Houses of Congress pass the legislation dealing with the debt crisis. It is not over until the President signs the bill.

After weeks of facing off against each other, and this partisan divide we have in the Senate, we were finally able to break through with an agreement, which is typical for agreements that are difficult. No one got everything they wanted. Everyone had to give up something. People on the right are upset, people on the left are upset, and people in the middle are upset. It is a compromise. It is not always easy for two sides to reach a consensus, but that is what we did. We did it on a bipartisan basis.

So I believe reasonable Republicans and Democrats alike understood in this case that without compromise our country faced a very difficult situation. But we did send a message to the world and to the American people that our great democracy is working; as difficult and as hard as it is, it works.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the next 2 days on both sides of the aisle to pass this remarkable agreement that will protect the long-term health of our economy and avert default on our Nation's debt. We still have a lot of problems dealing with the debt. Today, Congress has a unique opportunity and responsibility to show the world what we can achieve, not in spite of our divided government but because of it.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leader time is reserved.

ESTABLISHING THE COMMISSION ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT PROCESSING DELAYS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message to accompany S. 627, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

> Motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 627, ''An Act to establish a Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays,'' with an amendment.

Pending:

> Reid motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill, with Reid amendment No. 589, to cut spending, maintain existing commitments, and for other purposes.
>
> Reid amendment No. 590 (to amendment No. 589), to change the enactment date.
>
> Reid motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on the Budget, with instructions, Reid amendment No. 591, to change the enactment date.
>
> Reid amendment No. 592 (to the instructions (amendment No. 591) on the motion to refer), of a perfecting nature.
>
> Reid amendment No. 593 (to amendment No. 592), of a perfecting nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say a word about the leadership in the Senate. I have the good fortune of working with Senator HARRY REID, our majority leader. In my role as whip, or assistant leader, I have been close at hand when most of the major decisions have been made. I have come to take the measure of this man from Searchlight, NV, and I have found him to be an extraordinary leader.

At first blush, most people would not choose him for his ringing oratory or a commanding presence. But I will tell you that he has created a leadership style in the Senate that is exceptional. I have watched him during the span of the last 2½ years, particularly as he has faced a myriad of challenges: a new President of his own party; passing the stimulus bill, when we didn't have 60 votes on the Democratic side and had to rely on a cross-over vote from three Republican Senators; dealing with the TARP crisis; the recession and what needed to be done to save financial institutions from dissolution; his efforts, as well, on the Health Care Reform Act, which might have been the mightiest political battle I have ever been engaged in; the Financial Reform Act—the list goes on and on.

Then comes this year with the new Congress—divided, with a Republican leadership in the House. He has had to face passage of appropriations bills, continuing resolutions, and now the most recent crisis over the extension of the debt ceiling. He is an exceptional leader.

I think the majority leader is such an exception because of his humility. He is not the first to the camera nor the loudest in speech. He is a person whose word is trusted and who works night and day until we reach our goal. I admire him so much as a friend, and I am proud to be part of his leadership team and Democratic caucus.

I would like to say a word, as well, about Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader. He stepped forward several weeks ago with an exceptional show of political courage when he made a suggestion about how we could find our way through this crisis. It was not a welcome idea on his side of the aisle, and many of his critics took him to task for suggesting how we could get through the debt ceiling crisis. I admired the fact he stood up and understood his responsibility—our responsibility—to the Nation beyond any partisan consideration. Senator MCCONNELL played a critical role in working out the agreement which will come before us and is now pending before the

Senate—or will be pending before the Senate shortly. I thank him. I thanked him last night personally, and I thank him publicly for joining in this bipartisan effort on behalf of the Senate with Senator REID and working directly with the President and Vice President.

I am also happy the leaders in the House—Speaker BOEHNER and the minority leader, Congresswoman PELOSI—were able to work together to come up with this agreement.

There are harsh critics of this idea because, as Senator REID stated earlier, what we have come up with as an agreement is not what I would have written and certainly not what any Senator would have written. There are parts of it that I don't care for at all and other parts I think are very wise. That is the nature of compromise. I do not believe I have compromised my principles as a person or as an elected official in coming to this agreement.

At some point, you have to sit at the table and look the other side in the eye and realize they feel just as strongly as you do, and the only common ground to be found between you is not when you give up or when the other side gives up.

Let me tell you what I think are the pluses and minuses of what we are about to consider during the course of this day. First, we have averted an economic crisis—if both House and Senate should approve this measure. The notion we would default on our national debt for the first time in our history—as of midnight tomorrow night—would be devastating to a weakened economy with more than 9 million Americans out of work. It would have raised America's interest rate on its own debts, adding to our national debt.

As I have said on the Senate floor many times, a 1-percent increase in the interest rate paid by America costs us $130 billion more on our deficit. So the idea of interest rates going up would add to our debt, not solve our debt crisis.

In addition, it would force interest rates up all over America. Individuals, businesses, and families would feel it in their credit card bills, student loan debts, automobile loans, and home loans. Businesses trying to engage in borrowing to expand the size of their business for the developments they are undertaking would feel it. That is exactly the wrong thing to do, as the Federal Reserve strives to keep interest rates low to promote growth, for us on Capitol Hill to do something which would have the opposite impact. So averting this crisis was the No. 1 achievement of any agreement we reached among our leadership.

The fact we don't have to revisit this crisis on a weekly or monthly basis is also a positive step forward. There was a feeling on both sides of the aisle—though not as clearly spoken on one side—that to come back and do this over and over could not help but weaken the role and reputation of the United States and the global economy. So we now have an agreement which will take us to February 2013, beyond the next Presidential election, giving whoever is elected or reelected an opportunity to govern and to manage the economy in a responsible way. I think those are the major achievements.

Secondly, we make a downpayment on the deficit. I think that cuts both ways. We need to address our deficit. This Nation cannot be great, cannot continue to grow while borrowing 40 cents for every dollar the government spends. That is an unacceptable approach, and we need to reduce that dependency on borrowing and reduce the debts we are creating. Reducing spending is the starting point.

I would question whether this is the right moment to do that. I happen to believe, as others do, when we are in a recession and trying to create economic growth, pulling back on spending on such things as training and education and the building of infrastructure makes the situation worse, not better. I didn't prevail in that point of view, and this does not reflect it. But the fact that we will be putting some money down toward reducing our deficit is a positive.

I am also glad that included in this agreement, when it comes to spending cuts, is protection for the most vulnerable people in America. I can't get over how many times Members of the House and Senate get up and make glowing speeches about cutting spending when those projects and programs they are cutting are safety nets for the most vulnerable people in America. We are talking about those who are unemployed and looking for work. We are talking about those who are elderly and poor. We are talking about those who are suffering from physical and mental disabilities. We are a great and caring nation. We have created a safety net of programs so we don't see the homeless on our streets any more than necessary because of the inadequacy of our programs, and we don't turn a blind eye when it comes to the suffering many families are going through.

I am sorry we are making some cuts, but we are protecting most of the safety net programs, such as Medicaid, the health insurance program for the lower income people in America. Who counts on Medicaid? One-third of the children in America have their health insurance through Medicaid. Almost 50 percent of the live births in America are paid for by Medicaid. In addition, many elderly people, even those on Social Security and Medicare, have to turn to Medicaid to sustain them in their nursing home and convalescent home settings. So protecting Medicaid as part of this package is very important as far as I am concerned.

I would also add, the approach we are using is more balanced than some. I want America to be strong and safe. Everyone does. It is part of our Constitution that we swear to uphold. But there is money being wasted in the Department of Defense. There are contracts that are overrun, money overspent, and there is a lack of oversight. We can save money in the Department of Defense to reduce our deficit and not compromise by one penny the safety and security of the United States.

This agreement before us says both the Department of Defense and all other departments of the government have to look for savings and reduction in spending to move us toward our deficit-reduction goal. I think that is good.

What is missing in this package? What is missing is obvious. At its best, this package will reduce our deficit by $2.1 trillion, maybe a little more, when it comes to future spending. Most of us believe unless we can reduce our deficit by $4 trillion, which is almost twice as much, over a period of 10 years, we will not make the positive impact we need to make to spur economic growth and more confidence in the American economy. But Senator REID suggested, as part of this program, we create a joint committee to try to find a way to increase the savings and reduction in deficit in the years to come.

Some skeptics this morning have said that is a typical Washington cop-out; that we are going to create another joint committee. Haven't we had enough? One could make that argument, but I think it overlooks the obvious. We are committed to reducing our deficit. We are committed to creating a joint committee that comes up with specific programs that work. If we fail, there is a penalty. If the joint committee fails to produce a product enacted by the House and Senate, there is a penalty.

Under our legislative language—it is known as a trigger—it says: If you should fail to reduce the spending and reduce the deficit through the joint committee, there will be a price paid—even deeper cuts in spending on both the defense and nondefense sides.

I don't want to see it move in that direction. I hope we can find a more balanced approach and do it through the joint committee, working on a bipartisan basis with appreciation and respect for one another across the table, and we can reach that goal.

Erskine Bowles, former Chief of Staff to President Clinton; Alan Simpson, former Senator, cochaired the commission on which I served. They sat down and created a template for us to reach meaningful deficit and debt reduction over 10 years of over $4 trillion. I took those ideas and with others—Senator MARK WARNER of Virginia, Senator CHAMBLISS of Georgia, Senator CRAPO of Idaho, Senator COBURN of Oklahoma, and Senator CONRAD of North Dakota—sat down with the Gang of 6, and we turned those ideas into what we thought was a legislative approach that would work.

I still think that has merit, and I still think it should be actively considered when we talk about the long-term

reduction of debt. It is bipartisan, it is honest, it achieves real debt reduction, and it does it in the fairest possible way. It puts everything on the table—everything. There are no sacred cows. Everything is on the table. It means it goes beyond spending cuts to the entitlement programs, which makes those of us on the Democratic side particularly nervous. But it also goes to revenue—new revenue—to reduce the deficit, which makes those on the other side of the aisle nervous. But what we should be nervous about is a continuing deficit and a weakening economy and a debt left to our children.

I believe this proposal that is before us now—this agreement of the leaders—should be adopted in a timely fashion. I hope we can move to it today. We are working out with the Republicans a schedule when these matters will be considered. There will be those on the right and the left who will be critical, and I can understand their thinking. It doesn't serve either side particularly well. But it is a compromise and a consensus.

I think of all the people who contacted my office from Illinois and beyond during the last several weeks, begging us to do something, to not let this economy fail, to work together and compromise and find a way to resolve our differences. I think this is a reasonable attempt to do that. I will support it, with some misgivings. But I believe it gives us the way to get through this crisis and to move to a better place where we deal with this deficit and debt in a responsible, bipartisan manner, asking for shared sacrifice from all those across America who can make a sacrifice. That is the nature of our Nation. It is the nature of our history, where time and again we have rallied as a nation to face even more daunting challenges in the past.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 12:30 p.m.

Thereupon, at 11:01 a.m., the Senate recessed until 12:30 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. WHITEHOUSE).

ESTABLISHING THE COMMISSION ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT PROCESSING DELAYS—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2 o'clock shall be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Who yields time? If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally between the parties.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the time under the quorum call be equally divided between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I have come to the floor and talked many times of my constituents back home in Alaska and the importance of ensuring we have a balanced approach in how we deal with this incredible debt crisis we are in and how we manage to create some certainty not only for today but in the years to come. We want to make sure we not only create certainty but we also do what we can to protect working families, honor our commitment to seniors and veterans, and let our small businesses know that we stand behind them, we want them to be successful, and we want to create some certainty out there so they can expand their operations and opportunity.

I am sitting here in Washington, DC, and it is whatever temperature it is outside right now—maybe 100 degrees, with 80 or 90 percent humidity—and sometimes I think we could have gotten this done quicker if we had just turned off the air-conditioning. We probably could have gotten things done quicker, with better results. But we are where we are. We are in the last 24 hours or so before we have to make a decision as to what to do with the proposals, the solutions that have been presented.

I am here, but I wish I were home, to be frank with you. This last weekend, my son was celebrating his ninth birthday, and as a parent every birthday is huge and makes a difference. I know the Presiding Officer knows that very well. So while I am here, they were enjoying life, and it made me think about a lot of things.

I wanted to put this poster up because I think it is a great poster. I got this text during a committee meeting. This is my son, who just turned 9, with a real fish. For those who can't see it, it is the same height as he is. He caught this fish with his mother a few days ago. It is a 40-pounder king salmon. It is what we call a real fish. We consider this small in comparison to some others we catch.

But when I got this text—and that is what is so great about technology: He sends me little notes and comments during meetings and wants to make sure I am connected to what he is doing back home. But this debate we are having—this moment in time—to figure out where we are going is about the Jacobs and the other children of his age and those not yet born. It is about what we are going to do for them. The Presiding Officer and I have already experienced and enjoyed many years of our life, and hopefully we will enjoy many more, but really it is about Jacob and the other children.

When I go back home, I get a chance to talk with the kids. I am sure the Presiding Officer has done the same, where you go into an elementary school—I know the Presiding Officer was a teacher in Sunday preschool—you go in and have conversations with the kids, and in their own way, which is sometimes very brutally honest, they tell you all about what they think is going on. And I will give a quote here in a second of what my son said to me. He doesn't understand everything we are doing, but he understands it is an intense time here because I am not home. I am not with him. So he knows it is important, what we are doing here, as we debate this solution and what will be the next step.

Is what we have come up with a perfect solution? No. Are there some issues about which I am still concerned? Yes. But does it move us down a path to start dealing with the spending, the deficit, and the debt, creating certainty and protecting those who need protection, such as our seniors and our veterans? Yes.

This proposal produces about a $1 trillion downpayment on our deficit and debt. It lays out a process by which we can achieve another $1.5 trillion in debt reduction if this joint committee can come back with a proposal.

In the process of all this, we will create certainty in the marketplace. We will create certainty for that small businessperson who has been thinking about expanding their business. They can do that because the markets will respond positively.

We will create certainty for the individual who was thinking about buying a house or a car because now there will be stable rates.

For those who are putting money aside for the education of their young family, as I have been putting aside for Jacob for his college, we will know now that the markets are better and safer, the bonds we invest in are safer, and our children's future is a little more secure if we do the right thing over the next 24 hours, still knowing it is not the perfect deal.

The proposal evenly splits cutting between half in discretionary and half in Pentagon waste, ensuring we still are a secure nation and protecting our defenses but cutting what I would consider opportunities within the Pentagon to reduce.

As we sit here today, I think about Jacob's future and the futures of all

the kids I see back home. There is an enormous amount of opportunity for the pages sitting here in this room, for the kids here during the summer running around Washington, DC, and seeing these great monuments. That is what we are doing here—guaranteeing those opportunities for this generation and future generations. That is our task, making decisions based on that, not on what our next election cycle will bring should we get elected or not get elected or will this look good or not look good on a brochure. Those who have that kind of thinking are not about this country and are not supporting what this country is all about. I think about all the issues in front of us, and there has been no more critical issue during my almost 3 years in the Senate that I have had to deal with.

Is there a component missing in this solution? Yes. We are not dealing with the tax cuts the millionaires and billionaires received and benefited from when they really didn't need them. We are not dealing with the loopholes, the scams and shams people have taken advantage of with our tax structure. We haven't resolved the question of fairness in our tax structure so that the middle class doesn't continue to carry the burden. We have not created a tax reform strategy that creates an opportunity for us to be more competitive in this world economy. We know that is still a big piece of this.

I am hopeful that the joint committee, made up of Democrats and Republicans, will present to us a plan before Thanksgiving and we can then sit down and look at that plan and realize it is an addition to what we are doing—hopefully in the next 24 hours—in creating more fairness.

I know the amazing thing about here—and I know, Madam President, you know—this place is an unbelievable place for media. We breathe, they report it. We sneeze, they report it. There will be two opinions on how we sneeze—maybe three, maybe four—because that is how it works here. They feed on every word we say, everything we do, and I know some are out there bragging that this is a great deal because it just does cuts, and it doesn't deal with revenues. Then there are others who say it doesn't deal with revenues or it hurts Social Security. We can tell when that occurs, that is probably not a bad plan because there is so much that people don't like of each element or there are elements we don't like. But we do need to deal with revenues at some point.

We will need to deal with a tax reform policy that brings balance and fairness where the middle class does not continue to keep holding the bag for everything.

There is a proposal Senator WYDEN, Senator COATS, and myself have proposed. It is bipartisan. It is tax reform. It creates simplification, creates more corporate competitive rates, reduces the rates down for individuals but gets rid of a pile of these loopholes, these scams and shams that people have taken advantage of so they don't have to pay their fair share for the services and the benefits we all receive in this great country: the roads we drive on, the schools our kids go to, the defense of this country, the border protection of this country, the safest food in the world—you name it, we have it. That is why we are the envy of every country in the world as a place to be and raise your family.

But as I look at this picture—and, yes, I am doing a little marketing of Alaska salmon. I would be remiss if I didn't do that. I think about Jacob's future and what he has and what his potential is. But I also think about his dream—because as he celebrated his birthday, my father-in-law passed the same day. When he was a young man working in Connecticut, he bought a house in New Haven as he went off to Vietnam and served his country. He was a colonel as he retired in the Army, and then he sold that home to buy what is in the background here, his cabin for his grandson to enjoy the fruits of his life and what he enjoyed of his American dream. That is what this is about.

It is about making sure this generation and future generations can also have that American dream; that they have choices and options not restricted by politics or the financial condition of the country but have huge opportunities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 10 minutes.

Mr. BEGICH. I ask for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BEGICH. I think about where we are today.

My son has been watching this because I am not home. He has a phrase he likes to use, even though it is not the perfect deal, but it does create balance. He will say at times: ''Suck it up, buttercup.'' I don't know what show he saw that on, but all I know is that is his phrase. That is what we are going to have to do here. It is not perfect, but we are going to have to do what is right for the next generation and future generations.

Madam President, we have huge opportunities and challenges ahead of us. We have an economy that needs additional work to ensure we are creating every opportunity to create jobs in this country for everybody, no matter who they are, where they live, what age they are. We need to make sure we continue to be the respected country my father-in-law fought for in Vietnam, my son hopes for, we hope for, and future generations hope for.

So today I come down because I think we are close to resolving the issue that has stretched us almost to the brink. Hopefully, as we get beyond this issue we will have the ability as Democrats and as Republicans to look, first, as Americans, as Alaskans, as North Carolinians—wherever we are from—and focus on what is good for this country.

We will hear more over the next 24 hours about the details and more of the deal. I have heard a lot of it already, but the public will learn. There will be pieces we don't like. There will be pieces about which I will get phone calls in my office that people don't like it. We will get calls. But at the end of the day, we are going to do it because it is the right way to move forward. It is going to be tough, and we will get criticism for what we could have done, but we are where we are and we need to move forward.

As my son would say, we have to ''suck it up, buttercup.''

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 6 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, and that Senators during that period of time be permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, for the information of all Senators, after the House votes later today—they have a 1-hour rule, so whenever they take it up they will debate it for 1 hour—it is my intention to try to lock in a unanimous consent to set a vote to complete action on the debt limit increase. This vote could happen either tonight or tomorrow. So I want Senators to be aware of that. Of course, with a consent agreement we could move anytime we wish to this bill, but it would take consent.

When we finish this we have some nominations we have to deal with, and we have to get the FAA issue resolved. But I think this will probably be the last vote we have that I am aware of.

It has been a pretty hard work period we have had, the last two weekends and working late, and I think the Senate deserves to be able to go home as soon as we can. If there were ever a time when we needed to work with our constituents, it is now.

For me, personally, I have been here for a long time. I have a home in Nevada that I haven't seen in months. My pomegranate trees are, I am told, blossoming and have some pomegranates on them. I have some fig trees and roses and stuff that I just haven't seen. I have constituents I am anxious to see, friends I need to visit, relatives I need to visit. So as soon as we can complete our work, I would like to move as quickly as I can to the summer recess period.

So what I would ask is that as the House moves to this bill this afternoon, Senators should use this time to come and talk about the bill, whether they like it or dislike it or are neutral. It would be a time that they could get their remarks on the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I am happy to be the first to take the distinguished majority leader up on his offer and be here on the Senate floor to talk about this very important matter.

I plan on voting no on this proposal. It is a very important matter. It is in many ways the greatest challenge we face as a nation. So I don't come to this decision lightly, but I do come to it firmly for three primary reasons.

First of all, this bill, this so-called solution, doesn't fundamentally change our spending and debt picture. It just plays around the margins. It doesn't make any big change whatsoever.

To put it differently, I don't want to default under any circumstances, but I don't want a downgrade of our credit rating either. From everything the markets and the credit rating agencies—Moody's and Standard & Poor's—have said for months, this would result in a downgrade. This would result in higher interest rates—first for the government and then for all of us—on our home mortgages, on our car payments, and everything else. Why? Because, again, it doesn't fundamentally change our spending and debt picture. It only cuts $7 billion in the first year and $3 billion in the second year, a total in the first 2 years of $10 billion. That is basically a minuscule rounding error in terms of the size of the Federal budget.

Over the next 10 years, we continue to mount up $7 trillion worth of new debt. So we are at $14 trillion now; we are going to add on another $7 trillion of new debt under this plan, and we do nothing to stabilize our debt-to-GDP ratio, which is perhaps the most important metric that economists and others point to.

We need to do better. We need to have some plan to balance the budget. This plan never balances. This plan has mountains of new debt still building. This plan never stabilizes our debt-to-GDP ratio.

Again, I don't want to default. I will vote to avoid a default. But I do not want a downgrade either that costs every American in a meaningful way.

Second, I have looked very hard at the enforcement provisions of this bill, and I am convinced that even the meager numbers in this bill, in terms of cuts, are going to be blown, are going to be waived, because there is no meaningful enforcement. The only thing it will take to bust the numbers in this bill is a new bill that passes by a simple majority in the House and by 60 votes in the Senate. We are constantly looking at those sorts of vehicles, particularly when we are probably going to have disaster appropriations and disaster bills coming to the Congress. There are no real teeth in this bill. There is not adequate enforcement.

To their credit, several Members of this body and several Members of the House have spent months talking about how good, meaningful enforcement mechanisms could work. The Gang of 6 had real enforcement mechanisms that they spent a lot of time on. Senators here, such as BOB CORKER, had meaningful enforcement mechanisms built into their proposed legislation. None of those are in this bill. Those could easily have been adopted. Those could easily have been put in the bill; they were not.

Third, and finally, I am very concerned that the triggers in this bill that are supposed to be there to ensure a second round of savings and deficit reduction are not going to work. I do not see how they are going to incent, particularly the Democrats, particularly the left, to move to a new package of savings and deficit reduction. I think, rather, the triggers will be triggered, and we will have unsustainable defense cuts and also unsustainable cuts to doctors and hospitals in Medicare. That is perhaps another reason, going back to point No. 2, that even the numbers in this bill are not going to hold. They are going to be waived; they are going to be busted.

I have to say I hope I am wrong on all three counts if this bill, in fact, passes. But I have looked at it carefully, soberly, and that is the clear conclusion to which I have come. I hope we can do better. I hope we do better because we must for the American people, because we need to start turning around our completely unsustainable spending and debt situation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I didn't come to the floor to comment on what Senator VITTER just said, and I can sure appreciate his view that a decision that ends up with a $7 trillion addition to the national debt over the next 10 years is not getting us very far down the road compared to what the people of the United States, who have to live within their income, believe this Congress should accomplish. But a $7 trillion addition to the debt over that period of time, compared to what the President suggested we spend over the next 10 years when he issued his budget to Congress, on February 14, we could end up with $13 trillion added to the national debt—so somewhere along the line, between February 14 and last night, when the President announced his support for this compromise, he has come to the conclusion that we could spend $6 trillion less over the next 10 years.

Even though a lot of people see this as not making progress, the President admitted he has found ways of changing his mind about $6 trillion in the course of just a few months. I suppose it also might lead our constituents to think in terms of, there has to be something wrong with the thinking in Washington if, on February 14, they think we have to spend X number of dollars that will add $13 trillion to the national debt and here it is just 3 or 4 months since then and the President goes on television and says this is a good compromise and we can be at $6 trillion less in spending. It probably leads people to believe there has to be a lot of money wasted in Washington, DC, if, in fact, between February 14 and last night, the President can find consensus in spending $6 trillion less over the next 10 years. That is a comment on what Senator VITTER just said and not disagreeing with Senator VITTER's comments in any way.

When we are in the Senate of the United States talking about what to do about the deficit situation and how much deficit spending we are having, it probably gets lost in the minds of people that what we are spending today and adding to the national debt is creating a great legacy of debt to leave to our children and grandchildren. This debate around this issue brings me to this question: Is it fair to tax our children and grandchildren just because they cannot vote? Our children and grandchildren, for the most part, do not have any voice in this, except what is given by our generation and people representing the older generations, other than our children, making these decisions. That is because we, in fact, are doing just that; taxing our children and grandchildren by adding to the national debt. That is what we are doing with our irresponsible budget deficits.

We have a choice between a brighter future for our descendants or more social spending now; more social spending or, as President Obama might put it, investments. Any way we look at it, money we spend today and we do not pay for, we are putting this bill on future generations—our children and grandchildren. This is a choice we should be thinking about as we arrive at a decision of whether to vote for or against this grand compromise that has come out of these negotiations.

It gets down to basic choices of what do we do to encourage private sector employment. It gets down to choices of what we do about the size of government. There is a real choice in this debate as we talk about how big government should be. The choice is, do we grow government or do we grow the private sector?

What are the philosophical differences as well as the economic differences between growing government versus allowing business and entrepreneurship to flourish in America? We have had these dramatic increases in expenditures over just the last 2 years; 22-percent increases in appropriations in the last 2 years, when the economy only grows about 2 percent. Everybody knows that is not sustainable. On top of that, we had a $814 billion stimulus package that did not do what it was supposed to do to keep unemployment under 8 percent. At this time, we have

gone from the national debt being 35 percent of the gross national product to today being about 65 percent and before the end of this year it is going to be 72 percent. And it is on a path to go to 90 percent. So we have seen government grow during the last few years out of proportion to the 20 percent of the gross national product that the public sector, represented by the Federal Government, took, compared to that growth from 20 to now 25.

Those 5 percentage points of growth in the government may not seem like a lot but just look at the difference between incentives for growth of the private sector for creating wealth as opposed to the Government consuming wealth. That is a fact. Government consumes wealth; it doesn't create wealth. People who are using their labor and their minds and investing are the ones who create wealth in our country. Those 5 percentage points make a difference because it is a very dramatic growth in government. As government consumes more—and I said it does not create wealth—it takes money out of the private sector, where it can grow more and create jobs and, consequently, then limits the opportunity for expanding the economic pie. That is what the private sector does through investment and labor, expands the economic pie. We can have economic growth so we can have more for more people.

But when government gets bigger, we restrict the opportunities for economic growth in the private sector and we have less pie for more people.

So a 5 percentage point growth in the government for the last 5 years compared to a 50-year average lessens the chance for a brighter future for our children and grandchildren, and that has to be a part of this debate as we decide the size of government versus the size of the private sector—the wealth-producing private sector.

If we keep government at 20 percent, then that is going to leave more in the private sector that is going to create wealth. It is going to be a more productive use of our resources.

The promise of our free market system can only be realized if we choose less social spending, if we choose less intrusive regulation and more efficient use of our resources in the private sector as opposed to the public sector.

We should be doing those things not only in this budget agreement, this deficit reduction agreement, but in all the decisions we make in the Congress. We should be doing more to encourage productive uses of our resources in the private sector, rather than consumption of those resources in the public sector.

President Obama has launched a campaign over the 30 months he has been in office to defend the welfare state and of course the woefully inefficient government-run health care system that is an example of that welfare state. I think we can learn some lessons from the rest of the world as well in looking at what is right for America. We should learn from history and not repeat the mistakes that have been made in other countries.

Since the 1950s, we have seen a lot of countries around the world use transfers of wealth from one generation to another or the transfer of wealth from one group of people to another. We have seen grants. We have seen a redistributive philosophy in a lot of countries. What did that do? It did very little to raise the living standards of those in Asia, Latin America, Africa. More open economies have proven otherwise. More open economies as we have had in Japan since the 1950s have lifted more people out of poverty in 10 years than welfare state programs have done in 50 years.

Japan—just using it as an example—forced its producers 50, 60 years ago to compete. Private sector resources are more productive than those of the public sector making the decisions on how to use those resources, or a command economy, as you might call it. After Japan, we had Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore. More recently, in the last 20 years, China and India have been encouraging more competition and more productive uses of resources with less of it promoted by the government. There are more decisions being made by the private sector in Brazil, and even parts of Africa are learning that is the route to go. We should learn from that. We should not turn backwards and rely more on government than we have in the past. By doing that, we retire opportunity in America. We retire opportunity by growing government at the expense of individual initiative. I hope we don't go that route. I think this budget debate has something to do with whether we are going to turn this around from the direction that it has taken over the last few years. Those last few years have not just been the 30 months of this Presidency but a little bit going back into the previous Presidency as well.

In regard to President Obama's programs, we have had few results from the government becoming more involved in the economy. We have dealt with near zero interest rates for a long period of time. I have already mentioned the $814 billion stimulus. There are other things that have been done in recent months to turn this economy around. We still have unemployment above 9 percent. The recovery that was supposed to come from all of these programs that have had greater government involvement in our economy have made a recovery very elusive.

In fact, there are even questions in the media recently of whether we could be going into another recession. President Obama tried mightly and wastefully—and in the end, very ineffectually—to turn this economy around through a massive number of government programs, but it has not worked. Progress would have been greater if we had tried programs by President Reagan or even President Kennedy's policies. In both of those instances they cut marginal tax rates. They eliminated burdensome regulations. Instead, what do we have out there right now even today coming from the White House? Promises yet of higher taxes; almost a demand that Congress pass higher taxes right now, and more regulations.

I just recently read about a businessperson saying there are 29 onerous regulations coming out of EPA that will be detrimental to job creation because they are so costly. Another way of putting it is it might cause businesspeople to worry about the uncertainty of what government is going to do. When we have that uncertainty—and right now there is a heightened uncertainty—it retards growth. It retards growth because people will not invest. When there is not increased investment and hiring, there is less productivity. What these issues are all about is creating jobs, and we are not creating jobs right now. That is what people are going to see as a test as to whether we are out of a recession—regardless of the leading economists who made the decision that we have been out of a recession now for 2 months.

For people who are unemployed, it is not a recession; it is a depression. They are going to measure coming out of a recession or coming out of a depression by whether they have a job. Jobs are not being created.

President Obama promises what he wants is something that is fair and balanced. When I hear him talking about ''fair and balanced,'' I wonder if he is trying to steal those words from Fox News. Why is it fair to distribute more welfare to the present generation and today's voters by growing government at the expense of the wealth-creating private sector? That harms our children and our grandchildren who are going to end up paying for it with less productive uses of the resources of this country.

We should not be thinking, as Europe has thought, about growing government, having government consume more of the resources of the economy, leaving less to individuals to make decisions whether to save or spend and what to save and what to spend on. That is the way it is done in Europe. We should not go that way.

I always use a statistic that may seem so small to be insignificant, but I use a statistic of 1 percent. If we compare the United States with Europe over the last 25 years, our growth has averaged about 1 percent more in the United States than in Europe. Now that 1 percent may not sound like very much, right? However, over a generation, just 1 percent difference in growth—between the economy of Europe and the economy of the United States—adds up to 25 percent differential in per capita income.

It seems to me the issues of this debt reduction debate—or if you want to call it increasing the deficit ceiling, the borrowing capacity of the Federal Government—too often tend to be

about what is the situation right now, but it is really a debate about what is fair for our children and grandchildren because those are the decisions on borrowing that we are making today.

I have to go back to where I started with a question of whether it is fair for us to tax future generations for the borrowing that we are doing today, and simply say it is not fair to tax future generations just because they cannot vote.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I want to say a few words to my fellow Vermonters and anyone who might be interested as to why I will be voting against this deficit-reduction package when it comes to the floor. The reason is pretty simple. This deficit-reduction package is grotesquely unfair, and it is also bad economic policy. It should not be passed.

The wealthiest people in this country and the largest corporations are doing phenomenally well. In a recent 25-year period, 80 percent of all new income created in America went to the top 1 percent who now earn more income than the bottom 50 percent. In terms of wealth, the United States has the most unequal distribution of wealth of any major country on Earth with the top 400 people owning more wealth than the bottom 150 million Americans.

When we talk about this deficit-reduction package with the richest people becoming richer, huge corporations making billions of dollars in profits and in some cases paying nothing in taxes, how much are those people—the wealthy and the powerful—asked to contribute toward deficit reduction and shared sacrifice? How much are the rich and the powerful going to contribute into this deficit-reduction package? The answer is zero. Not one cent.

Meanwhile, as everybody in America knows, we are in the midst of a horrendous recession. Real unemployment is over 16 percent. People have lost their homes, their life's savings. We have the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world. Yet this deficit-reduction package comes down on those people—the working families, the low-income people, the sick, the elderly, the children. The rich pay nothing. Large corporations pay nothing. Yet working families and the most vulnerable people in this country are going to be shouldering the burden of deficit reduction on their shoulders. That is immoral, that is wrong, that is bad economic policy.

Mr. President, as you well know, this is a complicated package, and nobody can predict with any certainty exactly what programs will be cut and how much they will be cut because the process will kick in to the appropriations committees all over, the House and the Senate, and they will go to a supercommittee that will make very significant decisions. Nobody with certainty can tell exactly what programs will be cut.

What we can say is we are looking at up to $1.4 trillion in cuts, and virtually every program that working families depend upon, that our children depend upon, that the sick depend upon, is on the line.

In my State, for example, it gets cold. We have a beautiful State. We love our winters, but it gets cold. It gets 10 below zero, 20 below zero. Many people in my State, including senior citizens, desperately need a program called LIHEAP, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, which provides help to many people, including a lot of seniors, to help keep them warm when it gets 20 below zero. I fear very much there will be major cuts in that program.

In our State we have done very well in expanding community health centers. We have over 110,000 people now accessing new community health centers, finally being able to get a doctor and dentist when they need it. I am going to do everything I can to prevent those cuts. I fear that those programs can be cut.

In Vermont, in Connecticut, all over this country, we have a major crisis in childcare. Families want to get into the Head Start Program. They want affordable childcare. Those programs will be cut.

In my State, we have a program that helps struggling dairy farmers, a program called the milk program. It helps them stay in business. I fear very much—and I am going to fight against this—I fear that program will be cut.

We have young people today from working-class families hoping upon hope that maybe they will be able to afford to go to college. Well, we can expect major cuts in Pell grants and other programs that make college affordable for our young people.

In this country, we have people who are going hungry. We did a study recently. There is more hunger among seniors. Some of those programs will be cut. Affordable housing programs will be cut.

So let's not kid ourselves. In the midst of a terrible recession, when so many people are hurting, so many people are struggling just to keep their heads above water economically, this deficit-reduction package is going to slap them at the side of the head and make life much more difficult for them.

Now, Mr. President, as you well know, this is a two-part program. The first part calls for approximately $900 billion in cuts, and the second part calls for about $1.2 trillion to $1.5 trillion in cuts. Here is where it gets a little bit complicated because a supercommittee, made up of six Democrats and six Republicans, will have the opportunity to look at everything.

As the majority leader said, everything is on the table. Now, what does that mean? If everything is on the table, Social Security is on the table. What we have heard from our Republican friends, what we have heard from some Democratic friends, what we have heard from the President of the United States is that maybe we should adopt a so-called chained CPI, which will result in very significant cuts in Social Security benefits. If you are 65 now and that program is implemented, when you are 75, you are going to lose $560 a year, and 20 years from now, when you are 85, you are going to lose $1,000 a year. Am I saying that definitely will happen? No, I am not.

Social Security will be on the table. Medicare will be on the table. Medicaid will be on the table. Everything will be on the table.

If that committee ends up not coming to a decision, if they end up being deadlocked, say, six to six, then we go to a sequestration program and more cuts will be made.

So I would say, when poll after poll after poll suggests strongly that the American people want shared sacrifice—a poll just came out last week from the Washington Post where 72 percent of the people polled said they believe folks making more than $250,000 a year should pay more in taxes in order to help us with deficit reduction. Poll after poll says it is absurd that large corporations get incredible loopholes that enable them to make billions of profits and not pay one nickel in taxes.

So this is a bad proposal. This is an unfair proposal. We can do better, and we must do better. I do not intend to vote for a deficit-reduction package where the sacrifices are being made by people in the middle class and working class who are already hurting. It is time for the big-money interests to start remembering they are also Americans and they should contribute to deficit reduction.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF MATTHEW OLSEN

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, later on this afternoon the Senate Intelligence Committee is going to vote

out the nomination of Matt Olsen to be the next Director of the National Counterterrorism Center. I rise today in support of the nomination of Matthew Olsen to be the next Director of NCTC.

Following the September 11 terrorist attacks, we did a lot of self-examination as a government and, putting it simply, realized that pieces of intelligence that should have been connected had not been or, in other words, the dots had not been connected. Congress understood we could not afford another lapse like 9/11, so it created the National Counterterrorism Center to analyze and integrate counterterrorism information across the government.

While we have not suffered another 9/11, our record is not perfect. From the Christmas Day bombing attempt, to Fort Hood, Times Square, and the New York subway plot, the threats to our homeland are very real. At the same time, changing political landscapes and challenges from adverse nations require constant attention. In this environment, it is essential for NCTC to perform its mission beyond reproach.

After the Christmas Day near-bombing aboard flight 253, the Senate Intelligence Committee conducted a review to determine where the intelligence community could have done a better job of anticipating this attempted attack. Unfortunately, the committee's review showed that NCTC had not lived up to its statutory responsibilities. The then-Director, Mike Leiter, to his credit, took criticism in a very positive way and made the right kinds of changes at NCTC to move us in the right direction.

While I am encouraged by the progress NCTC has made since then to repair those shortcomings, there is much work that still needs to be done. I believe Matt Olsen has the right background to take the helm of this important intelligence center at this very critical point in our history. He is no stranger either to the Senate Intelligence Committee or to the serious threats that face our Nation. Members and staff have worked with him on several high-profile issues over the last few years.

As a Deputy Assistant Attorney General for the National Security Division, he was responsible for ensuring that our intelligence professionals had all the legal authority they needed from the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court in order to continue this country's safety. Let me just say this was no easy task and the stakes were high, especially given the political wrangling over FISA and the USA PATRIOT Act in recent years. Matt spent countless hours briefing our staff and other committees on many highly sensitive FISA issues. In large part because of his willingness to stick to the facts and not play political games, he has earned the respect of Members on both sides of the political aisle.

For the last year, Matt has served in a very professional way as the General Counsel for the National Security Agency, a position that has also put him in close contact, again, with the Intelligence Committees.

GEN Keith Alexander, who heads up NSA, provided a letter of support for Matt's nomination. I have also spoken personally with General Alexander about Matt. I have a great deal of respect for the general, and it speaks volumes to me that he has such high, unequivocal praise for Matt, both as a leader and as a person.

Matt's other job—not an enviable one—which brought him in close contact with the committee was his service as the Executive Director of the Guantanamo Review Task Force. I have had numerous conversations with Matt about some of the recommendations made by the task force on transferring what I believe continue to be potentially dangerous detainees.

I appreciate that the task force was following a deadline set by Executive order to close Guantanamo Bay. But I believe we have accepted too great a risk to our national security by transferring many of these detainees to other host countries. The recidivism rate continues to climb. It is today somewhere in the range of 26 percent. We have no reason to expect it will stop climbing anytime soon. Our first obligation must always be to ensure the safety of the American people, not to transfer dangerous detainees to meet an arbitrary political deadline.

Of particular concern to me are the transfers of a number of Yemeni detainees during 2009, when the intelligence community was already warning about the dangerous security situation in Yemen. Of course, we all know that al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula makes its home in Yemen and that several former GITMO detainees now hold high positions in AQAP. AQAP was directly responsible for the Christmas Day bombing attempt, and their efforts will continue to inflict harm on our Nation.

Matt acknowledges the difficulties presented by the Yemeni transfers, and he has acknowledged that the task force did not get every recommendation right, just as the previous administration did not get every recommendation right. He also shares my personal view that Guantanamo should remain open so that we are not transferring any more detainees as the recidivism rate continues to grow.

I appreciate the many conversations and briefings he has had with my staff on those transfer issues. I appreciate his willingness to continue to discuss these issues and the need for a long-term detention policy even after taking on his new position as NCTC Director.

Ironically, in his new position, he will be responsible for tracking former detainees, including detainees whose transfer the task force may have recommended who slipped into their old ways, before they can strike us again. It was in this capacity that Matt had an issue with a colleague, and I have vetted this with Matt and with most of those who were in the room on the occasion the issue arose. While better judgment could have been used, the issue is now behind us. I have impressed upon Matt that if he is confirmed as the Director of NCTC, his credibility must be unquestionable. He has confirmed to me that he will always communicate with Members of Congress fully and openly without political censorship. He also is committed to being totally open and will have an ongoing dialog with members of the respective House and Senate Intelligence Committees.

My good friend Senator KENT CONRAD, who is actually the home Senator for Matt since he is originally from North Dakota, spoke extensively about Matt's reputation and commitment to public service during his confirmation hearing. Many intelligence professionals on both sides of the political lines wrote letters of recommendation on Matt's behalf.

I believe Matt when he tells me he is committed to working closely with Congress and the Intelligence Committees to do the job needed to keep this country safe. I will be supporting his nomination when it comes to the floor, and I look forward to working with him.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, the Senate Intelligence Committee just approved the nomination of Mr. Matthew Olsen to be the Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, known as NCTC, by a unanimous voice vote.

The distinguished vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee spoke on the floor earlier in support of this nomination. I would like to add to his comments and offer my support so that the Senate can take up this nomination quickly and hopefully confirm Mr. Olsen before the Senate goes on its August recess.

I have tried to move quickly on this nomination because the period leading up to the tenth anniversary of 9/11 is a period of heightened threat, and one in which all parts of the national security agencies of the government need to be operating at full capacity.

Mr. Olsen is currently the general counsel of the National Security Agency and has held a number of senior positions in the Department of Justice, including at the National Security Division and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Let me take just a moment to discuss the current terrorist threat and the role of the National Counterterrorism Center, or NCTC, which Mr. Olsen will be leading, if confirmed.

The NCTC is the central agency within the U.S. government dealing with the identification, prevention, disruption, and analysis of terrorist threats. While it is best known for its role in consolidating and analyzing terrorism-related intelligence, the NCTC also plays an important role in conducting strategic planning for counterterrorism actions across the U.S. Government.

As I mentioned before, I believe that the period leading up to the tenth anniversary of the 9/11 attacks is a period of heightened threat. Despite counterterrorism pressure against al-Qaida in Pakistan—including the successful strike against Usama bin Laden in Abbottabad—the group remains dangerous and vengeful.

At the same time, the threat from al-Qaida's affiliates and adherents around the world has increased and presents particular challenges. I am especially concerned about the threat to the U.S. homeland from al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, AQAP, as well as threats emanating from terrorist safehavens in Somalia and elsewhere.

This means, to me, that this is a crucial time for our counterterrorism establishment to be at full strength. And the NCTC is a linchpin of that establishment.

So I am pleased that the President moved quickly to nominate Mr. Olsen—an individual serving in a senior intelligence community position today—to take the helm of the National Counterterrorism Center.

As I mentioned previously, Mr. Olsen is currently the general counsel of the National Security Agency. In that capacity, he has the challenging job of ensuring that the NSA's highly technical and highly capable signals intelligence system is operating fully within the law, and using all legal authorities available to it.

Before his current position at the NSA, Mr. Olsen served in the Department of Justice in several capacities for 18 years, including 12 years as a Federal prosecutor.

Among Mr. Olsen's positions at the Department of Justice, which has been the subject of some recent attention, was that of executive director of the Guantanamo Review Task Force created by Executive Order 13492. The role of the task force was to conduct a detailed review of all of the information available on each of the roughly 240 detainees being held at Guantanamo as of January 2009.

It was Mr. Olsen's job to lead the large, interagency effort of more than 100 national security professionals to compile and analyze all intelligence relevant to the detainees, the feasibility of prosecuting them, the ability of a potential country receiving a detainee to mitigate the threat the detainee posed, and whether some detainees should be held in long-term Law of War detention.

I will say this to my colleagues. Being the director of a large task force making recommendations on Guantanamo detainees is about as thankless, as difficult, and as controversial a position that I can imagine. Every decision would be reviewed and criticized. But the new Attorney General asked Mr. Olsen to take on this job, and he agreed to do it. That is what we admire about career professionals in government service. And we should respect and reward that dedication and willingness to take on the difficult and unpopular jobs.

I note as well that Mr. Olsen has been recommended by his current and past colleagues in the current and the past administration. The Intelligence Committee received letters of recommendation from General Alexander, former Attorney General Mukasey, former DNI McConnell, all three former assistant attorneys general for National Security, former NCTC Director Mike Leiter, and many others. They have all spoken to his capability and to his character.

I believe that Mr. Olsen is well qualified for the position, that he will be forthcoming with Congress, and that he will do a good job in leading the NCTC.

Prior to serving on the Guantanamo Review Task Force, Mr. Olsen had been the Acting Assistant Attorney General for National Security at the Department of Justice as well as the deputy assistant attorney general with responsibility for intelligence matters.

He led the Department's effort to update the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, a process that eventually led to the passage of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008. In that position he worked closely with both sides of the aisle, and was an invaluable resource as we found a compromise to update important surveillance authorities and strengthen civil liberty protections.

Mr. Olsen was also previously a federal prosecutor in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia, chief of the office's National Security Section, and a special counsel to FBI Director Robert Mueller.

The Intelligence Committee has thoroughly reviewed Mr. Olsen's background, he has answered all of our questions, and we held a hearing on July 26 on his nomination. In sum, our due diligence is complete.

Now it is up to the Senate to confirm Mr. Olsen so that we do not leave the NCTC without a permanent director as we approach the 10th anniversary of 9/11.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the agreement that has been reached between the leaders in the Senate, the House Republicans and Democrats, and the President of the United States with respect to an extension of the debt limit and certain deficit reduction steps to be taken in conjunction with that action.

I wish to remind my colleagues that if we fail to act, most economists believe we will face an interest rate spike. For every 1 percentage point increase in interest rates, we would add $1.3 trillion to deficits and debt over 10 years. If there was only a 200-basis point increase, that would wipe out all the deficit reduction that is in this package.

Colleagues need to keep in mind the consequences of our actions and how critically important it is to prevent that interest rate spike.

In addition, David Beers at Standard & Poor's, global head of Sovereign Ratings, made a statement in an interview on CNBC on July 26. The chart is headlined, ''To avoid a U.S. credit rating downgrade, S&P wants to see a bipartisan debt reduction effort.''

He said this, specifically:

> We will measure this matter on a number of parameters. One is, is it credible? And credibility, among other things, means to us that there has to be some buy-in across the political divide, across both parties, because politics can and will change going forward. And if there's ownership by both sides of the program, then that would give us more confidence. . . . It is not just about the number. It is about the all-in intent.

However imperfect this agreement is—and it is imperfect because, after all, it is a work of the hands of men. We are all imperfect. But it is critically important. It is important to demonstrate that we can work together to achieve a result.

This package contains these elements: First, it prevents a default. It saves the Nation from immediate economic crisis. It creates a process to allow a debt ceiling increase to 2013, so we don't have to reenact this entire episode in just a matter of months. It provides a $900 billion downpayment on deficit reduction that is enforced with 10 years of spending caps. It creates a joint select committee of Congress on deficit reduction, tasked with finding an additional $1.5 trillion in savings and to bring us a report before Thanksgiving. This select committee has a goal of $1.5 trillion in savings as a floor; it is not a ceiling. This committee could come back to us with an even more ambitious, more bold proposal to get our fiscal affairs in order. Let us hope that it is so.

The overall package that is before us—or about to be before us—requires a vote on a balanced budget amendment. The debt ceiling increase is not contingent on its passage, but there is a requirement to give colleagues in both Chambers an opportunity to vote. It also protects Pell grants from deep near-term cuts. I think most of us understand how important Pell grants are to providing opportunities to young, talented people all across America to improve themselves through higher education.

I was raised by my grandparents. My grandmother was a schoolteacher. We called her ''little chief,'' because she was only 5 feet tall. But she commanded respect. She commanded respect because she had character, and she told people in our family there are three priorities in this household: No. 1 is education. No. 2 is education. No. 3 is education.

We got the message. I can remember, fondly, her telling us over and over: What you put in your head no one can take away. They can take your property, they can take your wealth, but one thing nobody can take from you is what you have done to improve your mind. That ought to be something that is taught in every household in our country because it is central to America continuing to be a world leader.

The proposal that will be before us also creates a joint select committee on deficit reduction. As I have indicated, they have a goal of finding an additional $1½ trillion in savings, but they are not limited to that level of savings. They could do more. It is bipartisan and bicameral, 12 Members—6 Democrats, 6 Republicans. Congress is to have a report by Thanksgiving on their work. No amendments are allowed and a simple majority vote to pass in the Senate and the House.

This closely follows the recommendation of Senator Gregg and myself from 5 years ago to create a commission empowered to bring to a vote in the Senate and the House a plan to get our debt under control and to do it so we wouldn't have the endless process our current situation requires. The idea was to create a BRAC-like system, so a proposal could come before the Senate and the House to get our debt down. It is modeled, in many ways, after the reconciliation process that was designed for deficit reduction and only requires a simple majority vote.

There is a fail-safe if this committee fails to produce a result. The fail-safe is across-the-board cuts in defense and nondefense spending, with exemptions for Social Security, veterans and low-income people and it limits the Medicare reductions to 2 percent. I would prefer the Medicare reduction not be there because there is no revenue that is assured in this plan. But we do have to have a fail-safe. We do have to have some assurance that savings are actually realized, and this mechanism does that.

I think all of us know our current status finds us borrowing 40 cents of every $1 we spend. In fact, we are in a condition in which the United States is borrowing more than we have ever borrowed before as a share of our national income. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has told us the long-term outlook is even more sober; that we have a debt held by the public that is about 70 percent now. Right here—the debt held by the public is at about 70 percent. Our gross debt is actually approaching 100 percent, but our publicly held debt—that is debt held by the public, not counting what we owe to trust funds such as Social Security—is about 70 percent.

But look where we are headed if we stay on our current course. The Congressional Budget Office tells us by 2037 our publicly held debt will be 200 percent of our gross domestic product if we fail to act.

How did we get into this circumstance? This says it very clearly and very well. The red line is the spending line of the United States and the green line is the revenue line going back 60 years. What we can see is the red line—the spending line—is the highest it has ever been. Twenty-four percent of gross domestic product is Federal spending. The revenue line is the lowest it has ever been in that period—the lowest it has been in 60 years. Some of our friends on the other side say we just have a spending problem. They have it half right. We do have a spending problem. Spending is almost the highest it has been in 60 years. But we also have a revenue problem because revenue is the lowest it has been in 60 years as a share of our national income. That is a fact. So we have to work both sides of this equation.

If we go back and reconstruct how we got into this ditch, a story on May 1, 2011, in the Washington Post, is instructive. This is what they found:

> The biggest culprit, by far, has been an erosion of tax revenue triggered largely by two recessions and multiple rounds of tax cuts. Together, the economy and the tax bills enacted under former President George W. Bush, and to a lesser extent by President Obama, wiped out $6.3 trillion in anticipated revenue. That's nearly half of the $12.7 trillion swing from projected surpluses to real debt. Federal tax collections now stand at their lowest level as a percentage of the economy in 60 years.

This buttresses and confirms the point I just made. In addition, if one examines our history going back to 1969 and looks at the five times we have balanced the budget, in each of those times, revenue was almost 20 percent of GDP. Right now—remember what I just said—revenue is 14.8 percent of GDP. The five times since 1969 we have balanced the budget, revenue was 19.7 percent of GDP in 1969; in 1998, it was 19.9 percent; in 1999, it was 19.8 percent; in 2000, it was 20.6 percent; and in 2001, it was 19.5 percent. By the way, all these budgets—these last four—were the responsibility of Bill Clinton. Bill Clinton not only balanced the budget, he stopped using Social Security funds to finance other government operations, and he did it with the longest period of uninterrupted growth in our Nation's history and created 23 million jobs. The Clinton administration record on deficits, on debt, on economic growth, and job creation is the best, by far, of all modern Presidents.

Facts are stubborn things. We have a Tax Code that is riddled with tax expenditures. It is riddled with tax expenditures. We are losing to the Treasury $1.1 trillion a year to tax expenditures—tax preferences, tax loopholes, tax deductions, tax exclusions. Guess who gets most of the benefit. Twenty-six percent of the benefit goes to the top 1 percent of those tax expenditures—those tax loopholes, those tax preferences.

Here is a quote from one of the most conservative economists in America—Martin Feldstein, professor of economics at Harvard, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Reagan. This is what he said about tax expenditures on July 20 of last year.

> Cutting tax expenditures is really the best way to reduce government spending. Eliminating tax expenditures does not increase marginal tax rates or reduce the reward for saving, investment or risk taking. It would also increase overall economic efficiency by removing incentives that distort private spending decisions. And eliminating or consolidating the large number of overlapping tax-based subsidies would also greatly simplify tax filing. In short, cutting tax expenditures is not at all like other ways of raising revenue.

That is precisely why the fiscal commission and the Group of 6—both groups I was proud to participate in—chose the reduction of tax expenditures as one way of reforming the tax system, improving the competitive position of the United States, and raising revenue to help reduce this debt threat.

Anybody who wonders what is happening with respect to loopholes—exclusions, deductions, preferences in the Tax Code—doesn't have to go any further than this picture I have shown many times. This little five-story building—Ugland House, down in the Cayman Islands—claims to be the home of 18,857 companies. What an amazing building that is. This little building, the home to 18,000 companies. They all say they are doing business out of this building. Anybody believe that? They are not doing business out of that building. They are doing monkey business, and the monkey business they are doing is to avoid paying the taxes all the rest of us pay because the Cayman Islands is a tax haven. They do not impose taxes on these companies.

Guess what these companies do. They file returns that show—miraculously—the profits from all their operations across the United States don't show up in the United States. They show up in this little five-story building down in the Cayman Islands. They say that is where the profits are being realized. What a blessing that is because the Cayman Islands do not impose any taxes on the profits that show up in the subsidiaries of the companies that are doing business all over the world.

Anybody who wonders if this is costing all the rest of us huge amounts of money, here is what our Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations found in a report in 2007.

> Experts have estimated the total loss to the Treasury from offshore tax evasion alone approaches $100 billion per year.

Let me repeat that—$100 billion a year. If there is any doubt about this, go home and Google tax havens. See what you find. I think you will be quite startled by what you see. Continuing the quote from the report:

> Those losses include $40 to $70 billion from individuals, and another $30 billion from corporations engaging in offshore tax evasion. Abusive tax shelters add tens of billions of dollars more.

My family and I, we pay what we owe. The vast majority of people in this country pay what they owe. We

have a few people—unfortunately, it is a growing number and they tend to be people with much greater resources—who are not paying what they owe. We shouldn't permit it. That should come to a screeching halt.

The bipartisan groups proposing comprehensive and balanced plans with spending cuts and new revenue include the fiscal commission, the Bipartisan Policy Center, and the Group of 6. These are the only bipartisan plans that have come from anywhere, and all of them recommended a balance between spending cuts and revenue. Almost all of them focused on reducing tax expenditures—the loopholes, the exclusions, the preferences, the tax havens—in order to raise revenue, to reduce rates, and make America more competitive but also to raise additional revenue to dump this debt.

The other day there was a spirited debate on the floor between the senior Senator from Arizona and the senior Senator from Illinois. I arrived at the end of that debate and didn't have a chance to participate. There were a number of assertions made there by my friend, Senator MCCAIN, and I wish to set the record straight. If we look at the records of Reagan, Bush 41, Bush 43, and Clinton, with respect to deficits, the record is very clear.

Here it is: During the Reagan administration, deficits exploded, and we can see on the graph the deficits that averaged about $200 billion a year. During the first Bush administration, the deficits actually got worse and ended up still in the range of $200 billion a year. President Clinton inherited deficits of $200 billion a year, but we can see by the last 4 years of his administration, he was in the black. The budgets were balanced, and for 2 or 3 of those years, he actually stopped using Social Security money to fund government operations. Then, of course, we see what happened in the second Bush administration: Deficits absolutely exploded—absolutely exploded.

The second Bush administration was, by far, the worst on record for deficits and debt of any of these administrations; and, by far, the best was the Clinton administration.

But we can look at it a different way. This chart shows, in dollar terms, what happened to the debt. We can see in the Reagan administration the debt more than doubled. The Bush administration took it up much further. The Clinton administration actually started bringing down the debt. President Clinton was actually paying off debt during his administration. Then we saw what happened in the second Bush administration: The debt absolutely skyrocketed, going up well over 2½ times.

Mr. President, when we then look at the record of economic growth under those different Presidents, it is very interesting. Reagan, who more than doubled the debt, had a pretty good record of economic growth—3.5 percent. Bush 1, who ran the debt up even further, had a pretty paltry record—2.1 percent economic growth. Clinton, who actually paid down debt, had the best record of economic growth—3.8 percent on average. Bush 2, who put in place the massive tax cuts that ballooned the deficits into debt, had the worst record of economic growth, averaging 1.6 percent.

Let's connect the dots. There was a big increase in debt during the Reagan administration but pretty good economic growth; he took the No. 2 spot. Bush 1: massive increase in deficits and debt, and economic growth faltered. The Clinton administration has by far the best record on deficits and debt and also the best record of economic growth. Bush 2, who had huge tax cuts never offset by an adjustment, as Reagan did, had the worst record of economic growth.

Finally, on job creation, during the Reagan administration, 16 million jobs were created—quite a strong record of job creation during his 8 years. During the first Bush administration, only 3 million jobs were created. During the Clinton administration—by far the winner on the jobs derby—23 million jobs were created, and he had the best record of deficit and debt reduction and the best record on economic growth. Do you know what. He raised taxes and cut spending. Wow. Our friends on the other side said, when President Clinton raised taxes and cut spending, it would crater the economy. I was here. I heard the majority leader on that side say that proposal would crater the economy. Republicans repeated that line all across America. The Clinton plan to get the deficits and debt down by raising revenue and cutting spending, they all said, would crater the economy. They were wrong. Then it came time for the Bush administration, and he had massive tax cuts, and they all said that would be a huge job creator and fire up the engines of economic growth. They were wrong again.

The record is clear. Look at the difference. There were 16 million jobs created under Reagan, 3 million under Bush 1, 23 million under Clinton, and 3 million under Bush 2. Clinton had the biggest reductions in deficits and debt by far of any of them. He had the best economic growth, and he had the best job creation. And the second Bush administration comes and they say big tax cuts—that is going to fire up economic growth, that is going to fire up job creation. They were wrong.

When Clinton had a proposal to raise revenue and cut spending, they said it would crater the economy. Yet Clinton had the best record on economic growth and the best record on job creation. They were wrong again. During the second Bush administration, at the end—has everybody forgotten?—we were on the brink of financial collapse. I was called to a special meeting in this building with the Bush administration's Secretary of Treasury, and I, along with other leaders of the House and Senate, was told we were days away from a financial collapse. This idea that you can't raise revenue or it will kill jobs, you can't cut spending or it will kill jobs has not proven to be right. In the real world, the Clinton administration raised revenue, cut spending to get our debt under control, and they had the strongest record of job creation, the strongest record of economic growth of any of the four Presidents during that period by far.

I would just say I wish I could have participated in that debate last night. I missed it, but I wanted to set the record straight.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the floor to talk about the deal the Senate will vote on sometime later tonight or tomorrow. Before I do, I want to say to my distinguished colleague from North Dakota, the chairman of the Budget Committee, as always, what an exceptional job he has done in laying out fact from fiction, the realities of the choices before us. I only hope that the revenue possibilities he clearly expressed exist as part of an equation to a solution could be invoked, but I am concerned based upon what the other side says.

We have a deal before us that is a result of a manufactured crisis. The debt limit has historically been raised as a matter of course by both Republicans and Democrats, both sides, without conditions. Ronald Reagan did it 18 times without conditions. George W. Bush did it 7 times without conditions. But, no, not this time.

For days, for weeks, this Congress has been held hostage by a radical few—a band of tea party tyrants—who believe their opinions, their values, their view of the world, their vision of government must be America's vision. It is not. In their world, there is no room for reasonable compromise, there is no room for fair and balanced budget approaches, the kinds of approaches to budgets I and many on this side have worked for and voted for throughout our careers in Congress.

I have voted for balance going in, and I was looking for balance in the final agreement or the hope of balance that the American people themselves have expressed clearly they wanted to see: spending cuts but also ending those tax loopholes and creating revenue.

I have voted for $2.4 trillion in cuts in the Reid amendment, with the inclusion of a joint committee process—Senator CONRAD was talking about that—that could include revenues, a balanced approach.

I have supported increasing the debt limit in a responsible way, a balanced, responsible, fair approach that implements significant but responsible deductions.

I voted in 2010 to establish the Bipartisan Task Force for Responsible Fiscal Action—the precursor to the Bowles-Simpson Commission—to review all aspects of the financial conditions of our government, including tax policy and entitlement spending.

I voted to protect Social Security from being used to balance the budget when it hasn't contributed to our debt.

I voted in favor of the Pryor amendment to reduce the budget deficit by at least $154 billion with a balanced approach to cutting our deficits that included discretionary spending, entitlements, and revenues.

I have supported budget enforcement measures, such as the statutory pay-go, to pay as you go when you come up with a new idea for spending or a tax break, to control both spending and revenues.

I led the effort in this Chamber to cut $21 billion in unwarranted Big Oil subsidies and supported saving almost $6 billion this year alone by cutting ethanol subsidies.

I have voted five times in the past to increase the debt limit in a responsible way.

But this eleventh-hour deal, with so many strings attached that it has become a tangled web of conservative social values, is nothing more than a concession to the radical right of one party, and it flies in the face of our values as a nation. It would mean drastic and dramatic cuts to one side of the ledger, overwhelmingly from nondefense spending, and no balance—I repeat, no balance—on the revenue side.

I know their suggestion is that the commission can look at revenue. Yes, it can look at revenue, but that commission which is going to be appointed with an equal number of Republicans and Democrats and appointed by the leadership in both Houses pretty much tells you where it is going to end up.

Speaker BOEHNER has said he won't appoint anyone to the committee who would accept revenue as part of the mix. Senator MCCONNELL has said there will be no new revenue. They get appointments to that commission. That is half of the commission. Even Gene Sperling, the President's economic adviser, said there will be no new revenues for the next 18 months, which is a clear reflection of what Speaker BOEHNER and Minority Leader MCCONNELL have said.

Since they won't accept revenue except maybe in the context of tax reform, which the joint committee has said it can't do by the end of the year, which is when this commission is called upon—by Thanksgiving—to come forth and make a presentation, and we Democrats will have members on the commission who will be responsible and want to strike a deal, we will end up either having to accept the commission's spending cuts without revenue, leaving us with trillions of dollars in nondefense and entitlement cuts, or automatic sequestered cuts that are even more Draconian.

Does anyone in this Chamber really believe that the Bush tax cuts for the top-tier, the richest, the wealthiest people—millionaires and billionaires—which will expire in 2012, will be on the table in an election year, that the President will issue a veto threat for those tax cuts and make them the hallmark of his reelection campaign? I don't think so.

While I know that if we go to the automatic sequestered cuts, nearly $1 trillion of those automatic cuts will come supposedly from defense, what guarantees are there that we won't use the overseas contingency fund of $1 trillion to meet the defense side of the cuts—the very fund which Republicans, in the budget passed in the House, put in their budget and which virtually all of my Republican colleagues here in the Senate voted on, and they voted on it as cuts. If that isn't the case, what makes us think that supplemental emergency appropriations won't be offered on the defense side while warfighters are in the field, leaving us with no real defense cuts but a hard $1 trillion in cuts on domestic programs such as education, student loans, health care, renewable energy, research and development? And the list goes on.

For those who suggest that this commission and the threat, the sword of those automatic cuts will make people act responsibly, what makes us think that the old paradigm, which I long for, that people will be responsible will take place given what we have seen in which we have a manufactured crisis that has brought us to the verge of an economic crisis that is not only national but international in proportion? If people have been willing to bring us to that point, what makes us think this negotiation as proposed by the legislation will work?

They will continue to look for deeper and deeper cuts to those basic services we as a party and as a nation have fought for. We will spend the next year headed into the national decision-making that will take place next November forced to debate deeper cuts, refight old battles, debate a balanced budget amendment and the Bush tax cuts, instead of talking about creating jobs, which is what Americans want to see again, and helping middle-class families who are struggling to make ends meet.

But don't listen to me on that. Listen to Paul Krugman, a Nobel Prize-winning economist who wrote today that this deal is a disaster—his words—for the economy. He said:

> Start with the economics. We currently have a deeply depressed economy. We will almost certainly continue to have a depressed economy all through next year. And we will probably have a depressed economy through 2013 as well, if not beyond.
>
> The worst thing you can do in these circumstances is slash government spending, since that will depress the economy even further. Pay no attention to those who invoke the confidence fairy, claiming that tough action on the budget will reassure businesses and consumers, leading them to spend more. It doesn't work that way, a fact confirmed by many studies of the historical record.
>
> Indeed, slashing spending while the economy is depressed won't even help the budget situation much, and might well make it worse. On one side, interest rates on Federal borrowing are currently very low, so spending cuts now will do little to reduce future interest costs. On the other side, making the economy weaker now will also hurt its long-run prospects, which will in turn reduce future revenue. So those demanding spending cuts now are like medieval doctors who treated the sick by bleeding them and thereby making them even sicker.
>
> And then there are the reported terms of the deal, which amount to an abject surrender on the part of the president. First, there will be big spending cuts, with no increase in revenue.
>
> Then a panel will make recommendations for further deficit reduction—and if these recommendations aren't accepted, there will be more spending cuts.

I described before the possibility of getting revenue in that equation with the appointments being made by the authorities making them, saying they will appoint no one who will consider revenues. There will be, therefore, even more spending cuts. That is a Nobel Prize economist.

No, there is no balance in this agreement, no real compromise. It simply does not force the shared sacrifice the American people have demanded. Oil companies will make $143 billion in profits this year, the Big Five. They will keep picking the pockets of American taxpayers with a ridiculous handout while they earn those billions in profits. Ethanol millionaires will be off the hook with this deal. There is no balance in this deal. There is no fairness. There is nothing but concessions to the radical rightwing of the Republican Party that is holding the American economy hostage, with a gun to its head, threatening to pull the trigger if they don't get their way.

Yet no one on the right seems to be happy. They want more. They believe they have not gotten enough. When is enough, enough? How far do we have to bend before we break? How much do we have to give of our values, our beliefs, our vision of America? How much do we have to give of the promises we have made as a nation to hard-working, middle-class families struggling to make ends meet, struggling to pay the bills, the mortgage, pay for health care, tuition to put their children through college, and give them a chance at a better life?

How about those whose lives would be shattered except for the government's protection? We are their voice. I speak for them when I say this is not a fair deal, but it is the deal before us. What is fair is fair, but this plan is not fair to the American people. I cannot in good conscience support a plan where soldiers, seniors, students, and working families must endure trillions in cuts while oil companies, billionaires, corporate jet owners are not asked to pay one cent toward shared sacrifice.

The Republicans turned a relatively routine vote to meet America's obligations into a crisis threatening the world's economy. In response, the Reid plan met them 80 percent of the way by proposing $2.4 trillion in cuts, creating a process where a bipartisan commission could find a balanced approach to deficit reductions that would go beyond that and that would meet the

American people's call for shared sacrifice from those who have not only the greatest wealth in the country but also those who seem to have the privilege and the power to fashion the Tax Code in a way that benefits them but doesn't benefit working-class families in our country.

No, that was not enough for the tea party, nor for the party they now control. No, instead they have insisted on a process where oil companies, billionaires, offshore tax havens, and the corporate elite are completely protected from making shared sacrifices. That is simply not fair. I cannot support it. The thought that because our soldiers will join seniors, students, and working-class families on the chopping block that Democrats should flock to this plan is wrongheaded. Eliminating troubled DOD weapons systems is one thing, but across-the-board cuts will punish those who are bravely serving our country in a time of war. Adding these cuts just makes what was a painful plan a totally unfair, unbalanced, and unacceptable plan.

I supported the majority leader's plan. I have shown I am serious about deficit reduction. I have supported a fair deal as described by people in New Jersey and across our country, a reasonable deficit-reduction plan that truly represents compromise, a deal that fulfills the commonsense idea of shared sacrifice.

I know shared sacrifice. This is not shared sacrifice. This is capitulation to a radical fringe of the Republican Party that will not bend until they break this economy or get their own way. I have been for deficit reduction. I have voted for fair approaches to deficit reduction. I know fairness, but this deal is not fair, and I will not support it.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the proposed debt crisis agreement. The first thing I would like to do is express my appreciation—I think I would actually say empathy to the President, the Vice President, and the bipartisan leadership of both Houses of Congress who have had to deal with this enormously significant and difficult problem for our Federal Government because the obvious fact is we have worked our way into a very deep hole of debt. When I say ''we,'' I mean we, all of us—succeeding Presidents of different parties, Members of both parties in both Houses of Congress. There is a tendency, when you have a problem such as this, to want to point and blame everybody else. The truth is, we are all responsible, and we are only going to get out of this hole and get the American government and the American people out of this hole if we work together to solve the problems, just as we have together caused these problems.

I saw some numbers recently—I think I have them right; I know I have them almost right—that express very simply what happened over the last decade. In fiscal year 2001, the last year of the Clinton administration, the Federal Government tax revenues—revenues—were at about 19.6 percent of the gross domestic product. Federal Government spending in that year was about a point lower, 18.5 or 18.6 percent of the gross domestic product. So you are raising about 1 percent more of the GDP than you are spending, and you have a surplus.

What is it now? It is startling how the change has occurred. Spending is up close to 25 percent of the gross domestic product, and revenues are down to about 15 percent. Now you have a gap of about 10 percent of spending, as a percentage of GDP, over revenue, and we have this enormous deficit and debt—$14 trillion. If you said to me when I came to Congress in 1989 that our government would one day have a debt of over $14 trillion, I would have said: Impossible. But here we are. And it is growing at $1 trillion a year and more. That is the problem we have.

When you think about those percentages I cited, speaking very simplistically, the way we are going to get out of the hole we are in is by cutting spending and raising revenues. We would like to do that in a way that also gets us back to economic growth. That is the critical third factor. If we are growing economically, the revenue system we have will raise more money and help us to close this gap.

But doing these two things that are critical to solving the national crisis we have—which is to raise revenue and cut spending—is difficult politically, very hard politically. It is not what a lot of politicians think our constituents want us to do. But I think today the American people are so anxious about the national debt, so anxious about the economy, and so frustrated and angry with Members of Congress that they would like us to do what is counterintuitive, which does not seem like traditional politics, which is to actually do together what will solve the problem—stop the partisan politics, solve the problem. They know we have to cut some spending, we have to raise some revenues, and they want us to do it fairly. That is the difficult dilemma the White House and the bipartisan congressional leadership faced in dealing with this problem, and it results in the agreement.

I thank the leaders and the White House for the agreement because it does do some significant things. No. 1, it avoids the unknown risk of a default for the first time in our history. Some people think it would not be so bad. I do not want to play that game with our economy and our financial future. I think it would have hurt us. So it avoids that. Second, it does begin to cut some spending and put some caps on. Third—and maybe this is the most hopeful—it creates a special joint committee of Congress to recommend further cuts in this so-called second tranche of cuts.

But it does not do two other things, and as a result, this proposal before us now is unfair. What doesn't it do? It seems to me that in reaching this agreement, each political party yielded to the other party's highest priority political and ideological interest. So this agreement does not deal with entitlement reform at all, including Medicare reform, which is a priority for Democrats, and it does not raise revenues, which is a priority for Republicans. Why do I say it is unfair? It is unfair because it sets before us a solution to the problem that only asks of the discretionary spending lines in our budget.

What I mean to say here is that discretionary spending in fiscal year 2010 represented about 35 percent of all government spending. Mandatory spending, the so-called entitlements, was almost 60 percent. So 35 percent discretionary, 60 percent mandatory. Interest payments were about 5.5 percent. So if you are taking the mandatory spending off the table and you are not going to add any revenues, then you are left with taking all the savings that this agreement proposes to achieve—almost $3 trillion, maybe at best $3 trillion—you are taking it all out of discretionary spending. In doing that, you are going to end up having a devastating effect on our security and I believe on our prosperity and also on our future, on the capacity of our government to take care of those who are most vulnerable and on the capacity of our government to help the economy grow.

To better explain this, I just want to say very briefly, what is discretionary spending? Well, there is the defense side, which is the Department of Defense. In some cases in the agreement, it is described as security, and that would include Homeland Security and the Veterans' Administration. The nondefense discretionary includes most of what most people see as our government: education, health, administration of justice, energy, environment, agriculture, commerce, community and regional development, science, space, technology research. All of those will suffer devastating cuts under this proposal because we have not been able to deal with entitlements, particularly Medicare.

Why do I cite Medicare? I believe in Medicare. I think it is a great program. But, look, it is on course to do two things: One, it is going to go bankrupt soon, according to the report of its own trustees, no later than 2024 but as soon as 4 or 5 years from now. The hospital part of Medicare is going to go bankrupt. It is not going to have enough

money. Why? Because though people put money, through their payroll taxes, into hospital insurance, the reality is that the average beneficiary of Medicare takes $3 or $4 out for every $1 put in. You cannot do that and have it be sustained over the long haul. And over the next decade, approximately 20 million more Americans are going on to Medicare because of the baby boomer generation. So it is the single largest, fastest growing element of our Federal budget.

It seems to me—again, I support Medicare. I voted against the Ryan budget. I do not want to privatize it. But you cannot protect Medicare as it is and expect it to stay as it is. You are only going to protect Medicare by changing it, and this budget does not touch that at all. I could say more about that, but that is enough for the moment.

So the end result of all this is that of the approximately $1 trillion in the so-called first phase or tranche of cuts adopted by this plan, they are pretty much all from discretionary spending, defense and nondefense—Head Start, Pell grants, education, and defense.

The second phase is the part that bothers me and really worries me, I would say. The proposal before us sets up a committee, 12 Members of Congress equal in terms of party allocation. They have the opportunity to deal with the problems that are left out of this and have this be a fairer proposal to get America back in balance; that is, to deal with the entitlements and deal with the revenues—tax reform, entitlement reform, whatever you want to call it. But will they? And if they do not, if the two parties' priority political and ideological interests are reflected in the committee and stop it from dealing with entitlements and revenues or are reflected on the floor, then there is an automatic mechanism for cutting an additional $1.2 trillion to $1.5 trillion, and that all comes out of discretionary spending, defense and nondefense.

Some of my other colleagues have come to the floor to describe the impact on nondefense discretionary spending, really most of what we know as government: education, health care, environmental protection, transportation, et cetera, et cetera.

I am on the Armed Services Committee. I am on the Homeland Security Committee, privileged to be chair. My priority in my service in the Senate has been our national security. I will tell you this: If that sequester ever went into effect, it would have a devastating impact on the ability of our men and women in uniform and their leaders to protect our security in what remains a dangerous world.

The initial $1 trillion of cuts mandated in this proposal includes $350 billion over the 10 years from defense, as I understand the numbers. President Obama had earlier directed the Department of Defense to cut $400 billion from their spending over the next decade.

The Department of Defense is working on that. GEN Martin Dempsey, soon to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee, said he was working on that. He thought he could accomplish it, but it was not going to be easy.

He was asked: What would happen if you were demanded to go beyond the $400 billion in cuts from defense over the next 10 years? He said it would be extraordinarily difficult and involve very high risk to our national security. He is not against cuts in defense. I am not against cuts in defense. But they have to be reasonable because, in the end, the first responsibility of our national government is to protect our security.

If we do not have security, we do not have anything else. We do not have freedom. We do not have prosperity. We do not have anything else. The world is full of people who want to do us damage, who want to kill us, who want to bring down our civilization, who are involved in an ideological—some sense theological—clash with us. I am just saying that if the joint committee, the special committee, cannot reach agreement or reaches agreement and Congress rejects its proposals, there will be an automatic cut in defense of an additional $500 to $600 billion over the next decade. Add that to the $350 billion already in the first phase mandated by this proposal, we have $1 trillion in cuts. We are not going to be protected, as we have to be.

It is as simple as that. It is unfair—not only unfair, it is irresponsible. Admiral Mullen was in Afghanistan over the weekend. He had a conversation with some of our troops that got a lot of attention from the media. One of the soldiers got up and said: Admiral Mullen, we were following the debt debate in Congress. Can you promise us we will get paid regularly in the coming weeks?

Admiral Mullen quite honestly said: I do not know. Because it was not clear whether we were going to come to an agreement and avoid a default.

I will tell you, if this full package goes forward and the joint committee does not reach a different result and recommendation and $1 trillion of cuts are imposed on our national security-Defense Department budget over the next 10 years, whoever is Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff when this goes into effect—it will be General Dempsey—he will still be there, fortunately, in January of 2013—when they are asked: Will we get paid, I believe they are still going to say: I do not know. Some of you will. We may have to have a reduction in end strength in the force, the number of people we have protecting our country. If families of men and women in uniform for the United States ask, if this total package of cuts goes into effect on defense, if their families of the military ask: Are our loved ones in uniform going to be given the equipment to carry out the missions our country is asking of them in a way that maximizes their ability to succeed and protects them, I do not think anybody in the military can say yes. I could not say yes, if that was the case.

So I am disappointed. I will say one other thing because we are all so focused on jobs and the economy. The American military does not just protect our security and advance our ideals, as it does, and live by our ideals, as it does, but it also has a tremendous positive impact on our economy. It is the American military that is the foundation of an international system of stability and security that has undergirded, that has been the precondition of the enormous growth that has happened in America and a lot of other places in the world, where hundreds of millions, probably billions, of people have come out of poverty because they could rely on the safety of the sea lanes, they could rely on order in the world in places such as Asia, Europe, and throughout the world.

If the American military is cut as much, in the worst case as this proposal would cut it, it is the beginning of the end of America as a great international power. It is the beginning of the end of this system of international security that has undergirded our prosperity and so much of the prosperity of the world. Which other nation will assume the responsibility we have? We have benefitted from it greatly. It is a statement that we are prepared to decline as a country.

I come back and say again, that to get us out of the fiscal hole we in the Federal Government have put this country into, everybody is going to have to give. Everybody is going to have to take cuts. That includes defense, and there is a lot that can be cut out of defense. But there is also a lot that has to be changed in entitlement spending.

There are people who are getting away with tax loopholes who ought to be paying more in taxes. Everybody has to contribute to solve this national crisis. Right now, this proposal is unfair because it adds contributions, cuts, sacrifice only from the recipients of discretionary spending, and that means while all of them should be paying—should be accepting cuts, they are being asked to take cuts that are unfair and counterproductive to our security, to our liberty, to our prosperity, to our morality as a country that has always taken care of people who could not take care of themselves.

If these discretionary cuts go into effect, all that will be jeopardized. So I have come to say this to my colleagues and to say, frankly, that I have not decided how I am going to vote. I understand the proposal does prevent the default, it does begin some process of cuts, and it has this committee which offers the most hope.

But on the other hand, I see in front of me a mechanism set up which I think—if it goes through its conclusion—will have not a net positive effect

on our future, if the committee's work is not good and accepted by Congress, but a net negative effect on America's future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the debt ceiling agreement that was reached last night.

Over the past week I have heard from countless Minnesotans who want Congress to come together and reach a compromise on the debt ceiling.

They did not want their interest rates to rise, the value of the dollar to fall, or to see their retirement savings decimated again because some in Washington believe that if they refuse to compromise, the resulting crisis will score them political points.

I would like to share with you some of the comments I received from Minnesotan's throughout the State.

Judy from Rochester writes:

As senior citizens, we understand where our country is compared to where it has been in the last 50 years or so, and we appreciate that sacrifices must be made. It is almost too far back to remember when people all pulled together, including congress, to solve our corporate issues.

. . . all the American people want is for you to represent us and make the best decisions for us . . . using your best judgment. Not prejudice or narrow viewpoint, but the best judgment.

Paul from Rochester writes:

This is not the place for partisan political stubbornness. It is the time for our elected officials to work together for the good of the United States.

Louis from Lakeville writes:

It is time for all you legislators to put your political affiliations aside and act as Americans and do what is right for all Americans not just those who voted for you. We have a tremendous fiscal mess in this country and we cannot waste time blaming each other. It was jointly created and must be jointly resolved.

Bonnie from Osseo writes:

Please put your ideologies aside and work in a collaborative effort to restructure our debt and to give the USA the opportunity to continue to prosper.

Marla from St. Paul writes:

It is so frustrating to see the same game of political budgetary chicken playing out at the national level that happened in the state level in Minnesota.

Tom and Mary from St. Paul write:

If you wanted to wake us up as citizens, you certainly have. We've been told that if you allow a default, that will cost our 401K to lose $9,000. Our stock portfolio and retirement savings will likely take a 6 percent hit.

If ever a situation called for compromise, this is it. Raise the debt ceiling, and not just for 6 months, (Reagan did it many times) but make real promises to deal with the debt, and then make the real fight where it belongs, over the next budget, not paying for our current obligations. Do you really want the Chinese to call in all our debts now? Have a phased, sane plan for bringing down the debt, not a forced/false crisis. We're just hard working Americans trying to go on with our lives. We never write these kinds of messages. This is scary and we won't forget. Get it done please.

Jake from Minneapolis writes:

In these upcoming days, as you are faced with difficult decisions, I implore you to work with your colleagues on both sides of the isle to finalize the budgetary issues facing the United States at this time. As a husband who is supporting his wife as she attends a graduate program at the University of Minnesota, I am very concerned about what a default of United States loans would mean in regards to our finances.

I am faithfully paying down student loans and my wife and I will begin to pay down the student loans that she has incurred to pay for her education as she finishes her program in May. Paying off loans is never fun; it means cutting some things out of our budget (things that we like such as going out to eat or to the movies) and compromising on difficult decisions.

I hope that as decisions are made regarding the financial situations facing the United States you will be a person who reaches across the aisle, with a willingness to compromise and to make difficult decisions.

Marilyn from Buffalo writes:

As an independent voter I am asking you to compromise on the budget issue. I am also asking you to use a balanced approach to reduce the budget deficit.

Jay and Bonnie from Moorhead write:

We would like to see a timely resolution to both the debt limit issue and deficit reduction by means of genuine negotiation resulting in a nonpartisan compromise which will keep our country financially solvent.

Kim from Duluth writes:

I am writing to add my voice to the growing number of citizens worried about Washington's inability or perhaps unwillingness to get done the work you were elected to do. In my opinion as a working class American, I believe we ALL are expected to compromise in hopes that we can further the good work of our nation. I firmly believe all of America needs to be accountable to the economic disaster we have known was approaching these many long decades. So please, in the vernacular, ''suck it up'' and get the job done!

While no one feels the agreement we will soon vote on is the perfect solution, we are in the bottom of the ninth here, the time has come to break through the partisan stalemate and pass something to provide certainty so we can move our country forward.

This is why I plan on voting for this agreement as it will ensure our country does not default on our obligations—something that would have caused real pain for Minnesota families and businesses—while also providing a down payment on deficit reduction.

Unfortunately, this debate has once again shown we need to change the way Congress conducts its own business.

I come from county government and I can tell you local governments do not operate this way.

Minnesota is home to more Fortune 500 companies per capita than any other state. After fielding many calls over the past few weeks from business leaders from the biggest businesses in our State, like General Mills, to the smallest, one, two, three-person operations, they do not run their businesses this way.

And there is no doubt, this is not how families balance their budgets.

The sooner we can come together to agree on the next stage of this package, the better for our economy and the better for our country.

I believe we should look at things such as closing the loopholes for oil subsidies. I believe we should look at things such as tax cuts on the wealthiest expiring at the end of 2012. These are things that should be in the mix as we move forward.

It is time to put our political differences aside to work on an agenda that strengthens our economy, promotes fiscal responsibility, and increases global competitiveness.

If we insist on using the debate as a vehicle for rhetoric only, we will not just be doing ourselves a disservice, we will be cheating our children and grandchildren out of knowing the America in which we grew up.

We already know much of what will need to be done. Our failure to act has not been because we lack solutions but because, too often, Congress has lacked the political will to get behind a consensus proposal.

In the Senate, we have had this work going on. We have had bipartisan groups of Senators, including the Gang of 6, working together to find a solution. We need to now take that work and make sure that gets included in the consideration by this committee.

It is time for us to work together and tell the American people what they need to hear. We need to show them that Washington isn't broken; that, instead, we are willing to put aside our partisan politics to do what we were elected to do—to do what is right for America.

PASSING AN FAA EXTENSION

Mr. President, I will turn to another issue I hope we can resolve before the end of this week, which is to pass an FAA extension.

I rise today to speak about the urgent need to pass a Federal Aviation Administration extension. The Federal Aviation Administration not only keeps our airways safe but it also ensures that our air transportation runs effectively by overseeing grants for critical construction projects at our airports.

As you know, Congress allowed the FAA's most recent extension to expire on July 22. This has resulted in a partial shutdown of the FAA.

While the current partial shutdown of the FAA is not affecting the safety of our airways, it is still having some detrimental effects on our country's air service.

The lack of an extension means the FAA doesn't have the authority to collect the fees and taxes the aviation system needs to fund ongoing construction and improvement projects at our airports. This is approximately $200 million a week.

The fees and taxes have nothing to do with the current debt issues we have been debating over the past few weeks. These fees and taxes go into a trust fund that is self-funded and separate

from the budget that has been in the news.

The trust fund pays for construction projects such as a new terminal at the Duluth Airport in Minnesota. This new terminal is critical to the Duluth area. The terminal will allow more flights in and out of the airport, which is vital as more and more businesses are moving to Duluth.

Unfortunately, the airport at this time is waiting for a $5.2 million grant that has already been awarded from the FAA. For each day that the airport waits to receive its grant money, the risk is higher that the airport will be forced to delay the terminal project for 1 year. Why is that? Why can't they go through constructing things in December and January in Duluth? It is pretty cold in Duluth then, and it is hard to do the construction, if not impossible. That is why it is so critically important that we get this money in Duluth immediately. Such a delay will not just be inconvenient, it will cause the cost of the project to significantly increase.

Duluth is not the only airport suffering. Construction projects are being halted throughout the country. The Associated General Contractors estimates that 70,000 construction workers in related fields have been affected by this shutdown.

I know there are political issues surrounding Congress's inability to pass an FAA extension. However, these issues have nothing to do with the construction projects such as the Duluth terminal, the 4,000 furloughed FAA employees, or the 70,000 construction workers just trying to make a living.

I appreciate the bipartisan work that has gone on in the Commerce Committee and in this Chamber with Senator ROCKEFELLER from West Virginia and Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON from Texas. I continue to support them in their efforts to get this FAA extension done.

I urge my colleagues to pass the FAA extension. The lack of one is hurting our aviation system and our economy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, are we in a quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are not.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the debt ceiling agreement that will soon come before the Senate is a clear and present danger to the fragile—indeed, faltering—economic recovery. To say this is the wrong policy at the wrong time is a gross understatement. One has to ask the question: Is anyone paying attention? We just learned economic growth fell to a 1.3-percent annual rate in the second quarter. The first quarter growth was revised downward sharply to just four-tenths of 1 percent—virtually flat.

The economy created a meager 16,000 jobs in the month of June—again flat, not even keeping up with population growth. Last month, over 25 million Americans could not find full-time employment. Let me repeat that: over 25 million Americans are effectively out of work. This includes those formally looking for work and those so discouraged that they are no longer looking but want to work. State and local governments continue to slash funding for jobs at a stunning pace, destroying an estimated 500,000 jobs in the last 2 years. Let me repeat that: In the last 2 years, State and local governments have destroyed an estimated 500,000 jobs. Those are consumers too. Those are people who shop and buy cars and clothes and houses and go out to eat at restaurants and things such as that.

According to an article in today's Wall Street Journal, in the first half of 2011, all government spending fell at a 3.5-percent annual rate, enough to knock three-quarters of a percentage point off the GDP. On top of this wreckage, this so-called budget deal is proposing to slash funding in investment by $2.4 trillion over the next 10 years—an unprecedented step that will further destroy demand and directly kill millions of public- and private-sector jobs.

This is what Mohamed El-Erian, chief executive of the bond investment firm of PIMCO, said just yesterday on one of the network shows in regard to this budget deal:

> Unemployment will be higher than it would have been otherwise.

Speaking of this budget deal we are talking about, he said unemployment will be higher because of it.

> Growth will be lower than it would be otherwise, and inequality will be worse than it would be otherwise.

He added:

> We have a very weak economy, so withdrawing more spending at this stage will make it even weaker.

For months now, Washington politicians have been distracted by the phony manufactured crisis about raising the debt ceiling. This city has been obsessed with this. The rest of the country, for a very good reason, is more concerned with a far more urgent deficit than the budget deficit. They are more concerned about the jobs deficit—25 million people out of work. In a recent CBS News-New York Times poll, 53 percent of the public polled named jobs and the economy as the most important problem, while only 7 percent named the deficit.

So I oppose this misbegotten, misguided deal they have conjured up in return for raising the debt ceiling. I don't oppose raising the debt ceiling. I wish to make that clear. I believe we have a constitutional obligation to pay our debts and to make good on our debts, as we have done since the Revolutionary War. What I am objecting to is the deal that was put together in order to permit us to perform our constitutional obligation.

I oppose it for four reasons: Reason No. 1 is this deal will destroy millions of jobs, as I have said, in both the public and private sector. By shutting off Federal funding in investment—a critical engine sustaining our sputtering economy—it could easily plunge America back into recession.

Please read your history, see what happened in 1937 and 1938. We were coming out of the Depression and all of a sudden Congress decided to tighten down the screws and plunged us right back into higher unemployment.

Secondly, I have always advocated a balanced approach to deficit reduction, including both spending cuts and revenue increases. This deal—the one we are going to have before us this evening, I guess—rejects a balanced approach. It rejects any sense of equity and fairness.

As my friend, the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ, said earlier on the floor: This is not fair. Are we concerned about fairness or is that just sort of passe? Is that something we should even be concerned about, whether something is fair? I think we ought to be concerned about fairness. This is the message that is coming across loudly and clearly in the phone calls coming into my office and the e-mails I am getting from Iowa and around the country.

This deal offends people's basic sense of fairness—that Congress would slash funding for things such as student loans and cancer research and Head Start programs and Vista and legal services or cut essential funding for seniors—senior volunteer programs, senior centers, and Meals on Wheels—cutting support for people with disabilities, cutting the safety net for a lot of the most vulnerable people in our society, hurting the middle class. We can do that, but we simply can't ask for one more dollar of shared sacrifice from the millionaires and billionaires who have made so much money in the last decade and who have received, thanks to this Congress, huge tax breaks.

This deal is not fair.

Third, I oppose this deal for the simple reason that I oppose paying ransom to hostage takers. Since the 1930s, Congress has routinely raised the national debt 89 times, including 7 times during the recent Presidency of George Bush, and 18 times under Ronald Reagan. Did Democrats hold the economy hostage? Did we say: Oh, no, we are not going to raise the debt unless you do this, this, this, and this? No. Did we filibuster? No.

Oh, there is always a skirmish on raising the debt ceiling. Ever since I have been here, for the past 35 years that I have been here, 36 years now, there is always a skirmish on it. But do you know how it has always worked? The majority always has to come up with the votes so there is no default. Well, that is not the way it is working this time.

This time congressional Republicans are holding our Nation hostage, threatening to default on our national debt and plunge America into an abyss that we don't even know what would possibly happen; that would affect our

bond rating for years in the future, affect the interest rates that everyone pays on their car loans, their student loans, housing, and everything else. They would plunge America into that unless their demands are met.

Let's be clear. This is not a negotiating tactic; this is blackmail. Republicans have basically said: We will inflict grievous harm on the economy if Democrats do not meet our demands. Well, President Obama said it earlier. We are not going to go into default. So with this kind of a lopsided deal, the ransom is paid, the hostage is released. But what a terrible precedent this sets. Make no mistake, Republicans will use these same despicable tactics down the road in the future.

Now, if I sound like I am picking too much on Republicans, let me just say, with this kind of precedent, I can see a Republican President—and there will be another one sometime, but I hope not too soon. But there will be a Republican President and there will be a Democratic Congress, and Democrats will use this as a precedent: We will hold it hostage.

Is this the way we want to start running our country? What a terrible precedent this sets. It reminds me of the precedent that was set starting back in the 1980s with the use of the filibuster in the Senate.

Now, I say to the President that I have for years advocated that we do away with the filibuster over a short period of time; that we allow things to be slowed down but not be stopped because of a filibuster. I didn't just say this now; I said it in 1990s. It was right after Democrats had lost control of the Senate and Republicans had taken over, and I even advocated doing away with the filibuster then because I said it was escalating. It was a tit-for-tat. When the Republicans were in charge, we filibustered; and then when we got in charge, they filibustered, but they added a few more. Then when we got in charge, we filibustered, but we did it a little bit more than what they did. This went back and forth.

I predicted in 1995 that if we didn't nip that in the bud, it was going to get out of hand. Sure enough, it got out of hand. That is what I mean. That is what happens. You set a precedent like that, and there is no end to it.

So I think the precedent that has been set bodes ill for our country, not just for Republicans but for Democrats too.

President Obama had an alternative, however, to capitulating to the Republicans' hostage taking and their blackmail. In remarks in the Senate on Saturday and many times, I have urged the President to respond to this unprecedented threat by taking the unprecedented action under the 14th amendment to the Constitution of basically eliminating the debt ceiling. I know the occupant of the chair, the distinguished Senator from Delaware, has advocated this for some time also. It is deeply regrettable that President Obama preemptively took this option off the table.

Throughout history, where meaning is unclear, where precedent was nonexistent, the American people, through their elected officials and through their President, have acted boldly to protect the interests of the United States and to save our country.

I have heard it said that people around the President at the White House—well, they got attorneys to weigh in on this and the Justice Department. I understand that the Vice President said this morning to the House caucus that the authority was unclear as to whether the President could take such action.

Again, I repeat: Where there is no precedent, where the meaning is unclear, we can't run across the street to the Supreme Court and ask for an advisory opinion. They don't give those advisory opinions. But when the country is in a crisis mode and our future is at stake, I believe the President can act boldly, should act boldly, must act boldly, both to prevent the country from falling into a crisis but also to prevent this kind of hostage taking, this kind of blackmail that we either do it this way or we will not raise the debt ceiling.

I pointed out in my speech Saturday, and I point out again, Thomas Jefferson concluded the treaty with the Louisiana Purchase—and he himself wrote letters, and I have copies of those letters. I have read them, letters to Senator Breckenridge anguishing over whether he had the constitutional right to do this.

In one letter he said: I believe Congress is going to have to pass a constitutional amendment and send it to the States for their ratification before I can do this. But, finally, Jefferson came to the realization that if he didn't take this action, the whole western part of the United States at that time might never become part of the United States. Think about that. We might have been facing a part of the United States that belonged to France.

So Jefferson acted boldly. In fact, there were critics at that time who said he didn't have the authority to do that, and they had a vote in the House of Representatives, by the way. I think it carried by a couple votes.

Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation. There is nothing in the Constitution that gave him the power or the authority to do that, but he did it. He did it to help save the country and to right an egregious wrong.

More recently, Franklin Roosevelt—you can read about it in the history books. In the 1930s, it was clear if we didn't come to the assistance of Great Britain, it was going to fall to Nazi Germany—not that they needed our men but they needed our material. They needed the kind of material that we could supply in a short amount of time so they could defend Great Britain against Nazi Germany.

So Franklin Roosevelt concluded a lend-and-lease program. That is what it was called, the lend-and-lease program. Even President Roosevelt at that time said in his writings he considered this probably unconstitutional. But he had to do it to save our country because it was a crisis, and he acted boldly to do it.

There was no clear authority for him to do that, but, as I point out, there was no prohibition against him doing that either. There was no prohibition explicitly in the Constitution to prohibit Thomas Jefferson from making the Louisiana Purchase. There was no express prohibition against Lincoln signing the Emancipation Proclamation. There was no express prohibition against Franklin Roosevelt signing the lend-and-lease deal.

So, again, I point out, where meaning is unclear—and in the 14th amendment the meaning is kind of unclear. But we do have a court case, Perry v. U.S., 1935. Read what Chief Justice Hughes wrote in his opinion. He said quite clearly that Congress has the power to borrow money. He said that is a good thing. It may be used to save our country sometime. But, he says, Congress does not have the authority to alter or destroy those obligations. We cannot alter or destroy those obligations once we make them.

So as I argued Saturday, and I continue to argue, if Congress either through action or inaction destroys or alters those debt obligations, then I think it is up to the President of the United States to step into the breach.

Is there clear authority for the President to do this? No. I submit there is no clear prohibition against him, either, to do this. So when I cast my vote later today against this deal, I am not casting a vote to send our country into default. I would not do that. If I thought that my vote was the determining vote to send this country into default, I would not do that. That is not the way I see it, Mr. President. The way I see it is even if we turn this down, the President can use his Presidential power and authority to sign an Executive order getting rid of the debt ceiling so that, constitutionally, we make good on our debt obligations.

Read Perry v. U.S. I think you can see it there. So if this deal goes down either in the House or the Senate, the President can act before tomorrow to save this country. He may not want to do it, but he should do it. And he should have put that out there a long time ago.

Each one of the three cases I mentioned, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Roosevelt, three great Presidents, took action to save the country, and they did the right thing.

Mr. President, my fourth reason for opposing this deal is because, in truth, it is not about reducing the deficit. First and foremost, this deal is about preserving hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks for corporations and the wealthiest in our society. Bear in

mind this is the singular purpose and goal of today's Republican Party: not reducing the deficit but preserving and expanding tax breaks for the wealthy. Here is why I say that.

Back last December when Republicans demanded the deal to preserve the Bush-era tax cuts for the wealthy, that deal added a whopping $800 billion to deficits in just 2 years: this year 2011, next year 2012. Here we have it. We are being asked to raise the debt ceiling. A big portion of that is to pay for tax breaks to the wealthiest just in 2 years because of that deal last December where the Bush-era tax cuts were extended for 2 years, the wealthy can get billions in tax breaks for 2 years. So now what we are being asked to do is to pay for these 2 years' of tax breaks to the wealthiest by slashing funds to the most vulnerable in our society.

So that is the game here. The game here is to preserve those tax breaks even though we have to slash funding for the most vulnerable.

In December, Republicans' No. 1 priority was preserving tax breaks for the wealthy even if that meant adding hundreds of billions of dollars to the deficit. So last December Republicans said: We have to extend the Bush-era tax breaks for 2 years. That tax bill added $800 billion to our deficit. I didn't hear a peep out of them, not one peep from the Republicans about the impact on the deficit.

Now, in recent weeks and months Republicans have repeatedly rejected grand bargains to reduce future deficits by nearly $4 trillion. Why did they reject the Reid proposal and proposals by the administration and others? Because each one would have required some modest sacrifice from millionaires and billionaires to help pay for those tax breaks they got. Republicans adamantly opposed this.

In his remarks last evening announcing this debt ceiling bad deal, as I call it, President Obama said the result ''would be the lowest level of annual domestic spending since Dwight Eisenhower was President.'' That bears repeating. President Obama said the result ''would be the lowest level of annual domestic spending since Dwight Eisenhower was President.''

For the record, the American people do not want to take down Federal funding and investment to the level of the Eisenhower years. To do so would be tantamount to repudiating what we have done since then to make our country better and more fair, to make our country more of a middle-class society, more a country where people born into poverty can aspire to be in the middle class to get a good education, good health care, decent housing, a ''Head Start.''

To return to the spending of Dwight Eisenhower would be tantamount to repudiating the Great Society programs. We always hear from Republican friends how the Great Society was a failure, what a failure the Great Society was. I respectfully disagree. Head Start a failure? It was a Great Society program. Medicaid? Of course Medicaid now is exempted out of this measure. How about the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title I, where we have agreed to put money out to the States to help low-income students and schools in poor areas? That is a Great Society program. How about the Higher Education Act? Student loans help a lot of kids go to college.

I have here a list of some of the Great Society programs: the Civil Rights Act of 1964; the Voting Rights Act of 1965; the Age Discrimination and Employment Act of 1967; Job Corps—that is another one which is going to get slashed because of this, Job Corps; VISTA; Upward Bound; food stamps, now called the SNAP program, which enables low-income people to have a decent diet during economic downturns; LIHEAP, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program; the community action programs that do so much for the elderly and the poor. I mentioned the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Bilingual Education Act to help kids—learners of English as a second language. I mentioned Medicare and Medicaid. How about the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Land and Water Conservation Act and on and on. I am not going to read them all. These are all parts of the Great Society programs. They made our country what it is today. But, they do cost money.

We have cleaner air, cleaner water, better educated kids, better health care, better cancer research—all kinds of research done at the NIH. These programs, along with Social Security, undergird the middle class in our society. They create a ladder of opportunity to allow disadvantaged Americans to work, move upward, and become part of the middle class. These programs define America as decent, compassionate, and, yes, as a great society.

The President is sorely mistaken if he believes the American people want to slash the budget to the level of the Eisenhower years and turn back the clock on half a century of progress.

Mr. President, I hope that is not what you meant. I hope that is not what you meant. To turn spending back to the level of the Eisenhower years is not a bragging point. That is not something positive. To me, that is a big negative.

What we need is to have a better and more fair tax system to pay for all the things that make our society great. We are not having the right debate here. We have not had the right debate for a long time. The debate ought to be about what is happening to our society.

I just read a recent interview with Bill Moyers. Bill Moyers was asked what his greatest fear was. His greatest fear was that we in America would accept greater and greater inequality, wealth inequality, as the norm; that we would accept a greater and greater inequality as normal. Here is maybe what he was talking about. From 2005 to 2009, the median net worth of Hispanic households went down 66 percent. The median net worth of African-American households went down 53 percent. The median net worth of White—Caucasian—households went down 16 percent. The median net worth right now of a White—Caucasian—family in America is 20 times that of an African-American family and 18 times that of a Hispanic family. This is twice the gap since before the recession, and it is the biggest gap since this data was collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1984.

Do you see what is happening? Our country is pulling apart. There are fewer and fewer people at the top getting more and more wealth and more and more people at the bottom, destroying the middle class.

From 2005 to 2009, the median net worth—I keep stressing ''median net worth.'' What that means is you take all the things you own—your house, car, TV sets, all the stuff you own—and you subtract that from all your debts and obligations—mortgage, things such as that for the middle household with half having more and half having less. The median net worth from 2005 to 2009 of African-American households went from $12,124 to $5,677. The median net worth of Hispanic households went from $18,359 to $6,325. Keep those figures in mind—median net worth of African-American households in 2009, $5,677; Hispanic households, $6,325. That is their net worth. That is everything. White households, in 2009—from 2005 to 2009, the net worth went from $134,992 to $113,149. So as of just 2 years ago, the median net worth of White households was, indeed, 20 times that of African-American households and 18 times that of Hispanics. Here is Hispanic households: net worth, $6,325; median for Whites, $113,149. Again, that wealth, as I say, is the sum of all their assets—their houses, their cars, their bank accounts—minus their debts, including mortgages, loans, and credit card debt.

The share of wealth? In 1988, the top 5 percent of Americans, in terms of wealth, had $8 trillion in assets. That was 1980. In 2010, that top 5 percent had $40 trillion in assets. That is more than 60 percent of the national wealth. The other 95 percent of America has the remaining 40 percent.

Jim Wallis, president of Sojourners, Rev. Jim Wallis, said, ''A budget is a moral document.''

''We are making choices,'' he added, such as whether to cut $8.5 billion for low-income housing or whether to retain a similar amount in tax deductions for mortgages on vacation homes for the wealthy.

As Senator MENENDEZ said earlier, it is not fair. This is the debate and discussion we should be having in America, in the Senate, and in the House. There is this huge disparity in wealth in this country, and it is getting worse year by year. Yet our Republican

friends say: Give more tax breaks to those at the top.

The American people get it. They understand this. They know there are over 25 million of them out of work. They know that wealth disparity is opening up a huge gap. The middle class is being destroyed in our country, and this so-called budget deal is going to make it even harder for anyone to succeed in becoming a middle-class person.

I just want to say that the most important thing we can do right now, the single most important thing we can do—I hate to say this—is not ''balance the budget,'' which is not what we are going to do now—this is raising the debt ceiling. That is not the most important thing. Slashing government spending is not the most important thing right now. The most important thing is to marshal the forces of the Federal Government to put people back to work, to get jobs going in our society.

There is a lot of work to be done. There are highways to be built and bridges to be built and schools to be remodeled, new technologies, new power systems, new clean energy, a smart grid, cleaning up the environment. Anyone who has suffered through the heat wave in the last couple of weeks knows something is going on in this country. Something is going on. We need more clean energy.

We need to make sure those children who are born today whose parents do not have anything, whose net worth is so little they don't have anything, we need to make sure that they have decent health, that they have early education programs and Head Start Programs. We need to make sure that every child has the best school and the best teachers in America, make sure that our streets and our neighborhoods are safe so families can go out and walk in the evening or at night and feel safe. We need to make sure the food we eat is duly inspected so we can have a high assurance we are not going to get sick and make sure the drugs we need are available, that the medicines we need, are affordable.

There are a lot of jobs that need to be done in this country, and we can put a lot of people to work. That should be the role of the Federal Government.

Some people say—I have heard it said many times: Government doesn't create wealth, only the private sector creates wealth. The government consumes wealth, it doesn't create it.

I had a hearing in my committee about a month ago or so, the HELP Committee, and we had the head of the National Institutes of Health down, Dr. Francis Collins. The head of NIH had an interesting story to tell. It had to do with the Human Genome Project, mapping and sequencing the human gene. We did it. It was a tremendous scientific accomplishment. Dr. Collins headed that effort. So we mapped and sequenced the human gene. The Batelle organization in Ohio, a research organization, analyzed it and said we had to put in taxpayers' money, $3.8 billion worth of tax dollars into this. In the last 10 years, the private sector—because of this research that was done in mapping and sequencing the human gene—has put in over $790 billion in investment, creating thousands of jobs all over this country, making huge breakthroughs in the genetic causes of so many diseases and finding interventions to help cure diseases and keep people healthy. Private investment never would have been done if we had not put $3.8 billion into the NIH to map and sequence the human gene.

The Interstate Highway System would never have been completed by any private company. We did, through the power of the Federal Government. You know what. It was not Federal Government workers out there working on that highway. It was young kids like me. When I was a kid, I was working out on the Interstate Highway System making summer money to go to college in the fall. I didn't work for the government; I worked for a private contractor.

There are plenty of jobs that need to be done, and we need to put people to work. That is the single most important thing we can be about. Yet what we are doing, as I quoted earlier, is we are actually going to make it harder. Economists say the deal could complicate the task of putting people to work. There is broad agreement that the United States needs to pay down its debts, but most economists say the government should have waited a year or more for the economy to strengthen. We sure missed a big window of opportunity to reduce our debt in our strong years when the asset prices were booming. This time it is different. Instead we are stuck trying to do it now when the economy is so weak, and we should not be cutting and slashing. We should be investing and putting people to work.

Again, I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided, counterproductive debt ceiling deal. Let's stop this precedent of taking a hostage of the United States until we get what we want. Mark my word, if we do this, it is going to happen again. Then maybe sometime when there is a Republican President and the Democrats are in charge, then the Democrats will turn on the screws and we will hold them hostage for something. It is a terrible way to run a country. It is a terrible way to run a democracy.

I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided, counterproductive debt ceiling deal. Let's join together to pass a truly balanced approach to bring deficits under control, one that first invests in putting people to work. Then as the economy begins to grow and the private sector begins to invest, then we start cutting spending, reducing the deficit. Let's have a balanced approach that will allow us to continue to invest in education, infrastructure, research, and the other things that will create jobs and boost our economy, that will build the middle class. This bill is a job killer. This debt ceiling deal is a job killer. A lot of economists agree with that. We should reject it.

Mr. President, you have the pen, and you have the Executive order and you can get rid of that debt ceiling. Take a bold action to save our country and say: No, we are not going to let any group of Congressmen or Senators of any political party take our nation hostage again.

I ask unanimous consent the time until 8 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. I yield the floor.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, you have only been in the chair for a couple of minutes. I was going to ask you what is going on today, but I think I have a pretty good idea. You and I have spent a fair amount of time discussing and thinking through what we ought to do in light of these big deficits. We had the privilege of serving together as Governors for a number of years. We had a requirement to submit balanced budgets and to balance the outflows and revenues in an ongoing basis. In some cases we had pretty good fiscal controls in place to help us. The rules were in place to help us, whether constitutional or statutory. In some cases not.

Your State and, I think, my State have a reputation for being fiscally sound operations. I was elected State treasurer and became State treasurer. In 1976 to 1977—as the Presiding Officer has heard me say before—we had the worst credit rating in the country, and we managed to climb from there until the time when I finished my last term as Governor to have a AAA credit rating. I am very proud of that.

I am relieved, if you will, that today it looks as though we have in place a course that will enable us to preserve the AAA credit rating for our country and, hopefully, for our States around the United States. One of our members of our caucus said something the other day that really struck a chord with me with respect to deficits and the debt ceiling. He said: We need a solution, not a deal. That is what he said. He said: We need a solution, not a deal.

I could not agree more. I could not agree more. While I am going to vote for what has been represented to us probably tomorrow, I do not regard this as a solution in the true sense. It is closer to a deal. Some may argue whether it is a good deal or a not-so-good deal, but I see it as a deal, not a solution.

What is difficult for me is there is a solution out there. There is a solution that a lot of people worked on very hard, including the guy who helped craft the last bipartisan deficit-reduction plan in the Congress in 1997, Erskine Bowles, then-President Clinton's

Chief of Staff. He worked with a lot of folks—a Republican-controlled House, a Republican-controlled Senate. One of the people he worked with was a guy named Alan Simpson, a Republican from Wyoming. He was a pretty good deficit hawk in his day and still is.

The two of them and others came up with the deficit-reduction plan that led to several balanced budgets at the end of the Clinton administration. A lot of people forget we actually balanced our budget a dozen years ago—not just once, not just twice, but several times. We can do this sort of thing.

The deficit-reduction plan they came up with then was not just revenues, it was not just spending. I don't think it was just domestic discretionary spending or defense spending. As I recall, pretty much everything was on the table, and they came up with a deficit-reduction package—50 percent revenues and 50 percent spending—and as I said earlier managed to balance the budget several times in a row.

I like to say there are four ways to balance the budget. The first of those is to cut spending. The second way is to raise revenues. A third way is to grow the heck out of the economy. The fourth way is to look in every nook and cranny of the Federal Government, including every kind of program—defense programs, domestic programs, entitlement programs—and ask this question: Is there a way to get better results for less money or better results for the same amount of money?

If we pass this agreement and what is being presented to us that is before the House this evening, and we actually pass it in the Senate and the President signs it into law, we are going to see not the promise of the deficit commission's recommendations, which was co-chaired by Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson. We are not going to see the opportunity to reform or overhaul entitlements, to reform the Tax Code, to raise some revenues—not by raising taxes but by broadening the base, limiting some of those $15 trillion of tax expenditures. It is what it is.

One of the things we are going to have the opportunity to do and probably a greater need to do is this: We are going to need to redouble our efforts to look at programs—domestic, defense entitlements—and ask that question: How do we get better results for less money?

We have one former Governor, the Presiding Officer, Senator SHAHEEN leaving, replaced by another former Governor, Senator MANCHIN, now the Presiding Officer, who knows what it is like to make these tough decisions. He has had to do them for 8 years.

Just as an aside, I would like to say this: There are two Senators born in West Virginia. That is the two of us, two Senators who were former Governors and former chairs of the National Governors Association. So we share a very special bond.

Madam President, I am talking about what could have been and what I think still should have been; that is, the deficit commission's recommendations, which is broad-based and a real solution and not just a deal. That is not going to happen. Whether we like it or not, it is not going to happen.

The question is, What do we do? The suggestion is that we do at least more of what we are already doing; that is, trying to get better results for less money out of the Federal programs, all kinds of Federal programs, the kind of thing you and I did as Governors of our States, the kind of thing we are trying to do in the Federal Financial Management Subcommittee which I chair, formerly chaired by TOM COBURN. We work across party lines. It is a pretty good example of how we ought to work on how to get things done. Democrats and Republicans on the subcommittee work together. We work on the OMB, we work with the General Accountability Office, we work with the inspector generals and all of the departments of the Federal Government across the landscape. We also work with nonprofits such as Citizens Against Government Waste.

What are we working on? We are working on how to get better results for less money. How do we not just identify fraud, but how do we get rid it? How do we put a spotlight on agencies and departments and Federal folks who are doing a good job with good results for the money they are spending, and how do we put a spotlight on those who are not and make sure we get more good behavior and less bad behavior.

Almost everything I do I know I can do better. I think the same is true of all of us. The same is true with our Federal programs. We have to go for it. I like to try to find an opportunity in adversity. Albert Einstein used to say in adversity lies opportunity. I have been looking at this deal and trying to see where is the opportunity. The opportunity is to just do a better job in evaluating performance, demanding high performance, and working hard to get that performance and working with the administration and those Democrats and Republicans in the Senate.

One of the reasons I like the deficit commission's proposal is because it addresses some of the uncertainty that currently faces the business communities in our Nation, whether they happen to be large or small. I have heard—and I am sure the Presiding Officer has heard—from all kinds of businesses that one of the things they need from us is some certainty, some predictability. Businesses need certainty and predictability.

I have had any number of CEOs and businesses, large and small, who say to me that the reason we are sitting on a pile of cash and not investing our money is because we don't know what we are going to do with the budget. We don't know if we will have a default. We don't know what will happen with the Tax Code. We don't know if we are going to have an energy policy. We don't know if the Supreme Court or if the Federal courts are going to overturn the health care reform. We don't know if we are going to do something about our infrastructure, transportation or otherwise. Businesses are reluctant to spend money until we address those uncertainties.

One of the things I loved about the deficit commission's recommendation, refined by the Gang of 6, is they would have addressed uncertainty with respect to the spending plan and getting us on the right track for deficit reduction. It would have been bipartisan, and it would have been comprehensive. It would take a big step toward providing expectations and predictability and certainty with respect to our Tax Code, and we could use both of those.

I was talking today and listening a little bit to the news, and they were talking about who is winning because of this debate and who is losing. I would like to think that Democrats are not big winners or Republicans are big winners. I hope the American people, the people we represent, are at least modest side winners.

One of the things the President didn't want to do was have us go into default. He was willing to bargain long and hard in order to avoid default, and I commend him for that. The President doesn't want to have another debate over the debt ceiling until we get past the next election, and for him that was important. He wants to be able to run the administration.

As a Governor, I remember how hard it was for us in Delaware to work in the Governor's Office on more than two or three big things at a time. It is hard to do. This administration had their hands full on this issue for months and were unable to work on some of the other things they needed to be doing to help run our country and move us forward.

The other thing I think is important to the President is he wanted to get started or continue on the deficit-reduction side and finding more savings in reduction. He didn't want to slam on the brakes right now. If I could use a car analogy of driving down the road, we have been driving down the road for the last couple of years to try to come out of this recession with both feet on the accelerator. What the President didn't want, and what I don't want, is to go from both feet on the accelerator to both feet on the brakes.

One of the values of the plan that is being presented is that we don't make that transition. We do start tapping on the brake and eventually we do put the brakes on, but it is not just like that. So there are some things important to the President.

On the Republican side, they wanted deficit reduction; they wanted it to be real, they did not want it to be illusory—neither do we—and they are unwilling to raise any revenues, even by reducing some of those $15 trillion worth of tax expenditures—tax breaks, tax loopholes, tax credits, and so forth.

So we get, I think for the Republicans who are focused on spending and who didn't want to do any kind of revenues, even revenues that were being provided by dividing the base and lowering the rates, they weren't willing to go there. I think, for them, they can maybe declare victory.

The question is, How about the rest of us? How about the people who don't work here, the people who don't focus that much on partisan politics, how did they make out? For them, it is sort of a mixed bag. It is a mixed bag. If I were a teacher giving a grade in a class, I think I would assign it incomplete because we have plenty of work to do.

This idea of creating this bipartisan committee, joint committee, of 10 people, 6 Senators, 6 House Members—the total would be 12, 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans, I hope that works. I think—my preference would have been taking the Gang of 6, the people who worked for 1 year on a deficit reduction plan, which I think is a whole lot better, and just make them—if we are going to have a special committee—make them the folks on the committee. That isn't going to happen, unfortunately. They would have been my nominees, my appointees, but it is not my decision to make.

But, anyway, we are going to create this joint committee. Sometimes I think if we can't come to consensus on good public policy, what we are inclined to do around here is just to do more process. I hope and pray this isn't more process. I hope, at the end of the day, the men and women who serve on this joint committee will be open to our input and certainly open to the input of some of the Senators, including the Democrats and Republicans who served on the deficit commission and who went on to be a part of this Gang of 6.

The last thing I think I want to say is this: A lot of times in government—I hope we weren't quite as guilty of this in State government as here—but a lot of times in government we focus on symptoms of problems. We don't focus on the underlying disease or the cause of the problem. I like to use the patient analogy. The patient is exhibiting certain symptoms and sometimes we can look at those symptoms and figure what the cause of the problem is and try to cure the patient. Here the symptom has been all along the debt ceiling, but that is the symptom the patient is exhibiting or is facing. The underlying cause of the disease is the way we spend money and raise money. I think we have been treating the symptom—avoiding the default on the debt ceiling—but I am not entirely pleased that we are curing the patient, taking the steps to cure the patient.

That is sort of where I see us. I will close with these words. I see Senator DEMINT waiting to speak, so I will wrap up. A guy who never served in the Senate, served over in the House, Rahm Emanuel from Illinois, Congressman and later Chief of Staff to President Obama for his first couple years, Rahm Emanuel, now the mayor of Chicago, has a saying, and I think it is his original saying. He likes to say: ''Never waste a good crisis.'' Sometimes it takes a crisis around here to get something done. He likes to say: ''Never waste a good crisis.'' We have wasted this crisis, and we should not have done that. We should have taken the bull by the horns. I wish the President had embraced his own deficit commission sooner, more robustly. I wish our own leaders, Democratic and Republican, here and over in the House, had said: That is a pretty good idea. Let's give that a shot. Unfortunately, they chose not to do that. It was bipartisan. It was bicameral. It is unfortunate.

But it is what it is. We need to move forward. I just hope colleagues will be given the opportunity to offer a lot of input to this bipartisan joint committee that is being created, and maybe, in their wisdom, reporting back to us at the beginning of December, there will be some of the elements in deficit reduction that were captured by that deficit commission that are missing in this deal that is before us today. If that happens, this will have been a better outcome than I might have otherwise hoped for.

With that, I yield the floor and yield to my friend from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. Thank you, Mr. President.

The last 2 years—2½ years—have been remarkable in a lot of ways. We have seen a lot of things around our country that are beginning to change the political landscape in Washington.

After President Obama's election, with a lot of fanfare and hope attached, we saw a lot of changes begin in Washington—a lot of new spending with huge stimulus plans that clearly have not worked. We have seen a takeover of the health care system and the financial system.

But what we saw across America is what encouraged me. We saw millions of Americans, from all spectrums of politics, united, coming together for tea party rallies and townhalls. They were concerned about our country. They were concerned about the spending and the borrowing and the debt. In these groups were liberals and Libertarians and Independents and Republicans and Democrats—people with all political beliefs who knew intuitively, instinctively, in their guts, that, in Washington, we couldn't keep spending more than we were bringing in without bankrupting our country.

I joined a lot of those groups around the country, and these were hardly radical people. They were commonsense Americans from all walks of life who were just concerned about what we were doing in Washington. They wanted us to get control of the spending and debt. We saw a lot of people in Washington ignore what was going on. But across the country, many Republicans, and even some Democrats, were listening to what they were saying and made strong commitments that if they were elected to the House or the Senate, they would come and get control of the spending and the borrowing and the debt and try to return to some fiscal sanity, some concept of constitutional limited government that we promise people when we take our oath of office and that we would stand by it. So we saw many new Republicans come to the House and to the Senate with a commitment to get control of the spending and debt, to save our country from this obvious bankruptcy we are headed toward.

The tea party was involved with that. It is hard for me to listen to a lot of the criticism of the tea party and their desire to balance the budget. There is no one tea party. What we are talking about are thousands of citizen groups across this country who are being vigilant about their government, which is what our Founders asked them to be. They are not radical people. They are very commonsense people, and they understand what we are doing in Washington is about to destroy the country.

The tea party is being used a lot to suggest it is a small, radical group that is controlling some in the Republican Party. Over 70 percent of Americans agree with them—that we should balance our budget, that we should cut spending and send a balanced budget amendment to the States to ratify. For every person who says they are part of a tea party, there are hundreds of Americans who feel the same way who share those ideals of constitutional limited government and the concern and real fear that what we have been doing in Washington is taking our country literally to the brink.

It is deeply disturbing to hear the Vice President refer to tea parties as terrorists, as he did today, holding a gun to the heads of Republicans and forcing us to make cuts. Clearly, Vice President BIDEN and many here are not listening to what Americans are saying, and they are trying to diminish what Americans are saying by suggesting this is part of one small group.

The President showed right away this year, even after the November election, that he wasn't listening. He sent a budget to Congress that increased the debt another $10 trillion by his measures but actually another $15 trillion if we look at it in any kind of objective way. When the Republicans in the House demanded that they keep their commitment to cut $100 billion the first year, what did the President do? He said he would meet halfway, at $30 billion. He doesn't think we need to cut anything. He thinks we need to increase spending, and that is what he has been doing.

This is the second crisis we have had this year. The first was that year's budget, where we came right to the edge of closing the government because the President and the Democrats did

not want to cut anything—at least in the negotiations we see. If they are going to meet us halfway between 100, they start below zero if they end up at 30. They are not with us, and it is hard to negotiate with people who don't understand that we truly do have a problem.

Washington, as Senator RUBIO said, has a debt problem, but America has a jobs problem. One of the things we need to understand is, if we could stop growing the government, we could start growing the economy. More jobs would mean more tax revenue and less debt. But, unfortunately, this President continues to make things much worse. He wants to continue to spend and borrow, but he will not take responsibility for his spending. He has failed to lead and he loves to blame others. Sure, he inherited some problems—every President does. George W. Bush before him inherited a recession. Reagan inherited double-digit inflation, double-digit interest rates. Yet they moved to solve the problems. The difference is, Obama continues, after 2½ years, to blame others and his policies continue to make things worse.

Let's talk about this debt ceiling for a minute, this debt crisis, and try to set the record straight. Clearly, President Obama has failed to lead in this whole process. We do need to remember, while he is trying to blame others for this debt ceiling problem, that it was a Democratic Congress and the President who signed into law the current debt limit we have. This was not a Republican-created problem that we have. Then, for the last 4½ years, Obama and the Democrats had control of spending, so they set the debt limit, and they have spent the money to take us up to the debt limit.

We have known for the last 6 months that we needed to deal with this problem. Yet the President submitted no plan at all. He just asked Congress to rubberstamp an increase of $2.4 trillion in our debt, to borrow another $2.4 trillion, and, he said, with no strings attached. He didn't want to cut anything when this whole debate started—no leadership; 6 months, no plan, just speeches, trying to shift the blame.

He likes to ignore the fact that the House passed a bill that would solve our problem. It was a bill called Cut, Cap, and Balance. It cut spending right now, it controlled spending out over the next 10 years, and it sends a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution to the States to ratify. The response from the Democrats in the Senate and President Obama was truly astounding. The President says he wants a balanced solution, but he does not want a balanced budget. He has actually called us extreme for wanting to balance the budget, and, he said, we can do our job without a constitutional requirement to balance the budget. We can do a job on America, but we are not doing the job we were sent to do, and we certainly have proved we cannot control spending unless it is by law that requires us to do that.

Even though this bill passed the House by a large number, with some Democratic support, and it gave the President a $2.4 trillion increase in the debt limit but only if we cut spending and controlled it and created some permanent accountability, we sent it to the Senate, and the leader of the Democratic Party would not even allow it on the floor for any debate because he saw the polls. He saw that already, within just a couple days, that 70 percent or nearly 70 percent of Americans supported the approach of cutting and controlling spending and creating some permanent accountability. So it was pushed aside so we could make some more backroom deals, with no transparency, no accountability, no leadership.

I commend Speaker BOEHNER, Leader MCCONNELL, the Republicans who have worked through this process. Dealing with people who will not put a plan on the table is very difficult. The Republicans passed cut, cap, and balance. Then they followed up with another plan that was not so good, but it was a plan, and it did not even get past the front door in the Senate.

For 6 months, no plan from the President, no plan from the Democrats. Now we have gotten a deal with a partner who does not want to cut spending, after a November election where we were sent here, and the country pleaded with us to get control of spending, borrowing, and debt.

We can look at this deal two ways. There are two realities. From any Washington standard, this is a historic sea change in the way we do business. Instead of what we were doing last year, where we were talking about how much more we could spend and how much porkbarrel bacon we could take home, at least this year we are talking about the fact that we need to cut spending. So we can say the deal makes progress in that respect.

But in the real world, a dollars and cents world, we have to realize our country is on a path toward bankruptcy right now. We are projecting adding another $10 trillion or $15 trillion to our debt. No one is going to lend us that amount of money. We do not have 10 years. This deal does not change that trajectory at all. We will still borrow $10 trillion or more in the next 10 years. We will still add $1 trillion a year to our debt.

We cannot call this a debt reduction bill. We can not even call it a spending reduction bill. For the next couple years, it hardly cuts anything. When we talk about cutting in Washington, we are not cutting spending from where it is today; we are reducing the rate of increase that is planned. So it is important we tell the truth to the American people that while this deal may be the best we can do—with the leadership in the White House, or lack thereof, as well as the leadership, or lack thereof, in the Senate—it may be the best political solution we can get, but it does not solve America's problem. It certainly does not solve America's job problem, and it does nothing but add another $10 trillion to our debt if we are able to go that far.

I will be voting against this bill because I do not believe we have 10 years to try to get it right. I think it is very likely, over the next year or two or three, that we are going to reach a very real debt limit when no one will lend us any more money.

Today, in America, we have to borrow $140 billion a month in order to pay our regular bills. The people who are adding to that debt every month think it is extreme to balance their checkbook. It is time we get our House in order and force this Congress, by the Constitution, to balance its budget. We cannot continue to spend more than we are bringing in and expect to reduce our debt. That is the inside Washington mentality.

This deal is not a good deal for America. It may be the best deal Washington can come up with, with the current leadership, but it puts our country at risk. But in a Washington where there is no leadership in the White House, there is no accountability, and there is someone sitting in the Oval Office who will not take responsibility for anything, this may be a deal we have to accept for now.

I intend to vote against it because it is important we tell America the truth; that this puts our country at risk. It is time we do what is best for America, not what makes the best deal in Washington. I would encourage my colleagues to vote against this deal, even though I know they already have the votes. But I hope when this is passed, we will not think for 1 minute we have solved the problem, we will not try to convince Americans that now we have a few more years to spend and borrow without any repercussions.

We need to immediately get back to the debate that was getting America involved in the last election, which was balancing our budget and getting some fiscal sanity in Washington. While we are in desperate straits in our country right now, and we see our economy getting worse because of the policies of this administration, the good news is this: We can solve this problem with one more good election. That is what I am looking forward to: taking my case to the American people and the case they sent us here to make to this Congress, that we need one more election to finish the job they started in 2010. If they want us to get control of spending and borrowing and debt, we need a few more good people, such as the House freshmen who have stood their ground on this whole debate and those who have come in here in the Senate and have led the way for a balanced budget. It is that day I am looking forward to because on that day, we will once again, hopefully, listen to America, get our House in order, balance our budget, and do what is best for our country.

I yield back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING DR. AGNES VARIS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, I know the Presiding Officer cares a lot about Dr. Agnes Varis as well, and as soon as I finish speaking, I will take the chair so the Presiding Officer may say a few words about her.

I would like to say some words about a great American, a wonderful New Yorker, and a dear friend, Dr. Agnes Varis.

Sadly, for all of us, Agnes died last Friday, July 29. She fought a relentless disease for more than 2 years. She did not want a funeral, a memorial service or an obituary, but those of us who knew and admired Agnes could not allow this passing to go unremarked.

Agnes was a miracle worker, and I would like to take a few moments just to share a small fraction of the wonderful things she accomplished in her life of over 80 years.

Dr. Varis was an incredible woman who founded a generic drug company 40 years ago, when a woman CEO was very uncommon. After great success in business, she turned her time and support to people and issues she cared about. From her tireless support for affordable drugs to her generous and unwavering assistance to students, artists, musicians, and animals, Agnes was an angel to so many.

Agnes was a woman who did not take no for an answer. She fought for battered women of Bergen County, NJ, helped out music lovers seeking affordably priced tickets, supported and cheered on women in politics, and generously improved veterinary science and animal shelters.

When one met Agnes, one saw she was a powerful woman and a caring woman. She combined both those features in a beautiful human being.

She came from humble beginnings, and maybe that is why she never stopped making a difference in the lives of those around her. She would see somebody whom she hardly knew and hear about their plight and then move heaven and Earth to help them. She was a generous soul.

She knew education, success, and culture were essential ingredients to a happy life, and she brought all those gifts and opportunities to thousands, if not millions, of people.

Dr. Agnes Varis was born in Massachusetts in 1930 and was raised in Brooklyn, NY, my hometown. She was the only one of eight children of Greek immigrant parents to attend college. She earned her degree in chemistry and English from Brooklyn College and later in her career attended NYU's Stern School of Business.

Right out of school, she took an entry-level job in a chemical manufacturing company that focused on bulk pharmaceuticals and her smarts made her incredibly successful.

Agnes was a pioneer and a leader in the pharmaceutical industry. As president and founder of Agvar Chemicals and Aegis Pharmaceuticals, Dr. Varis worked tirelessly to increase the accessibility of lifesaving pharmaceuticals for people in the United States and around the world.

She was one of the founders of the modern generic drug industry and a key player in the adoption of the Waxman-Hatch Act of 1984, which created a streamlined approval process for generic pharmaceuticals. It is the reason affordable generics exist.

Today, just about every one of us takes generic drugs. They are low cost, save people money, and, even more importantly, it makes those drugs accessible to people who might not otherwise afford them. In this way alone, Agnes probably saved the lives of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of people.

She was the one who introduced me, along with a few of her friends, to the issue of generic drugs and why they are so important. I have worked very hard on that issue for over a decade—a decade and a half—and it was Agnes always importuning me on.

She was always generous, as well as being a skillful and savvy businesswoman. Nearly 1,000 unemployed service workers who lost their insurance in the aftermath of September 11 got Agvar generic drug plan cards, which were good for 1 year, and they gave free generic drug prescriptions at any Duane Reade pharmacy in New York City.

Isn't that amazing? No one asked her to do this. She heard it somewhere or other that there were people who lost their jobs, and she knew they needed drugs, so she bought them a drug card.

At the height of the AIDS epidemic in Africa, Agnes helped broker an arrangement between the Clinton Foundation and an Indian generic pharmaceutical company to provide affordable AIDS medications to African nations at a very low cost.

This was written up in all the newspapers but not Agnes's name. She did not want her name out there. She just wanted to do good, help people who needed help, save lives.

Agnes and her husband Karl were great music lovers. They loved classical music. Just as she brought affordable drugs to market, Agnes supported the arts and made music and concerts more affordable to all.

She donated the Agnes Varis Performance Stage to Jazz at Lincoln Center and sponsored the Jazz Foundation of America's national educational children's Jazz in Schools Program, which employs elderly jazz musicians. Just like Agnes: She knew there were elderly jazz musicians who were out of work and struggling. She knew bringing jazz to young children would be a great thing for many of them. She combined the two and just did it. That was Agnes.

She was one of the Metropolitan Opera's—in New York City, one of the greatest operas in the world—she was one of its most generous and engaging board members. She was committed to bringing opera, typically, again, to the widest possible audience, including those who could not afford tickets. In 2006, she funded the enormously popular Agnes Varis and Karl Leichtman Rush Tickets program, which offered expensive orchestra seats for $20, $25—affordable to one and all.

In 2009, Dr. Varis was appointed by President Obama to the President's Commission on the Arts and Humanities.

She was a great lady, a rare lady, someone who combined so many different attributes and made a powerful impression, even if one only met her for 10 minutes.

Agnes, we will miss you. But all your good works and all the possibilities and opportunities you made for others will allow your spirit to live on.

God bless you, Agnes Varis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHUMER). The Senator from Ohio

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I only wanted to add my voice to yours about Agnes Varis. I appreciate the junior Senator from West Virginia giving me a moment or two.

I have known Agnes for many years. I worked with her on generic drug issues for the last decade—more than that—when I was in the House of Representatives. She had a commitment and a compassion for the underdog that is rare in this world, especially rare for someone as successful as she was.

I remember years ago hearing her story as a Greek immigrant and with a mother who actually could not read and write and how Agnes was so important to that family after her father died when Agnes was a very young woman—a girl still—and how Agnes went to Brooklyn College and was, I believe, the only woman there at the time.

And something else Agnes did—and I apologize to the Senator from New York, now the Presiding Officer, for not hearing all of his remarks. Agnes really stepped up after Hurricane Katrina and helped by not just giving some of her wealth to these musicians who did not have jobs because of the destruction of New Orleans but stepped up and actually hired these musicians so they were actually working, not just getting help from her, hired them to go around to the schools and through much of Louisiana and play for students and teach students music and, if nothing else for those students who had the musical talent that most of us have, which is limited, helped those students appreciate music and appreciate jazz. So she was a terrific woman whom I last saw maybe a month and a half ago. I miss her. I miss her already. I miss her laugh and her smile and her

service not to just New York and New Jersey, where she lived, but much of this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MANCHIN. Thank you. It is hard to add to the Senator's recognition of Agnes, and also my colleague, the Senator from Ohio. You can tell Agnes touched quite a few of us in so many different ways.

Agnes was a friend of mine and also a friend of my family's. She was a dear mentor to my daughter Heather, who is in the industry. We are all going to mourn her passing. Heather introduced me to Agnes about 10 years ago, and from the first day I met Agnes, she was the type of person I always heard my grandmother would say: People don't know how much you care until they know how much care.

The thing about Agnes was it was not how much you had here, but it was what you had in your heart. Agnes was that type of person who was truly remarkable. She lived an astonishing life, Mr. President, as you referred to. She represented the best in our country, and she truly lived the American dream.

Agnes was a first-generation American and went to college at a time when few women attended college. She started at the very bottom rung of the chemical industry and worked her way up the ladder to the top. She was truly an entrepreneur. She and her husband Karl loved the arts, but they also took a risk. They took their life savings together of about $50,000 to start Agvar Chemicals.

Agnes was a fortunate American. She used her wealth to support the causes she most believed in, especially the arts, women's issues, and caring for the workers in New York after September 11 and, as we heard from our colleague from Ohio, after Katrina.

Agnes was always telling my daughter Heather that you can see a lot more from the edge than the middle, and it was the few who were willing to be on the edge who created the right middle. That deep and poetic statement is a piece of wisdom many in this country could benefit from hearing. Agnes had such a generous spirit, and over the years, my daughter Heather sought her ''agvice,'' as she called it, many times.

Our entire family and all of my colleagues, I know, who knew Agnes well are definitely going to miss her. Our thoughts and prayers are with her and her family. I am glad we had a chance to honor Agnes on the floor of the Senate. I know she would be so proud. I thank my colleagues for recognizing her also.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST H.R. 2553

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, we are entering the second workweek of a partial shutdown of the Federal Aviation Administration. I know the Congress, the President, and the American people have been focused on the debt and deficit crisis, but behind that, and not in the shadows to those of us who care about aviation, I want people to understand that what has been happening to the FAA is causing enormous pain throughout the country, and the pain will only grow because of an apparent shutdown of the attempts to pass the Federal aviation bill, primarily because of the House.

Because Congress has failed to pass the 21st short-term extension of the FAA—do you understand what that means? It is simply saying: I would like to have a clean bill of extension. That is all. No policy, just a clean bill. Give us another several weeks to work on some of the complicated issues.

So 20 times we have done that over 4 years, and there has been no objection. The 21st time, there is content—suddenly, policy is injected into the request for a clean extension, or the response to the request. In this time, nearly 4,000 hard-working Federal aviation employees have been furloughed. That means they go without pay. If things follow their current course, as I believe they will, they will go at least another month or more without pay. I do not know how many of them continue to stay in their jobs.

It has halted critical airport safety capacity and air traffic control projects. To be quite honest with you, the whole prospect of NextGen, that is, the GPS system of tracking planes and how far they are from each other—once we have that like every other industrialized country, they will be able to land quickly and more efficiently and with fewer delays.

They have suspended payments to hundreds of small businesses dependent upon reimbursement from contracts they have made with the FAA for their work. So that just stops. Things just come to a dead halt. Runways, control towers, whatever—they just stop, and they will stay stopped. They will remain stopped, as things are going now, throughout the month of August and the early part of September.

They have forgone more than $250 million in aviation tax revenue that is critical to supporting our aviation system. That is about $25 million a day that is meant to go into the airport trust fund that does not, and by the time we return, that will be about $1.2 billion.

Very shortly, I will seek unanimous consent to pass a clean extension of the FAA, and it will be objected to by the Senator from Utah. In some ways, you can say it is a futile gesture, but it is all I have left. It is all I have left in trying to take this incredible process which we have been working on, Senator HUTCHISON and myself, forever—forever.

With so much damage being caused, you might ask why not all of my Republican colleagues but some of them have refused repeated requests to pass a clean extension, some here in the Senate, mostly all in the House, all of the leadership in the House. So I want to outline how we have, in fact, in my judgment, come to this point.

The chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, which is called T and I—that chairman is my counterpart on the Commerce Committee. He has certain jurisdictions, and I have certain jurisdictions. They are not always the same. He is transportation and infrastructure; that doesn't comport exactly with the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee. But in any event, he seems willing to shut down the FAA, you know, is certainly going to stick it to the FAA employees, and there will be many more of them by the time this has ended.

It is a tragedy that never had to happen. It is a tragedy about ego, about bullying, about an attempt to prove one side would cave. It is sort of the worst kind of political bickering the American people are so sick of, but this time, they are going to pay a terrible price.

They are insisting on antiworker language. It has to do with the National Mediation Board. They know full well this was destined never to happen in the Senate. They knew full well the President of the United States had already said publicly a number of times that he would veto anything which contained this kind of language for the National Mediation Board, basically changing 75 years of labor law.

To be just a little bit explicit about this because it is interesting, what they want to do is have a system wherein if, when—you are voting to join a union or whatever, and let's say I am a worker but my mother is very sick, so I am at home taking care of her, so I do not vote. The fact that I did not vote does not mean I just did not vote; it means I voted no, thus helping the company, thus tilting, in a very odd way, very un-American way, what an election is all about.

We have not had a formal conference. Senator HUTCHISON and I have resolved over—and MARIA CANTWELL, JOHN THUNE—we have resolved over 250 differences between the House and the Senate, and now there are only about 12 that remain to be resolved, all of which can be resolved. But that is of no consequence.

I also sent over suggested language for a significant program such as the Essential Air Service Program, 6 weeks ago, to the chairman, Chairman MICA, that reforms in a way that saves $71 million each year for the 4 years of the bill in the Essential Air Service Program.

Six weeks ago, the House passed a clean, short-term extension—the 20th—like every other extension that has gone on around here forever—passed it clean, no policy, nothing in it, just extend it so we have more chances to talk—but then they promptly left on a week tour of European and Middle

Eastern airports, which made it a little more difficult to talk.

Since they returned, I have been told that unless and until the Senate accepts House language on their proposed changes to the National Mediation Board, they would negotiate no further, and that message was reaffirmed in the strongest terms this afternoon.

You know, this all started with Delta Air Lines. Delta Air Lines is out of Atlanta, GA. They do not have any unions. That is their business, not mine. They have had four elections. Unions have tried to organize four times.

Four times the unions have lost. So it would appear their chances are not very good in the future. But that doesn't stop Delta. They want to make sure we put in place a structured system that is out of kilter to a fair election, and other purposes with other unions.

What they then did is sent over an Essential Air Service policy rider on the extension—unprecedented—with which we didn't agree. Therefore, when you don't do it in the first place, or if you do it, both sides have to agree before you send it over—and it is easy to say we will extend it and include that policy because both sides agreed to it. But they sent over an Essential Air Service program essentially targeting rural communities in the States of Democratic Senators. If the House was serious about reforming Essential Air Service, they would have stayed at the negotiating table. They would have welcomed the chance to come back.

The House-passed extension is not about policy; it is about politics, and everybody knows that. So here we are on the eve of the August recess, and we have a choice tonight. We can pass a clean extension and put people back to work—all the 4,000 people who are furloughed and have gone through some period of time without paychecks. They would automatically be taken back and life would be as it was before through September 16. So that is another month and a half of wages they would have to feed their families, and contractors could go back to work, and projects at airports and related facilities could continue. It is very important.

Aviation is 10 percent of the American economy—the GDP. We have inflicted far too much damage on our aviation system for the needs of one airline—one airline.

I urge my colleagues to allow this consent agreement to go forward. It won't. But if you believe in the goal of having an FAA system that is funded, and is well, and which can take on the incredible technological needs that we have to—in particular, the Next Generation system, which is not just ground-based, but avionics have to be placed in every single plane that flies. That is a major undertaking.

What they have done by their decision is to take $25 million a day outside, away from the airport trust fund. The airport trust fund cannot afford that. What I want the airlines to be thinking about over the next number of weeks, until we can get back at this—unless everything suddenly changes tonight, but I doubt that—is how they are going to divide up between themselves the $1.2 billion they will owe to the airport trust fund.

I commit to the President of the Senate and my colleagues that I will do everything I can to make sure that not just the $250 million, which they have already vanquished out of the airport trust fund, which we depend upon for everything, but the billion above that. That will happen at $25 million a day, because they didn't want to give up anything so they could have their National Mediation Board stacked the way they wanted it, and in a most unfair and most un-American way.

Having said that, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 109, H.R. 2553; that a Rockefeller-Hutchison substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read the third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, for the third time in a week, I must object to another short-term Federal Aviation Administration extension. I want to make it absolutely clear that a long-term FAA reauthorization is a priority for this country, and it is a priority for me. The current lapse in FAA taxes and expenditure authority from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund is a detrimental situation brought on by the Senate majority's refusal to engage in substantive negotiations on a long-term FAA reauthorization bill, which, by the way, did pass the House. Additionally, it is not clear to me that the legislation just offered would avoid a retroactive tax increase on travelers. I didn't set out to cause FAA taxes to expire, but reinstating them on a retroactive basis is more than I am willing to subject taxpayers to.

As I have already said, I share House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman MICA's frustration, and the frustration of Republican leadership in both the House and Senate, that favors to organized labor have overshadowed the prospects for long-term FAA reauthorization.

Last year, the National Mediation Board changed the rules under which employees of airlines and railroads are able to unionize. For decades, the standard has been that a majority of employees would have to agree in an election to form a union. However, the new NMB—National Mediation Board—rules change that standard so that all it takes to unionize is a majority of employees voting. This means the NMB wants to count an employee who doesn't vote as voting for big labor.

Somehow, organized labor is able to claim that it is democratic to appropriate someone else's vote without that person's input and participation, even though the rule I am talking about has been in place for 75 years. They just changed it in favor of the unions. Unions win—at least the NLRB proceedings. They win 60 percent of the unionizing attempts.

I personally have not had any communication with anyone in the industry. I am here because I think what the NMB did is absolutely wrong, and someone needs to stand up to them.

This issue is much larger than the NMB itself, and the airlines and railroads impacted by the NMB ruling. If NMB succeeds, and the administration is allowed to put their thumb on the scale in favor of big labor in contradistinction to 75 years of labor law practice, every small businessperson anywhere will be at risk.

The long-term House FAA reauthorization bill does not create a new hurdle to unionization; instead, it restores the longstanding ability of airline employees to make decisions for themselves—and not just a few of them but all of them.

In a few minutes, I will ask unanimous consent for an amendment that includes NMB language from the original House-passed long-term FAA reauthorization, and this whole problem would go away. Again, in a few minutes, I am going to ask unanimous consent for an amendment that includes NMB language from the original House-passed long-term FAA reauthorization.

My critics will point out that both times I have previously asked consent, it has been for legislation that didn't include the removal of the NMB's heavy new hand. However, I have spoken frequently on this issue, and I bet my position is very well known. I was hopeful my earlier request for consent would stimulate discussion on a long-term reauthorization and the issues preventing a long-term reauthorization from taking place.

My concern is that the White House and their allies in Congress will continue to hide behind a perpetual series of short-term extensions, rather than working toward an actual bill. This is why I have decided to ask unanimous consent for an amendment containing the NMB language, because it is clear this is the only way to move this issue forward—by NMB language getting the law back to where it really has been for 75 years. As my critics will point out, this wasn't my first choice. But as my critics have made clear, this is the only way to actually acknowledge and deal with the issue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2553, which was received from the House; that the Hatch amendment at the desk

be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read the third time and passed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, may I make a further comment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I made one mistake in my remarks—which is very unusual. The repeal of the National Mediation Board's decision language did in fact pass the House. I said it didn't. It never passed the Senate and has never been debated in the Senate. The committee of jurisdiction has never brought it up, never had a hearing, and it was not raised during any of the floor considerations in the Senate.

I suggest that if we were operating under the rules the Senator from Utah wants to see happen, I don't think any of us would be here. I don't think there would be any mayors, Governors, or Senators, because most people don't vote. They would all be voting no. One way or another, we would not be here. It is ludicrous.

I regret very much that this card is being played. I regret even more the fact the business community and the airline community, in particular, led by Delta, was so quiet during all of this.

I got a message in the middle of this afternoon that the American Transportation Association, which is a legacy of the big airlines association, and Delta in particular, wanted to pass a clean bill of extension.

Well, that doesn't work, Mr. President. It is so easy to say we would like to have it passed. But it is much too late to do anything about it. There are no phone calls. The whole thing is really a sham. It is very painful, and potentially very threatening, to West Virginia. I therefore object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I have not wanted to pursue this issue, because the debt ceiling issue has absorbed all of the air in the room and in the United States, as it should; it is a huge priority. But I have to set the record straight a little bit about how this came about.

First, I agree with the House position. I would reverse the NMB decision because I think it is wrong. However, what happened here is that, after 20 extensions of the FAA bill because of disagreements on several issues, the House decided to put this one—well, actually, to be honest, the House didn't even bring up NMB; they put another issue on the extension language, and it is the Essential Air Service language, which we have been trying to negotiate but have not yet come to a full agreement on among all of the parties. It is really the NMB issue that is causing the House to shut down the FAA. So the entire FAA—not the air traffic controllers, thank goodness but 3,492 employees of the FAA have been shut down, and this affects 35 States. They are on furlough without pay, through no fault of their own.

And interestingly, airports that were in the midst of building runways or adding to their infrastructure or repairing their infrastructure also have had work stoppages because of the House action. The Associated General Contractors of America has estimated that 70,000 construction and related jobs are at risk because the House put an Essential Air Service amendment on a clean extension of the FAA.

Mr. President, I want the House position to prevail. But we are getting ready, in the next day or so, to leave probably for the month of August and then come back after Labor Day. We should not shut down the FAA because of a rider put on the extension of the FAA legislation that has not been negotiated.

In fact, Mr. President, the House has not even appointed conferees. The chairman of the House committee has not called a meeting of the chairman of the Senate, plus the two ranking members. There has been no full negotiation with the principals. Yet the House put this extraneous amendment on the bill, and the FAA is shut down and the lives of 70,000 people are at risk.

We got a letter from Boeing because they are trying to get their new Boeing 747–8 certification, but the workers are not there to do it. So in addition to the work stoppages—and the FAA has now issued a total of 219 stop-work orders across the country—we also are seeing the certification of a great new airplane also on hold. That may start disrupting the capability for the airlines that have purchased these planes to be able to start flying the airplanes and upgrading their services.

This just does not make sense. We are going to lose $1 billion in the aviation trust fund if we leave this Congress for the month of August and we don't extend the FAA—$1 billion of revenue paid by passengers in a ticket tax. They are paying it, but it is just not going to the aviation trust fund. It is going to the airlines in the form of a higher ticket price. It should be going to the aviation trust fund because that is what we use to build the runways and to make the repairs and to keep our airports operating. So we are going to lose $1 billion in revenue.

Here we are, on the brink of cutting spending and raising the debt ceiling and trying to put our fiscal house in order. Yet we are going to let $1 billion be lost that rightfully should go to the aviation trust fund. The users are going to pay for it anyway, and that money is going to have to be made up. How is it going to be made up? It is going to have to come from general revenue because contracts have already been let. That money is going to have to be spent.

I cannot think of anything more fiscally irresponsible than to tax the users, not put it in the aviation trust fund and have to replace that money at some point.

I am a fiscal conservative, and I am trying to make the cuts that are necessary, trying to do the things that are right. But I have to question those who are saying we are going to not be for essential air service—which has a total budget of about $200 million—but we are going to waste $1 billion to not let a bill go through that keeps the aviation trust fund and the FAA going. That just doesn't add up.

If we are going to be sincere about the wise use of our taxpayer dollars, I don't think it is right taking money from people who are traveling on the airlines and who are thinking that money is a ticket tax to pay for airport infrastructure when, in fact, it is going into the airlines' pockets, and then having the taxpayer make up that money because these contracts have already been let. Is that fiscal responsibility?

Here we are on the eve of trying to show fiscal responsibility and do the right thing for our country. I don't think so, Mr. President. It doesn't pass the smell test.

I hope my colleagues, before we leave—and the House of Representatives and the people who are supporting them in the Senate—will relent and let the FAA keep operating. Let's come back in the month of September and negotiate an FAA bill as we normally do in this Congress. If we can't come to an agreement, then, on the NMB—and I am certainly going to support changing the decision that was made—maybe we can talk harshly and throw down the gauntlet, but not without any notice, adding it to this FAA extension without ever negotiating on it. That is not the way we ought to operate. It is enough to make the people of our country think: You know what. We expect better. We expect better, and I expect better.

I cannot believe my colleagues would let the FAA shut down and jeopardize 70,000 jobs and take money from airline travelers—when on their ticket it says ticket tax for aviation trust fund—and defraud them because that tax is not going to the aviation trust fund. Is that going to make the people of our country believe Congress is doing the right thing? It doesn't pass the smell test.

It is time for the airlines of this country to stand up and say: We need a clean extension of the FAA, and we need for the House and Senate to meet, as we normally do, in a conference and take up the issues. As I said, I am going to support the reversal of the NMB decision, and I am going to support a reform of essential air service in the context of negotiating perimeter rule and other issues that are in contention, which is the honorable way to

proceed. But I don't feel very good right now about what the Senate is doing in supporting the House in an irresponsible position that is defrauding the airline passengers of this country right now because they are collecting a ticket tax that is not going to the aviation trust fund.

It is wrong, Mr. President. I hope in the next few hours our colleagues will come to their senses, do the right thing, pass a clean extension, and send it to the House, where I hope they, too, will act so that we can have a conference committee and work out the issues with honor and integrity.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I understand the anguish of my dear friend from Texas, and I don't disagree, except for one thing. The tax is not being charged, and that should be a savings to the customers and consumers who are using the air services. But whether it is or isn't, that takes away from the major issue, and there may be another issue on essential air service, I don't know, because I am not on these committees. I have been asked by our leadership to make these objections.

What is important here—and it is not some itty-bitty little thing—is that we have labor law regulators out of control. When the NMB—the National Mediation Board—which is run by a bunch of Democrats—comes out and does away with 75 years of labor law with just the stroke of a pen and makes employee votes not important, that is not some little itty-bitty issue. That is a big-time issue.

For 75 years unions have been winning union elections by getting a majority of the employees in a firm, not by getting a majority of those who vote. Those other people, whether they vote or not—and they may be sick, they may be ill, they may not have been able to be there, they may have been out of town—their votes are important as well. The unions have always had to get a majority, and they have done that year after year after year in most situations and in most union elections.

Let me give an example: Let's say you have a company with 1,000 employees and only 100 show up, and 51 of them vote for the union. Is it right to bind all 1,000 employees in the company itself when only 51 out of the 1,000 employees have voted for it? Of course, it is not. This is a very important issue.

All those who propose getting this long-term extension, or even a short-term extension, have to do is correct the National Mediation Board. Get union elections back to where a majority of employees are a requisite in order to have a union, and I don't think there would be any problem in solving this problem. It would be solved in a nanosecond.

Now, maybe this essential air service language is something that might cause problems. Well, I would suggest both sides get together and try to resolve those issues. But this is not some little, small issue. This is a big issue.

It even becomes bigger when you consider the National Labor Relations Board, run 3-to-1 by Democrats, and the President will not appoint the recommended Republican to make it an even 3-to-2, so it is 3-to-1. They are running ramshackle fast over labor laws in this country. This kind of oppressing is something they will do, if they can, in a nanosecond. They have been saying they are going to do it. They have been trying to enact card check for years. In fact, they have been trying to enact labor law reform—which I fought back in 1977 and 1978—for years so they can give the unions a decided advantage that should not be given under any circumstances in union elections.

If this gets through—the NMB—then what would stop the National Labor Relations Board, which handles millions of employees—millions of employees—from doing the same and continuing to do things that are just outrageous, like they are doing? They are usurping the ability of this legislature, the Congress of the United States, to run these issues the way they should be run. They should not be acting as a superlegislature, enacting laws from a partisan board to do these things.

This is not some little issue. This is a big issue. I wish I wasn't in the middle of it. I just happened to be here one day when I was the last one here, and I had to object. But I knew when I did object it was the right thing to do under the circumstances.

If we allow these boards to usurp our powers of the legislative branch of government and do anything they want to do because they have a supermajority—a superpartisan majority—then this country can't last, and the freedoms we all value will not last.

The freedoms we all value won't last. I don't want to see anybody not paid. I don't want to see anybody not be able to do their job. But, by gosh, I don't want to see a runaway National Mediation Board, either, or a National Labor Relations Board that will use a precedent such as this in ways it really shouldn't be used. So these are not small issues.

I hope we can get together. I hope the two committees will get together and resolve this issue. I am not on either of the committees. I am just someone who around here has had to stand up on some of these labor union issues—not against unions. I am one of the few persons in this whole Congress who actually earned a union card and became a skilled tradesman and worked for 10 years in the building construction trade union, and I am proud of it. But I have to say that I am going to call on both sides to get this problem solved and get rid of allowing the National Mediation Board to usurp the powers of the legislative branch of government and get the law back where it was, where it is more fair and where it makes sense. If we do that, I don't see why this would be held up for 10 seconds.

So I call on both sides to try to resolve this issue. I don't feel good being in the middle of it just because I happened to be on the floor at the wrong time. All I can say is that, having gotten in the middle of it, as much as I love and admire the distinguished Senator from Texas and appreciate and admire and love my friend from West Virginia—and I do—this could be resolved, and there is no reason we shouldn't resolve it. This is an important issue, and all I can say is that I would like to help get it resolved, if I can, and if I can, I will. But both sides have to get together, and that includes both sides of Capitol Hill. I think this problem could be resolved, but these are not little issues.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah, and I appreciate his passion for the issue. I agree with him on the issue.

The way for us to get together and resolve it is to have a conference committee, to have the conferees appointed on the House side. The conferees are appointed on the Senate side already, and we are ready to negotiate this bill. And I am going to be for the same position as the Senator from Utah because I don't think NMB made the right decision. I think it is a terrible overstretch, overreach of that board to change the law or change the regulation about what is a union election. I think they are wrong.

But we cannot solve the issue with the House sending an extension of the FAA with a rider that is completely separate from that issue. NMB is not in the rider, it is not in the rider at all, but that is the issue everybody is negotiating unilaterally here. The House has sent over a bill that has an essential air service amendment that also has not been negotiated, but what they are negotiating on is the National Mediation Board. Well, if that is confusing, there is a reason—because it is confusing.

So why don't we unconfuse and have a conference committee the way we normally do here, and let's hash out these issues. If we would have a chance to actually have a conference, negotiate all the issues, and then if someone is not satisfied, there are procedures that are honorable to blow up a bill that you don't like, but it is not honorable for the House to send an extraneous amendment on an FAA extension and shut down airports that are being repaired and built in our country, jeopardizing an estimated 75,000 jobs, jeopardizing the certification of a major new airplane that wants to get out there and start being used and an aviation trust fund that will lose over $1 billion because we are not collecting the tax, and the airlines are pocketing

the money by having a higher ticket charge, mostly. They may not all be doing that, but most of them are. That is just not right, and we are going to have to make that up because there are contracts pending that are going to have to be paid for.

It is not fiscally responsible, and it is not honorable, and it is time for us to pass a clean extension of the FAA. Let's negotiate until September 30, and then, if we can't agree, we won't sign a conference report and it won't come back. I will stand there and not sign a conference report, but it is kind of hard to do that if you are not doing the right thing by sitting down and talking.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Before the distinguished Senator from Texas leaves the floor, I wish to express my appreciation for her bipartisanship in working through this difficult issue.

Everyone understands that the labor issue is something that is overhanging this very important piece of legislation, but it shouldn't be hanging over an extension of the bill. Tens of thousands of people are not working because of this. Actual safety of our airports is a concern to me. FAA is doing everything it can to make sure it is safe and sound, but 4,000 people who work for the Department of Transportation are off work, in addition to the tens of thousands of people who have construction jobs. We have a new airport control tower in Las Vegas being constructed. They worked about 2 weeks, and they are now all laid off. It is not fair.

This extension should go forward and be resolved in conference with the other body. It is so unfair. But this is not the last word. There will be more said about this. This is wrong.

We are going to be leaving town leaving up to 80,000 people who are construction workers out of work. We need those jobs. I can't stress enough how much we need those jobs. So it is too bad.

I do thank my friend, the Senator from Texas, for being so forward-leaning on this and not being partisan. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Chair lays before the body the House message to accompany S. 365, I be recognized to move to concur in the House amendments; that the time until noon, Tuesday, August 2, be for debate on the motion to concur, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that at noon, the Senate proceed to vote on the Reid motion to concur; that the motion to concur be subject to a 60-vote threshold; that no amendments, points of order, or other motions be in order to the message prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. For the information of all Senators, it is my intention to have the Chair lay before the Senate the House message to accompany S. 365 at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow morning, August 2. There will be no rollcall votes tonight. The first one will be tomorrow at noon.

Mr. President, I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we do have a financial crisis in our country. The debt limit we will be considering tomorrow is the thermometer, the canary in the coal mine that tells us we are at a dangerous level. For example, we have reached it faster and at higher levels than we ever have, the result of which is that our debt rise is telling us we have to raise our debt limit. Those things happen periodically, but this one would be the largest debt limit increase in our history. We have never had such a surge.

The deficit for this single fiscal year ending is expected to be $1.5 trillion. The largest deficit President Bush ever had, and it was large, was $450 billion. The last 2 years have been $1.2 trillion, $1.3 trillion, and this year it is expected to be $1.5 trillion. Under the President's budget, we will go from interest on our debt this year of $240 billion to $940 billion in the tenth year. That is for a single year.

For example, our education and transportation budgets have greatly expanded. Spending $940 billion on interest will crowd out tremendous portions of the good things we would like to do with taxpayers' money. Instead of being able to improve our infrastructure or do other things we think could be good, we will be sending that money to debtholders abroad to pay them back for the money they have loaned us that we have been spending now. As I speak, 42 cents of every dollar we spend will be borrowed.

This is a very real situation. I have always felt that we have a responsibility to be honest with our constituents, and we are going to need to raise the debt limit. It places too much risk on our economy not to raise it. But I want to share some thoughts about why I am uneasy about the legislation that is before us and why I will not be able to support it.

I have been warning for months now that we are heading to a situation in which we will have a last-minute, eleventh-hour bill; that the Senate will be asked to pass it without adequate time to review it; that other bad items could be included in this debt limit increase. Additionally, it is not the kind of process we need to pursue.

Our Democratic leadership decided they did not want to bring up a budget. They instructed the Budget Committee chairman—of which I am the ranking member—not to bring up a budget. When asked about it, the majority leader said it would be foolish to have a budget.

We have gone now 824 days without a budget under the Democratic majority in the Senate at a time when we have had the largest deficits in American history. At this extremely important time we do not have a budget. They said it would be foolish to have a budget. My questions is, Why would it be foolish? Because, if you pass a budget—and one can be passed with a mere 50 votes. It is given an expedited procedure. It cannot be filibustered, it is guaranteed a vote in 50 hours, but you have a right to file amendments. When you file and get a vote on amendments, then people are held accountable for their yea or nay.

We have had a lot of people say we would like to do more. Maybe if we had a budget we would have had a chance to vote on spending.

The problem is a decision was made that it would be too difficult to execute the normal, regular order in the Senate, to bring forth a budget and actually have amendments filed and Senators do what they are paid to do. I think that is particularly problematic in light of what happened in the last election. The American people are not happy with us. They rightly believe that Congress cannot justify a situation in which 42 cents of every dollar we spend is borrowed. Congress cannot justify a $1.5 trillion deficit this year. People are not happy about that. I have been to town meetings and people say: You work for me. I am not happy.

You have seen that on television in the last election. It was a shellacking for those who thought that business as usual ought to continue in the United States of America; that money could just be borrowed, borrowed and spent, and when the problems hit we would just raise taxes on the American people and they would have to pay for our spending binge. People are not happy with this.

They were demanding, among other things, accountability. They were demanding that we in Congress be responsible for what we do. We should be transparent and willing to answer at home for what we had done. That is a fair request in a great Republic such as ours. I have been critical of the absence of a budget. We will not vote on one.

We had the Reid proposal and the Boehner proposal and finally this compromise proposal. Our colleagues, the Democratic majority, brought up the House budget so they could vote it down. It was a historic budget. They did it publicly. They voted on the floor. There were amendments. The House plan reduced spending by as much as $6 trillion. They changed the debt course of America. I would have liked to have seen them go further because even that plan to alter the debt trajectory of America, bringing down our deficits, still did not balance in the 10th year.

People say the House was radical and they did strange things. Not so. Read that budget. It was an honest budget based on good numbers. It changed the debt course of America. But even that,

as I said, did not go as far as we really need to go.

The House did its bit and we did nothing in return. Now we get to the point where the debt limit, August 2, is upon us and we are supposed to vote. This morning at 3 a.m., apparently, legislation was finally put together. It was brought forth to the floor of the Senate. We will vote on it tomorrow morning, maybe noon, after a couple of hours of debate tomorrow. I am really uneasy about that. I am uneasy about what is contained in it.

What does it do? The good part is it reduces our spending by about $2.1 trillion, maybe $2.4 trillion. A more solid belief is we will reduce spending if Congress adheres to the guidelines. Over a period of years we tend to figure ways around the limits and constraints that are put on spending, but the plan is to reduce spending by $2.1 trillion.

It is a step. It is better than more spending like we have been doing. In the last 2 years under President Obama, when the Democratic majority had 60 Senators in the Senate, nondefense discretionary spending went up 24 percent. The budget that the President submitted this year calls for a 13.5 percent increase in education for next year. Beginning October 1, fiscal year 2012, when we are in the worst financial shape ever, a 13.5 percent increase in spending? Is that common sense? Does that make reasonable judgment? Is that a reasonable judgment for America, when we are in a situation such as this?

It proposes a 9.5 percent increase in the Energy Department. It proposes a 10.5 percent increase in the State Department. It proposes a 60-percent increase in the Highway Department. And I'm told there will be a tax. I ask them: Mr. Secretary, what tax?

It will not be a gas tax.

I say: OK, we agree, it is not a gas tax. What is the tax?

We will talk about that.

The Congressional Budget Office said that is no income. You cannot say you have income to offset a big increase in high-speed rail and things like that if you do not have a source of revenue.

That is the situation in which we find ourselves. We have a deep, philosophical disagreement. The majority in this Senate and the President believe in spending. When I said 24 percent increase, that did not include the almost $1 trillion in the stimulus package. It did not include that, all of which, every penny, was borrowed because we are in debt. When you spend this extra money, you borrow the money. We do not have it to spend.

However, we have a disagreement about where we are heading in our country. We should have had a full, glorious debate in the Senate. The Finance Committee should be looking at how to deal with taxes. The Appropriations Committee should be asking how can we reduce expenditures. Every authorizing committee needs to be looking at what they can do to do the job better with less cost and more efficiently. The Budget Committee should be producing a budget that can be adhered to and passed, and that would bind the Senate to change the spending trajectory we have been on. But none of that has happened.

Instead, we have a bill to raise the debt limit. We are here because we spent so much money. We are up at the limit and if we do not raise the debt limit there will be substantial reductions in spending occurring pretty quickly. That is where we are.

I believe this bill raises serious questions about the Senate and how we do business. As I said, I warned that we would be at the eleventh hour when it all came forward.

One thing particularly concerning to me as the ranking member of the Budget Committee is that this bill deems certain budget numbers and in a way gets around, again, the budget process. It is going to give my colleagues, the Democratic majority, additional avenues to avoid producing a budget for the third consecutive year. I do not believe that is a healthy process.

Second, I ask my colleagues to think about this, and I will wrap up. I don't need to go into great detail about it. We are being asked to allow our leaders to select up to 12 people, 12 people who will be on a special committee and will have almost complete jurisdiction to work on any issue they choose. After they reach an agreement, if they do, that agreement will be presented to both Houses of Congress. There will be only 30 hours of debate, no opportunity to amend it, and there will be an up-or-down vote. I have to say the chance of an up-or-down vote being successful is very high, because the product that will come out of that committee will be in harmony with what the leaders who appointed the members of the committee desire, because the power to appoint is the power to control.

The committee will come back with this leadership proposal. It will be on the floor and it will be for an up-or-down vote and it is very likely to pass. Hopefully, it will have some good things in it. But it is unlikely that it would go past $1.5 trillion in reduced spending over 10 years. That is roughly what they have been given. That on top of the $900 billion that would go into effect immediately with the passage of the legislation would result in about a $2.4 trillion total.

I believe that is an insufficient number. It is not close to what we have to do given our expected debt. Over 10 years the debt of the United States will increase an additional $13 trillion. Reducing it $2 trillion is not enough. We have heard the economists and others testify before the Budget Committee. Republicans and Democrats, say those reductions are not sufficient. Many economists said the absolute minimum was $4 trillion, and this will be half that.

That legislation will then come before us. We will have an up-or-down vote and presumably it will pass. The great traditions of the Senate, full, free, open debate will not occur to the degree that it ought to occur. The regular order will not be followed. Committees will have only an ability to send over advice if they so desire. As a result, I think we as Members of the Senate need to ask ourselves if we are getting pretty far away from the traditions of this body when you do not have public debate on a budget, you create a committee of limited numbers of people to produce legislation that cannot be amended and will only be up-or-down and no ability to have a supermajority vote, but a 50-vote, contrary to the normal process of this body.

For those reasons I believe, as a Senator and a ranking member on the Budget Committee who has wrestled with this for some time, I will not be able to support the legislation, although I truly believe it is a step forward, and I respect my colleagues who worked hard to try to bring it forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period for mornings business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EAST AFRICA FAMINE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, many of us undoubtedly remember the heart wrenching images of starving Ethiopian and Somali children in the 1980s and 1990s. Those haunting images are hard to forget.

Unfortunately, I am compelled to come to the floor to draw attention to a tragic famine again confronting that part of the world.

On July 21, the United Nations declared ''famine level food insecurity'' in two regions in southern Somalia.

What does ''famine level food insecurity'' mean?

It means three tragic conditions are all occurring at the same time. First, malnutrition rates exceed 30 percent. Second, access to food and water is below subsistence levels for extended periods of time. And third, more than 2,000 to 10,000 people are dying of hunger each day.

Or more simply—a severe famine threatens the lives of 11 million people in east Africa today. The area affected by famine is expected to expand in coming weeks—and if not addressed soon—in coming months.

These millions of men, women, and children in Somalia and around the Horn of Africa are literally starving to death. These are children who will never reach their full potential because they do not have simple nutrients to fully develop—nutrients we take for granted.

Josette Sheeran, executive director of the World Food Program, carries around devastating photos showing what malnutrition does to the brain development of children.

She notes that when a child is born, about 60 percent of that baby's brain is formed and, if in the next 3 years in life they don't have adequate nutrition, their brains will not grow to maturity.

Her photos show the brain of a 3-year-old child who was properly nourished and that of a child who was malnourished. The actual volume of the brain of the malnourished child is as much as 40 percent smaller.

These are the innocent victims of hunger in east Africa and sadly, in still too many other corners of the globe.

I am happy to note that the U.S. is the largest bilateral donor of emergency assistance to this growing crisis. We have responded with over $431 million in food and nonfood emergency assistance this year alone. And Secretary of State Clinton just announced an additional $28 million in aid for people in Somalia and for Somali refugees in Kenya.

But more needs to be done and the United States cannot solve this crisis alone.

How did this happen again?

The Horn of Africa is rife with challenges, both natural and man-made. The region has had two insufficient rainy seasons culminating in the driest growing season recorded in 60 years.

Neither crops nor livestock are surviving, so food and commodities now sell at prices well beyond the reach of the country's people.

The price of red sorghum, a staple crop in Somalia, has increased more than 200 percent. In Kenya, the price of white corn has increased 58 percent. And in Ethiopia, the price of yellow corn has increased by more than 100 percent.

Millions of people, including in the neighboring countries of Kenya, Ethiopia, Djibouti, and Uganda are also at risk of starvation.

It's also a man-made crisis. Somalia's central government collapsed over 20 years ago. And al-Shabaab, a terrorist organization, has controlled much of southern Somalia since 2006.

Not surprisingly, the two areas most acutely experiencing famine are in southern Somalia, which is under al-Shabaab-control. Al-Shabaab recently expelled relief organizations, which effectively destroyed food-aid distribution channels—the lifeline for Somalis trapped under their control.

The mounting food crisis is also creating a refugee crisis that recognizes no borders. Already almost 25 percent of the Somali population—2 million out of 7.5 total million people—are displaced.

Kenya, with 3.5 million people who are vulnerable to food insecurity, is also already home to Dadaab, the largest refugee camp in the world.

This camp was built 20 years ago as a temporary shelter for 90,000 people. Today it holds 400,000. And another 1,300 refugees arrive every day from Somalia.

In Ethiopia, a refugee camp called Dollo Ado is holding 120,000 people. But with a population of 3.2 million people affected by the famine, this camp is growing by 2,000 people per day.

Mogadishu, the hollowed out capital of Somalia, has become an oasis in southern Somalia because relief organizations are allowed to operate life-saving programs there. This is the city that thousands of people have fled in the past 20 years due to violence.

Can you imagine Mogadishu being an oasis?

Yet the capital city is seeing a daily influx of 1,000 to 1,500 people.

This network of emergency and humanitarian programs is the only hope for millions of people and deserves continued international support.

Stepping in to provide food, water and basic sustenance where there is none is not only the right thing to do, it is the American thing to do. We have always led and joined efforts to help the most vulnerable around the world and should continue to do so.

The House passed its Agriculture Appropriations for 2012 and chose to reduce the aid available for emergencies like these by 49 percent.

Thankfully, USAID is on the ground in Africa providing expertise, and Administrator Shah personally visited the region last week.

And the Feed the Future Program—which is modeled on the Global Food Security Act I sponsored with Senators LUGAR and CASEY—has been undertaken by the Obama administration. The program works to break the cycle of hunger and food insecurity by getting at the root causes and helping countries develop their own viable agricultural sectors.

As Josette Sheeran points out, ''for the first time in most people's memory we're in a post-surplus world. There is no surplus of food in the world and you have one bad drought or one bad flood . . . it will impact the price of food globally.''

In the meantime, the international community needs to step up to the plate in east Africa before it is too late. And the United States must continue to show moral leadership even in a time of stretched budgets.

International donors are meeting this week in Nairobi to try to raise $1.6 billion to help with this crisis in Africa. I urge our friends and allies around the world to help do their part.

ALLIED INVASION OF SICILY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of the 68th anniversary of the Allied invasion of Sicily.

On July 10, 1943, under orders from GEN Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Fifteenth Army Group, comprised of GEN George Patton's Seventh Army and British GEN Bernard Montgomery's Eighth Army, began the Allied invasion of the island of Sicily, termed Operation Husky.

Prior to the ground invasion, brave Allied pilots softened the Axis defenses with heavy aerial bombardment. In the early hours of July 10, Allied ground forces successfully landed on enemy shores with little resistance.

Over the next few days Allied forces continued on with much success. On July 11 and 12 enemy forces attempted numerous counterattacks, all of which were repelled by the skill and determination of the American forces. On July 22, an element of GEN Patton's Seventh Army captured the city of Palermo, the news of which so inspired the Italian people that on July 24 and 25 a palace revolt took place toppling the fascist government of Mussolini.

On July 31 Italian and German forces, faced with certain defeat, began a tactical withdrawal from Sicily.

One of the heroes of the action of July 31 received the Medal of Honor. Near Gagliano, Sicily, SGT Gerry H. Kisters, of Bloomington, IN, and nine other soldiers ''. . . were advancing ahead of the leading elements of U.S. troops to fill a large crater in the only available vehicle route through Gagliano,'' the award citation reads, and ''. . . was taken under fire by 2 enemy machineguns. Sgt. Kisters and the officer, unaided and in the face of intense small arms fire, advanced on the nearest machinegun emplacement and succeeded in capturing the gun and its crew of 4. Although the greater part of the remaining small arms fire was now directed on the captured machinegun position, Sgt. Kisters voluntarily advanced alone toward the second gun emplacement. While creeping forward, he was struck 5 times by enemy bullets, receiving wounds in both legs and his right arm. Despite the wounds, he continued to advance on the enemy, and captured the second machinegun after killing 3 of its crew and forcing the fourth member to flee.''

For his actions under fire Lieutenant Kisters received our Nation's highest military award, the Medal of Honor.

Lieutenant Kisters, like so many Hoosiers before and since the Battle of Sicily, demonstrated the stalwart courage and self-sacrifice that is necessary to preserve the freedom and liberty that we all too often take for granted.

Lieutenant Kisters, in addition to receiving the Medal of Honor, also received a Distinguished Service Cross and a Bronze Star during WWII, not to mention his Purple Heart, and continues to be remembered and honored in Indiana, where last year July 31 was named Gerry Kisters Day in Bloomington, and in 1945 Monroe County Airport was dedicated as Kisters Field in honor of the Medal of Honor awardee.

As we recognize these historical events, I call attention to the 99,500 military personnel who today are on the ground in Afghanistan, with another 31,000 deployed to the region aboard ships at sea, on bases, and air

stations in the region supporting Operation Enduring Freedom. Mr. President, 48,110 personnel are deployed to Iraq, with another 32,000 deployed to the region aboard ships at sea, on bases, and air stations; 4,469 have been killed in Iraq operations since 2003, and 1,638 have been killed in Afghanistan since 2001. These men and women continue to answer the call to serve a cause greater than themselves as those men did in Operation Husky 68 years ago this month. I ask my colleagues here today to join me in humbly honoring Lieutenant Kisters, and all those who have and continue to serve our Nation in uniform, for their inspirational service, selflessness, and sacrifice.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT NATHAN R. BEYERS

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life and heroic service of a young Coloradan, SGT Nathan R. Beyers. Sergeant Beyers died on July 7, 2011, when insurgents attacked his convoy with an improvised explosive device in Baghdad, Iraq. Sergeant Beyers was serving in support of Operation New Dawn. He was 24 years old.

Sergeant Beyers loved the Army and he was proud to be serving our country. Born and raised in Littleton, CO, Sergeant Beyers graduated from ThunderRidge High School. He joined the Idaho National Guard a few years ago, and he was assigned to Bravo Company, 145th Brigade Support Battalion, 116th Cavalry Brigade Combat Team.

He is remembered by family, friends, and servicemembers as a brave soldier, dedicated husband, and proud father. Sergeant Beyers and his wife, Vanessa Mary Beyers, recently had their first child. Vanessa said that he died ''doing something he loved.'' Hundreds gathered at Fort Logan National Cemetery in Denver to honor and remember Sergeant Beyers.

Sergeant Beyers' commanding officers immediately recognized his exceptional bravery and talent. He earned, among other decorations, the Bronze Star Medal, Purple Heart, Army Good Conduct Medal, Army Reserve Components Achievement Medal, National Defense Service Medal, and Iraq Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star.

Mark Twain once said, ''The fear of death follows from the fear of life. A man who lives fully is prepared to die at any time.'' Sergeant Beyers's service was in keeping with this sentiment: by selflessly putting country first, he lived life to the fullest. He lived with a sense of the highest honorable purpose.

Mr. President, I stand with Colorado and people nationwide in profound gratitude for Sergeant Beyers's tremendous sacrifice. He served proudly and honorably in Iraq when his country needed him most. We are humbled by his service and his sacrifice. I ask my colleagues to join me in extending heartfelt sympathy and condolences to Sergeant Beyers's family.

MARDI GRAS INDIANS HALL OF FAME DAY

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, most of my Senate colleagues are aware of the rich culture and heritage that is on display in Louisiana during the days and weeks before Lent. Parties and parades mark the end of the Mardi Gras season and the beginning of fasting and sacrifice. But few outside of Louisiana are familiar with the unique tradition of the Mardi Gras Indians.

I rise today to celebrate this unique Louisiana tradition and recognize the Mardi Gras Indians Hall of Fame Day to be celebrated at Oretha Castle Haley Elementary School in New Orleans, LA, on August 7, 2011.

The history of the Mardi Gras Indians dates back to the late 1800s, but their origin remains a mystery. Because most of their history and practices have been passed from generation to generation orally, we may never know if the Mardi Gras Indians came about to pay homage to Native Americans for hiding runaway slaves or simply as a expression of the connection between Native Americans and African Americans. What we do know is that their tradition adds an incredible story to the history of New Orleans and Mardi Gras.

Today, the Mardi Gras Indians consist of more than 40 individual tribes. These tribes compete against one another using chants and music along with their elaborately decorated costumes called ''suits.'' The suits are each hand sewn by the tribe members and typically take an entire year to complete. Ornaments on the suits can include feathers, ostrich plumes, beads, velvet, rhinestones, and sequins, all beautifully sewn together to tell the story of the individual tribe member and contribute to the tapestry of whole tribe. Native American, Aztecan, Caribbean, and West African cultures have all greatly influenced the work of art that is the Mardi Gras Indian suit.

The traditions of the Mardi Gras Indians also include a hierarchy structure consisting of a ''big chief,'' a ''big queen,'' ''chiefs,'' ''spy boys,'' ''flag boys,'' and ''wild men,'' just to name a few. Every member of the tribe has a specific set of duties culminating in the big chief who represents the tribe against all other tribes.

In addition to being a key part of Mardi Gras, Mardi Gras Indians are strong community leaders in New Orleans and the surrounding areas. The Mardi Gras Indians have worked to preserve, celebrate, and advance the cultural arts and music of their tribes and communities. By doing this, the tribes have also continued to encourage the younger generations to learn and embrace the tribes' histories. One tribe, the Guardians of the Flame, has established a nonprofit called Guardians Institute to educate New Orleans children on the importance of art, music, and history in order to keep these traditions alive.

Dr. Roslyn Smith, former principal of Oretha Castle Haley Elementary School in New Orleans, summarized the Mardi Gras Indians best by saying, ''the Big Chiefs are community leaders, and in many ways they are social warriors, struggling to preserve traditions of beauty in the community while working to make the communities better places.'' Please join me in honoring and celebrating the Mardi Gras Indians and especially the Mardi Gras Indians Hall of Fame Day on August, 7, 2011.

CAMPBELL COUNTY, WYOMING

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate the Centennial of Campbell County, WY.

The citizens of Campbell County are blessed to live in this beautiful environment. Located in northeastern Wyoming and nestled in the Powder River Basin, the county is bordered by the Black Hills and the Big Horn Mountains. Its 39,000 residents live in the communities of Gillette, Wright, Weston and Rozet. Land was taken from previously established Weston and Crook counties to create the new district. Officially recognized on May 23, 1911, the county was named after John A. Campbell, Wyoming's first territorial Governor.

Campbell County as we know it today is vastly different from 100 years ago, but it is this shared history between today's residents and those of the past that creates a special bond. It has been host to Native Americans, fur trappers, mountain men, homesteaders, ranchers and oil men. The basin area was first used by members of the Sioux, Crow and Arapaho Native American tribes. They used the wide plains and grasslands as hunting grounds, and evidence of their presence can still be found today. Fur trappers and mountain men also traveled in the county. One such frontiersman, Robert Campbell, was a successful trader and explorer of the Rocky Mountains. He travelled through the county on his way to the Wind River Mountains.

The construction of the railroad had a major impact on the development of Campbell County. As the desire to move west increased, the residents of the county recognized the need to lay tracks of their own. Incorporated as a town in 1891, Gillette was originally developed as a transfer point for the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad. It was named after Edward Gillette, who was in charge of an early survey for the railroad. The addition of the railroad, along with the emigrant trails in the area, was essential to the establishment of the county.

Campbell County has since capitalized on these rich opportunities for growth and development. While ranching and agriculture are important industries, the extraction of coal, oil and natural gas is widely acknowledged as the principal industry within Campbell County. The residents proudly recognized their county as the Energy Capital of the Nation. The Powder River Basin is the largest supplier of coal in

the United States, providing nearly 40 percent of the Nation's coal. Coal mining has had an important role in the development of the county's infrastructure. For instance, Wright was built in close proximity to the Black Thunder coal mine, the second most productive coal mine in the United States. Improved technology in extraction methods has increased the production of coal bed methane gas and oil. These advancements will continue to serve the nation's growing energy needs well into the future.

This year, the Campbell County Centennial Committee has planned several countywide celebrations, including the installation of a Survey Plaque in the Campbell County Courthouse. In addition, the Centennial Ranch Committee plans to honor the members of 33 ranches that have been in operation for 100 years or longer. It is my pleasure to recognize the following ranches and their commitment to preserving Wyoming's ranching way of life: the Brennan Ranch, T-Chair Ranch, Pumpkin Butte Ranch, Christensen Ranch, Clabaugh Ranch, Collins Ranch, Daly Ranch, Fitch Ranch, 2 Heart Ranch, Hall Ranch, Innes Ranch, Kretschman Ranch, Little Buffalo Ranch, T7 Ranch, Maycock Ranch, Mooney Ranch, Morse and Harris Family Ranch, Have Not Ranch, Oedekoven Ranch, Pahasha Ranch, Parks Ranch, Parks Evans Ranch, Paul Rourke Ranch, Sorenson Ranch, Swartz Ranch, Thar Ranch, Underwood Ranch, Wright Ranch, Barlow Ranch, Bridle Bit Ranch, John Hines Ranch, Kuhbacher Ranch and West Cross V Ranch.

In honor of the centennial of Campbell County, I invite my colleagues to see this wonderful place in person. I applaud the residents of the county for their efforts to celebrate such rich history and to present it to visitors from all over the world.

BOYS AND GIRLS CLUBS OF CENTRAL WYOMING

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, on Tuesday, August 9, 2011, I will have the honor of announcing the Boys and Girls Clubs of Central Wyoming's Youth of the Year at their annual award and recognition breakfast. This event is a wonderful celebration. In addition to the Youth of the Year, the Boys and Girls Clubs will honor two of Wyoming's own: Vice President Dick Cheney and Lynne Vincent Cheney. They are being recognized for their devotion and commitment to the youth in our communities and across the State of Wyoming. While both of these distinguished individuals have received many honors and accolades, to be recognized by the Boys and Girls Clubs is very special to them.

The Boys and Girls Clubs of Central Wyoming is a great organization that continues to have a positive impact in the lives of youth. They serve all children, regardless of economic circumstances. Dedicated staff and volunteers enthusiastically work with the students, creating an environment that fosters their positive growth and development. Young people are provided the tools and opportunities needed to succeed. Hundreds of kids benefit each year from the Boys and Girls Clubs.

The mission of the Boys and Girls Clubs is to create a better future for its members through focusing on positive outcomes: academic success, good character and citizenship as well as healthy lifestyles. At this year's awards and recognition breakfast, three outstanding young people will be honored and one will be chosen as the 2011–2012 Youth of the Year. These young citizens have excelled in all of the positive outcomes, and serve as excellent examples for other youth to follow.

Jessica Treto is a sophomore at Kelly Walsh High School. She loves to play card games with younger club members and admits she hardly ever wins. Jessica wants to be a counselor because she enjoys helping people.

Chrissy Stufft is also a sophomore at Kelly Walsh High School. She is a cheerleader and plays third base on her softball team. Her favorite television show CSI has inspired Chrissy to be a forensic scientist.

Anthony MacMillan is a junior at Natrona County High School. Anthony is an avid swimmer. Due to his love for cooking, he wants to be a pastry chef.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Jessica, Chrissy, and Anthony. Knowing of these fine young people gives me the confidence that the future of America is in good hands.

TRIBUTE TO JORDAN BROWN

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Jordan Brown for his hard work as an Indian Affairs Committee intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Jordan is a native of Wyoming and graduated from Sheridan High School. He attends Stonehill College in Massachusetts where he is majoring in political science and minoring in business administration. Throughout his internship, he has demonstrated a strong work ethic which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the time he has been with us.

I thank Jordan for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL DECECCO

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Daniel DeCecco for his hard work as an intern in my Rock Springs office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Daniel is a native of Wyoming and graduated from Green River High School. He attends the University of Wyoming, where he is majoring in business economics and international studies. Throughout his internship, he has demonstrated a strong work ethic which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I thank Daniel for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.

TRIBUTE TO BRIAN LYNCH

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Brian Lynch for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Brian is a native of Wyoming and graduated from Encampment High School. He attends the University of Wyoming, where he is majoring in criminal justice with a concentration in pre-law. Throughout his internship, he has demonstrated a strong work ethic which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I thank Brian for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.

TRIBUTE TO ABIGAIL MULCAHY

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Abigail Mulcahy for her hard work as an intern in my Cheyenne office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Abigail is a native of Wyoming and graduated from Central High School. She attends the University of Wyoming, where she is majoring in political science and minoring in music. Throughout her internship, she has demonstrated a strong work ethic which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I thank Abigail for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will

have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.

TRIBUTE TO KYLIE NEGICH

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Kylie Negich for her hard work as an intern in my Sheridan office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Kylie is a native of Wyoming and graduated from Laramie High School. She attends the University of Wyoming, where she is majoring in business administration. Throughout her internship, she has demonstrated a strong work ethic which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I thank Kylie for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.

TRIBUTE TO RACHEL SCHMIDT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Rachel Schmidt for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Rachel is a native of Wyoming and graduated from North Atlantic Regional High School. She graduated from the University of Wyoming, where she majored in international studies and Spanish. Throughout her internship, she has demonstrated a strong work ethic which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I thank Rachel for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.

TRIBUTE TO KATHERINE SCHUM

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Katherine Schum for her hard work as an intern in my Cheyenne office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Katherine is a native of Wyoming and graduated from Cheyenne Central High School. She graduated from the University of Wyoming, where she majored in elementary education with a concentration in diversity. Throughout her internship, she has demonstrated a strong work ethic which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I thank Katherine for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.

TRIBUTE TO ALLISON STRUBE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Allison Strube for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Allison is a native of Wyoming and graduated from Laramie High School. She attends the University of Wyoming, where she is majoring in political science and minoring in German. Throughout her internship, she has demonstrated a strong work ethic which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I thank Allison for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.

TRIBUTE TO CLAYTON TANNER

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Clayton Tanner for his hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Clayton is a native of Wyoming and graduated from Lander Valley High School. He attends the University of Wyoming/Casper College where he is majoring in English and journalism. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the time he has been with us.

I thank Clayton for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL ZABRISKIE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Daniel Zabriskie for his hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Daniel is a native of Wyoming and graduated from Natrona County High School. He attends the University of Wyoming where he is majoring in criminal justice and minoring in communication. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I thank Daniel for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.

GOSHEN COUNTY, WYOMING

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the Centennial of Goshen County, WY.

Goshen County is remarkable. Its 13,250 residents are fortunate to live in the unique and diverse communities of Torrington, Lingle, Fort Laramie, LaGrange and Yoder. Nestled in a temperate basin along the North Platte River, the people have always connected with the land and its legacy. Officially recognized on February 24, 1911, the basin area has a rich history, one that gave the county its unique name. Legend has it an unknown traveler roamed the area known as Goshen's Hole. Though his identity was never discovered, he was most likely a trader or a fur trapper. The legend of the name's origins has long been celebrated and contended by the folks in this area.

Goshen County was a gateway to the Wild West, and its organization benefited from those headed westward. The Goshen Hole area, a popular stop for many, saw traffic from Native Americans, mountain men and fur traders. Thousands of emigrants following the California, Mormon and Oregon trails passed through the county by way of Fort Laramie. Established in 1834 along the banks of the Laramie River, the fort served as a trading post, post office, resting point and an important military base during the Plains Indian Wars. Today, the community of Fort Laramie works to preserve the fort's key role in our State's history.

Between 1876 and 1887, the area hosted part of the Cheyenne-Black Hills Stage Route between Cheyenne and Deadwood, SD. The route provided safe transport of freight, gold and passengers through land inhabited by Sioux Indians. The town of LaGrange began as one of many stage stops created to accommodate these passengers—it is now the oldest incorporated town in Goshen County. The development of the Union Pacific Railroad extension project offered new opportunities and connected the county to an ever-expanding West. Yoder began as a station along the extension line into the valley, and later prospered as an agricultural center. These

extended tracks—coupled with the stage routes—were vital to the county's establishment.

Today, the county is home to those looking to tame their own bit of the Wild West. Thanks to its temperate climate, agriculture is Goshen's primary industry. A highly developed irrigation system borrows waters from the North Platte River, the Hawk Springs reservoir and the Pathfinder Dam, which allows profitable crops of sugar beets, beans and wheat to prosper in the North Platte Valley. Small-acreage farms and sustainable growing practices bring the farming tradition into the 21st century. The county is consistently the leading beef producer in the state as over 200,000 head of cattle are raised each year. In addition, Goshen County is working to answer America's growing energy demands. Its proximity to the Niobrara Shale Formation provides the county with opportunities for future oil and natural gas production.

In honor of the 100th anniversary of Goshen County, I urge my colleagues to see this ''Valley of Abundance'' in person. I congratulate the citizens who have worked so hard to preserve the county's heritage. They should be proud to celebrate this landmark achievement.

CUBA

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I condemn in the strongest possible terms the Cuban regime's unjust incarceration of Alan Gross. As the editorial highlights and as the Castro regime well knows, Mr. Gross is simply a humanitarian who was seeking to help the Jewish community in Cuba access the Internet. Only the most oppressive, totalitarian regime would seek to jail someone for trying to expand access to uncensored information.

As this editorial notes, ''The regime in Havana is so brittle and creaky that it blanches at the idea of its subjects communicating too freely with the outside world, lest they undermine a communist system whose attempts at economic development have delivered scanty results.''

I also take this opportunity to once again call on the Obama administration to halt its new Cuba policies that liberalize travel and expand allowable remittances to Cuba. This unilateral gift to the Castro brothers by the Obama administration is totally unwarranted, especially in light of Mr. Gross' case as well as the ongoing repression of the Cuban people.

I ask unanimous consent that a July 29, 2011, editorial by the Washington Post entitled ''Cuba Should Free Alan Gross'' be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, July 29, 2011]

CUBA SHOULD FREE ALAN GROSS

Alan P. Gross, the U.S. Agency for International Development subcontractor who committed what Cuba considers the unconscionable offense of making the Internet available to members of its minuscule Jewish community, has almost exhausted possible judicial appeals of his 15-year prison sentence.

Mr. Gross, 62, a resident of Potomac, was arrested in December 2009 as he prepared to fly home from Havana. Convicted on trumped-up charges in March this year, he appeared a few days ago before Cuba's highest tribunal to appeal his conviction and plead for release. The outcome of his appeal, expected in the coming days, is certain to be dictated one way or another by Cuban leader Raul Castro—and will be a sign of whether Cuba is remotely interested in better relations with Washington.

Cuba, besides its repressive ally Venezuela, is virtually the only place in the Western Hemisphere where distributing laptop computers and satellite phone equipment intended to connect people to the Internet—Mr. Gross's supposed ''crime''—could be construed as subversive. The regime in Havana is so brittle and creaky that it blanches at the idea of its subjects communicating too freely with the outside world, lest they undermine a communist system whose attempts at economic development have delivered scanty results.

There are plenty of humanitarian reasons to release Mr. Gross, who has been confined for 19 months. Somewhat overweight when he was arrested, Mr. Gross has lost 100 pounds, according to his wife and other American visitors who have been allowed to meet with him; he also suffers from gout, ulcers and arthritis. His daughter is struggling with cancer, and his mother is reported to be in poor health.

Cuban authorities have portrayed Mr. Gross as a spy involved in an enterprise aimed at undermining the regime. That seems unlikely in the extreme. In fact, Mr. Gross, a veteran development worker who had minimal command of Spanish, was part of a democratization project of the sort the U.S. government runs in countries all over the world.

At the time of his arrest, Mr. Gross was working for Development Alternatives Inc., a Bethesda firm that had won a $6 million government contract to promote democracy in Cuba. His work consisted mainly of providing computers and satellite phones to Cuban Jews, a community thought to number about 1,500, so they could access the Internet, whose use is restricted in Cuba, and contact Jewish communities beyond Cuba's shores. Not exactly a cloak-and-dagger project likely to bring the Castro brothers to their knees.

The Obama administration has made it clear that any improvement in relations with Cuba is on hold pending Mr. Gross's release. That's a fitting response to the communist regime's knee-jerk behavior in persecuting an American whose ''crime,'' if any, may have been an excess of naiveté.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING DR. MELVIN SABSHIN

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to Dr. Melvin Sabshin, a tireless advocate for mental health issues, who passed away on June 4, 2011. I am proud that Dr. Sabshin's family lives in Connecticut and honored to remember a man who spoke out against harmful discrimination, breaking down the stigma of mental health ahead of his time.

As the former director of the American Psychiatric Association, Dr. Sabshin worked diligently to advance the field of psychiatry by strengthening research efforts and advocating for increased mental health funding.

Dr. Sabshin was born on October 28, 1925, in New York City. Graduating high school at age 14 and college at 17, he was a scholar from childhood. After graduating from the University of Florida, he served briefly in the U.S. Army and then enrolled in medical school and completed his residency at Tulane University in Louisiana. Upon graduation from medical school, he practiced medicine at the Michael Reese Hospital in Chicago and eventually became the head of the University of Illinois' Department of Psychiatry.

At the University of Illinois, he became an active member of the American Psychiatric Association. In 1974 he was appointed medical director of the American Psychiatric Association and served as director until 1997. During his time, he oversaw the publication of new editions of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, which sets standard criteria for classifying mental health conditions.

In fighting discrimination, he worked tirelessly to eliminate homosexuality from the list of psychiatric disorders in the manual, and his work helped to change attitudes toward homosexuality. During his tenure as director, Dr. Sabshin was also a leading voice against the ideological manipulation of psychiatry by communist authorities in the Soviet Union.

Upon his retirement from the American Psychiatric Association, Dr. Sabshin was hired as a clinical professor at the University of Maryland's medical school. He also was an Honorary Fellow of the Royal College of Psychiatrists. He is survived by his wife Marion Bennathan of London, his son Dr. James Sabshin of Woodbridge, CT, and four granddaughters.

Dr. Sabshin has been called ''central to the evolution of modern American psychiatry.'' This characterization could not be more accurate. Dr. Sabshin's death is a great loss to the professional community and especially to all those who have benefited from his many years of great public service. I know my colleagues will join me in honoring the great life of Dr. Melvin Sabshin.•

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI DELTA RESEARCH CENTER

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 50th anniversary of the University of Missouri's Delta Research Center. The Portageville, MO, facility was officially dedicated on August 8, 1961, and has since become a beacon for the agriculture industry. I am so proud of the Delta Center's many accomplishments.

Over the course of five decades, the success of the Delta Center was made possible by a special team of experts from the University of Missouri, College of Agriculture, Food and Natural

Resources, a dedicated field staff, talented scientists, and the wisdom of top-notch agricultural leaders serving on the Delta Research Center's Advisory Board. The University of Missouri's Delta Research Center has advised farmers about boosting harvests and battling pests, while overseeing research with global implications. This includes the development of numerous strands of cotton and most notably 16 new soybean varieties, some with cyst nematode resistance, which has impact far beyond the rich cropland of the Bootheel of Missouri.

On September 2, 2011, the Delta Research Center will host the 50th Annual Field Day which showcases the world class studies they conduct, bringing together all sectors of the agriculture industry from those who plant the seed to those who market the product. It is always a day of learning and gives Missourians the tools needed to stay competitive in a global market. I look forward to joining hundreds of farmers, agri-businesses and others to learn the results of the special research that will be on display.

For our Nation to remain a leader in the production of food and fiber for our citizens and the world, we must continue important agriculture research like that conducted at the University of Missouri's Delta Research Center. Jake Fisher, superintendent and a dedicated employee for 50 years, summed it up best when he said, ''Our team effort is not only about the results we bring about today; we must be focused on ten to fifteen years down the road, so we remain on the cutting-edge of agriculture production and technology.''

Jake Fisher and his talented team at the University of Missouri's Delta Research Center demonstrate every day that hard work, vision, and public-private partnerships can be successful in advancing our Nation's rich agricultural resources.

I am very proud of the many accomplishments of the University of Missouri's Delta Research Center and ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the center on 50 years of service and monumental accomplishments in agriculture research.●

REMEMBERING DON DICKEY

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, Don Dickey, a longtime resident of Juneau, AK, passed away on June 25, 2011, at the age of 89. A native of Stockton, CA, Don moved to Alaska in 1952 to manage the Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce. He returned to California in 1955 to work for the California State Chamber but in 1960 decided Alaska would be his home. It was then that he relocated, once again to Alaska, to organize the Alaska State Chamber of Commerce. He served as president for the Alaska State Chamber for 22 years.

In 1981, Don was named director of the Alaska Division of Tourism, working for Governor Hammond and then Governor Sheffield. He was a key player in the growth of Alaska's tourism industry.

Terry Miller, who served as Don's deputy when he directed the Alaska Division of Tourism remembers Don's effort to persuade all of those in the Alaska tourism business to join together in a cooperative marketing effort to sell Alaska as a destination, rather than their individual businesses. ''He got the little mom and pop operations, the cruise companies, the airlines, everybody with a stake in it to pool their marketing dollars.'' Alaska's former Lieutenant Governor John Coghill described Don as, ''the one who probably laid the blueprint for what happened later.'' What happened later was the emergence of Alaska as the premier visitor destination it is today.

Those who knew Don best describe him in these terms: classy, gentle, dynamic, charming, a great promoter of Alaska, and a very funny guy. His admirers refer to him as one ''who could totally captivate a room and be very persuasive,'' and as one ''who could inspire and motivate others.''

I have known Don since I was a young girl growing up in southeast Alaska. He always had a joke, a story, or funny quip to share. My family and I have fond memories of good times spent together.

On behalf of the U.S. Senate and the people of Alaska, grateful for his leadership, as well as his wit, I extend condolences to Don's wife Gen, his children Dru and Dane, and all of those who mourn the loss of this exemplary Alaskan.●

TRIBUTE TO ERIN DUFFY

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Erin Duffy, an intern in my Washington, DC office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past couple months.

Erin is a graduate of St. Thomas More High School in Rapid City, SD. Currently, she is attending Stanford University, where she is majoring in international relations and economics. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Erin for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO LAUREN HAAHR

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Lauren Haahr, an intern in my Washington, DC office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past couple months.

Lauren is a graduate of Lincoln High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, she is attending the University of Iowa, where she is majoring in economics and ethics & public policy. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Lauren for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO PHILIP HENZLIK

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Philip Henzlik, an intern in my Rapid City, SD office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past couple months.

Philip is a graduate of Stevens High School in Rapid City and recently of Wyoming State University in Laramie, WY. He will be attending Oregon Health & Science University in Portland, OR, majoring in dentistry. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Philip for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ERIK KEVIN NYBERG

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Erik Kevin Nyberg, an intern in my Washington, DC office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past couple months.

Erik is a graduate of Lincoln High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, he is attending Augustana College, where he is majoring in economics, business administration, and political science. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Erik for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO LAUREN WERTH

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Lauren Werth, an intern in my Washington, DC office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past couple months.

Lauren is a graduate of Aberdeen Central High School in Aberdeen, SD. Currently, she is attending Concordia College, where she is majoring in political science and French. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Lauren for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:50 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2062. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 45 Meetinghouse Lane in Sagamore Beach, Massachusetts, as the ''Matthew A. Pucino Post Office''.

At 2:40 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2715. An act to provide the Consumer Product Safety Commission with greater authority and discretion in enforcing the consumer product safety laws, and for other purposes.

At 3:18 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 398. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to toll, during active-duty service abroad in the Armed Forces, the periods of time to file a petition and appear for an interview to remove the conditional basis for permanent resident status, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1933. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the requirements for admission of nonimmigrant nurses in health professional shortage areas.

At 7:36 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, with amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 365. An act to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution correcting the enrollment of S. 365.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 398. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to toll, during active-duty service abroad in the Armed Forces, the periods of time to file a petition and appear for an interview to remove the conditional basis for permanent resident status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1933. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the requirements for admission of nonimmigrant nurses in health professional shortage areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2062. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 45 Meetinghouse Lane in Sagamore Beach, Massachusetts, as the ''Matthew A. Pucino Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2801. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Quarterly Listings; Safety Zones; Security Zones; Special Local Regulations; Regulated Navigation Areas; Drawbridge Operation Regulations'' (Docket No. USCG–2011–00732) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2802. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Quarterly Listings; Safety Zones; Security Zones; Special Local Regulations; Regulated Navigation Areas; Drawbridge Operation Regulations'' (Docket No. USCG–2011–0732) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. MURRAY, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 277. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care to veterans who were stationed at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, while the water was contaminated at Camp Lejeune, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 112–42).

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN, from the Select Committee on Intelligence, without amendment:

S. 1458. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 112–43).

By Mrs. MURRAY, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 894. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2011, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 112–44).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN for the Select Committee on Intelligence.

*Matthew G. Olsen, of Maryland, to be Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 1455. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to authorize certified States and tribes to use amounts made available from the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund for hard rock and coal mining reclamation projects and to extend liability protection to certified States and Indian tribes carrying out approved abandoned mine reclamation programs; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts):

S. 1456. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and expand tax relief for national disasters; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1457. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish a Made in America Block Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1458. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; from the Select Committee on Intelligence; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. BAUCUS:

S. 1459. A bill to prohibit air carriers from charging a fee for the transportation of checked baggage by members of the Armed Forces traveling to or from an overseas contingency operation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. BURR):

S. 1460. A bill to grant the congressional gold medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1461. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1462. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to encourage and support parent, family, and community involvement in schools, to provide needed integrated services and comprehensive supports to children for the ultimate goal of assisting students to stay in school, become successful learners, improve their academic achievement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 1463. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to protect breastfeeding by new mothers and to provide for reasonable break time for nursing mothers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

S. 1464. A bill to enable States to implement integrated statewide education longitudinal data systems; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1465. A bill to authorize a pilot program on enhancements of Department of Defense efforts on mental health in the National Guard and Reserves through community partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1466. A bill to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays; considered and passed.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. Res. 247. A resolution recognizing the accomplishments and efforts of John I. Wilson, executive director of the National Education Association, for dedicating his career to education professionals and students, and honoring his retirement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERRY:

S. Res. 248. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 249. A resolution honoring the achievements of E. Thom Rumberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. Con. Res. 27. A concurrent resolution honoring the service of Sergeant First Class Leroy Arthur Petry, a native of Santa Fe, New Mexico, and the second living recipient of the Medal of Honor since the Vietnam War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 48

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 48, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of pharmacists in National Health Services Corps programs, and for other purposes.

S. 274

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 274, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to medication therapy management services under the Medicare prescription drug program.

S. 344

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 344, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 344, supra.

S. 425

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 425, 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.

S. 438

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of S. 438, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve women's health by prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of heart disease, stroke, and other cardiovascular diseases in women.

S. 604

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 604, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 648

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 648, a bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 668, a bill to remove unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats from seniors' personal health decisions by repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 697, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Services for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 722, a bill to strengthen and protect Medicare hospice programs.

S. 735

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 735, a bill to reauthorize the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004.

S. 756

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 756, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide for the public availability of Medicare claims data.

S. 798

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 798, a bill to provide an amnesty period during which veterans and their family members can register certain firearms in the National Firearms Registration and Transfer Record, and for other purposes.

S. 834

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve education and prevention related to campus sexual violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

S. 839

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 839, a bill to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs.

S. 1018

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1018, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, and the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 to provide for implementation of additional recommendations of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services.

S. 1019

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1019, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to support secondary school reentry programs.

S. 1048

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1048, a bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to the Islamic Republic of Iran, North Korea, and Syria, and for other purposes.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1094, a bill to reauthorize the Combating Autism Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–416).

S. 1107

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1107, a bill to authorize and support psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis data collection, to express the sense of the Congress to encourage and leverage public and private investment in psoriasis research with a particular focus on interdisciplinary collaborative research on the relationship between psoriasis and its comorbid conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 1142

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1142, a bill to promote the mapping and development of the United States geothermal resources by establishing a direct loan program for high risk geothermal exploration wells, to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to improve geothermal energy technology and demonstrate the use of geothermal energy in large scale thermal applications, and for other purposes.

S. 1149

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1149, a bill to expand geothermal production, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to provide predictability and certainty in the tax law, create jobs, and encourage investment.

S. 1221

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1221, a bill to provide grants to better understand and reduce gestational diabetes, and for other purposes.

S. 1245

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1245, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 1273

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1273, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act with regard to certain exemptions under that Act for direct care workers and to improve the systems for the collection and reporting of data relating to the direct care workforce, and for other purposes.

S. 1280

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 1280, a bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to require sexual assault risk-reduction and response training, and the development of sexual assault protocol and guidelines, the establishment of victims advocates, the establishment of a Sexual Assault Advisory Council, and for other purposes.

S. 1281

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1281, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing two or more levels stacked on top of one another.

S. 1316

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1316, a bill to prevent a fiscal crisis by enacting legislation to balance the Federal budget through reductions of discretionary and mandatory spending.

S. 1324

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1324, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit the importation, exportation, transportation, and sale, receipt, acquisition, or purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species, and for other purposes.

S. 1368

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1368, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal distributions for medicine qualified only if for prescribed drug or insulin.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1369, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt the conduct of silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements.

S. 1374

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1374, a bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules prohibiting deceptive advertising of abortion services.

S. 1376

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1376, a bill to conform income calculations for purposes of eligibility for the refundable credit for coverage under a qualified health plan and for Medicaid to existing Federal low-income assistance programs.

S. 1378

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1378, a bill to ensure that Social Security and Tier 1 Railroad Retirement benefits are properly taken into account for purposes of determining eligibility for Medicaid and for the refundable credit for coverage under a qualified health plan.

S. 1413

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1413, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily increase the investment tax credit for geothermal energy property.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1431, a bill to amend section 242 of the National Housing Act to extend the sunset provisions for the exemption for critical access hospitals under the FHA programs of mortgage insurance for hospitals.

S. 1439

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1439, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding ready school needs reviews.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. BURR):

S. 1460. A bill to grant the congressional gold medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President: When speaking of the Royal Air Force before Parliament, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill said: ''Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few.''

Churchill's words would ring true for the First Special Service Force as well. An elite and clandestine military unit during World War II, the Force was trained for the most difficult missions over the most arduous terrain. The Force pioneered many of the tactics used by today's Special Operations Forces. Their courage and audacity helped break through Nazi lines. Surprise night raids. Scaling cliffs. Traversing snowy mountain passes. The

Force never faced a mission that was too difficult or too dangerous to accomplish.

It is a great honor to introduce legislation today with my colleagues Senator TESTER and Senator BURR bestowing the First Special Service Force with the Congressional Gold Medal.

The Congressional Gold Medal is the highest honor the United States Congress can present. It is reserved for an individual—or group of individuals—who performs an outstanding act of service to the United States. I can think of no group of men more deserving of this high honor than the First Special Service Force.

The Force was comprised of volunteers from 49 States, the District of Columbia, and Canada. These men trained at Fort Harrison, in Helena, MT. Later, they were nicknamed the Black Devil's Brigade by a German soldier who complained they attacked in the middle of the night and then disappeared.

The Force's training in Helena, Vermont, and Virginia was unconventional and brutal. Hand-to-hand combat. Demolition. Rock climbing. Ski and mountain warfare. Amphibious landings. Night air drops. Their training far surpassed that of any other unit during World War II. This unique training led to remarkable success in battle.

The Force deployed to Italy in 1943. The first mission was to capture two peaks on the German Winter Line. This line had proven unbreakable and defeated massive Allied attacks. The road to liberate Rome led straight through this line. General Eisenhower needed to find a way to blast through. He chose the First Special Service Force.

The Force attacked the German line using what both Allied and Axis forces thought was an impossible route—the north face. In the dead of winter. In the middle of the night. Needless to say, they surprised the German forces on Monte la Difensa. Over the next 46 days, the Force defeated the fortified German Winter Line. The victory came at a devastating price. The Force lost 1,300 men out of a total of 1,800.

The First Special Service Force then moved to the Anzio-Nettmo beachhead. For 99 days, the Force battled the infamous German Hermann Goering Division. The Force pushed the Germans back, liberating Italian villages as they moved north toward Rome. On June 4, 1944, members of the Force routed German Forces guarding the eight bridges leading into Rome. Their advance cleared the way for other Allied forces to liberate Rome.

The Force then turned to the Îles d'Hyères, islands in southern France. Their amphibious assault surprised the Nazi occupiers and led to the capture of four Nazi forts. The Black Devil Brigade continued to the mainland where they hunted down the retreating German Eighth Army. The Force drove eastward in 15 weeks of battle to the Franco-Italian border, liberating the towns of Grasse, Villeneuve-Loubet, Sospel and Castillon in southern France.

The Force deactivated on December 5, 1944 in southern France. The remainder of the war would be fought by large-scale armies, not covert units like the First Special Service Force.

During the war, the Force suffered 2,314 casualties, equating to an astounding 134 percent of its combat strength. It captured over 30,000 prisoners, won five U.S. campaign stars and eight Canadian battle honors. It never failed a mission. Today, only 230 of these brave soldiers remain to tell the tales of their remarkable service.

As a testament to the unwavering camaraderie of the Force, the First Special Service Force Association was formed and continues to have reunions every year. They will be honoring the 70th anniversary of the creation of the Force at their reunion next year. With every passing day we lose more of these brave warriors, and it is crucial that we honor them now.

We owe the liberty we enjoy today to the brave men of the Black Devil Brigade. So many of us indebted to so few. Fortunately for our great Nation, the legacy of the First Special Service Force lives on. The Canadian Special Operations Regiment and the Special Forces of the United States trace their lineage back to the First Special Service Force.

It is time to award the First Special Service Force the Congressional Gold Medal. I strongly urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill to honor these American heroes with the recognition and gratitude they have earned.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1465. A bill to authorize a pilot program on enhancements of Department of Defense efforts on mental health in the National Guard and Reserves through community partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the Joining Forces for Military Mental Health Act with my colleagues Senators AYOTTE, KERRY, SHAHEEN, SCOTT BROWN, WHITEHOUSE, LEAHY, and BLUMENTHAL.

This legislation seeks to improve the coordination of research, treatment, education and outreach of mental health, substance use disorders, and traumatic brain injury, TBI, among members of the National Guard and Reserve and their families.

These service members often return from a tour of duty and transition into civilian life far from military bases and without easy access to the care they might need, which can make transitioning back into family life and careers more difficult. Those who do seek care in their community may not always receive the most appropriate and effective treatment.

The Joining Forces for Military Mental Health Act would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide grants to community partners that engage in research, treatment, education, and outreach. This will help ensure that every member of the military receives innovative and effective treatments and the most updated information about mental illness, substance abuse, and TBI connected with military service.

This type of coordination of research, treatment, education, and outreach, and collaboration with community partners could improve the health outcomes of members of the National Guard and Reserve and their families. This bipartisan legislation has been endorsed by the National Guard Association of the United States, and the Red Sox Foundation and others have already shown this type of coordination to be effective in providing quality care. I urge my colleagues to take a close look at this legislation and join me in supporting this effort to improve the mental health care that members of the National Guard and Reserve and their families receive in the community.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1465

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 ''Joining Forces for Military Mental Health Act''.

SEC. 2. PILOT PROGRAM ON ENHANCEMENTS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EFFORTS ON MENTAL HEALTH IN THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES THROUGH COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of enhancing the efforts of the Department of Defense in research, treatment, education, and outreach on mental health and substance use disorders and Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) in members of the National Guard and Reserves, their family members, and their caregivers through community partners described in subsection (c).

(2) DURATION.—The duration of the pilot program may not exceed three years.

(b) GRANTS.—In carrying out the pilot program, the Secretary may award not more than five grants to community partners described in subsection (c). Any grant so awarded shall be awarded using a competitive and merit-based award process.

(c) COMMUNITY PARTNERS.—A community partner described in this subsection is a private non-profit organization or institution (or multiple organizations and institutions) that—

(1) engages in each of the research, treatment, education, and outreach activities described in subsection (d); and

(2) meets such qualifications for treatment as a community partner as the Secretary shall establish for purposes of the pilot program.

(d) ACTIVITIES.—Amounts awarded under a grant under the pilot program shall be utilized by the community partner awarded the grant for one or more of the following:

(1) To engage in research on the causes, development, and innovative treatment of mental health and substance use disorders and Traumatic Brain Injury in members of the National Guard and Reserves, their family members, and their caregivers.

(2) To provide treatment to such members and their families for such mental health and substance use disorders and Traumatic Brain Injury.

(3) To identify and disseminate evidence-based treatments of mental health and substance use disorders and Traumatic Brain Injury described in paragraph (1).

(4) To provide outreach and education to such members, their families and caregivers, and the public about mental health and substance use disorders and Traumatic Brain Injury described in paragraph (1).

(e) REQUIREMENT FOR MATCHING FUNDS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may award a grant under this section to an organization or institution (or organizations and institutions) only if the awardee agrees to make contributions toward the costs of activities carried out with the grant, from non-Federal sources (whether public or private), an amount equal to not less than $3 for each $1 of funds provided under the grant.

(2) NATURE OF NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—Contributions from non-Federal sources for purposes of paragraph (1) may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated. Amounts provided by the Federal Government, or services assisted or subsidized to any significant extent by the Federal Government, may not be included in determining the amount of contributions from non-Federal sources for such purposes.

(f) APPLICATION.—An organization or institution (or organizations and institutions) seeking a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary an application therefore in such a form and containing such information as the Secretary considers appropriate, including the following:

(1) A description how the activities proposed to be carried out with the grant will help improve collaboration and coordination on research initiatives, treatment, and education and outreach on mental health and substance use disorders and Traumatic Brain Injury among the Armed Forces.

(2) A description of existing efforts by the applicant to put the research described in (c)(1) into practice.

(3) If the application comes from multiple organizations and institutions, how the activities proposed to be carried out with the grant would improve coordination and collaboration among such organizations and institutions.

(4) If the applicant proposes to provide services or treatment to members of the Armed Forces or family members using grant amounts, reasonable assurances that such services or treatment will be provided by a qualified provider.

(5) Plans to comply with subsection (g).

(g) EXCHANGE OF MEDICAL AND CLINICAL INFORMATION.—A community partner awarded a grant under the pilot program shall agree to any requirements for the sharing of medical or clinical information obtained pursuant to the grant that the Secretary shall establish for purposes of the pilot program. The exchange of medical or clinical information pursuant to this subsection shall comply with applicable privacy and confidentiality laws.

(h) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall share with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs information on best practices in research, treatment, education, and outreach on mental health and substance use disorders and Traumatic Brain Injury identified by the Secretary of Defense as a result of the pilot program.

(i) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days before the completion of the pilot program, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and to Congress, a report on the pilot program. The report shall include the following:

(1) A description of the pilot program, including the community partners awarded grants under the pilot program, the amount of grants so awarded, and the activities carried out using such grant amounts.

(2) A description of any research efforts advanced using such grant amounts.

(3) The number of members of the National Guard and Reserves provided treatment or services by community partners using such grant amounts, and a summary of the types of treatment and services so provided.

(4) A description of the education and outreach activities undertaken using such grant amounts.

(5) A description of efforts to exchange clinical information under subsection (g).

(6) A description and assessment of the effectiveness and achievements of the pilot program with respect to research, treatment, education, and outreach on mental health and substance use disorders and Traumatic Brain Injury.

(7) Such recommendations as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate in light of the pilot program on the utilization of organizations and institutions such as community partners under the pilot program in efforts of the Department described in subsection (a).

(8) A description of the metrics used by the Secretary in making recommendations under paragraph (7).

(j) AVAILABLE FUNDS.—Funds for the pilot program shall be derived from amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for Defense Health Program and otherwise available for obligation and expenditure.

(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''family member'' and ''caregiver'', in the case of a member of the National Guard or Reserves, have the meaning given such terms in section 1720G(d) of title 38, United States Code, with respect to a veteran.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 247—RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND EFFORTS OF JOHN I. WILSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, FOR DEDICATING HIS CAREER TO EDUCATION PROFESSIONALS AND STUDENTS, AND HONORING HIS RETIREMENT

Mrs. HAGAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 247

Whereas John I. Wilson is a native of Burlington, North Carolina;

Whereas John I. Wilson began his career as an activist for the National Education Association while attending Western Carolina University as the president of the National Education Association student chapter;

Whereas John I. Wilson taught special needs students as a middle school teacher;

Whereas John I. Wilson served as the executive director of the North Carolina Association of Educators;

Whereas John I. Wilson developed a new support system for teachers pursuing certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in North Carolina, and as a result, North Carolina has more National Board-certified teachers and candidates than any other State;

Whereas John I. Wilson led a successful campaign that increased the average salary of teachers in North Carolina, as compared to other States, from 43rd to 23rd in the United States;

Whereas, after serving on numerous boards throughout his career, John I. Wilson became the executive director of the National Education Association, the largest union in the United States, in 2000;

Whereas John I. Wilson is an advocate of a minimum salary of $40,000 for every teacher and a living wage for education support professionals;

Whereas John I. Wilson launched a National Education Association initiative to engage the best teachers in sharing ideas on staffing high-poverty, underachieving schools with the most accomplished teachers; and

Whereas John I. Wilson was presented with the Educator 500 President's Award in 2006: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends John I. Wilson for his leadership and service to educators across North Carolina and the United States;

(2) recognizes John I. Wilson as a successful leader who has served the United States by improving our education system;

(3) commends John I. Wilson for his numerous accomplishments;

(4) congratulates John I. Wilson on his retirement; and

(5) supports the continued effort of education leaders to aid and improve the education system of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 248—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL BRAIN ANEURYSM AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. KERRY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 248

Whereas a brain aneurysm is an abnormal saccular or fusiform bulging of an artery in the brain;

Whereas an estimated 1 out of every 50 people in the United States will develop a brain aneurysm;

Whereas brain aneurysms are most likely to occur in people between the ages of 35 and 60;

Whereas brain aneurysms are more likely to occur in women than in men by a 3-to-2 ratio;

Whereas brain aneurysms are more likely to occur in African-Americans than in Whites by a 2-to-1 ratio;

Whereas various risk factors can contribute to the formation of a brain aneurysm, including infection, tumors, traumatic head injury, drug use, smoking, hypertension, and a family history of brain aneurysms;

Whereas approximately 6,000,000 people in the United States will develop a brain aneurysm that will not rupture;

Whereas an unruptured brain aneurysm can lead to fatigue, short-term memory problems, speech problems, loss of balance and coordination, and changes in behavior;

Whereas a brain aneurysm is often discovered when it ruptures and causes a subarachnoid hemorrhage;

Whereas a subarachnoid hemorrhage can lead to brain damage, hydrocephalus, stroke, and death;

Whereas annually more than 30,000 people in the United States suffer from ruptured brain aneurysms;

Whereas annually between 3,000 and 4,500 people in the United States with ruptured brain aneurysms die before reaching the hospital;

Whereas a number of advancements have been made in recent years regarding the detection of aneurysms, including the computerized tomography scan, the magnetic resonance imaging test, and the cerebral arteriogram;

Whereas September is an appropriate month to designate as ''National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month''; and

Whereas various research studies are currently being conducted in the United States in order to better understand, prevent, and treat brain aneurysms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month; and

(2) continues to support research to prevent and treat brain aneurysms.

SENATE RESOLUTION 249—HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF E. THOM RUMBERGER

Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 249

Whereas E. Thom Rumberger served in the United States Marine Corps;

Whereas Thom Rumberger earned a bachelor's degree, with honors, and a J.D. from the University of Florida;

Whereas Thom Rumberger is a founding partner of the law firm Rumberger, Kirk & Caldwell, which has represented multinational corporations such as American Airlines, Inc., Sears, Roebuck and Co., and Toyota Motor Corporation;

Whereas Thom Rumberger has been listed in Florida Super Lawyers every year from 2007 to 2010;

Whereas Thom Rumberger was appointed Circuit Judge in the 18th Judicial Circuit of Florida in 1969;

Whereas Thom Rumberger has committed himself to numerous acts of public service, including serving on the Federal Judicial Advisory Commission of Florida and the Board of Supervisors of the Spaceport Florida Authority;

Whereas Thom Rumberger has been one of the most steadfast champions of the Everglades in Florida;

Whereas Thom Rumberger has served as lead counsel for the Everglades Foundation since 1999;

Whereas Thom Rumberger was instrumental in the passage of two amendments to the Florida Constitution and of section 601 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–541; 114 Stat. 2680), known as the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan;

Whereas Thom Rumberger was instrumental in obtaining several billion dollars in funding for Everglades restoration; and

Whereas Thom Rumberger served on the Florida Governor's 2001 Select Task Force on Elections and the 2002 Select Task Force on Election Procedures, Standards and Technology, and was Chairman of the Legislature's Study Committee on Public Records in 2002: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and honors the professional success of E. Thom Rumberger; and

(2) recognizes and honors the lifelong dedication of Thom Rumberger to the protection of the Florida Everglades.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the important contributions of a very special Floridian for his unrelenting determination to protect one of our nation's most unique natural resources—America's Everglades. A prestigious attorney and commanding litigator, Thom Rumberger has dedicated much of his personal and professional life to advancing the restoration and protection of the River of Grass. His brilliance, creativity and fearlessness combined to make Thom one of Florida's most influential Everglades leaders.

A man proud to serve his country and his community, Thom interrupted his college career to volunteer for the Marine Corps and serve in the Korean War. Over the course of his life he has continued his service as a dedicated public servant, a respected judge and prosecutor. Thom is a dedicated father and grandfather who has always found great happiness and comfort in his ever-expanding family. The relentless efforts Thom undertakes to preserve Florida's natural heritage will be a legacy gift to his family, his colleagues, and to the American public.

After serving two years in the United States Marine Corps, Thom earned his bachelor's degree, with honors, and his law degree from the University of Florida, where he was Associate Editor of the University of Florida Law Review in 1960. Before becoming Florida's youngest Circuit Court Judge in 1969, serving in the Eighteenth Judicial Circuit, he was the Brevard County Solicitor and Special Assistant State Attorney in the Eighteenth Judicial Circuit. From 1971 through 1974 he was the County Attorney for Seminole County, Assistant to Florida's Governor Claude Kirk, and served as a member of the Florida Land Sales Board.

Thom has been a long-time friend of George and Mary Barley, both of whom dedicated their lives to restoration of the Everglades. George and Mary established the Everglades Trust and the Everglades Foundation. Upon George's untimely death in 1995, Thom joined with Mary to make sure George's dream of a restored Everglades became a reality. An active leader in the Republican Party, Thom was able to elevate Everglades restoration to a bi-partisan issue at both the state and federal level.

Thom's success extends to his career in private practice, as he is one of the founding partners of the Rumberger, Kirk & Caldwell law firm. Under his leadership, his firm's modest beginnings were quickly surpassed as it moved to the forefront of business litigation, representing such multi-national corporations as American Airlines, Sears, Roebuck and Co., General Motors Corporation, Honda Motor Company, Ford Motor Company, and Toyota Motor Corporation. Today, his firm includes 75 trial attorneys in five offices across Florida and Alabama. Thom has been listed in Florida Super Lawyers every year from 2007 to 2010.

Legend has it that Thom once convinced a Federal judge to allow a real automobile in the courtroom as evidence. Yes, Thom convinced the judge to have a window enlarged in a historic courthouse to accommodate a crane that lifted the car right into the courtroom.

Thom has been known throughout his life for his infectious sense of humor as well as the breath of his various careers. Often referred to as a ''career chameleon'', Thom worked his way through college as a snake handler at the Ross Allen Reptile Institute at Florida's Silver Springs performing shows with lethal snakes to the thousands of visitors who came to watch the dangerous performance. Thom promises that it was there that he learned the skills of public speaking and working with the public which would become such a critical component of his future success. Thom also enjoyed a brief acting career as the stunt man for the Creature of the Black Lagoon before beginning his legal career.

In addition to building an impressive legal career, Thom has generously committed himself to public service. He was appointed to Florida's Federal Judicial Advisory Commission and the Board of Supervisors of the Spaceport Florida Authority. Currently, Thom is Chairman of The Everglades Trust, and has served as Chairman of the Collins Center for Public Policy, and as a member of the Board of Visitors of Florida State College of Law and Board of Trustees for the Law Center Association of the University of Florida.

He has represented environmental organizations including Save the Manatee, The Everglades Trust, and Save Our Everglades. Thom has also served as lead counsel for The Everglades Foundation since 1999.

Notably, Thom was instrumental in the passage of two Everglades related Florida constitutional amendments, the Federal Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, and in obtaining several billion dollars in funding for Everglades restoration. Thom also was primarily responsible for Florida's acquisition of the 75,000-acre Babcock Ranch which provides new and necessary corridors for the endangered Florida panther. And, in the late 1980's, Thom worked to implement some of the first manatee protection laws.

Throughout his four decades in public service, Thom Rumberger has demonstrated the importance of looking out for the common good. Thanks to the selfless commitment of folks like Thom, America's Everglades will be restored for the benefit of future generations. America owes Thom a great debt of gratitude.

Grace joins me in thanking Thom and his lovely wife, Debbie, for their

contributions to Florida's treasured landscapes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 27—HONORING THE SERVICE OF SERGEANT FIRST CLASS LEROY ARTHUR PETRY, A NATIVE OF SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO, AND THE SECOND LIVING RECIPIENT OF THE MEDAL OF HONOR SINCE THE VIETNAM WAR

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. CON. RES. 27

Whereas Sergeant First Class Leroy Arthur Petry of the United States Army, a native of Santa Fe, New Mexico, was awarded the Medal of Honor by President Obama on July 12, 2011;

Whereas the Medal of Honor is the highest honor awarded to members of the Armed Forces for valor in combat;

Whereas the official citation awarding the Medal of Honor to Sergeant First Class Petry states that then-Staff Sergeant Petry ''distinguished himself by acts of gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty in action with an armed enemy in the vicinity of Paktya Province, Afghanistan, on May 26, 2008'';

Whereas Sergeant First Class Petry joins an elite group of Medal of Honor recipients dating back to the Civil War;

Whereas Sergeant First Class Petry has continued a long tradition of military service to the United States by New Mexicans, dating back to the defense of the Western United States during the Civil War, and followed by participation in every major war fought by the United States;

Whereas Sergeant First Class Petry is the second living recipient of the Medal of Honor since the Vietnam War;

Whereas Sergeant First Class Petry fought with bravery and, despite wounds to both of his legs, had the courage and quick thinking needed to save the lives of his fellow soldiers by throwing back an enemy grenade and losing his right hand when the grenade detonated shortly after he released it;

Whereas the actions of Sergeant First Class Petry represent the highest values of the Army, the Rangers, and the United States;

Whereas Sergeant First Class Petry has consistently demonstrated humility and dedication to his fellow soldiers;

Whereas Sergeant First Class Petry, who overcame a troubled youth and found the strength to turn his life around and dedicate himself to serving the United States, is an example to all people who are struggling in the United States; and

Whereas the brave actions of Sergeant First Class Petry, as well as his modesty and selfless service, stand as the embodiment of the best attributes of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) honors the service and sacrifice of Sergeant First Class Leroy Arthur Petry of the United States Army and his family; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to recognize the valor, heroism, and dedication to the United States exhibited by Sergeant First Class Petry.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I rise today to submit a resolution with Senator JEFF BINGAMAN honoring the bravery and sacrifice of Santa Fe, New Mexico native Sergeant First Class Leroy Arthur Petry, an Army Ranger who in 2008 risked his life to save his fellow soldiers on the battlefields of Afghanistan and who was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor by President Obama in July.

I was humbled to be at the White House along with Sergeant First Class Petry's family, friends, and fellow soldiers as President Obama honored him with the Congressional Medal of Honor. It was truly a special day for everyone involved as we honored only the second living, active-duty service member to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor for actions in Iraq or Afghanistan.

On July 12, I detailed the actions of Sergeant First Class Petry. Under enemy fire, with bullet wounds in both of his legs, Sergeant First Class Petry still had the courage and valor to render aid to his fellow Rangers and to throw a grenade that landed near his fellow soldiers back towards the enemy.

When the grenade exploded, it took with it Sergeant First Class Petry's hand, but not his spirit. Not even the loss of a hand would stop him from fighting the enemy and supporting his unit. He would tie a tourniquet to his arm and continue the fight.

As I have said before, Sergeant First Class Petry's story is one of courage and sacrifice and immense love of country. It is a story that began years ago in Santa Fe with a young man who struggled in high school but refused to give up, to drop out and instead buckled down, dug deep, and found the hero within. A hero to the men he saved that fateful day in Afghanistan, and a hero to all Americans who owe their freedoms to our brave men and women in uniform.

Today, let us honor him further with this resolution and send the message that Congress honors his service and sacrifice.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 1, 2011.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 1, 2011, at 3:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Elle Charles and Ashley Crawford, of my staff, be granted the privilege of the floor for the rest of today's proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privilege of the floor be granted to the following member of my staff: Robin Dutta.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FASTER FOIA ACT OF 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. 1466.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1466) to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, I joined Senator CORNYN in reintroducing the Faster FOIA Act of 2011, a bipartisan bill to strengthen the Freedom of Information Act, FOIA. Last week, the House Republican leadership stripped these FOIA provisions from legislation that unanimously passed the Senate in May as part of a procedural maneuver to address unrelated issues surrounding the debt limit. I urge the Senate to promptly reaffirm its bipartisan commitment to open government and to once again pass the Leahy-Cornyn Faster FOIA Act of 2011 so that this good government bill can be enacted into law.

The Faster FOIA Act enjoys broad bipartisan support from across the political spectrum. The Senate unanimously passed this bill in May, after the Judiciary Committee favorably reported the bill by voice vote. Recently, more than 35 transparency organizations urged the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to act on this legislation. On July 26, the Washington Post editorialized that the House should promptly enact this bipartisan bill to improve the FOIA process.

Senator CORNYN and I first introduced the Faster FOIA Act in 2005 to address the growing problem of excessive FOIA delays within our Federal agencies. During the intervening years, the problem of excessive FOIA delays has not gone away. We reintroduced this bill in 2010, and the Senate unanimously passed it last year. The current bill is the most recent product of our bipartisan work to help reinvigorate FOIA.

The Faster FOIA Act would establish a bipartisan Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays to examine the root causes of excessive FOIA delays. The Commission would recommend to Congress and the President steps that should be taken to reduce these delays so that the administration of the FOIA is more equitable and efficient.

The Faster FOIA Act will help ensure the dissemination of government information to the American people so that our Democracy remains vibrant and free. This is a laudable goal that we all share. Neither Chamber of Congress should allow partisan politics to obstruct the important goal of this bill.

The ongoing debate in Congress about the national debt has made clear that we must find ways to work together, across party lines and ideologies, to address the many challenges facing our Nation. This bipartisan spirit is at the core of the Faster FOIA Act. I have said many times that open government is neither a Democratic issue nor a Republican issue it is truly an American value and virtue that we all must uphold. I urge the Senate to promptly pass this bill and I hope that the House of Representatives will quickly follow suit and enact this good government measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial entitled: ''Time to Reinforce FOIA'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 26, 2011]

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT NEEDS A PUSH

This year marks the 45th anniversary of the Freedom of Information Act, FOIA, a crucial, if sometimes sluggish, vehicle through which journalists can demand greater government openness and accountability. In May, in a rare moment of bipartisanship, Sens. Patrick Leahy (D–Vt.) and John Cornyn (R–Tex.) won unanimous Senate passage of the Faster FOIA Act, which would establish an advisory panel to examine the backlog of more than 69,000 FOIA requests. It's time for the House to take it up.

While the panel would be authorized only to provide Congress with recommendations for further action to enhance the filing and receipt of FOIA requests, it would be a small step forward. At best, the panel could develop the means to enforce the 20-day standard for the screening of requests, which, in reality, can take months or years.

As much as FOIA can be a journalist's best friend, it can also be a nightmare. Despite amendments in 2007 and 2009, the FOIA process remains beset by incompetence and lack of guidance for evaluating requests. ''The overarching problem is inadequate implementation and compliance among the agencies,'' Malcolm Byrne, deputy director at the National Security Archive, told us.

Despite a 2009 executive order that instructed all federal agencies to open more documents to the public—to err on the side of openness when deciding whether to release documents—government offices have classified more documents since President Obama took office, according to the Federation of American Scientists.

The executive order tried to force all federal agencies to implement new regulations to ensure greater transparency in the disclosure process. But this hasn't happened, either. A report by the Information Security Oversight Office in April found that less than half of 41 evaluated agencies had made significant efforts toward this end.

These facts should reinforce the need for progress, however modest, when it comes to improving the FOIA process. While there was no opposition to the Faster FOIA legislation in the Senate, Rep. Darrell Issa (R–Calif.), chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, has yet to take a position on the bill, according to a spokesman. We urge him to embrace it in the same bipartisan spirit as the Senate, and to do so immediately.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, there be no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1466) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1466

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

SECTION 1. COMMISSION ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT PROCESSING DELAYS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Faster FOIA Act of 2011''.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays (in this Act referred to as the ''Commission'' for the purpose of conducting a study relating to methods to help reduce delays in processing requests submitted to Federal agencies under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Freedom of Information Act'').

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of 12 members of whom—

(A) 2 shall be appointed by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(B) 2 shall be appointed by the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(C) 2 shall be appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives;

(D) 2 shall be appointed by the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives;

(E) 1 shall be appointed by the Attorney General of the United States;

(F) 1 shall be appointed by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

(G) 1 shall be appointed by the Archivist of the United States; and

(H) 1 shall be appointed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

(2) QUALIFICATIONS OF CONGRESSIONAL APPOINTEES.—Of the 2 appointees under each of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of paragraph (1) at least 1 shall have experience as a FOIA requestor, or in the fields of library science, information management, or public access to Government information.

(3) TIMELINESS OF APPOINTMENTS.—Appointments to the Commission shall be made as expeditiously as possible, but not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) STUDY.—The Commission shall conduct a study to—

(1) identify methods that—

(A) will help reduce delays in the processing of requests submitted to Federal agencies under section 552 of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) ensure the efficient and equitable administration of that section throughout the Federal Government;

(2) examine whether the system for charging fees and granting waivers of fees under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, needs to be reformed in order to reduce delays in processing requests; and

(3) examine and determine—

(A) why the Federal Government's use of the exemptions under section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code, increased during fiscal year 2009;

(B) the reasons for any increase, including whether the increase was warranted and whether the increase contributed to FOIA processing delays;

(C) what efforts were made by Federal agencies to comply with President Obama's January 21, 2009 Presidential Memorandum on Freedom of Information Act Requests and whether those efforts were successful;

(D) any recommendations on how the use of exemptions under section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code, may be limited; and

(E)(i) whether any disparities in processing, processing times, and completeness of responses to FOIA requestors have occurred based upon political considerations, ideological viewpoints, the identity of the requestors, affiliation with the media, or affiliation with advocacy groups;

(ii) if any disparities have occurred, why such disparities have occurred; and

(iii) the extent to which political appointees have been involved in the FOIA process.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit a report to Congress and the President containing the results of the study under this section, which shall include—

(1) a description of the methods identified by the study;

(2) the conclusions and recommendations of the Commission regarding—

(A) each method identified; and

(B) the charging of fees and granting of waivers of fees; and

(3) recommendations for legislative or administrative actions to implement the conclusions of the Commission.

(f) STAFF AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Archivist of the United States shall provide to the Commission such staff and administrative support services, including research assistance at the request of the Commission, as necessary for the Commission to perform its functions efficiently and in accordance with this section.

(2) PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.—

(A) STAFF SALARIES.—The Archivist of the United States shall pay staff expenses relating to salaries under this subsection from available appropriations in the applicable account for salaries of the National Archives and Records Administration.

(B) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.—Except as provided under subparagraph (A), the Archivist of the United States shall pay staff and administrative expenses under this subsection from available appropriations in the operating expenses account of the National Archives and Records Administration.

(3) APPROPRIATIONS REQUESTS.—Expenses paid under this subsection shall not form the basis for additional appropriations requests from the National Archives and Records Administration in the future.

(g) INFORMATION.—To the extent permitted by law, the heads of executive agencies, the Government Accountability Office, and the Congressional Research Service shall provide to the Commission such information as the Commission may require to carry out its functions.

(h) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation for services performed for the Commission.

(i) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(2) PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.—The Administrator of General Services shall pay travel expenses under this subsection from available appropriations in the operating expenses account of the General Services Administration.

(3) APPROPRIATIONS REQUESTS.—Expenses paid under this subsection shall not form the basis for additional appropriations requests from the National Archives and Records Administration in the future.

(j) TRANSPARENCY.—All meetings of the Commission shall be open to the public, except that a meeting, or any portion of it, may be closed to the public if it concerns matters or information described in chapter 552b(c) of title 5, United States Code. Interested persons shall be permitted to appear at open meetings and present oral or written statements on the subject matter of the meeting. The Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to any person appearing before the Commission.

(k) TERMINATION.—The Commission shall terminate 30 days after the submission of the report under subsection (e).

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 2715.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2715) to provide the Consumer Product Safety Commission with greater authority and discretion in enforcing the consumer product safety laws, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements related to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2715) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDER FOR STAR PRINT—NO. 112–6

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate report No. 112–6 be star-printed with the changes that are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore and upon the recommendation of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 98–183, as amended by Public Law 103–419, appoints the following individual to the United States Commission on Civil Rights: David Kladney of Nevada vice Alice C. ''Dina'' Titus of Nevada.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, AUGUST 2, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., August 2; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the majority leader—that is me—will lay before the Senate the House message with respect to the debt limit compromise upon convening tomorrow. The rollcall vote on the compromise will be at noon tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:47 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, August 2, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RICHARD (RICK) PARSLEY

HON. DENNIS A. CARDOZA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to honor the late Richard Parsley. Rick passed away peacefully on July 25, 2011.

Rick was born in Atwater, California on November 30, 1949. He graduated from Atwater High School. He joined the Navy at the age of 17 and served his country with a tour of duty in Vietnam where he was awarded a bronze star.

Rick began a career as a local merchant but learned that business was not where his passion lied and he was a person who refused to live life without passion. In his late 30's, he set out to become an educator, where he found his calling. Rick spent many years as a dedicated teacher, principal and administrator.

Many people have said how Rick profoundly influenced their lives and they considered him to be their mentor. His pure passion for life inspired others to live the same way. Rick always encouraged others to strive for a better life. He lived a life of passion for the things he loved including spending time on the water in his boat with his friends and family.

Though Rick's life ended much too soon, it was a life complete in so many ways. He is survived by the love of his life, Mae Pierini; his daughter Lori and Lori's husband Jason; his son Jeff and Jeff's wife Jen; stepsons Santi and Michael; Michael's wife Azeb; stepdaughter Shelli and Shelli's husband Jason; his seven grandchildren: Maren, Madison, Santi, Gianni, Hanna, Maya, Lucca; and so many who called him a friend.

Mr. Speaker, the recognition that I am offering today before the House of Representatives for Richard Parsley is small compared to the contributions and impact he had on the lives of so many. He was truly an invaluable member of our community and an outstanding human being.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE BALTIC AMERICAN FREEDOM LEAGUE

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 30th Anniversary of the founding of the Baltic American Freedom League, an important national Baltic American organization. The Baltic American Freedom League (BAFL) was founded in February 1981 by Baltic American political activists in southern California to raise American consciousness about Baltic issues and to carry out specific and concrete goals and projects toward helping achieve freedom for the Soviet occupied Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

In 1982, BAFL initiated a Congressional resolution asking President W. Reagan to designate June 14, 1982 as Baltic Freedom Day—reiterating U.S. non-recognition of the forcible and illegal incorporation of the Baltic Republics into the U.S.S.R. This Proclamation continued each year until the Baltic countries regained their independence in 1991.

Due to the combined efforts of BAFL, other Baltic organizations, and the Senate and House Baltic Caucuses, the Senate passed SCR 35 on May 19, 2005, and the House of Representatives unanimously adopted H.R. 128 on July 22, 2005; historic resolutions stating that ". . . it is the sense of Congress that the Government of the Russian Federation should issue a clear and unambiguous statement of admission and condemnation of the illegal occupation and annexation by the Soviet Union from 1940 to 1991 of the Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, the consequences of which will be significant increase in good will among the affected people".

In February 1997, at the request of BAFL, a Baltic Caucus in the U.S. House of Representatives was organized by me and my colleague, Congressman KUCINICH of Ohio. The Caucus currently has 55 House Members and has played and continues to play an important role in supporting Baltic issues.

Since November 17, 2008, the citizens of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been able to travel to the U.S. without obtaining visas, thanks to BAFL and other Baltic organizations, and all those in Congress whose dedication and persistent work overcame strong opposition, and persuaded the U.S. to expand its Visa Waiver Program to include the Baltic countries.

I want to congratulate the Baltic American Freedom League and all its members, past and present, on this 30th anniversary celebration, and to join with other Members of this House in wishing them continued success for another 30 years and beyond.

H.R. 2671 CORRECTION OF ORIGINAL COSPONSORS

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, due to a clerical error, Representatives DAVID DREIER, MICHAEL BURGESS, and DENNIS KUCINICH were omitted from being Original Cosponsors of H.R. 2671, the CAL Undiagnosed Diseases Research and Collaboration Network Act of 2011, which was introduced on July 27, 2011. I would like to apologize for this clerical error and thank my colleagues for their support on this important piece of legislation. Additionally, I would like to extend Representative DREIER a special thank you for his support and role in developing this legislation.

CAPTAIN THOMAS HARPER HONORED WITH FRENCH CROSS OF MILITARY VALOR

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ocala's own Army National Guard Captain Thomas Harper of the 20th Special Forces Group (Airborne).

Captain Harper and the 2nd Battalion, 20th Special Forces unit successfully provided security assistance for the French Foreign Legion in the Uzbeen Valley of Afghanistan.

He was among those soldiers separated from their unit by a mortar blast causing shrapnel to injure four of the five American soldiers and exposed to enemy fire.

Despite their injuries, Captain Harper and his comrades moved the severely injured to safety and repelled the attack for more than an hour until air support and medic helicopters arrived.

Captain Harper was among five National Guards and one active duty Special Forces soldiers honored with the French Croix de la Valeur Militaire (French Cross of Military Valor), an honor rarely bestowed on any soldier, especially those who are not French.

I join his family, Dr. Wayne Harper, Debbie Harper and sisters Chrissy and Lauren in sharing great pride in the accomplishments of this great American. For their bravery, I rise today Mr. Speaker to honor Captain Thomas Harper and his comrades for their service, and for the unwavering dedication shown to their country.

RICK CABLES TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rick Cables for both his established career with the United States Forest Service, and for being named director of the Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife.

Mr. Cables is a native Coloradan, and he grew up in Pueblo. In the early 1970s, Mr. Cables left Pueblo to attend Northern Arizona University, and in 1976 he earned a Bachelor of Science degree in forestry, leading him to his first job in Arizona's Kaibab National Forest as a forestry technician.

Mr. Cables' work ethic led him throughout Arizona and New Mexico before he was promoted to be district ranger of Arizona's Apache-Sitgraves National Forest. As the district ranger, he oversaw the management of the campgrounds and trails, protected the local vegetation and wildlife, and served as the first point of contact for the forest service. Fourteen years later, Mr. Cables moved to Juneau, Alaska, to be the regional forester for

the Alaskan region, overseeing the two largest national forest systems in the U.S.

In 2000, Mr. Cables moved back to Colorado to serve as the regional forester for the Rocky Mountain region. Throughout the past 11 years, Mr. Cables served the Rocky Mountain region, working with both local and federal officials to enhance the productivity of the Rocky Mountains. In June of 2011, Mr. Cables was named to be the director of the Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife, a position he called a "dream job."

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Rick Cables and his outstanding career in conservation and forestry. I look forward to witnessing him continue to bring the same success he has brought to the communities he served throughout the U.S. to the state of Colorado.

HONORING STANLEY WELCH ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Stanley Welch, a member of my staff who has been with me from the beginning, as he retires after almost twenty-eight years of federal service. Stanley has dedicated a lifetime to public service and has served the New Haven community in a variety of capacities—all of which have enriched the City and improved the quality of life for its residents.

Stanley has been a member of my staff for more than twenty years, though I have known him for much longer. We first met during Frank Logue's first campaign for Mayor where he was involved in coordinating the roving canvass—a get out the vote initiative that is used by candidates throughout New Haven still today. When I was first elected to Congress, I asked Stan to join my team and he was an invaluable resource as we started up the District Office, hired staff, and began our work in constituent services. Stanley understood the importance of constituent services in the District and, over the years, he has been a mentor to many new staff members—offering them guidance and support as they began their own careers in federal service. As Deputy District Director and casework supervisor he has played an integral role in ensuring that the District Office has run smoothly and that our constituents have had access to federal resources and assistance in resolving issues with federal agencies. Stanley himself worked on issues concerning veterans and over the course of his career he developed an expertise in this area. His presence in my office will certainly be missed.

Born in upstate New York and raised in the greater Boston area, Stanley came to New Haven in 1962. In the nearly five decades since he came to our community, Stanley's work has touched the lives of thousands. He was a teacher in the New Haven public school system, a case manager with the City of New Haven's Department of Human Services, vocational counselor with the Greater New Haven Opportunities Industrial Center as well as the Director of a Connecticut State sheltered workshop for mentally challenged adults, Director and Education Coordinator of the Vanguard Teen Center in Newhallville, and served as the first Director of the Community Action Agency of New Haven. Stanley began his career in federal service with my predecessor, Congressman Bruce Morrison, and has spent nearly thirty years assisting the people of Connecticut's 3rd Congressional District with difficulties they have had with federal agencies. In each of these endeavors, Stanley was looking to make a difference in the lives of some of our most vulnerable citizens.

In addition to his professional contributions to the community, Stanley has also dedicated innumerable hours to local civic and service organizations. For more than twenty years he has served on the Board of Directors of Columbus House, Inc., a non-profit organization dedicated to serving the homeless and those at risk of homelessness, as well as the Hill Development Corporation, a local non-profit organization dedicated to the revitalization of New Haven's Hill neighborhood. He has also been involved with the United Way Campaign cabinet and was the first Chairman of the Combined Federal Campaign of Western Central Connecticut. Stanley has been recognized by a myriad of organizations for his efforts on their behalf including MaKeLa Incorporated, the Marine Cadets of America, Youth Business Enterprises, the Greater New Haven Youth Continuum, the Hamden Black Democratic Club, and Casa Otonal.

It is not often that you find an individual who dedicates so much of themselves to serving others. Throughout his professional career and in his personal time, Stanley has sought every opportunity to do just that. On a more personal note, Stanley is not just a member of my staff—he is family. I cannot thank him enough for all that he has done over the years. Today, as he celebrates his retirement, I am proud to extend my very best wishes to Stanley, his companion of more than twenty years, Linda Thorpe; his five sons Stanley, Jr., Jordon, Julian, Kwad, and Jamal; as well as his fifteen grandchildren; and two great-grandchildren. I wish them all the best for many more years of health and happiness.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 323 I was unable to cast my vote on the House floor because I was ill. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING THE COMMUNITY SERVICE ETHIC OF RALPH NILLES

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great American, Ralph Nilles. Ralph is a friend of North Carolina and the High Country whose tireless volunteerism is an inspirational testament to his concern for others and his community.

Ever since he retired in North Carolina's High Country, he has dedicated his retirement years to volunteering for almost every local organization that was doing good things for the community. One of the characteristics people admire most about Ralph is how he never shies away from hard work—he knows the value of a hard day's work, especially when it is given to help others in need.

Although his health has declined recently and taken him from the volunteer work he loved so much, his legacy is strong. He is known as Mr. Volunteer, as the man who will do what it takes to get the job done. From his work with the Foscoe Grandfather Mountain Community Center to his unflagging support for so many good causes, Ralph is the kind of person that every American community loves to call their own.

That's why I'm so proud to honor him today for his many years of selfless service and his countless hours of work on behalf of so many deserving organizations. Ralph is a one-of-kind man who has made an indelible mark on his community and I'm confident he has inspired many to follow in his footsteps of volunteerism.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEOFF DAVIS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 7, 2011, I mistakenly voted "no" on Rollcall No. 522—Cole of Oklahoma Amendment No. 4, an amendment to H.R. 2219, Department of Defense Appropriations Act. The amendment stated that none of the funds made available by the underlying bill 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 the underlying bill. I intended to vote "yes" on Rollcall No. 522.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SMART ELECTRONICS ACT

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Smart Electronics Act.

The Smart Electronics Act is an effort to reduce the amount of energy consumed by consumer electronic devices. Electronic gadgets already account for about 15 percent of household electricity consumption, and as these gadgets proliferate, their energy use continues to grow.

The International Energy Agency (IEA) estimates that by 2030, new electronic gadgets will triple their energy consumption to 1,700 terawatt hours, the equivalent of the home electricity consumption of the U.S. and Japan combined. According to the IEA, the international community will have to build over 15,000 wind turbines (or 200 nuclear power plants) to power all the TVs, iPods, PCs and other home electronics expected to be

plugged in by 2030. The electric bill to power all household electronics will top $200 billion a year, compared with last year's bill of $80 billion. Most of this increase in consumer electronics will occur in developing countries, where economic growth is outpacing developed nations and ownership rates of gadgets are lowest.

If the devices are not made more energy efficient, their proliferation will undermine efforts to increase energy security and reduce the emission of greenhouse gases responsible for global warming. The answer to this problem will not be found in stemming the tide of electronic gadget envy, because there is no way we will be able to do that. Instead, we must encourage the development of better devices that are built more efficiently and run on less energy.

Programs like Energy Star have already started improving our electronically dependent world. Last year as a result of Energy Star, Americans saved $6,000,000,000 while also saving enough energy to power over 10,000,000 homes. However, the Energy Star program as it is currently structured cannot solve the problem due to the limited number of devices it covers.

To address this, I am reintroducing the Smart Electronics Act. The bill would require the Department of Energy (DOE) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to report to Congress within a year on several key areas to ensure we achieve the clarity needed for industry to thrive. First, the DOE and EPA must assess the potential for energy efficient electronics to receive an Energy Star designation, and the potential savings accrued (e.g. cost, energy) through a specific program focused on smart electronics. Second, they must assess the global growth of electronics usage and utilization and the associated energy consumption. Lastly, the bill calls for the DOE and EPA to standardize a process for defining, categorizing, and ranking technologies as "smart." If it is deemed appropriate, a smart electronics emphasis and a Smart Electronics Registry would be incorporated into the Energy Star program.

The bill defines smart electronics as devices that cooperate with the electrical grid to cut down on energy consumption. This minimization can be achieved through power-factor correction, utilizing stand-by modes, communication and monitoring with the smart grid, taking advantage of off-peak charging and operation, on-demand and variable processing speed semiconductors, or switching to a lower power mode.

Importantly, this legislation will help us green the electronics industry by providing the private sector with reliable standards and incentives and by educating and empowering consumers to make smarter and more efficient choices—all of which help cool the planet.

I look forward to working with Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN on moving this bill through their committee and the House.

RECOGNIZING VENANCIA R. COLET ON BEING NAMED A 2011 OUTSTANDING SENIOR VOLUNTEER BY THE NATIONAL SENIOR MEDICARE PATROL

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Venancia R. Colet, for her exemplary volunteer work with the Guam Senior Medicare Patrol Project (Guam SMP), an outreach program which educates Medicare recipients about the complexities of the Medicare program. Mrs. Colet was recently named one of ten SMP volunteers, nationwide, to receive the Outstanding Senior Volunteer Award. This national award from the U.S. Administration on Aging recognizes the commitment of volunteers to fight against health care fraud and abuse.

Mrs. Colet worked as a counselor with the Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse (DMHSA) from 1976 to 1997. After her retirement, she continued to serve the community of Guam by training and supervising DMHSA counselors in responding to crises, and she has worked with local programs that address the needs of emotionally disturbed children and youth in Guam.

In 2008, Mrs. Colet began volunteering for the Guam SMP program, and since then she has conducted numerous counseling sessions with homebound Medicare recipients. She was the first and is currently the only SMP volunteer with proficiency in both the Tagalog and Ilocano languages of the Philippines, a skill that has helped the program reach many Medicare beneficiaries on Guam.

Mrs. Colet was born in the province of Vigan, Ilocos, in the Philippines and moved to Guam in 1974. She currently resides in the northern village of Dededo, Guam. She has been married to Rodolfo Colet for the past 35 years, and they have two children. In addition to her contributions to Guam SMP, Mrs. Colet is an active volunteer for the American Red Cross and has provided voluntary services following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on our Nation.

I congratulate Mrs. Colet on being named an Outstanding Senior Volunteer for the Senior Medical Patrol Project. On behalf of the people of Guam, I extend to her a sincere un dangkulo nab Si Yu 'os Ma'ase for dedication and commitment to our community.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF CAPTAIN JEFF BOWEN OF THE ASHEVILLE FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. HEATH SHULER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Captain Jeff Bowen for his distinguished service in the Asheville City Fire Department.

A husband and father of three, Captain Bowen passed away July 29th, 2011, at the age of 37, while serving the people of Asheville, North Carolina. Captain Bowen first joined the Asheville Fire Department 13 years ago and dedicated himself fully to protecting the city until his life was claimed during a fire at a Biltmore Avenue medical office building.

Firefighters serve as an integral part of our community. It is remarkable that men such as Captain Bowen commit themselves to a profession that engenders such risk and sacrifice. These stakes often fashion strong friendships and bonds that go beyond the walls of any fire department. Today, we all stand with the 240 firefighters in the Asheville Fire Department who lost a colleague, a friend, and a brother. We also pray for Captain Bowen's wife, Stacy, and his three children as they grieve for the loss of a remarkable husband and father.

Captain Bowen was often described as a "firefighter's firefighter," a selfless man who truly enjoyed coming to work every shift. He was respected by his fellow firefighters and appreciated by his officers. Through his commendable service, Captain Bowen has made Western North Carolina proud. It is my honor to commemorate him, and I urge my colleagues to join me today in honoring Captain Jeff Bowen for the sacrifice he has made for the city of Asheville, the citizens of North Carolina, and the people of the United States.

JOHN P. ERCUL TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to rise in recognition of Deputy Chief John P. Ercul, for his 42 years of service in the Pueblo Police Department, and for his service in the United States Army.

Mr. Ercul graduated from the Southern Colorado State College with a degree in English and Mass Communications, later attending many specialized law enforcement schools as he built his distinguished career of service to the people of Pueblo. Mr. Ercul's passionate dedication to his work over four decades has left an indelible mark on the community and on the legacy of the Pueblo Police Department.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the duration of his service in the Pueblo Police Department, Mr. Ercul has been devoted to his community. His years of service and commitment to the people of Pueblo deserve great recognition and admiration.

THE SERVICE OF ROD WEIGAND, GRAND LODGE REPRESENTATIVE, IAM

HON. MARTIN HEINRICH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a notable labor advocate in New Mexico's First Congressional District, Mr. Rod Weigand. Mr. Weigand has served for the past 7 years as Grand Lodge Representative for New Mexico, Colorado and Wyoming as part of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, or "IAM."

In his role, Mr. Weigand has conducted numerous campaigns in the Aerospace, Service Contract and Automotive sectors of industry. He was also instrumental in securing collective bargaining agreements in the Service Contract arena which included White Sands Missile Range and Kirtland Air Force Base. His 31 years of membership, dedication, and service to the Machinists Union have centered upon core values of organized labor: fair pay for an honest day's work, dignified treatment in the workplace, and equal opportunity for all. In recent years, those kinds of organized labor struggles have come under increasing attack. Yet the strength of the labor movement is visible in leaders like Mr. Weigand.

Mr. Weigand's dedication to the well-being of working New Mexican machinists and aerospace workers resulted in many sacrifices in his own life. Yet his work has been instrumental in mentoring numerous union activists in hopes of maintaining a middle class America, while allowing for those less fortunate to realize their American dream. This great nation should continue to be the land of equal opportunity as it was intended by our forefathers.

In New Mexico, when many other sectors recently struggled or lost jobs, our innovative industries grew in revenue and contributed to our national defense, energy independence, and economic vitality. Those sectors are helping our nation's ability to rise to the challenges of the 21st century and they're also providing high-skill high-wage jobs. I appreciate Mr. Weigand's leadership in those New Mexican sectors, including high technology manufacturing and aerospace.

I am proud to honor Mr. Rod Weigand for his continued leadership in strengthening the manufacturing and aerospace industry in New Mexico and for promoting the well-being of its workers. The impact of leaders like Mr. Weigand and the Machinists and Aerospace Workers is critical to New Mexico's future. As a result, today's workers enjoy benefits far beyond what they had before and in the words of IAM, "it doesn't cost to be a union member—it pays." I wish Mr. Weigand and his family our best in all of their future endeavors.

THE GRAND OPENING OF THE HEART MOUNTAIN WYOMING INTERPRETATIVE LEARNING CENTER

HON. CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Grand Opening of the Heart Mountain Wyoming Foundation's Interpretative Learning Center in my home State of Wyoming. While the Heart Mountain Relocation Center symbolizes a sad time in our nation's history, the opening of the Interpretative Learning Center begins a new era. It will be a first class educational facility that preserves and teaches the lessons embodied in the wartime experience of people of Japanese ancestry confined during World War II.

The Heart Mountain Relocation Center was located on then public lands in Park County, Wyoming. It was named after the Heart Mountain Butte visible in the distance. It was, and is, in a very rural area of Wyoming. It held nearly 14,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry during World War II on 740 acres. At the time it was the third largest community in Wyoming.

Heart Mountain was one of ten internment camps in the American West established by the War Relocation Authority and authorized by President Roosevelt under Executive Order shortly after the bombing of Pearl Harbor. Under the justification of national security, the U.S. military was authorized to create military zones on the West Coast from which residents of Japanese ancestry were excluded.

The Heart Mountain Relocation Center was surrounded by guard towers and barbed wire fences and consisted of 650 barrack-style buildings, including a hospital, other support facilities and 468 residential units. Nearly two-thirds of those imprisoned at Heart Mountain were American citizens born in the United States and living in California, Oregon and Washington States. Internees were able to take few possessions with them and were forced to leave their homes, farms, and businesses.

Yet, despite their unjust imprisonment, the Japanese Americans at Heart Mountain never forgot that they were Americans. While residing at the Relocation Center, internees set up systems for democratic governance, health care, education, farming, and community services. More than 800 internees served in the U.S. armed forces during World War II, 11 of whom were killed and 52 wounded in battle.

This dark spot on the history of America and Wyoming nevertheless created lasting friendships and an indelible imprint on Northwest Wyoming. While he was a young Boy Scout living in Cody, Wyoming, former Wyoming Senator Alan Simpson met former Representative and Secretary of Commerce and Transportation Norman Mineta when the Minetas were interned at Heart Mountain. They remain dear friends today. Senator Simpson, Secretary Mineta, and the people of Northwest Wyoming have wholeheartedly embraced the efforts of the Heart Mountain Wyoming Foundation to share this history with future generations.

The Heart Mountain Interpretative Learning Center is the culmination of a 15-year grassroots undertaking to preserve the historic site and interpret what occurred there for current and future generations of Americans. The Heart Mountain Wyoming Foundation has raised nearly $5 million through private donations, including significant contributions by former Heart Mountain internees. This funding has been used to acquire 50 acres at the original site and construct the Interpretative Learning Center. This effort has been supported by the Park County Commissioners, the Cody Country Chamber of Commerce, the Powell Valley Chamber of Commerce, the Park County Travel Council and the Northwest Region of the Wyoming Business Council.

The Center will house a number of permanent exhibits and artifacts in a barracks-like structure that will capture a sense of everyday life at the Relocation Center. Visitors will learn about the lives the internees left behind and the upheaval caused by the forced evacuation from their homes. There are a number of interactive displays and exhibits to help recreate the experience. There also will be an opportunity for visitors to gain insight into the postwar challenges for internees and the tragic legacy of civil rights abuses.

The world class facility will serve as a national center for education, policy and research in collaboration with universities and historic preservation organizations. Most significantly, it will be a visible reminder of the need to balance national security with respect for the civil rights of citizens.

The Heart Mountain Interpretative Learning Center, located between Cody and Powell, Wyoming, is located only 50 miles from Yellowstone National Park and Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area. Over 1,000 internees, descendents, and supporters from across the nation will attend the Grand Opening of the Heart Mountain Interpretative Learning Center later this month. It is my hope that my colleagues and their constituents will take time to visit the Heart Mountain Interpretative Learning Center when they visit Wyoming.

I congratulate the Heart Mountain Wyoming Foundation, and applaud the opening of a learning center designed to help us never to forget the importance of the liberties granted to all of us by our Constitution.

HONORING THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS, LOCAL 478 AS THEY CELEBRATE THEIR CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to join the many who have gathered to celebrate "A Century of Building Connecticut"—the 100th Anniversary of the International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 478. Over the last century, the members of Local 478 have been an integral part of Connecticut's construction industry, involved in some of the most important and influential projects in our state. The proud members of Local 478 work tirelessly to make the Union the premier supplier of heavy equipment operators, mechanics, and support personnel in Connecticut.

Local 478 began as most trade unions did—with a group of workers banding together to negotiate safer working conditions and better pay. The 18 original members of Local 478 were granted a charter by the International Union of Steam Engineers in September of 1911. Over the course of its history, Local 478 was also granted several other charters, including the Hoisting and Portable Charter, the Journeyman and Apprentice Charter, as well as the 478B, 478C, 478D and 478E charters—all of which represent the various skills and crafts of today's membership.

One hundred years later, Local 478 continues to serve the interests of their membership. From its humble beginnings, Local 478 has grown to represent more than four thousand members and it has ensured that each of its members and their families have access to state-of-the-art training, fair wages and benefits, and a secure retirement. These are protections that these hard-working men and women rightly deserve. Their work to provide and maintain our state's infrastructure strengthens our communities and improves the quality of life for all Connecticut residents. From the inception of the Merritt Parkway,

through the damming of the Naugatuck Valley, to the building of Connecticut's tallest structure and one of the world's largest casinos, the men and women of Local 478 have proudly worked day in and day out to quite literally build Connecticut.

As they celebrate this remarkable milestone in their history, I am proud to stand and extend my sincere congratulations to the leadership and membership of International Union Operating Local 478—past and present—for their many invaluable contributions to our community. I have and continue to be proud to work with them in their endeavors to enrich our state as well as the lives of their membership. Happy 100th Anniversary!

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 324, I was unable to cast my vote on the House floor because I was ill, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

CONGRATULATING SPIRIT AEROSYSTEMS ON THE OCCASION OF THE EXPANSION OF ITS MANUFACTURING FACILITY IN KINSTON, NORTH CAROLINA

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Spirit AeroSystems, Inc. on the expansion of its recently opened manufacturing operations at the North Carolina Global TransPark in Kinston, North Carolina.

Based in Wichita, Kansas, Spirit AeroSystems is one of the world's largest suppliers of commercial airplane components. Spirit, which has domestic facilities in Tulsa and McAlester, Oklahoma as well as international facilities in Prestwick, Scotland; Preston, England; Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia; and Saint-Nazaire, France, added Kinston, North Carolina to its roster of state-of-the-art aviation operations in July 2010.

Spirit AeroSystems' Kinston facility will begin a new production program responsible for constructing the wing for the Gulfstream G250 and will add approximately 150 to 200 North Carolina jobs over the next five years. This expansion will add to the Global TransPark operation that already produces composite fuselage and leading edge wing spars for the Airbus A350 commercial aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, I represent one of the poorest Congressional districts in the country, and the recession has been especially difficult on the citizens of the First District of North Carolina. However, through these tough times the people of eastern North Carolina have demonstrated their resiliency and competiveness. As a result of these qualities, I believe other companies will follow Spirit AeroSystems' lead and build successful and reciprocally beneficial relationships in eastern North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues join me in congratulating Spirit AeroSystems on the expansion of its manufacturing facility in Kinston, North Carolina. I thank Spirit AeroSystems for their demonstrated confidence in the workers of eastern North Carolina. I wish them the best in their future endeavors.

THE PASSING OF FORMER WASHINGTON HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, CHIEF CLERK, VITO CHIECHI

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Vito Chiechi—a friend, father, public servant and a political fixture in Washington State.

Anyone who worked in Olympia during Vito's tenure there remembers him as a diligent man, with a kind heart, fun-loving nature, smart nature, and a wealth of ideas. Vito, a first generation Italian-American, was born in Seattle, Washington in 1925 and grew up in Rainier Valley. His public service began in the U.S. Navy during World War II, where he served in the Pacific Theater aboard the destroyers *McKee* and *Plunkett*.

After the war, he returned to his native Washington, graduated from Seattle University with a Bachelor of Finance and married his sweetheart, Dolores. They were happily married for 52 years, had 9 children, 24 grandchildren and 11 great-grandchildren.

Vito had a vibrant and distinguished career that matched his larger than life personality. He worked for The Boeing Company for 20 years, served as the Regional Administrator for the General Services Administration and Chief Clerk for the Washington State House of Representatives. Always the entrepreneur, Vito founded his own public affairs and government relations company.

During these tough economic times, we could learn a great deal from Vito. A dear friend of his and mine, Alan Hayworth, recounted the time Vito served as Chief Clerk and the state was in the midst of a tough economic crisis. Vito instituted his own 10 percent across the board cuts. When vendors submitted invoices, Vito would only pay 90 percent of the bill and write back a nice note, "thanking them for participating in the House budget reduction program."

We all learned valuable political lessons from him as well, lessons that can be applied today. Vito was a true patriot, placing his love for America above partisan politics. Because of Vito's warmth and personality he was able to transcend party lines, and had a unique ability to bring people together on common ground issues. Remarkably, Vito held prominent positions for Democratic and Republican officials alike. He hosted the state famous bipartisan pasta dinners for state legislators and local elected officials. His daughter, also named Dolores, remarked that he was fond of saying, "I don't care what you are, just be something!"

Despite suffering a stroke in 1997, Vito refused to retire, or even slow down. Although he was confined to a wheelchair, he continued to frequent the Capitol and throw his famous pasta dinners until his passing on Tuesday July 26, 2011.

Vito's joy for living was never compromised and just three days before his death he celebrated his 86th birthday. Vito's ability to bring people together will undoubtedly be part of his legacy, as Members of both parties express their sorrow at his passing.

Mr. Speaker, Vito Chiechi's life of joy and service is worthy of tribute. As we remember Vito's life, we recognize that the sadness we feel is only for ourselves, at the loss of our friend. While the world has lost one of its bright lights, our dear friend has finally taken a well-earned retirement, and has been reunited with Dolores Audrey, his first love, and wife of 52 years.

INTRODUCING THE FEDERAL AVIATION EMPLOYEES PROTECTION ACT OF 2011

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Federal Aviation Employees Protection Act of 2011, which would allow the nearly 4,000 Federal Aviation Administration, FAA, employees left in limbo by a partial FAA shutdown to get back to work. While House Republicans continue to ignore their Congressional duties by opposing a short-term FAA extension, as well as an open and transparent process for a long-term FAA reauthorization, Democrats in the House and Senate have been working to address these furloughs. This legislation is a companion bill to S. 1433, introduced by Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER of West Virginia, Senator MARK WARNER of Virginia, and 14 other senators on July 27, 2011.

On July 23, 2011, the FAA went into partial shutdown on the watch of House Republicans who, earlier that week, voted to restrict Essential Air Service, EAS, for small and rural communities instead of passing a clean, short-term FAA extension. As a result, the FAA was forced to furlough 3,594 employees, including engineering and electronics technicians, computer and logistics specialists, and support staff, among other workers. In addition, the FAA has halted hundreds of airport construction projects, suspended research on next-generation air traffic control systems (NextGen), and lost upwards of $30 million in tax revenue with each passing day. Without steady funding or workers, the FAA is unable to move forward with 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 NextGen.

As House Republicans continue playing the blame game with the Senate, American businesses and workers are losing out on much-needed economic opportunities. The ongoing partial shutdown and consequent furlough of FAA employees have had a devastating impact on families and communities in 35 states across the country. In particular, my home state of Florida has lost 27 FAA employees, 3,061 airport construction jobs, and $88 million in airport construction funding. Furthermore, media reports indicate that certain airlines

have raised consumer prices in order to capitalize on the FAA's inability to collect aviation excise taxes.

Failure to address this dire issue threatens jobs, raises construction costs, and harms consumers at a time when the economic security and stability of our nation's economy is called into question by political gridlock. Fortunately, there is a solution. Much of the FAA is self-funded through user fees that go into the Airport and Airway Trust Fund. The Federal Aviation Employees Protection Act uses this revenue to allow furloughed FAA employees to continue working with pay and benefits, and to provide retroactive pay for the period of their furlough, as Congress seeks a compromise on long-term FAA reauthorization.

Mr. Speaker, the FAA is now in its 10th consecutive day of partial shutdown, which means that furloughed FAA employees have been out of work and without pay for 10 days. This is unconscionable and unacceptable. I urge my colleagues to join me in standing up for these hard-working federal employees and help ensure the continued safety and improvement of our nation's aviation system by supporting the Federal Aviation Employees Protection Act. Enough is enough. If House Republicans were serious about bringing an end to the partial shutdown and furlough of FAA employees, they would support a clean, short-term FAA extension so that Congress could finalize and pass a long-term FAA reauthorization as soon as possible. It is clear that they are not.

THANK YOU MELISSA HITE

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to Melissa Hite, a dedicated staff member in the office of the Second Congressional District of South Carolina. After spending almost two years in the Washington office, Melissa will be leaving on August 19th to return home to Irmo, South Carolina.

Melissa has played an instrumental role in the Second Congressional District's Washington Intern Program. Serving as Intern Coordinator, Melissa was in charge of training and overseeing all interns in our Washington office. As a Legislative Correspondent, she was responsible for answering constituent mail while serving as the primary contact for constituent tours and flag requests.

Melissa is the second child of Carey and Paula Hite of Irmo and is a 2009 graduate of Wake Forest University.

Melissa's hard work and patience have been a valuable asset to the office. It is with sincere gratitude that I would like to thank Melissa for her enthusiasm and dedication to our office and the people of the Second Congressional District of South Carolina.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS N. CLARK

HON. KEVIN McCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Thomas N. Clark, former General Manager of the Kern County Water Agency and respected water expert in our community, who passed away on July 23, 2011, after battling cancer.

While Tom rose to the height of California water politics as General Manager of the Kern County Water Agency, KCWA, he was proud of his Oildale beginnings and never let anyone forget that. After graduating from North High School in 1963, he served for two years in the United States Army and married his sweetheart, Karen. Tom and Karen moved back to Bakersfield in 1970, and he quickly earned degrees from Bakersfield College and California State University, Bakersfield. Tom then received a full scholarship to the University of Pittsburgh, where he received a Master's Degree in water supply and pollution.

Back in Bakersfield, Tom began his career with KCWA in 1974. During this time, he honed his understanding and knowledge of California water contract law, as well as the ins and outs of Kern County and California water policy. He left KCWA in 1978 and went to work for the late local farmer and entrepreneur George Nickel, where he learned a great deal about Kern River water rights. He later returned to KCWA and became General Manager in 1990, serving in this capacity for 14 years.

As General Manager, Tom was at the center of California water politics, fighting tirelessly for Kern County residents and farmers to ensure our local communities received the water they needed and were entitled to. Recognized as a skilled and shrewd negotiator, Tom could wade through complex water problems to achieve collaborative, win-win solutions, all the while improving water supply reliability for Kern County.

One of Tom's greatest achievements and lasting legacies was the Monterey Agreement, which he helped negotiate with the California Department of Water Resources and other State Water Project contractors. This averted an agricultural disaster in Kern County by preventing tens of thousands of acres of farmland from being fallowed because of lack of water. He also was at the table and worked on the historic 1994 Bay Delta Accord, which provided an agreement among water agencies and environmentalists, leading to the CalFed Record of Decision by the United States Department of the Interior.

To provide more water reliability and supply stability, Tom was the driving force behind the Pioneer Project, a 2,253-acre groundwater recharge and water banking project located in Kern County, which KCWA operates to this day. This project was deservedly renamed the "Thomas N. Clark Recharge and Banking Project" in 2010. His leadership over the years helped KCWA navigate through "wet" and "dry" years, and the benefits of that leadership are still seen throughout the community and at all levels of government.

Tom is survived by his wife, Karen, his children, Krista and Jeff, and his grandchild, Henry. I will miss Tom's great sense of humor and barbequing, but I know he will be fondly remembered as a strong leader who was a passionate advocate for Kern County water and respected by many.

HONORING COLONEL ADELE E. HODGES, USMC ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join the United States Marine Corps and the Marine Cadets of America in extending my sincere congratulations to Col. Adele E. Hodges as she retires after 33 years of dedicated service to the Marines. A Connecticut native, Colonel Hodges has demonstrated a unique dedication to the service of our nation and I am proud to have this opportunity to recognize her outstanding military career.

Following her graduation from Southern Connecticut State College, Colonel Hodges enlisted in the United States Marine Corps in June of 1978 and less than a year later was accepted into the Enlisted Commissioning Program. Beginning her career in a time when few women were entering the military, Colonel Hodges worked diligently to rise through the ranks and has built a reputation and record of service that is enviable by any standard. Her assignments have taken her to Japan, Hawaii, Louisiana, California, and Virginia. She has served at the U.S. Naval War College in Rhode Island, the NATO Joint Headquarters North East and the NATO Joint Warfare Centre in Stavanger, Norway. She concluded her career assigned to Headquarters United States Marine Corps Office of the Inspector General as the Director of Readiness Assessments.

Throughout her military career, Colonel Hodges has been recognized with the Legion of Merit, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal with 3 Stars, and a Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal. To say that Colonel Hodges has broken through barriers would be an understatement and her home state of Connecticut could not be more proud of the extraordinary officer she has become.

An organization in my home town of New Haven, Connecticut, the Marine Cadets of America, owes a debt of gratitude to Colonel Hodges. The Marine Cadets is a program that provides at-risk youth with training and activities designed to promote awareness of the dangers of drug/substance abuse and promote pride both in one's self and in one's community. It was through the assistance and support of Colonel Hodges that the Marine Cadets of America was formally recognized by the Corps—a designation that the organization had been seeking for several years. For the many marines that volunteer for the program as well as the cadets whose lives are changed by their participation, this recognition was extremely meaningful. I am honored to have this opportunity to thank Colonel Hodges for the personal commitment she gave to this effort.

For both her exemplary service to our nation in the United States Marine Corps as well as her personal contributions to our community, I am proud to stand today to pay tribute to Col. Adele E. Hodges. Hers is a legacy that will continue to inspire others for generations to come and I extend my very best wishes to her for many more years of health and happiness

as she embarks on this new chapter of her life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 325 I was unable to cast my vote on the House floor because I was ill. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

INTRODUCTION ON THE TERRITORIES ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2011

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the "Territories Economic Development Opportunity Act," a bill which would amend Title 23 of United States Code, to provide for the participation of the territories in Federal-aid highway discretionary programs. The bill provides a statutory fix to redress an inequity in transportation funding options for Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

I thank my colleagues, Congresswoman DONNA CHRISTENSEN of the U.S. Virgin Islands; Congressman ENI FALEOMAVAEGA of American Samoa; and Congressman GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, for their cosponsorship of this important legislation. The "Territories Economic Development Opportunity Act" ensures that our jurisdictions are able to compete for discretionary programs administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Currently, the jurisdictions of Guam, American Samoa, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands are not eligible to compete for funding under the National Bridge Program or the Ferry Boats and Ferry Terminal Facilities program. This legislation would make the territories eligible to compete under these discretionary funding accounts.

Economic development and facilitation of commerce in each of these jurisdictions is important. On Guam, a safe and comprehensive road network is important to facilitating improvements in our tourism industry. It is also important for the transport of military equipment and personnel from Andersen Air Force Base to Navy Base Guam. Without a well developed and maintained road network, these industries on Guam would be difficult to sustain. Therefore, a stronger infrastructure network is important to maintaining and expanding these economic lynchpins of Guam's economy.

However, in an era of declining budgets and given the current planned reductions in discretionary spending (according to the current deficit that will be voted on today by the House of Representatives), it is prudent and responsible to ensure that the territories have the same opportunity as any other jurisdiction to compete for discretionary funding to improve their infrastructure systems. Each of our territories has a unique economic situation but we all recognize the importance of having a robust infrastructure system to facilitate commerce and economic opportunities in each of our jurisdictions. For example, on Guam, as the realignment of military forces begins implementation, it may be necessary to develop a ferry system so that civilians and military alike can go between Guam and ports within the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. In any of the 50 states, the development of a ferry system could be aided, in part, by federal funding through the Ferry Boats and Ferry Terminal Facilities Program. However, this would not be possible on Guam or any of the other smaller territories.

Further, major bridge projects on Guam like the Ylig Bridge Replacement or the Route 4 Bridge repairs are not eligible for competitive funding under the National Bridge Program. Instead, such projects must solely be funded through the Territorial Highway Program. Given the scope and cost of many of these projects, other road projects are deferred or go unfunded. Thus, it is important to give the small territories the same opportunity to compete for this critical funding as any one of the 50 states.

Mr. Speaker, this bill allows us to begin a discussion about the treatment of the territories in any forthcoming development of a surface transportation reauthorization bill. In an era of tight budgets, it is only fair and right to allow Guam, American Samoa, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to compete for critical infrastructure funding that will help to develop economic opportunities and facilitate commerce in each of our respective jurisdictions.

RECOGNIZING THE SUCCESS OF THE PARADA SAN JUAN BAUTISTA IN CAMDEN, NEW JERSEY

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the Puerto Rican community of Camden on the occasion of the Parada San Juan Bautista. The parade celebrates St. John the Baptist, the patron saint of Puerto Rico and the namesake of its capital, San Juan. This year's festivities occurred on Sunday, June 26th and marked the 54th anniversary of the annual parade.

In 1957, parishioners from Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church decided to organize a parade. Their goal was to promote a positive image of Puerto Rican heritage and to share their culture with the city of Camden. This first parade has since expanded into a month-long celebration. The current organizers' dual objectives are to strengthen ties within the Puerto Rican community and with the larger Camden community.

The Parada San Juan Bautista holds special significance to the Puerto Rican community in Camden. It is an opportunity for them to share their culture with friends and enables them to pass on their traditions to younger generations. This year's parade travelled a mile-long route through the city and featured fire fighters from Camden and Philadelphia on their trucks. In addition to the parade, the day included traditional singing, dancing, and foods, all culminating in a concert on the beautiful Camden Waterfront. I thank the Puerto Rican community for all they do to enrich and support South Jersey, and I pay special recognition to this year's Parada San Juan Bautista.

IN TRIBUTE TO HENRY "HANK" LACAYO ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to Henry "Hank" Lacayo, who will celebrate his 80th birthday next month.

Despite the fact that Hank and I disagree on just about every political issue, we have become friends over the many decades we have known each other. Hank is a man of great integrity and intelligence. What we do have in common is a great love of our country and a desire to do whatever is in our power to make America a better place for all Americans.

As Hank knows, I greatly respect his right to be wrong on how to get there, as I'm sure he says the same about me.

To say Hank Lacayo is a union man is to say that Hershey makes chocolate.

I haven't time to list all of Hank's accomplishments, but let me touch on some of the highlights:

Hank began his labor career in 1953, and was soon elected to serve as President of UAW Local 887, representing over 32,000 workers at North American Aviation/Rockwell International in Los Angeles. In 1974, he accepted a position with the union's national headquarters in Detroit, Michigan, as an Executive Assistant to then President Leonard Woodcock.

He was appointed National Director of UAW's political and legislative department. Under Democratic administrations, beginning with John F. Kennedy, he served as advisor to both current and past presidents of the United States. He has also been involved with the electoral process of U.S. Senators, U.S. Representatives, State Governors and legislators, and national advocacy organizations throughout America.

Hank is listed in Who's Who in Labor, First Edition. He currently serves as a Commissioner of the California Commission on Aging, is a past member of the CCoA Executive Committee and chair of the policy/advocacy committee. He is the State President of the Congress of California Seniors and a member of the board of directors of: the Ventura County Community Foundation; El Concilio Family Services; St. Barnabas Senior Services in L.A; Health Access; Jewish Labor Committee; California Foundation on Aging; and CSU-CI Foundation; and Board Chair for La Hermandad. He is also a member of the Cal State University Channel Island President's Circle.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in wishing Hank a Happy 80th Birthday and wishing him many more with his wife, Leah, his family, and his many friends.

TRIBUTE TO BRAD HUDSON

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community of Riverside, California, are exceptional. Riverside has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make their communities a better place to live and work. Brad Hudson is one of these individuals. On August 9, 2011, Brad will be honored at a Riverside City Hall reception as he ends his tenure as the City of Riverside's City Manager.

Brad Hudson came to the City of Riverside after serving as the Assistant County Executive Officer of the Economic Development Agency where he was responsible for broad activities and operations throughout the county.

Earlier, Brad spent more than 14 years with the County of Riverside, where he began as Deputy Chief Executive Officer for Eastern Riverside County. Additionally, Hudson proudly served his country in the United States Air Force. He received his B.S. degree from California State University, Fresno, and an MPA from the University of San Francisco.

Appointed as City Manager by the City Council, Brad has acted as the Chief Administrative Officer of the City. He enforces the laws and carries out the policies of the Council through the control and direction of City Departments. In addition, during his time as City Manager, Brad made numerous recommendations to the Council on legislation, fiscal matters, capital improvements and other City policies, and he oversaw the responsibilities of the Communications Officer and the Intergovernmental Relations Office. Riverside City Council members have extensively praised Hudson for accomplishing so much during his six year tenure, particularly a long list of public works projects known as the Riverside Renaissance. After Brad leaves Riverside, he will take the helm as the City of Sacramento's Chief Executive. As such, he will provide leadership to ensure the smooth operation and management of all City Departments.

In light of all Brad Hudson has done for the community of Riverside, we wish him the best as he moves on to his next professional endeavor. Brad's tireless passion for the community has contributed immensely to the betterment of Riverside, California. I am proud to call Brad a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many community members are grateful for his service and salute him as he ends his time as City Manager for the City of Riverside.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the millions of Americans employed through our nation's vibrant arts sector. I stand in opposition to the unreasonable cuts proposed in Mr. Walberg's amendment to H.R. 2584, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2012. Both the amendment and the underlying bill propose irresponsible cuts to the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA).

To understand the rich history of federal funding for the arts, one need look no further than my home state of Florida. From our State Library's extensive archives of folksongs documenting the history of Florida's multicultural fishing communities, the exquisite Depression-era murals that tell the history of Florida along the walls of our Federal Courthouse in Tallahassee, to Key West's intricate Hurricane Memorial down south, evidence of the positive impact of federally supported art projects abound throughout Florida.

Federal funding for the arts began during a time of great economic hardship in our country, under President Roosevelt's New Deal. During the Great Depression, artists were among the tens of millions of Americans out of work. They were able to get back to work through vital federal arts programs of the day. A significant portion of the materials documenting Florida's New Deal arts projects are housed in my home district, in the Broward County Library's Bienes Museum of the Modern Book. This collection contains hundreds of vintage Florida tourism posters and postcards created by artists employed by the Federal Arts Program (FAP), and visual aids produced for use in schools across the country.

The words of President Roosevelt's director of the FAP, Harry Hopkins, ring just as true today as they did in 1939 when he said of artists struggling during the Depression, ''Hell, they have to eat too.'' The arts are not just a nice thing to have on display or something to do if there's free time, or if one can afford it. Arts jobs are real jobs, and today, more than ever, the arts are an economic engine in our communities.

My Congressional district is home to at least 2,800 arts-related businesses that employ 10,000 people. In this time of economic hardship, we know that the arts community has been affected deeply—forced to shed jobs and lose critical donations from the private sector.

I hear my colleagues across the aisle say that the arts can and should be supported by the private sector and philanthropy alone. However, federal support for the arts plays a critical role in leveraging private funding. On average, each NEA grant leverages at least seven dollars from other state, local, and private sources. Private support cannot match the leveraging role of government cultural funding. In our current economic climate when private donations are far harder to come by, this public seed money is more important than ever.

The NEA facilitates essential public-private partnerships through its grants and initiatives. Thanks to NEA support, previously underserved rural and inner city communities across the country are seeing a resurgence of cultural opportunities, which in turn increases tourism and attracts business. The arts have been shown to be a successful and sustainable strategy for revitalizing rural areas, inner cities and populations struggling with poverty. Arts organizations purchase goods and services that help local merchants thrive. Last year alone, arts tourism contributed more than $192 billion to the U.S. economy. Arts audiences spend money—more than $100 billion a year—on admissions, transportation, food, lodging and souvenirs that boost local economies.

Across the country, we see the positive impact of the arts on our students and families; yet, this bill proposes cuts to the NEA that will negatively affect thousands of children, young adults, and seniors engaged in lifelong learning.

As a legislator of more than 18 years and as a mother of three, I have seen time and again the tremendous impact art has on the developmental growth of children. It helps level the learning playing field without regard to socioeconomic boundaries. Students engaged in the arts perform better academically across the board and the NEA plays a crucial role in enhancing arts education across the country.

Children exposed to the arts are also more likely to do better in math, reading, and foreign languages. I will always support funding for arts in education because I know it is critical to America winning the future. An innovative country depends on ensuring that everyone has access to the arts and to cultural opportunity. We must guarantee that all children who believe in their talent are able to see a way to create a future for themselves in the arts community, be it as a hobby or as a profession.

Ever since our nation's founding, the inspired works of our artists and artisans have reflected the ingenuity, creativity, independence and beauty of our country. Federal support for the arts has helped preserve our cultural legacies for generations and we must protect its ability to do so in the years to come. The art our culture produces defines who we are as a people and provides an essential account of our history for future generations of Americans.

I urge my colleagues to stand against these irresponsible cuts to the NEA, which provides essential support for arts education and the arts community. Federal support for the arts keeps people employed and puts more Americans back to work. Now is certainly not the time to falter on our commitment to our nation's dynamic arts sector.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ''BUSINESS TRANSPARENCY ON TRAFFICKING AND SLAVERY ACT''

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce bipartisan legislation along with my colleagues on the Human Trafficking Caucus, Reps. CHRIS SMITH and JACKIE SPEIER.

Most Americans are unaware that many of the goods they use each and every day have passed through the hands of a slave at some point. In 2010, the U.S. Department of Labor identified 128 goods from 70 countries that were made by forced and child labor. We write to invite you to join us in becoming an original cosponsor of the Business Transparency on Trafficking and Slavery Act, which will increase transparency in supply chains in order

to remove slavery from business operations and products.

The Business Transparency on Trafficking and Slavery Act doesn't tell businesses what to do, but rather to tell consumers what they are doing to end human slavery.

This bill will help raise awareness for consumers who want to know where and how their goods are being made. While there are good actors, there are businesses operating in parts of the world that rely on enslaved humans to produce their products. We believe American consumers have a right to know who these companies are.

This legislation creates a market-based solution rather than relying on prescriptive action by the federal government. Companies simply have to report to the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) what they are doing to rid their supply chains of human slavery and post this information on their company Web sites. Consumers will be able to research a company and determine their purchasing decisions based on the information provided. Very simply, this bill creates competition to improve practices to end slavery by providing the public with information about what companies are doing to address slavery.

Human trafficking is the slavery of the 21st century. It is estimated that nearly 12.3 million people are working in some form of forced labor worldwide. The International Labor Organization estimates that for every person trafficked into commercial sexual exploitation, nine people are forced primarily into labor exploitation. We must use every tool available to help these men, women, and children around the world who are enslaved.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation.

HONORING THE FAIR HAVEN COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER ON ITS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to extend my sincere congratulations to the administrators and staff of Fair Haven Community Health Center as they celebrate their 40th Anniversary. Over the last four decades, the Fair Haven Community Health Center has provided quality, affordable health care to some of our community's most vulnerable families. In doing so, they have become an invaluable resource to hundreds, earning a well-deserved reputation for ensuring that health care is available regardless of ability to pay. This is an outstanding organization and I am proud to join community leaders and residents alike in commemorating this remarkable milestone.

In 1971 a small group of dedicated nurses, doctors, students, and neighborhood volunteers, under the leadership of a community advocacy agency called the Alliance for Latin American Progress, opened the Fair Haven Clinic in a local elementary school. Two nights a week, the Clinic served adults and children on a walk-in basis for minor ailments, immunizations, and family planning services. With a budget of only five thousand dollars, made available through a grant from the Greater New Haven Community Foundation, they were able to accommodate over five hundred visits in their first year. It was clear that families were not only in need of these basic services, but of expanded health care as well. Over the next decade the Clinic worked to expand the services that they were able to provide to more comprehensive primary health care. Today, the Fair Haven Community Health Center has grown into one of our community's most respected non-profit primary health care organizations, providing comprehensive health care—from prenatal and pediatric to adolescent, adult and geriatric care—to hundreds of residents every year.

The administrators and staff at Fair Haven Community Health Center continue to seek every opportunity that will allow them to provide quality health care to those families who are either uninsured or underinsured. With the growing number of those families who find themselves uninsured or underinsured, the Center has seen demands in the community rise exponentially. I have had many opportunities to visit the Center and am always impressed with the amount of good work that they are able to do with the limited funding that they receive. The Center not only provides health care services, but they have developed and implemented extraordinary outreach and education programs which benefit community residents. Perhaps most importantly, the Center provides the community with the security of knowing that their families will have access to the quality health care they need without the fear of the financial burden of excessive medical bills.

I would be remiss if I did not extend a special note of thanks and congratulations to the Center's Executive Director, Katrina Clark. Katrina has been at the helm of this organization for all but its first two years. It has been under her leadership and because of her vision that the Center has grown so successfully over the last four decades. I have had the privilege to know Katrina for many years. Her commitment to the people of the Fair Haven community is only equaled by her determination to ensure that they have access to quality, affordable health care. She is an extraordinary woman and I consider myself fortunate to benefit from her counsel and friendship.

Over the course of their history, the Fair Haven Community Health Center has developed strong partnerships that have helped them to continue to expand their services to meet the ever-changing needs of the community. I am proud of the work that we have been able to do together and am honored to have this opportunity to extend my warmest congratulations on their 40th Anniversary as well as my very best wishes for many more years of successful work in our community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 326 I was unable to cast my vote on the House floor because I was ill. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

THE LONE STAR BATTALION

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when called upon by their country to go into service, Texans have always been up to the challenge. And, in fact, today, serving somewhere in the world, one out of 10 people wearing the American uniform is from the state of Texas.

Texans are always on the front lines in the defense of freedom. It goes all the way back to 1836 when the first Texas veteran found himself at a beat-up old Spanish church in Central Texas that we now call the Alamo. The Alamo was more than 100 years old at the time that he and 186 other brave Texans defended freedom. The defenders of the Alamo were determined to seek liberty for the Republic of Texas. These veterans just like all of those who have followed risked their lives in the name of freedom.

To be a member of the United States military is a gift, a sacrifice and it is an honor. Every day our warriors risk their lives, and today I would like to commend a special infantry battalion close to the heart of many Texans.

The 1st Battalion, 23rd Marine Regiment, or 1/23, also known as "The Lone Star Battalion," is a home-grown group of soldiers headquartered in Houston, containing approximately 800 Marines and Navy/Corpsmen. The Lone Star Battalion has played a most significant and important part of history. I am proud to recognize and honor the service of the men and women of the 1/23 Marines.

The history of this unit is one of many great successes. Activated in 1942 in North Carolina, they were sent to the Pacific to aid in the United States' "island-hopping" campaign against Japan during World War II. They participated in many battles during this time including Roi-Namur, Saipan, Tinian and Iwo Jima.

Post-World War II, the battalion was activated once again, this time out of Houston on July 1, 1962. After the 9/11 attacks, it was mobilized for the first time since World War II in support of Operation Desert Storm.

Because of the ongoing conflicts in Iraq, the battalion continued to support the global war on terrorism by participating in Operation Iraqi Freedom. It is currently deployed in Afghanistan supporting Operation Enduring Freedom.

Ronald Reagan said this about the United States Marines: "Some people live an entire lifetime and wonder if they have ever made a difference in the world, but the Marines, they don't have that problem."

Recently, the Lone Star Battalion worked with coalition and the Afghan National Army troops to build a school in the small village of Abad, Afghanistan. Not only is this the first school the village has ever seen, the civilian enrollment is projected to be around 50 students come the start of the school year.

This is a critical development considering the literacy rate of the total population in Afghanistan is 28.1 percent.

Acknowledging that it was imperative for the ANA to establish trust and accountability for the civilians they defend, the Marines were eager to let the ANA take the lead role in the construction process of the school. It seems

as though not only are these exceptional Marines training the ANA and performing their respective duties, but they are also aiding in forging a bond between a young, willing military and a civilian people in need of a sense of security.

The sons of liberty and daughters of democracy throughout America, and especially Texas, continue to join the military. They understand that our nation is at war, yet they choose to charge headlong into battle. There are not many of us who would be willing to volunteer to leap into the lion's den of Afghanistan where the cowardly enemy hides in caves.

There have been two warriors killed from the Lone Star Battalion this year in Afghanistan: SSgt. Jeremy Smith and Navy Corpsman Benjamin Rast. We shall always remember Smith and Rast and the lives they gave for our freedom.

It has been said that wars may be fought by weapons, but they are won by warriors. It is America's warriors who pay the price for our freedom.

With the recent demise of the most wanted terrorist, Osama bin Laden, the Lone Star Battalion has rejoiced knowing that the Al Qaeda leader is dead but remains humble knowing the fight for freedom is not yet won. I am truly honored to represent many of these fine Marines in Congress and proud to know that there are so many Texans abroad aiding in the security, development and protection of the Afghan and American interests.

I sincerely thank each person who has served our country yesterday, today and tomorrow. Without your service we would not be the greatest country the world has ever known.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING LAFAYETTE, LOUISIANA, NAMED ''BEST FOR FOOD'' IN THE UNITED STATES BY RAND McNALLY

HON. CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the many contributors who hosted the Rand McNally Best of the Road competition's judges in Lafayette, Louisiana. Their combined efforts led to Lafayette being named the first ''Best for Food'' city in the United States. This recognition confirms what many of us already know—there is no place like Lafayette, Louisiana.

The Best of the Road competition began this year in search of the best city in the country in five categories: ''Most Beautiful,'' ''Most Patriotic,'' ''Friendliest,'' ''Most Fun,'' and ''Best for Food.'' Over 600 towns applied for the awards, and thirty finalists were chosen. After visiting the finalists, the judges (consisting of 10 amateur travelers) selected the final 5 winners.

Judges Bonnie and James Parr visited Lafayette to experience the culture and cuisine. The Lafayette Convention and Visitors Commission, LCVC, created an itinerary showcasing not only Lafayette's unique culinary landscape, but also her rich Cajun history. Chef Patrick Mould served as the culinary host, guiding them through their entire experience. The Parrs dined at the following restaurants: Dwyer's, Blue Dog Cafe, Jolie's Bistro, Johnson's Boucaniere, Don's Seafood Hut, French Press, Pamplona Tapas Bar and Restaurant, Charley G's, Randol's, Accidental Chef Cooking, and Hub City Diner. They had lunch with City President Joey Durel, toured the Jean Lafitte Center and Vermilionville, volunteered at St. Joseph's Diner, and visited St. John's Cathedral.

According to Rand McNally's website, the judges ''learned the true taste of Cajun food to be 'flavorful, not hot or spicy' and after a meal, the best dessert is 'Cajun dancing.'''

Because Lafayette was chosen as a winning city, it was featured in USA Today on Friday, July 22, 2011. Lafayette's ''Best for Food'' title will be displayed in the 2013 Rand McNally Atlas.

I am thrilled Lafayette, my hometown, has been honored in such a unique and fitting manner. The award is excellent publicity for our city and region. Once again, I congratulate City Parish President Joey Durel, all members of the LCVC who worked on this project, and the restaurants and chefs who provided such excellent food for the judges.

TO AMEND SECTION 402(a)(2)(M) OF THE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND WORK OPPORTUNITY RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1996 TO EXTEND BY TWO YEARS THE SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS UNDER THE SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME PROGRAM FOR CERTAIN ALIENS AND VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that would extend by two years the three-year effective period of extended Supplemental Security Income, SSI, eligibility for time-limited humanitarian immigrants. This is a commonsense bill that simply extends the current policy, which is set to expire on October 1, 2011. The population that would be assisted by this legislation is elderly and disabled refugees and other humanitarian immigrants who have very low income, and who face barriers to passing the naturalization exams within the time limits.

In 2007 during the 110th Congress I introduced H.R. 2608 with bipartisan support, which was signed into law by President George W. Bush in 2008 (P.L. 110–328). This legislation would extend that policy again so that approximately 3,000 refugees do not lose SSI benefits on October 1. Failure to enact this legislation would cause serious hardship for this population.

Mr. Speaker, July 28, 2011 marks the 60th anniversary of the Geneva Refugee Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, an international treaty signed by 142 nations, including the United States. This treaty remains the cornerstone of refugee protection and represents the struggle of millions of displaced people who are uprooted by conflict and persecution. The treaty explicitly commits nations to ensure that lawful refugees be eligible for basic public assistance. This legislation is a small step toward meeting our commitment. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

ON THE OCCASION OF DAVID PAYNE'S RETIREMENT AS SUPERVISOR OF BLOOMFIELD TOWNSHIP

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate David Payne on a successful career—40 years in service to the residents of Bloomfield Township, as he retires from his position as Township Supervisor.

Mr. Payne began his career in the Road Department in 1970 while finishing his college studies. Just five years later Dave was promoted to Director of the Road Department, the youngest director in the Township's history.

Dave's foray into elected politics began in 1995 when he was appointed Township Treasurer and was subsequently elected to that position in the following year. Thanks to his strong record as Treasurer, Dave was selected to replace his predecessor in the Supervisor's office in 1999 and the residents of Bloomfield Township have subsequently elected to that position three times, in 2000, 2004 and 2008.

Dave's stewardship of Bloomfield Township has resulted not only in continued prosperity of its businesses and residents, but also transformed the Township's professional environment.

When Dave took the reins of the Township he implemented new policies to change how the Township interacts with the media, its residents and intra-operationally. Upon entering office Dave worked to ensure good communication between the Township and the media—always making himself available to answer questions. He also sought to make it easier for residents and citizen groups to integrate their input into Township business and for concerned citizens to be able to communicate directly with elected officials.

During Dave's tenure as Supervisor, Bloomfield Township has weathered an economic storm that has affected so many other communities across Michigan and the Nation. As a result of Bloomfield Township's sure financial footing under Dave's leadership, Standard and Poor's raised the Township's credit rating to AAA, the highest rating possible for municipalities and as such, Bloomfield Township is one of only five municipalities in Michigan to hold this rating.

Dave's approach to leadership in Bloomfield Township has resulted in continued success for the Township's businesses and residents. I know his hands-on-approach to leadership and his ability to produce consensus will be greatly missed by his colleagues and residents who he served. I wish Dave many more years of success and know that as a resident of Bloomfield Township, the community will continue to benefit from his activism and service.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF MR. JACK G. STONE

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Jack G. Stone of Hanford, California who recently passed away at 93 years of age. Over the course of his life, Mr. Stone proved to be tirelessly devoted to confronting the challenges and issues affecting the agriculture and water community in the Central Valley. His contributions to the community and to California agriculture will be remembered.

Jack was born to L.M. ''Stoney'' and Elaine Stone on November 11, 1917 in Corcoran, California. During his youth, the Stones moved from Corcoran to Hanford, California, where Jack first became aware of the precarious balance between land, water and farming in Western Kings County and Tulare Lake. He continued to learn about the challenges facing the area while attending Hanford High School and subsequently went on to study engineering at the University of California, Davis.

Upon his graduation from UC Davis, Jack enlisted in the United States Army to serve the country during the second World War. He became a captain and went on to successfully command an Army Engineer Corps in the European Theater. When the war ended, Jack returned home and married his elementary school sweetheart, Hilda Orchard. The pair settled on a farm in Five Points, California where Jack founded J.G. Stone Land Co., and started a family soon thereafter.

Over the years, Jack became well known as a reckoning force in the agricultural community and gained the deep respect of his peers. In the early 1970s, Jack was elected to the Westlands Water District Board of Directors, where he served for an astounding 21 years. The Board of Directors confronted many challenges, and Jack was there to stand against the federal acreage limits for irrigation in the early 1980s, to help increase the land limits from 160 acres per farm to 960 acres, and to help guide the district through the turbulent time of the Kesterson Refuge. Through all those years, Jack remained steadfast in his desire to better the agricultural community.

It goes without saying that Mr. Stone was a one-of-a-kind man. Agriculture was a true passion for Jack and he was an enthusiastic supporter of its preservation throughout Fresno and Kings County. In addition to his work in the community, over the years Jack amassed more than 10,000 acres of land, which he continued to farm until as recently as this spring. His son, Bill Stone, carries on his father's mission at J.G. Stone Land Co., ensuring that Jack's legacy will not be soon forgotten. Mr. Speaker, it is with honor and respect that I ask my colleagues to rise with me in paying tribute to Mr. Jack G. Stone: a true gentleman and visionary for the agrarian way of life.

CONGRATULATING GENOMATICA ON WINNING EPA'S PRESIDENTIAL GREEN CHEMISTRY CHALLENGE AWARD

HON. BRIAN P. BILBRAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to congratulate Genomatica for being selected as one of the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) 2011 Presidential Green Chemistry Challenge Award winners. As America and the world faces the difficult challenges of addressing problems with our environment, it is reassuring that there are companies such as Genomatica taking the initiative and working towards a cleaner environment.

Green chemistry is a philosophy of chemical research and engineering that encourages the design of products and processes that minimize the use and generation of hazardous substances. This technology includes improvements to the environment such as cleaner processes by using safer raw materials. Green chemistry technologies also reduce cost and in most cases are less expensive when compared to conventional chemical products.

For the past 16 years, the EPA has commemorated innovative, clean technologies by presenting its Presidential Green Chemistry Challenge Awards. Together, the program's 82 award winners annually:

Eliminate on average 199 million pounds of hazardous chemicals and solvents—enough to fill a freight train nearly 11 miles long;

Save over 21 billion gallons of water—enough to meet the annual needs of over 820,000 people;

Eliminate more than 57 million pounds of carbon dioxide—equal to taking 6,000 automobiles off the road.

Collectively, the winners, as well as the nominated technologies, annually reduce the use or generation of more than 1 billion pounds of hazardous materials.

Genomatica received the Greener Synthetic Pathways Award for its production of High-Volume Chemicals from Renewable Feedstock's at Lower Cost. The company's 1,4–Butanediol (BDO) is one of those green chemicals. BDO is a high-volume chemical building block that is used to make many common polymers, such as spandex. Genomatica has developed a microbe that makes BDO by fermenting sugars. When this is produced at a commercial scale, Genomatica's Bio-BDO will be less expensive, require around 60 percent less energy, and produce less than 70 percent less carbon dioxide emissions than BDO made from natural gas. Genomatica is now partnering with major companies to bring Bio-BDO to the market.

Let history show that this year will be the year Congress makes progress on Green Chemistry and cleaning up the environment. All Americans want to come together to keep the environment safer and cleaner for both the present and the future. With influential companies like Genomatica leading the way, our nation is on its way to a greener tomorrow.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, I attended the service and funeral of a family member and missed rollcall vote 682. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall vote 682, a bill to cut spending and maintain existing commitments.

HUMBLE OIL FOUNDER WAS 'STERLING' CITIZEN

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we often speak of great American like Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson. In Texas, there are State heroes like Sam Houston, Stephen F. Austin and William Barrett Travis. Similar to these great men, I would like to recognize one of Houston's most influential leaders and citizens, Ross Sterling.

On a farm in Anahuac located in southeast Texas, Ross Sterling was born on February 11, 1875. After completing a fourth grade level education, he began working as a clerk at age 12. The experience led him at the age of 21 to launch his own merchandising business. Just seven years later, Sterling opened a feed store in Sour Lake, Texas. Despite his fourth grade education, Sterling could have taught a course about the hardworking man-Work Ethic 101. In 1910, Sterling's big break came when he purchased two oil wells; leading to the charter of The Humble Oil and Refining Company, which later became Exxon.

Now the rest is as they say—Texas history. Sterling went on to open many banks, one of which was the Humble State Bank. He also was a newspaper publisher after buying the Houston Post, and owned KPRC radio station. In addition to these many endeavors, he owned several properties in the Houston area and was involved with the Houston Port Commission.

Sterling entered Texas politics in the late 1920's when then-Governor Dan Moody appointed him as Chairman of the Texas State Highway Commission. Under his leadership, the State of Texas developed its first paved highway system. Sterling became known as ''the man who brought Texas out of the mud'' as a result of the project.

In 1930, Sterling defeated primary opponent Ma Ferguson, former governor of Texas, in a runoff and became the Democratic gubernatorial candidate. He easily defeated Republican William Talbot to become Governor of Texas.

The story could end there, but Texas politics is about as rough and tumble as the state we live in, and just about as diverse. Controversy plagued his first year in office, mostly concerning cotton prices and oil restrictions in East Texas counties. The East Texas oil fields were booming which led to a depression in the oil industry. To decrease production, Governor Sterling declared a drilling moratorium in four East Texas counties, ordering the National

Guard to enforce it. As a result, Governor Sterling was defeated for the Democratic Party nomination in 1932 by former opponent Ma Ferguson.

Out of work and in need of a job, Sterling returned to Houston bankrupt. All he had was a $100 Liberty Bond and sure determination to build another empire. Sterling decided to return to his first love—oil. Using the Liberty Bond he again founded his own oil company, this time naming it Sterling Oil and Refining Company. By the end of World War II, Sterling had managed to rebuild his fortune. He served as President of Sterling Oil for 13 years until his retirement at the age of 71. Ross Sterling passed away in 1949 at the age of 74.

In all of his endeavors, Sterling found a way to give back to his beloved Houston; leaving a legacy continuing long after his death. Two schools in my district bear his moniker, Ross S. Sterling High School in Baytown and Ross Sterling Middle School in Humble. A library, in Baytown, is also named for him, Sterling Municipal Library. However, one of his most notable contributions in my district was donating his home in La Porte to the Houston Optimist Club. In 1947, The Houston Optimist Club donated Sterling's former mansion to the Boys and Girls Harbor, a home that cares for children in crisis. Sterling also served on the board of trustees for the Hermann Hospital Estate for over 30 years.

The backbone of our Nation is formed from hard-working citizens like Ross Sterling who pull themselves up by their bootstraps when times get tough, and still find ways to give back to their community. Ross Sterling is an example not only to Houstonians, but to all citizens of our great Nation. That is what makes America what it is: the land of the free and the home of the brave.

And that's just the way it is.

ATHLETIC TRAINERS EQUAL ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the important and essential role that athletic trainers play in providing quality health care across our nation. Our nation's health care system is complex and every day people with many different health needs are served by legions of caring, qualified, and professional athletic trainers.

Athletic trainers are health care professionals who hold at least a bachelor's degree in athletic training. Almost 70 percent of athletic trainers have a master's degree or PhD. Athletic trainers are licensed health care professionals who provide injury prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation to patients of all ages.

Athletic trainers work under the direction of physicians to provide care to patients. Historically, they worked with athletes in secondary schools, colleges, universities and professional sports. Today, about 50 percent work outside of these athletic settings. Many athletic trainers are employed by clinics, hospitals, physician offices, commercial workplaces, the United States Armed Forces, and performing arts companies. The focus of athletic trainers' care is to prevent injuries and support patients and clients in their rehabilitation efforts to regain function as quickly and safely as possible.

Athletic trainers pass a national certifying exam. In most of the 46 states where they are licensed or otherwise regulated, the national certification is required for licensure. Athletic trainers maintain this certification with required continuing education. They work under a medical scope of practice, and adhere to a national code of ethics.

Unfortunately, in 2005, the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) implemented a policy to prevent physicians from employing anyone other than a physical or occupational therapist and speech language pathologist to provide physical medicine and rehabilitation services in a physician's office.

Due to all of these facts, I have proudly introduced the Athletic Trainers Equal Access to Medicare Act of 2011. This bill would make the following improvements:

Ensure coverage of and improve patient access to physical medicine and rehabilitation services under Medicare Part B;

Allow physicians to choose from a wider range of highly qualified health professionals to serve patients' needs; and

Restore the ability of athletic trainers to provide physical medicine and rehabilitation services incident to a physician's services.

I strongly support the vital role athletic trainers play in our health care system. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing this important group of health professionals and cosponsor the Athletic Trainers Equal Access to Medicare Act.

INAUGURATION OF LOBSANG SANGAY, NEW TIBETAN PRIME MINISTER

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on August 8, 2011, in Dharamsala, India, the home of the Dalai Lama and the Tibetan government in exile, Tibetans from around the world will gather for a historic occasion, the inauguration of their democratically elected Prime Minister (Kalon Tripa).

On March 20, 2011, tens of thousands of Tibetans living in countries around the world went to the polling booths to elect their next prime minister and parliament of the Central Tibetan Administration. Thousands of Tibetan-Americans across the United States also participated in these historic elections, including from my home state of Massachusetts.

In April, Dr. Lobsang Sangay was declared the winner. He has Bay State roots. Raised as a stateless Tibetan refugee in India, his parents saved to get him an education. Through the U.S.-funded Tibetan Scholarship Program, he entered studies at Harvard University. He got a law degree there and stayed on as a research fellow for many years.

The 43-year-old Lobsang Sangay takes over as chief executive of the Central Tibet Administration at a critical point, as much of the political responsibilities for the Tibetan community in exile now reside on his shoulders. In March 2011, the Dalai Lama announced his decision to devolve his political authority to the elected leadership. These changes were ratified by the Tibetan parliament in May.

At a time when autocrats around the world are clinging to power, the Dalai Lama's voluntary effort to give up power is remarkable. It is the culmination of a decades-long process of nurturing the development of democratic institutions in the Tibetan exile community. This stands in stark contrast to the reality that neither Tibetans in Tibet, nor anyone in China, are allowed fundamental democratic freedoms or free elections. What the Tibetans have accomplished is worthy of our attention and respect.

I had the chance to meet Lobsang Sangay when he came to Capitol Hill in July 2011, during the Dalai Lama's visit to Washington. I look forward to his return to discuss ways the United States can help Tibetans in their endeavor to find a solution for the Tibet issue.

On the occasion of the inauguration of the next Kalon Tripa, Dr. Lobsang Sangay, I send my warm wishes to the Tibetan people and congratulate them on their democratic achievements.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on July 13, 2011, I missed rollcall votes No. 564–573 due to a medical injury. I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall votes No. 564, 566, and 573. I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall votes No. 565, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, and 572.

Mr. Speaker, on July 14, 2011, I missed rollcall votes No. 574–582 due to a medical injury. I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall votes No. 574, 575, 576, 579 and 581. I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall votes on No. 577, 578, 580 and 582.

Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 2011, I missed rollcall votes No. 583–600 due to a medical injury. I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall votes No. 584, 586, 590, and 599. I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall votes on No. 583, 585, 587, 588, 589, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598 and 600.

Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 2011, I missed rollcall votes No. 601–602 for district business. I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall votes No. 601–602.

Mr. Speaker, on July 19, 2011, I missed rollcall votes No. 603–607 due to a medical injury. I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall votes No. 603, 604, 606, and 607. I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 605.

Mr. Speaker, on July 20, 2011, I missed rollcall votes No. 608–611 due to a medical injury. I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall votes No. 608, 609 and 611. I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall No. 610.

Mr. Speaker, on July 21, 2011, I missed rollcall votes No. 612–621 due to a medical injury. I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall votes No. 612, 613, 614, 619 and 621. I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall votes No. 615, 616, 617, 618, and 620.

Mr. Speaker, on July 22, 2011, I missed rollcall votes No. 622–629 due to a medical injury. I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall votes No. 622, 623, 624, 625, 626 and 629. I would

have voted "yes" on rollcall votes No. 627 and 628.

Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 2011, I missed rollcall votes No. 630–631 and I would have voted "no" on both votes.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the fiftieth anniversary of one of our nation's most pristine national parks and a favorite attraction in Massachusetts—the Cape Cod National Seashore.

On August 7, 1961, one of the most famous residents of Cape Cod, President John F. Kennedy, signed into law the bill designating the Atlantic shorelines of Chatham, Eastham, Wellfleet, Truro, and Provincetown a protected national treasure. The Cape Cod National Seashore was the second coastline to be adopted into the National Park Service, and remains one of only ten coastal areas to receive the same honor.

Since then, the Seashore has attracted millions of visitors from all corners of the world—boosting our local economy and helping to define Massachusetts as a top destination for both domestic and foreign tourism. In today's volatile job climate, the Cape Cod National Seashore serves as a stable employer to 100 year-round employees and nearly 200 additional seasonal employees.

Under the protection of the National Park Service and the care of the towns lining the outer Cape, the images most recognizable of the Cape Cod National Seashore have remained intact—lighthouses atop rocky jetties, rolling dunes of white sand and shells, the vivid scent of wild cranberry bogs. Today, as it was in 1961, local residents and visitors still find leisure and exploration in the forty miles of peaceful seaside trails and beaches.

As President Kennedy eloquently said some fifty years ago, ". . . this Act makes it possible for the people of the United States through their government to acquire and preserve the natural and historic values of a portion of Cape Cod for the inspiration and enjoyment of people all over the United States." A foreshadowing of years to come, President Kennedy's message of the critical importance of environmental conservation has never been more pertinent than today.

And so, it is with pride that I recognize the Cape Cod National Seashore for fifty years of ecological and historic preservation, and with sincerity that I look forward to another fifty.

HONORING EUGENE "SALT" SMITH ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JASON ALTMIRE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Salt Smith as he retires from the Municipal Water Authority of Aliquippa. I congratulate him on his outstanding career and extraordinary service to his community.

Over the course of his education and career, Salt has worked tirelessly to better his hometown of Aliquippa, PA. A graduate from Aliquippa High School in 1956, Salt went on to attend Geneva College, Duquesne University, and Robert Morris College.

A licensed barber, a licensed insurance agent, and a licensed real estate agent, Salt is a man of many talents. He put his degrees to good use working for LTV Steel Corporation, Prudential Insurance Company, and, finally, as the General Manager for the Municipal Water Authority of Aliquippa.

In addition to his career, Salt is an entrepreneur. Thirty years ago, he began what has proved to be a successful real estate company, E & J Smith Real Estate, in Aliquippa. His company has sponsored a little league baseball team for the past 30 years and has won the championship five times.

As a member of the Aliquippa School Board for 32 years, Salt dedicated his time to improving the local school system. Additionally, Salt was the first African-American ever to be elected as a trustee of the Community College of Beaver County.

As an active member of the community, Salt is the Chairman of the Aliquippa Democratic Party and the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Beaver County Hospital Authority.

Salt and his wife, Jackie, have been married for 51 years and still call Aliquippa their home. They have three children and six grandchildren.

I commend Salt for the work that he does, making him an invaluable member of the Aliquippa community. It is with great joy that I pay tribute to him on his well-deserved retirement.

BEN PARMENTIER: A TRUE ADVOCATE FOR VICTIMS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an exemplary staffer, Ben Parmentier, Congressman JIM COSTA's Victims' Rights Caucus Coordinator.

As co-founder and co-chair of the Victims' Rights Caucus with Congressman COSTA, I have appreciated Ben's consistent hard work and enthusiasm on behalf of victims.

He always made the Victims' Rights Caucus a priority, ensuring that projects were completed in a timely manner and events ran smoothly.

As Ben heads off to graduate school, we will miss his commitment to the Victims' Rights Caucus and passion for victims' rights.

The Victims' Rights Caucus was fortunate to have a dedicated staffer like Ben.

I wish him success in all his future endeavors and know he will excel as he did in his work on Capitol Hill.

And that's just the way it is.

REINTRODUCTION OF THE BREASTFEEDING PROMOTION ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing an important piece of legislation, the Breastfeeding Promotion Act with my colleagues Mr. MEEKS, Ms. LEE, and Mr. SERRANO.

The benefits of breastfeeding, to both mother and child, are significant. Scientific studies show babies who are breastfed the first six months of life have a greatly reduced risk for acute and chronic disease, yet only 10 percent of all infants in the U.S. are breastfed.

A 2001 USDA study found that if just half of the babies in the U.S. were exclusively breastfed for six months (as recommended by the American Academy of Pediatrics), our Nation would realize a savings of $3.6 billion in health care costs for the three leading childhood illnesses alone. According to the United States Breastfeeding Committee, if we replicate that study based on current breastfeeding statistics, the savings could reach nearly $14 billion in health care costs for all childhood illnesses in a single year.

I was so proud to partner with Senator JEFF MERKLEY (D–OR) to pass into law a provision of our bill, the Breastfeeding Promotion Act (H.R. 2819, S. 1744), in comprehensive health care reform legislation signed by President Obama on March 23, 2010. The provision requires that employers provide breastfeeding employees, who are hourly workers, with "reasonable break time" and a private, non-bathroom place to express breast milk during the workday, up until the child's first birthday.

Our bill will build on our past successes and encourage and promote breastfeeding by removing common obstacles to breastfeeding and expressing milk in the workplace that many women face by: (1) amending the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to protect breastfeeding in the workplace, and (2) expanding the requirement under current law for employers to provide break time to express breast milk, as well as make reasonable efforts to provide a private place for them to do so, to salaried workers in traditional work or office environments.

Public opinion and awareness of the benefits of breastfeeding continue to grow, and the momentum we've recently gained presents the perfect opportunity to build on that progress in achieving our goals.

We urge all of our colleagues to support this important legislation.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE NEWMAN AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH'S SESQUICENTENNIAL

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the leadership and congregants of the Newman African Methodist Episcopal Church in the City of Pontiac and to celebrate with them as the Church commemorates its sesquicentennial.

As the first African American church founded in Oakland County, Newman A.M.E.'s celebration of 150 years in the community is a testament to the vision and determination of its founders, the Reverends Augustus Green and George Newman, and other determined congregants. Established during a time of great strife and adversity, the founders sought to create a congregation where the negative social and theological tenants of the day would be left behind as members came together in fellowship to worship and perform great deeds in their community. After many years of uncertainty, with services moving from house to house in Pontiac, the congregation acquired its first home on Auburn Avenue in 1872 and received its first full time pastor, the Reverend Benjamin Roberts, in 1882.

Throughout its history, the leadership and congregants of Newman A.M.E. have always heard and answered the call to serve their community, in spite of whatever adversity lay before them. In 1920, facing the challenges of a world where equality was still scarcely more than a dream, the Men's Club of Newman A.M.E. founded the Oakland County Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to fight for greater equality. In the 1960s, even as the Church was displaced from its home, its leaders came together to establish the Newman Non-Profit Housing Corporation, devoted to making affordable housing available to area residents. Just five years after the Church was forced to relocate, the congregation was able to construct and pay off the mortgage on its new and current home.

Under the Church's current leader, the Reverend Lila Rose Martin, the congregation has continued its commitment to the principles of service and egalitarianism on which it was founded. Among its outreach programs, Newman A.M.E. has added a cancer survivor's ministry to help those who have been victims of this terrible disease, and re-instituted a summer program to provide area youth with the tools necessary to develop into productive members of the community.

Newman A.M.E.'s rich history is a true testament to the enduring success that can be achieved when strong bonds of fellowship are tested in the face of trial and tribulation. Even in moments of great challenge and sacrifice, the congregation of Newman A.M.E. has remained dedicated to serving Pontiac and the greater Southeast Michigan Community. The sesquicentennial of Newman A.M.E. is a truly momentous occasion and I wish its leadership and congregation many more years of success in spiritual fellowship and service to our community.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND TITLE 37, UNITED STATES CODE, TO ENSURE THAT THE BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING IN EFFECT FOR A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL GUARD IS NOT REDUCED WHEN THE MEMBER TRANSITIONS BETWEEN ACTIVE DUTY AND FULL TIME NATIONAL GUARD DUTY WITHOUT A BREAK IN ACTIVE SERVICE

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend Title 37, United States Code, to ensure that Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) or Overseas Housing Allowance (OHA) in effect for a member of the National Guard is not reduced when the member transitions between Active Duty and Full Time National Guard duty without a break in active service. I thank my good friend and colleague, Congressman DAVE LOEBSACK of Iowa for working with me on this measure and for his continued commitment to our country's National Guard.

The bill would close an apparent loophole in the application of BAH and OHA pay to certain members of the National Guard. Specifically, this legislation ensures that a member of the National Guard, who is coming home from a deployment and into a Full Time National Guard duty assignment, would not lose BAH or OHA payments to which they are entitled. This fix is needed now because of a recent Per Diem Travel and Transportation Advisory Committee (PDTTAC) legal interpretation that states a member of the National Guard who is on Active Duty on Title 10 orders who then moves into a Full Time National Guard duty position under Title 32 orders must be paid the BAH or OHA based on their home of record and not their permanent duty assignment station. This decision could drastically reduce the amount of BAH or OHA that a servicemember is entitled to when transitioning assignments.

The rationale, or legal basis for this interpretation from the PDTTAC, is unclear; however, this legislation would rectify the situation. Our men and women of the National Guard have deployed in great numbers in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, now Operation New Dawn; Operation Enduring Freedom and other contingencies. The National Guard, despite these unprecedented deployments abroad, were still able to meet mission requirements at home whether responding to tornado outbreaks, floods, ice storms, and even Hurricane Katrina. Yet, this recent decision by the PDTTAC seeks to treat our men and women in the National Guard without any parity. The PDTTAC effectively assumes that all National Guard duty is part-time whereas Full Time National Guard duty remains in support of the federal mission of the National Guard.

I ask my colleagues to support this measure and clarify, in statute, fair and equitable treatment for members of the National Guard who are on Full Time duty status under Title 32. Again, I thank my colleague Mr. LOEBSACK for his support and leadership with this matter.

TRIBUTE TO WARREN CARTER

HON. KEVIN McCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. McCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Warren Carter, who passed away on July 21, 2011. Warren was a family man and a respected community leader.

Warren grew up in McFarland and earned his bachelor's degree in 1958 from La Verne College (now the University of La Verne). He worked briefly as a teacher and later in the insurance industry. However, his true passion was farming.

In the 1960s, Warren planted almonds on 200 acres in McFarland, becoming one of the first to grow a crop that turned out to be one of Kern County's largest agricultural commodities. He was also active in almond production research.

His commitment to the agriculture industry extended beyond just farming. Warren served on the Almond Board of California from 1979 to 1992, including for two years as chairman and four years as vice chairman. Additionally, he served as president of the Kern County Farm Bureau, and shared his love of agriculture as chairman of the parent advisory committee for McFarland High School Future Farmers of America.

Warren also was involved in many community activities. For instance, he enjoyed working with the local youth, and was a past director and chairman of Kern County Youth for Christ. Additionally, he was a co-founder and past director of Kern County Student Leadership, a high school leadership program that is now on 20 campuses throughout the county.

Warren brought his leadership, charisma, and work ethic to the real estate industry when he purchased Watson Realty in 1980, eventually growing it from 20 agents to 100. His son, Ken Carter, is now president and owner.

Warren is survived by his son Doug and, daughter-in-law Dena, son Ken and daughter-in-law Renee, daughter Karen and son-in-law Joey, 10 grandchildren, and his brother Wayne and sister Opal. His wife, Lenore passed away in 2009. Warren will truly be missed, but he will be remembered as a strong leader and a man dedicated to improving his community.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NANOTECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT AND NEW OPPORTUNITIES ACT

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Nanotechnology Advancement and New Opportunities (NANO) Act.

The NANO Act is a comprehensive bill to promote the development and responsible stewardship of nanotechnology in the United States. The legislation draws upon the work of the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Nanotechnology that I convened. The Blue Ribbon Task Force included nanotechnology experts with

backgrounds in established industry, startup companies, consulting groups, non-profits, academia, government, medical research, and venture capital from around my home State of California, which is a leader in the field of nanotechnology.

Nanotechnology has the potential to create entirely new industries and radically transform the basis of competition in other fields, and I am proud of my work with former Science Committee Chairman Sherry Boehlert on the Nanotechnology Research and Development Act of 2003 to foster research in this area.

But one of the things I have heard from experts in the field is that while the United States is a leader in nanotechnology research, our foreign competitors are focusing more resources and effort on the commercialization of those research results than we are.

In its report Thinking Big About Thinking Small, which can be found on my website, the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Nanotechnology made a series of recommendations for ways that the Nation can promote the development and commercialization of nanotechnology. The NANO Act includes a number of these recommendations.

In addition, the bill addresses concerns that have been raised about whether the Federal Government is doing enough to address potential health and safety risks associated with nanotechnology. The NANO Act requires the development of a nanotechnology research strategy that establishes research priorities for the Federal Government and industry that will ensure the development and responsible stewardship of nanotechnology. This strategy will help to resolve the uncertainty that is one of the major obstacles to the commercialization of nanotechnology—uncertainty about what the risks might be and uncertainty about how the Federal Government might regulate nanotechnology in the future.

The NANO Act also includes a number of provisions to create partnerships, raise awareness, and implement strategic policies to resolve obstacles and promote nanotechnology. It will: create a public-private investment partnership to address the nanotechnology commercialization gap; establish a tax credit for investment in nanotechnology firms; authorize a grant program to support the establishment and development of nanotechnology incubators; establish a Nanoscale Science and Engineering Center for ''nano-CAD'' tools; establish grant programs for nanotechnology research to address specific challenges in the areas of energy, environment, homeland security, and health; establish a tax credit for nanotechnology education and training program expenses; establish a grant program to support the development of curriculum materials for interdisciplinary nanotechnology courses at higher education institutions; direct NSF to establish a program to encourage manufacturing companies to enter into partnerships with occupational training centers for the development of training to support nanotechnology manufacturing; and call for the development of a strategy for increasing interaction on nanotechnology interests between DOE national labs and the informal science education community.

I look forward to working with Science, Space and Technology Committee Chairman HALL and Ranking Member JOHNSON on this bill and their committee's other efforts to reauthorize the Nation's nanotechnology research and development program.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 327 I was unable to cast my vote on the House floor because I was ill.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

THANK YOU BRAD LEAKE

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to Brad Leake for his hard work and service to the people of the Second Congressional District of South Carolina. After working in the Midlands District office in West Columbia for over two and half years, Brad will be leaving on August 16th to work for the South Carolina Department of Social Services.

Brad began interning in the Washington office before becoming a caseworker in the Midlands District office. As a caseworker, Brad served as an important voice and liaison between constituents and federal agencies. Frequently, he would inquire to federal agencies on behalf of constituents on important issues such as receiving Social Security benefits and veterans' affairs information.

Finally, I would like to thank Brad for his role in successfully serving as Deputy Campaign Manager for my campaign during the 2008 cycle.

It is with sincere appreciation that I would like to thank Brad and his wife, Emily, all the best as you enter this next phase of your life.

IN HONOR OF LANCE CORPORAL ERIK GALVAN, AN AMERICAN HERO

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of an American hero, Lance Corporal Erik Galvan, USMC of the 1/5 Bravo Company.

While out on patrol in Sangin, Afghanistan on June 15, 2011, Lance Corporal Galvan was struck by an IED explosion and lost his right hand and both his legs. Thanks to quick response and attentiveness of his fellow soldier, Sergeant Joshua Yarbrough, his life was saved. Sergeant Yarbrough immediately placed tourniquets on all of the lost limbs and then proceeded to assist another injured Marine who also lost both legs after stepping on an IED. Lance Corporal Galvan's family has a history of public service. His older brother, Lance Corporal Edward Galvan, is also with the United States Marine Corps. With the love and support of his family and friends, Lance Corporal Galvan exhibits great strength and perseverance and now hopes to become a Crime Scene Investigator upon his full recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my esteemed colleagues to join me in recognizing Lance Corporal Galvan. No words can fully express our gratitude for the sacrifice of our brave and dedicated service men and women. May our thoughts and prayers be with Lance Corporal Galvan as he recovers from his injuries.

SUCH LIGHT

(By Albert Caswell)

Such . . .
Such Light . . .
All in that fight . . .
But, comes such heroes . . . who but bring their light!
Shining all there in the darkness of war, so bright!
Oh . . . Oh . . . Such Light!
As you Erik, have but brought to this our world . . . this night
All in your most sacred sacrifice, all in this light!
Which burns so bright, burns so bright!
All in your most magnificent Shades of Green . . .
As there as seen, all in honor's light!
To win that battle, to win that fight!
As when such hearts of valor do so ignite!
As you so walked into the darkness of war's dark light!
All for God and Country and what is right . . . is right!
Such Light!
And then as you lay dying!
Somehow your heart of brilliance, so kept on trying!
To win that fight!
To live on into this world, but to bright your light . . .
Because you are a
United States Marine, who can win any fight!
All for yourself and family, and lost Brothers In Arms,
like Nic O'Brien who died in that fight!
All in their most gallant . . . most gallant light!
And though you have lost your two strong legs . . .
And hand, you won't moan or beg!
Because all inside of you our Lord so gave!
So gave such light!
To So Teach Us . . .
To So Beseech Us . . .
To So Reach Us . . .
All in Such Light!
And if ever I
have a
son . . .
I pray his life has shown . . .
Has shown . . .
Such Light!

HISTORY OF A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

HON. JESSE L. JACKSON, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the current budget situation is most poignant when looking at the origins of the Balanced Budget Amendment and its history.

Mr. Speaker, after listening to my colleague's across the aisle present the Republican Study Committee's budget this morning, I'm apt to wonder what it is they're studying over there. Hopefully I'll be able to set the record straight.

As a reaction to FDR's New Deal, Republican Congressman Harold Knutson of Minnesota introduced the first version of the amendment in 1936. Like many Constitutional Amendments, this resolution did not receive a hearing or a vote. During President Dwight D. Eisenhower's first term, the Judiciary Committee of a barely Democratic Senate held its first hearing on this amendment. It again did not receive a vote.

After these partial defeats, BBA supporters shifted their focus to the states. From 1975 to 1980, 30 state legislatures passed resolutions calling for a constitutional convention to propose this Amendment directly to the states.

The election of President Reagan and a Republican Senate in 1980, renewed hopes for the Balanced Budget Amendment and passage by Congress. While the Senate did adopt the amendment in 1982, it failed to garner the necessary three-fifths majority in the House. This failure energized conservative groups such as the National Taxpayers Union and the National Tax Limitation Committee to refocus on state action.

In 1982 and 1983, the Alaska and Missouri legislatures passed resolutions supporting the BBA, bringing the total number of these resolutions to 32, two short of the 34 needed for a convention. However, a growing concern about the scope of a constitutional convention led some states to withdraw their resolutions, re-shifting focus to Congressional action.

From 1990 to 1994, Congress would make three additional attempts to codify this amendment. All failed to garner the necessary three-fifths majority.

However, the BBA made a comeback when it was included in Newt Gingrich's Contract with America. Twenty-six days after taking office, the newly empowered Republican majority adopted the BBA, giving conservatives their first Congressional win in a decade. Disappointment awaited in the Senate, where two separate votes fell just short of adoption. This failure, along with the balanced budget and the Budget surplus at the decade's end, sapped any remaining Congressional support for the BBA.

There was renewed Republican support for the amendment in 2000 as it was included in party's platform. The Bush Tax Cuts, wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the massive deficit spending created by them eventually led Republicans to sweep the Balanced Budget Amendment black under the rug. By 2004, the Republican Party left any mention of a balanced budget out of their platform.

Again in recent years, with the advent of the Tea Party and the return of extreme fiscal conservatism in the Republican party, there are currently twelve Balanced Budget Amendments in the House and three in the Senate.

I had my staff double check that for me. 12 Balanced Budget Amendments in the House. They are all basically the same. Some have even been offered by members of my own party.

I understand these Members' frustration, Mr. Speaker.—I've been trying pass my nine Amendments to the Constitution for 10 years now and my Amendments are based on FDR's "2nd Bill of Rights" which he proposed back in 1944. Today, 67 years later, here we are.

Mr. Speaker, I fundamentally believe that conservatives in congress are pushing for this amendment, not to force a vote in congress, but to rally states to act.

Mr. Speaker, we have a troubling national debt and deficit. But the Balanced Budget Amendment is not the solution.

The argument proponents of Balanced Budget Amendment make is as follows: like families, businesses, and states, the federal government should balance its budget. But since it does not, we need a constitutional amendment to guarantee that it will do so.

Nearly every state in this Union has some form of a balanced budget requirement. But those states are not out of debt. Their amendments have restricted their ability to care for their citizens in times of austerity or emergency.

According to a Forbes analysis of the global debt crises in January of 2010, every single state in the country is carrying some form of debt. These debts range from as little as $17 per capita in Nebraska to $4,490 in Connecticut.

How can this be, Mr. Speaker? It's because the infrastructure of these states allows them to hide debt in Capital Funds. The federal government cannot, and I would argue the federal government should not follow this path.

Congress should never seek to hide the fiscal realities from the public that bear the burden of the cost. Nor should we sell the public magic beans that a Balanced Budget Amendment will make the national debt and other problems go away. Debt will exist just as new problems will arise.

In the fiscal year 2012, approximately 44 states will face revenue shortfalls. Many are desperately looking for ways to declare their state bankrupt. Bankrupt, I say it again, Mr. Speaker, because this proposed amendment would place the federal government in a similar predicament. The effect in many states is calamitous.

For instance in Rhode Island, judges and court workers have cut pay and left 53 positions unfilled. This is still not enough to balance their budget. As a desperate last resort, the Chief Justice has begun to dispose of cases on backlog. Literally, just tossing them out. Florida is in the same predicament.

Mr. Speaker, a Balanced Budget Amendment would force the federal government to deny Americans the right to seek redress and justice in federal courts, for the sake of balancing the budget.

In my home state of Illinois, mental-health services have been cut by $91 million. Human Service directors are fearful that these cuts will cause a real public-health and public safety crisis.

Iowa, Idaho, Alabama and Ohio are considering drastic cuts to education.

My colleagues across the aisle are so concerned about handing our children and grandchildren any amount of national debt, that they have failed to realize we are setting future generations up for failure.

States are already cutting too many services that make the American workforce strong and competitive. Should the federal government do the same, our legacy will be an America that is uneducated and ill-equipped to compete on a global level.

Mr. Speaker, as exemplified by its effects on the states, this amendment may sound good on its face, but it falls flat when examined more critically.

Like an optical illusion whose image changes as you draw closer, the Balanced Budget Amendment masquerades as the savior of our budget, yet in reality threatens to permanently destroy it.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Citizens for Tax Justice, and others, a federal Balanced Budget Amendment would: Damage our economy by making recessions deeper and more frequent; Heighten the risk of default and jeopardize the full faith and credit of the U.S. government; Lead to reductions in needed investments for the future; favor wealthy Americans over middle- and low-income Americans by making it far more difficult to raise revenues and easier to cut programs; And weaken the principle of majority rule.

Therefore, passing a Balanced Budget Amendment is not a prudent path for the nation to follow.

FIVE FAULTS OF A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT OUTLINED BY CENTER ON BUDGET AND POLICY PRIORITIES AND CITIZENS FOR TAX JUSTICE

HON. JESSE L. JACKSON, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the First Fault: a Balanced Budget Amendment would damage the economy and make recessions deeper and more frequent.

Under a Balanced Budget Amendment, Congress would be forced to adopt a rigid fiscal policy, requiring the budget to be balanced or in surplus every year, regardless of the current economic situation, or threat to the nation's security.

A sluggish economy with less revenue and more outgoing expenditures creates a deficit. As we've seen from recent events, a deficit necessitates economic stimulation to reverse negative growth.

That is why in the last session of Congress, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act invested in roads, bridges, mass transit, and other infrastructure, provided 95% of working Americans with an immediate tax cut and extended unemployment insurance and COBRA for Americans hurt by the economic downturn through no fault of their own.

If Congress were forced to function under a Balanced Budget Amendment, deficit reduction would be mandated, even more so during periods of slow or stalled economic growth, which is the opposite of what is needed in such a situation.

This consistently proposed constitutional amendment risks making recessions more common and more catastrophic for middle class families, seniors, veterans and the poor. Under such an amendment, Congress is stripped of any power to adequately respond.

The Second Fault: A BBA would risk default and jeopardize the full faith and credit of the U.S. government while simultaneously challenging the Separation of Powers.

A BBA would bar the government from borrowing funds unless a three-fifths vote in both houses of Congress permitted a raise in the debt limit. Under such a scenario, a budget crisis in which a default becomes a threat is more likely, and because of the limits placed on the fluidity of the debt ceiling, that default becomes more likely to occur.

After a default of only a few days, long term impacts would quickly appear. Confidence in ability of the U.S. to meet binding financial obligations would erode almost immediately. The government pays relatively low interest rates on its loans because it pays its debts back in full and on time. A default would mimic an earthquake, shaking confidence in the U.S. on a global scale, resulting in exploding interest rates and aftershocks felt in our national economy.

The international economy would also succumb to the rumbling of this potential disaster, and our deep connection to it would cause even further chaos here at home.

Other BBA proponents argue that since states have to balance their budgets, so should the federal government. Indeed, many states are required to balance their operating budgets, but not their total budgets. No such distinction is made by a BBA.

''Rainy-day'' or reserve funds, which states can draw on to balance their budgets, are prohibited by a BBA. Many states operating under a BBA require the governor to submit a balanced budget, but do not require actual achievement of it. Some states allow governors to act unilaterally to cut spending in the middle of a fiscal year. This condition of the BBA would violate the federal Constitution's separation of powers.

The Founding Fathers were deliberate in their construction of government, and the separation of powers serves as a cornerstone in our democracy. Each branch has certain powers and limitations. Congress, the Courts, and the President work together, but in distinct ways, to move America forward. The threat of judicial involvement in matters of the budget, is real and present under the BBA.

The BBA would threaten the balance of power. It diminishes the authority of Congress, as the elected Representatives of the people, to have the final say on taxes and spending. Mr. Speaker, what purpose does this body serve if this amendment passes? Should we broaden the scope of Judicial Review granted to our federal courts?

By subverting the balance of power between the branches, this body steps on to a slippery slope of reassigning authority and moving away from the values inherent in our constitution.

The Third Fault: A BBA would lead to reductions in needed investments for the future.

Since the 1930's our nation has consistently made public investments that improve long-term productivity growth: in education, infrastructure, research and development. These efforts encourage increased private sector investment, leading to budget surplus, and a thriving economy. A Balanced Budget Amendment, which requires a balanced budget each and every year, would limit the government's ability to make public investments thereby hindering future growth.

For years, conservatives have abused the debt and the deficit as a springboard from which to argue for smaller government and cuts to programs that serve as social safety nets to American families. Although we must consider the debt and deficit, the larger and more significant issue is the nature of the debt—what created it.

If you invest fifty thousand dollars in a business, a house, or an education, you can expect future returns on your investment. If you ''invest'' the same fifty thousand dollars in a gun collection and ammunition, what are the future investment returns? Both investments result in a fifty-thousand-dollar debt, but only one results in returns that can transform that debt into a long term gain.

Social investments provide the potential for greater returns in the long run, in the same fashion as personal investments. Even small expenditures on social programs lay a foundation for great wealth in the long term.

If the nation chose to invest over a five-year period, $1.5 trillion in the building of roads, bridges, airports, railroads, mass transit, schools, housing, and health care, we would create a debt.

But the increased ability of companies to interact and ship their goods over well paved and planned roads, the new businesses that would sprout around a freshly built or newly expanded airport, the higher wages of a student who was well educated and a le to attend college resulting in more tax revenue, the improved productivity of employees at their healthiest, would eventually result in greater returns for our country.

The extension of Bush era tax cuts for corporations and the rich, brought about some short-term stimulus of consumer spending. But, similar to Reagan's tax cuts which resulted in record government deficits and debt, the long term damage outweighs the immediate effects.

Reagan's tax cuts for the rich came at the expense of investing in our nation's need for long-term balanced economic growth. The Reagan administration neglected and cut back on our nation's investment in infrastructure, education, health care, housing, job training, transportation, energy conservation, and much more.

The inclination of most conservatives in both parties, is to cut the debt by cutting programs for the most vulnerable among us—our poor, our children, our elderly, and minorities. This approach, however, has been proven false too many times. A Balanced Budget Amendment would take us back to this archaic and ineffective system, permanently.

The Fourth Fault: A Balanced Budget Amendment favors wealthy Americans over middle- and low-income Americans by making it harder to raise revenues and easier to cut programs.

Again, a BBA ultimately favors wealthy Americans over middle- and lower-income Americans. Under current law, legislation can pass by a majority of those present and voting by a recorded vote. The BBA however requires that legislation raising taxes be approved on a roll call vote by a majority of the full membership of both houses.

Thus, the BBA would make it harder to cut the deficit by curbing the special interest tax breaks of the oil and gas industries and make it easier to reduce programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, veterans benefits, education, environmental programs, and assistance for poor children.

Wealthy individuals and corporations receive most of their government benefits in the form of tax entitlements while low income, and middle income Americans receive most of their government benefits through programs.

As evidenced by the cuts that both parties agreed upon recently, its far easier to cut social welfare programs than to cut spending on our military, or to increase taxes. As long as spending is a political issue, cuts to those programs that assist those with the smallest voice in government, will always happen first.

Raising taxes, the only option to address a budget deficit aside from cutting programs, is already a burdensome political issue. The additional requirements of a BBA further complicate the process of raising taxes. This means that the richest Americans will likely keep the benefits they receive from our government via tax cuts.

Meanwhile, the poor lose the programs that provide them with housing, food, job training, health care, and the means to survive. This will further reinforce the growing gap between the rich, and the rest of our society: middle class, working poor, and destitute alike.

Aside from this already distressing point, when the baby boom generation retires, the ratio of workers to retirees will fall to low levels. This poses difficulties for Social Security, since Social Security has been a pure ''pay-as-you-go'' system, with the payroll taxes of current workers paying for the benefits of current retirees.

This was acceptable as long as today's workers could pay for today's retirees. But, in the future, when there are fewer workers to pay for more retirees, the system will be out of balance. So in 1977 and 1983, the Social Security Administration took important and prudent steps toward addressing this issue. It allowed the accumulation of reserves to be used later when needed. These changes were akin to what families do by saving for retirement during their working years, and then drawing down on their savings after they reach retirement.

The BBA insists that the total government expenditures in any year, including those for Social Security benefits, not exceed total revenues collected in that same year, including revenues from Social Security payroll taxes. Thus, the benefits of the baby boomers would have to be financed in full by the taxes of those working and paying into the system then. This undercuts the central reforms of 1983.

Drawing down on any part of accumulated reserves, required under present law, under a BBA would mean the trust funds were spending more in benefits in those years than they were receiving in taxes. Under a BBA, that would be impermissible deficit spending.

The Fifth Fault: A BBA weakens the principle of majority rule and makes balancing the budget more difficult.

Most Balanced Budget Amendments require that unless three-fifths of the members of Congress agree to raise the debt ceiling, the budget must be balanced at all times. They also require that legislation raising taxes must be approved on a roll call vote by a majority of the full membership of both houses, not just those present and voting.

Clearly this provision weakens the current principle of majority rule. A three-fifths requirement empowers a minority (40 percent, plus one). It creates a small group, willing to threaten economic turmoil and disruption unless they get their way, with the ability to extort concessions or exercise unprecedented leverage over our national economic and fiscal policy.

Mr. Speaker, haven't the last few weeks demonstrated how difficult it already is to reach consensus on a budget? This provision will make it simply impossible.

Ezra Klein Argument: There is a final fault, which is not on my list, but is significant

enough to mention: Ezra Klein, of the Washington Post, cleverly points out in a recent article titled, ''The Worst Idea in Washington'' that under a BBA, not a single budget of the Bush or Reagan Administrations would qualify as Constitutional. In fact, the only recent Administration which would not violate the requirements of the Balanced Budget Amendment would be President Clinton for only two of his budgets.

Mr. Speaker, if President Reagan's budget wouldn't qualify, is this really something we should even be considering?

Conclusion: I've listed a few, and certainly not an exhaustive list, of arguments against the Balanced Budget Amendment. The truth is the federal budget is quite unlike the fiscal practices of businesses, families, and states. Contrary to popular myth, except in times of war and recessions, the country has a conservative record of keeping deficits in line.

Our government needs the flexibility to respond in times of economic downturn or war, in a way that businesses, families and states never have to consider.

I've been in the House long enough to know, that when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle came into the majority with large deficits and debt, I knew their first response would be to cut social spending, weaken government regulation, and underfund protection of workers' rights, civil rights, environmental protections, you name it.

I wish I could say I didn't see this coming. But, conservative politicians want to get the government ''off the backs'' of business, finance and industry. They are willing and ready to use the current economic situation to do it and they intend to place the burden on the backs of middle class families, seniors, children, veterans and the poor.

The Republican budget we voted on today does just that. The Balanced Budget Amendment aims to make it a permanent fixture.

Mr. Speaker, I know we can do better. We cannot balance the budget on the backs of middle class Americans. We need to achieve the America of everyone's dreams. The burden of that dream must rest squarely on the shoulders of every American that can carry it.

I find it offensive that some of the most profitable corporations in this country pay no taxes and some even get a refund. I find it offensive that the richest 400 people in the country who have more wealth than half of all Americans combined have an effective tax rate of only 16.6%.

In the words of William Jennings Bryan, ''When I find a man who is not willing to bear his share of the burdens of the government which protects him, I find a man who is unworthy to enjoy the blessings of a government like ours.'' With those wise words, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING ALVIN AURELIANO DAVIS

HON. FREDERICA S. WILSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Alvin Aureliano Davis, who was recently named the 2012 Macy's Florida Department of Education State Teacher of the Year. With this honor, Mr. Davis will serve as the Christa McAuliffe Ambassador for education, touring Florida as an education advocate. Mr. Davis is the band teacher at Miramar High School and has been a music educator for the past 11 years. By actively encouraging his students and keeping them engaged on obtainable goals, his students find success both in and out of the classroom. For the past three years, every student who was a regular participating member of the Miramar High band program has gone on to college under his guidance and leadership.

Alvin Davis graduated from Florida A&M University with a Bachelor of Science degree in Music Education. He began his professional career as the band instructor at Crystal Lake Middle School, teaching the fundamentals of band to 6th thru 8th graders. As the director of the Miramar High School band, Mr. Davis, has continuously constructed his music program and performances with the philosophy of developing an award winning, academic-focused music program on the cutting edge of creativity and band pageantry.

Mr. Davis has a genuine and vested interest in his students. Passing on the legacy of music appreciation is only part of his greater mission of instilling academics and discipline. He requires his students to receive one-on-one counseling with a member of the band staff, and he personally reviews students' report cards and interim reports. Every school band rehearsal includes a one-hour study hall where students are tutored. He has implemented guidelines that high school seniors can perform only if they have registered to take the ACT or SAT college entrance exams, and must prove they have applied for admission to a college or university.

Over the years he has developed a reputation as an educator with a heart as big as the moon as he is wholeheartedly dedicated to the entire educational welfare of students.

Alvin Davis is the husband of Tiffani Davis and the proud father of 16-month-old Caitlyn. I proudly acknowledge his achievement as the 2012 Macy's Florida Department of Education State Teacher of the Year and appreciate his commitment to the many students whose lives he has positively impacted.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PRESIDENTIAL DOLLAR COIN EFFICIENCY ACT OF 2011

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the ''Presidential Dollar Coin Efficiency Act of 2011.'' This bill makes some changes to a law I was proud to cosponsor back in 2005, the ''Presidential Dollar Coin Act of 2005.'' At the time, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that the bill would reduce the deficit by $280 million over the life of the program. However, since the law has been in place, it is clear that demand for the dollar coins has not been as high as predicted. The Federal Reserve is now spending its resources to house excess coin stock that comes back to the reserve banks after they have been in circulation.

The bill I am introducing today will address the problems of a lack of coordination between the Fed and Treasury and will remove some of the statutory restrictions in the law that keep the two agencies from running the program efficiently in an environment of lower demand. But the bill will maintain the program which numismatists, citizens, and businesses have invested in and which should continue.

The bill seeks to make changes to the program that will allow it to function more efficiently with the goal of reducing the number of coins that have to be stored at the Fed. It will also require the Fed and Treasury to coordinate administration of the Presidential Dollar Coin program by: requiring the two agencies to come up with a plan to reduce excess reserves; eliminating the introductory period for unmixed coins; capping the number of coins that the Mint can produce based on numismatic demand from the year before; removing the requirement that the Mint spend money on marketing the coin; and moving up the reporting requirement under a law passed last year that gives the Mint the authority to research and develop new metals for coins.

By removing some of the statutory constraints that were placed on the Fed and Treasury in the original law, I believe that this worthy program can continue in a more limited manner which will reduce excess coin stock being housed at the Fed. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

INTRODUCING THE PARENTAL CONSENT ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Parental Consent Act. This bill forbids federal funds from being used for any universal or mandatory mental-health screening of students without the express, written, voluntary, informed consent of their parents or legal guardians. This bill protects the fundamental right of parents to direct and control the upbringing and education of their children.

The New Freedom Commission on Mental Health has recommended that the federal and state governments work toward the implementation of a comprehensive system of mental-health screening for all Americans. The commission recommends that universal or mandatory mental-health screening first be implemented in public schools as a prelude to expanding it to the general public. However, neither the commission's report nor any related mental-health screening proposal requires parental consent before a child is subjected to mental-health screening. Federally-funded universal or mandatory mental-health screening in schools without parental consent could lead to labeling more children as ''ADD'' or ''hyperactive'' and thus force more children to take psychotropic drugs, such as Ritalin, against their parents' wishes.

Already, too many children are suffering from being prescribed psychotropic drugs for nothing more than children's typical rambunctious behavior. According to the article ''Better but Not Best: Recent Trends in the Well-Being of The Mentally Ill'' (Health Affairs, May/June 2009) in 2006 more than one in 20 children were prescribed medications for mental-health conditions!

Many children have suffered harmful side effects from using psychotropic drugs. Some of the possible side effects include mania, violence, dependence, and weight gain. Yet, parents are already being threatened with child abuse charges if they resist efforts to drug their children. Imagine how much easier it will be to drug children against their parents' wishes if a federally-funded mental-health screener makes the recommendation.

Universal or mandatory mental-health screening could also provide a justification for stigmatizing children from families that support traditional values. Even the authors of mental-health diagnosis manuals admit that mental-health diagnoses are subjective and based on social constructions. Therefore, it is all too easy for a psychiatrist to label a person's disagreement with the psychiatrist's political beliefs a mental disorder. For example, a federally-funded school violence prevention program lists ''intolerance'' as a mental problem that may lead to school violence. Because ''intolerance'' is often a code word for believing in traditional values, children who share their parents' values could be labeled as having mental problems and a risk of causing violence. If the mandatory mental-health screening program applies to adults, everyone who believes in traditional values could have his or her beliefs stigmatized as a sign of a mental disorder. Taxpayer dollars should not support programs that may label those who adhere to traditional values as having a ''mental disorder.''

Mr. Speaker, universal or mandatory mental-health screening threatens to undermine parents' right to raise their children as the parents see fit. Forced mental-health screening could also endanger the health of children by leading to more children being improperly placed on psychotropic drugs, such as Ritalin, or stigmatized as ''mentally ill'' or a risk of causing violence because they adhere to traditional values. Congress has a responsibility to the nation's parents and children to stop this from happening. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Parental Consent Act.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. BILL MCKEON

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Bill McKeon, a member of the All-American Amateur Baseball Association (AAABA) Hall of Fame's Class of 2011. Mr. McKeon has been an extraordinary player as well as a motivating coach with several minor and major league baseball organizations. On August 6, 2011 Mr. McKeon will be inducted into the AAABA Hall of Fame and I applaud his distinguished and outstanding career.

Bill McKeon played to the highest standards and held those around him to similar expectations. Mr. McKeon made his minor league debut in 1952 with the Welch Miners and continued to produce impressive offensive statistics for three consecutive years. He later signed with the Boston Braves and was voted the All-Star Catcher of the Appalachian League in 1952. He continued his professional baseball career as a member of the Northern League of Wisconsin and Sooner State League of Oklahoma. In 1955, U.S. Army Private Bill McKeon was appointed coach of the 516th Divisional Baseball team. He guided his team to a win in the European Baseball Championship game. Mr. McKeon also participated in the 516th Division's basketball and football teams, demonstrating his athletic versatility. A devastating rotator cuff injury in 1956 ended Mr. McKeon's ability to perform on the field.

Mr. McKeon's baseball career also included roles as a scout for the Philadelphia Phillies, the Los Angeles Angels, the Los Angeles Dodgers, the Kansas City A's, the Oakland A's, as well as Eastern Scouting Director for the Kansas City Royals, and a Major League Special Assignment Scout with the San Diego Padres. Mr. McKeon looks back on his time with the San Diego Padres fondly as he enjoyed watching the team win the 1984 National League Championship as a member of their ball club. Mr. McKeon was also the coach for the Kansas City Royal's minor league affiliate in Corning, New York and also coached in Elmira, New York as a member of the Eastern League. In 2006, Mr. McKeon coached the Evansville Otters Baseball Club to a Frontier League Championship, having been the league runners-up in the previous year. His collegiate coaching experience includes head coach for Ashland University as well as an assistant coaching position for the University of Evansville.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in leading this body in acknowledging Mr. Bill McKeon's lifetime commitment to the game of baseball. His commitment to the sport is unparalleled and serves as an example of an influential, dedicated player and leader.

IN HONOR OF CORPORAL BRIAN AFT

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize United States Marine Corporal Brian Aft.

On April 18, 2011, Corporal Aft was heavily injured by an IED explosion while patrolling on duty in Afghanistan. Corporal Aft sustained life threatening injuries, losing his lower extremities. Like many of our brave and dedicated men and women in the United States armed forces, Corporal Aft demonstrates great courage in the midst of his rehabilitation and as he moves forward toward the next phase of his life.

Indeed, the families and loved ones of injured soldiers like Corporal Aft play a vital role in their journey to recovery. Their unwavering love and support provide these injured warriors great strength. These family members place their own lives on hold while focusing primarily on the injured warrior. Stories such as Corporal Aft's and his family remind us why we are proud to be Americans. May God bless them all in the midst of this difficult time. I ask that the following poem ''Forever . . . Aft . . . Er'' inspired from Corporal Aft's story be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FOREVER . . . AFT . . . ER

(By Albert Caswell)

FOR.
FOR EVER . . .
FOREVER . . . AFT . . . ER!
All in the days of our lives . . .
All in the moments that we're alive . . .
That which so make the Angel's cry!
All in what we have so left behind?
All in our lifetimes, so to find . . . , that which so does shine . . .
That which so lives on, long Aft . . . er we are gone!
To march off to war, all for your Country Tis of Thee . . . to her freedom to so insure!
All in your most magnificent shades of green . . .
To wear that mantel, and hold that high honor of being The Best . . . A United States Marine!
As on each new day you so faced death, all but for this our Nation to so bless!
As out on point Brian, somehow you so boldly went . . . all out into such death!
As you Corporal Aft, so selflessness, so bravely moved forth in all they asked!
All with your Brothers In Arms, with that blood that binds you so yes!
Is that but not what heaven is for?
For such things as these Brian, live forever on!
Long Aft . . . er, we are gone!
And then on battlefields of honor bright,
As you so courageously lost your two strong fine legs . . . this dreadful sight!
As the tears came rolling down, lying there . . . halfway to heaven, as you had to so decide!
When, from somewhere so very deep down inside . . ., you chose life, and began to try . . .
For such things Brian live on, Ever . . . Aft . . . er . . . Ever . . . Aft . . . er we are gone!
You see my son, some people like you are put upon this earth!
All by our Lord To So Teach Us, To So Reach, and So Beseech Us in all their worth!
Reminding us all in life, what so surely so comes first!
For you Brian will walk, and you will run . . . as your fine heart shines like the mid-day sun!
For you are a United States Marine, one of the greatest things our Nation has so seen!
And if ever I have a son, I but wish he could so walk as courageously all in those shades of green!
Ooo . . . Rah! Ooo . . . Rah, Jar Head . . . , all for our country you have bled!
Arms and legs we all need, but we can live without . . . but without a heart we can so breath!
As you Star of Texas, shine so brilliantly!
Because, in Heaven with our Lord you need not arms or legs!
And that's where your going Brian one day . . .
Forever . . . Aft . . . er!

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF GULF BREEZE, FLORIDA

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of Gulf Breeze,

Florida upon the occasion of its 50th Anniversary.

Located in Santa Rosa County, the City of Gulf Breeze shares a rich history and culture with the Florida Panhandle. Gulf Breeze forms part of the gateway to Pensacola Bay, where Don Tristan de Luna arrived in 1559 to build American's First Settlement.

Gulf Breeze first received its charter from the Florida Legislature in 1961. Today, the City has developed into a place where one can find peace and relaxation on its calm shores and whose natural beauty continues to withstand the test of time. Over 6,000 people call Gulf Breeze home, and countless thousands visit the City every year to see its world-class zoo and walk along the Naval Live Oaks portion of the Gulf Islands National Seashore.

Recently, Gulf Breeze has become a focal point of the Florida business community, known for high-tech companies who share a commitment to the heritage of the City. Gulf Breeze is truly a gem of the Gulf Coast, and I am honored to represent its citizens.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I congratulate the City of Gulf Breeze on its many accomplishments over the past 50 years. My wife Vicki joins me in offering our best wishes to the Mayor, Council, public servants, and citizens of Gulf Breeze for their continued prosperity.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF SAM McCULLOUGH

HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise on behalf of the following colleagues, ROBERT ADERHOLT, TODD AKIN, SPENCER BACHUS, KEVIN BRADY, DAN BURTON, JOHN CARTER, JOHN CULBERSON, ELTON GALLEGLY, SCOTT GARRETT, LOUIE GOHMERT, JEB HENSARLING, RUBÉN HINOJOSA, SAM JOHNSON, TIMOTHY JOHNSON, JIM JORDAN, STEVE KING, JACK KINGSTON, DOUG LAMBORN, DANIEL LUNGREN, MIKE MCINTYRE, CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, RANDY NEUGEBAUER, MIKE PENCE, JOSEPH PITTS, BILL POSEY, PETER ROSKAM, ADAM SMITH, CLIFF STEARNS, GLENN THOMPSON, TIM WALBERG, ED WHITFIELD, JOE WILSON, FRANK WOLF, and DON YOUNG, to pay tribute to the extraordinary life and service of Sam McCullough. Sam served this body faithfully for over three decades as a spiritual mentor and good friend to hundreds of Members, Congressional staff, Presidential appointees, and other government officials. Sam entered the presence of the Lord on July 2, 2011, after a brave, year-long battle with cancer.

Sam began his earthly journey in New Jersey where his missionary parents were in ministry at the Hydewood Park Baptist Church. At the age of four Sam accepted Christ as his personal Lord and Savior at a Child Evangelism Good News Club led by his mother. From that point on Sam always had a keen interest in spiritual things. At the age of ten, Sam, his parents and his sister, Ann, returned to the mission field in Bolivia. His faith grew even more as a student at a small missionary children's boarding school.

Sam returned to the States to join his sister at the Ben Lippen School boarding school in Asheville, NC. Under the influence of godly teachers, he rededicated his life to the Lord. Upon graduation he attended Columbia International University for two years of intensive Bible training. He then transferred to Houghton College in New York graduating with a degree in Business Administration and minors in Spanish and music. Campus Crusade for Christ staff visited the Houghton campus during Sam's senior year. Sam and his future wife Nan were impressed with the young people and their passion to share Christ.

Upon graduation in 1967 Sam worked for Art DeMoss' National Liberty Insurance Company. He also attended the Reformed Episcopal Seminary in Philadelphia. Art DeMoss, a personal friend of Campus Crusade founder Dr. Bill Bright, challenged Sam to join Campus Crusade to "help change the world" by reaching the future leaders on university campuses.

Sam and Nan were married after Nan's graduation from Houghton and joined the Campus Crusade ministry as staff. They had planned on a two year term to learn how to effectively share their faith, then to return to the business world. But as God used them in the lives of college students, they found themselves compelled to stay in full time ministry.

The McCulloughs were assigned to ministry on the campuses of the University of Maryland, University of Rochester, Monroe Community College, and Rochester Institute of Technology, after which they moved to the University of Buffalo where they ministered for four years. Over 20 of their University of Buffalo students went into some form of Christian ministry.

In 1973, Sam was appointed as Area Director for all of Pennsylvania and Delaware. He carried this responsibility for six years. He worked on all the campuses in those states where Campus Crusade had a presence.

In 1979 Sam felt the Lord leading him to leave his work with future leaders and to start reaching out to the present leaders in Washington. Sam and Nan joined the Christian Embassy (CE), a Washington, DC ministry of Campus Crusade and have faithfully served national and international leaders in Washington for 31 years. In addition to numerous administrative responsibilities at the CE, Sam led Bible studies and other men's groups. He was responsible for planning many of the CE retreats and fund raising events. Towards the end of his ministry on this Earth, Sam defied the cancer to continue modeling the Christian life and teaching the Word of God to presidential appointees, Members of Congress and their Chiefs of Staff.

Sam is survived by his precious wife, Nan, his three children and their spouses: Kristi & Darrin Kruft, Kevin & Sarah McCullough, Scotty & Kelly McCullough, and three grandchildren: Lily Kruft age 9, Jazlyn McCullough age 5, & Damien Atkins age 13.

Sam had an amazing ministry of presence to us on Capitol Hill. Whether it was praying with Members or Ambassadors distraught over national tragedies, helping defeated Members transition out of public service, or following up on the health episodes of family members, Sam was always there. In a town known for asking, "What have you done for me lately?" Sam was one of the few who would stop by simply to say, "Hi, do you have any needs?" He spent his lifetime pouring himself into the lives of others, driven only by the call of following the will of the Lord.

Sam was a truly special man who humbly touched the lives of all who encountered him. We will miss his presence with all our hearts and are so grateful that he chose to share the love of Christ with us. We also extend our appreciation to Nan and the children for sharing Sam with us. We have no doubt that when Sam entered the presence of the King, he was welcomed with "Well done, thou good and faithful servant!"

HONORING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF ROY ROGERS AND THE ROY ROGERS FESTIVAL

HON. JEAN SCHMIDT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 28th annual Roy Rogers Festival in Portsmouth, Ohio, and the 100th birthday of Roy Rogers himself. Leonard Slye—better known as Roy Rogers—was born on November 5th, 1911 in Cincinnati, Ohio. A few months after Roy was born, he and his family decided to travel up the Ohio River on their houseboat to Portsmouth, Ohio. It was near this area, in Southern Ohio, that Roy and his family called home.

Roy Rogers grew up on a farm in Duck Run, just outside of Portsmouth. Roy, who often rode his horse to school, once said, "We lived so far out in the country, they had to pipe sunlight to us." As a result, Roy and his family had to entertain themselves. It was while he was growing up that Roy learned to play the mandolin, call square dances, and sing. Little did his family know that one day, Roy would be known as the "King of the Cowboys."

Roy went on to star in numerous western movies, record multiple chart topping albums, and along with his trusty sidekicks Trigger and Bullet, star in a hit television show.

Regardless of how popular Roy Rogers became, he always spoke fondly of his home in Southern Ohio. In 1982, the Roy Rogers-Dale Evans Collectors Association was founded and immediately began planning an annual event to commemorate Roy Rogers and his wife Dale Evans. In 1983, the first Roy Rogers Festival was held.

This annual event attracts families from around the country to not only commemorate the life of Roy Rogers, but to turn Portsmouth into the Ol' West for a few days.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in not only honoring the Roy Rogers Festival, but also the 100th birthday of a great American—Roy Rogers.

TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 TO MODIFY THE INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT FOR COMBINED HEAT AND POWER SYSTEM PROPERTY

HON. JAY INSLEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduced a bipartisan bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the investment tax credit for combined heat and power

system property. There are economic opportunities for American industries that adopt combined heat and power (CHP) systems, which have the potential to greatly increase energy efficiency and the U.S. competitiveness of large industrial plants. The U.S. Combined Heat and Power Association has reported that CHP can save building and industry owners over $5 billion per year in energy costs. Further, the manufacture and installation of CHP projects have the potential to put our Nation back to work while producing cleaner energy and reducing emissions impacts of electricity generation costs.

CHP technologies capture some or all of the by-product heat for heating or cooling purposes and produce electricity and heat from the same fuel source, at or near the site of use. By-product heat at moderate temperatures can also be used in absorption chillers for cooling. Because they produce multiple forms of energy from the same source, CHP systems are two to three times more efficient than systems that produce one or the other alone.

In addition to CHP systems, newer, related technologies are available that can use low-grade heat to generate clean electrical power or simply make use of the heat as a thermal source. In traditional plants, this low-grade heat is wasted by venting it directly to the atmosphere. These new technologies, referred to as waste heat to electricity (WHE) and waste heat to thermal (WHT), have components that are manufactured in the U.S., and have the potential to become important exportable technologies. These systems are similar to traditional renewable technologies in that they do not require the direct combustion of fuels to generate power or heat, thus no emissions are generated.

If these technologies are widely adopted it would help move our country towards energy independence along with creating high quality, stable American jobs. According to the Department of Energy, if the U.S. was to increase its use of CHP to generate 20 percent of its electricity by 2030, it would spur $234 billion in private investment and create almost 1 million jobs.

Although the savings from CHP, WHE, and WHT can be substantial, significant up-front capital costs are a barrier to deploying these systems. This legislation will help deploy this energy-efficient technology by defraying a portion of these costs through an investment tax credit. My bipartisan bill raises the size of the system eligible for the current investment tax credit, allowing the credit to apply to the first 25 megawatts or 34,000 horsepower of an installed system. The bill also removes the cap on the eligible system size for the credit and also allows VVHE and WHT systems to qualify for this credit.

With our Nation's economic competitiveness and energy independence in mind, I urge my colleagues to support my bill to modify and improve the investment tax credit for combined heat and power and waste heat system properties.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DELMER ''PHIL'' PHILLIPPI

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the passing of my friend and an American hero, Delmer ''Phil'' Phillippi of Ridgeland, South Carolina. Phil was a Marine's Marine. His first tour of duty with the United States Marine Corps was from January 1944 to March 1946 and he landed at Normandy on D-Day. His second tour with the Marines was from March 1948 to October 1967. He was a hero of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, serving as a rifleman and received a Combat Infantry Badge and four campaign stars. He also served twelve years as a butcher for the commissary at the Parris Island Marine Corps Depot.

In addition to Phil's military service, he was a man of strong Christian faith and love of his family. Phil was a member of the Coosawhatchie Baptist Church. He loved his farm and his farm animals. He leaves behind his loving wife of almost thirty-nine years Karen, his daughter Allison, his son Keith and his grandchildren Tyler, Monica, Olivia, Christian, Keelie, and Chandler.

I would like to express my condolences to his family. My thoughts and prayers are with his family at this difficult time. Semper Fi.

CONGRESSIONAL COMMENDATION FOR THE LIFE OF GERTRUDE HOFFMAN PEELE

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of the Third Congressional District of Florida, and myself, we are deeply and profoundly saddened by the loss of our friend, Gertrude Hoffman Peele. Her motto was ''All we need to do is go for it'' and she always did.

Gertrude grew up in Jacksonville when it was extremely segregated. As the only black family in her neighborhood, her parents never let her play outside and when some black families moved into the neighborhood, the Hoffman's playroom became the place where the black kids could gather safely. She recently told the story of how she had to run through certain neighborhoods just to get to school or attend a football game. She did not let these experiences break her spirit, however. She was inspired by her grandmother's words, 'Brighten the corner where you are. If it's not bright enough for you, you make it bright. Take the light to the corner.'

During the civil rights movement, she was raising her daughters and didn't have time to march. Instead, she spent her time making friends with people who could understand what the movement meant. Relationships meant so much to her that she said her greatest accomplishment was changing the way women in Jacksonville work together.

In fact her accomplishments were many. The very essence of Gertrude Peele was service to, and for others. From her position as wife, mother, grandmother, to business and community leader, to officer of the National Council of Negro Women, to countless positions in national, state and community leadership positions and her tireless work on behalf of at-risk girls, Gertrude Peele meant service, dedication, leadership, and caring. Most recently, she was dedicated to The Reed Educational Campus, which provides a home-style environment for at-risk, tween girls to foster self-esteem, healthy lifestyle and academic success.

All our lives and those of generations to come have been made the better by the love and commitment of our dear sister, Gertrude Hoffman Peele. May she find perpetual peace and glory now in the loving embrace of her Heavenly Father, and forever abide in a special place in our hearts.

HONORING SISTER MARY ALICE MURPHY

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sister Mary Alice Murphy for her dedication in Ft. Collins, Colorado to serving the homeless and the poor.

For the last 26 years since Sister Mary Alice moved to Ft. Collins she has worked tirelessly to help the vulnerable populations of the state.

She opened the first soup kitchen in Ft. Collins and with the help of St. Joseph's Parish, an overnight homeless shelter was eventually attached to the soup kitchen.

When this homeless shelter opened, Sister Mary Alice ensured that the facility had a separate area for women and families who were seeking shelter.

In 1992, Sister Mary Alice founded CARE Housing, a non-profit organization, whose mission was to provide affordable rental housing and supportive services to working families. Over 85 percent of the residents were single women with children.

Just last year, the Sister Mary Alice Murphy Center for Hope opened. The mission at the Center for Hope is to help families and individuals achieve stability and long-term self-sufficiency. The Center is of tremendous value for the less fortunate families in Colorado.

A plaque on the Center for Hope reads the following ''For her relentless effort to quest better the lives of those less fortunate. Because of her earnest, fearless, and untiring interest in those who are vulnerable, weary or forgotten. In appreciation for her unwavering commitment to people who have no voice. This building stands as a dedication to Sister Mary Alice Murphy, a great friend to many, and the embodiment of service to others.''

It is my honor to recognize Sister Mary Alice on the House floor.

HONORING LANA HUGHES AND JP PRITCHARD FOR 3 DECADES OF SERVICE TO SOUTHEAST TEXAS

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a pair of southeast Texans who have honored us every weekday morning for more than a quarter century. Up until July 1st of this year, part of starting your morning in the Houston area was tuning into News Radio 740 KTRH for the news from JP Pritchard and Lana Hughes.

Whether it was announcing breaking news from Texas, Washington, DC or across the globe, Houston's anchors—and Houston depended on them. Through devastating Hurricanes like Alicia, Rita and Ike and the most destructive Tropical Storm in U.S. history, Tropical Storm Allison, these dedicated anchors were the calming, assuring voices that kept Texans informed through good economic times and bad. Along the way, these Texas Radio Hall of Fame members became the most honored radio news team anyone can remember with dozens of national, state and local awards.

Native Texan Lana Hughes is a graduate of Conroe High School in the 8th Congressional District and Baylor University. She joined KTRH from the Conroe Courier and KIKR Radio. She is a walking encyclopedia of modern southeast Texas history, especially the accomplishments of the men and women of NASA. Many animals in Houston also have Auntie Lana thank for their loving homes.

A graduate of Drake University, JP Pritchard wasn't born in Texas, but he got there as fast as he could. He and his wife Esther, raised three sons in Texas and are now enjoying being grandparents. From reporter/anchor and news director of KULF Radio to KTRH, JP has a lot to be proud of including his awarding-winning documentary on the History of Houston.

I have had the pleasure of getting to know these consummate professionals and just how hard they worked to keep Houston informed every day. It is hard not to be in awe of all they accomplished while making it look so effortless. Synonymous with Houston for more than a quarter century, JP and Lana were inducted together into the Texas Radio Hall of Fame together. As they move on to new adventures, Houston owes them a debt of gratitude for being an amazing resource for so many for so long. I just wanted to say "Thank you" to Houston's anchors.

TRIBUTE TO U.S. FEDERAL DISTRICT JUDGE MATTHEW J. PERRY, JR.

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a legendary American who has passed from this life into immortality. The Honorable Matthew J. Perry, Jr. was one of our great legal minds and a stalwart of the Civil Rights Movement. He was also my mentor and dear friend, and he leaves a void that cannot be filled.

On Friday, July 29, 2011, Judge Matthew Perry went to work as he did every weekday in the Columbia, South Carolina courthouse that bears his name. That evening he slipped quietly away at home, which was so in keeping with how he lived his life. August 3, 2011 would have been his 90th birthday.

Matthew Perry was the eldest child of Matthew and Jennie Lyles Perry, a tailor and seamstress in the segregated Waverly community of Columbia, South Carolina. Following his father's death when Matthew was just 12, he moved in with his grandfather, William Lyles, a brakeman on the Southern Railroad. Matthew was expected to contribute financially to the family, and he did odd jobs like painting, digging ditches and delivering newspapers to do his part. That led young Matthew to aspire to a better life.

He attended Booker T. Washington High School in Columbia and went on to South Carolina State College (now University) in Orangeburg from 1939 to 1941, until World War II broke out. Matthew was drafted and served as an Army Sergeant in an all-black Quartermaster Corps in England, France, Belgium and Germany.

When Matthew returned home on a furlough from the war, where he enjoyed more freedoms in Europe than he did in the Jim Crow South, he stopped to eat at a restaurant where he was forced to order through a window while he saw Italian prisoners of war eating inside with the white customers. This inequity stirred a passion in Matthew Perry that shaped his entire life.

He returned to South Carolina State College in 1946 and finished his degree in Business Administration, but he remained passionate about civil rights. He watched Thurgood Marshall argue a case in Columbia that led to the establishment of a law school at S.C. State to avoid the integration of the University of South Carolina's School of Law. That experience had a profound influence on Matthew's future. He determined he wanted to follow in the footsteps of future Supreme Court Justice Marshall and enrolled in the second class of S.C. State's law school in 1948. He was one of just five men to graduate in 1951.

Following graduation, Attorney Perry moved to Spartanburg, South Carolina where he was the only black lawyer. He made a name for himself representing the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), although he couldn't win a case. During that period, my mother took me—a teenager at the time—to see him represent the Sumter NAACP, so, in her words, I could see what I could be. He electrified everyone in the courtroom, and I was mesmerized.

A few years later, as fate would have it, I was arrested along with 387 other students in March 1960 during the first civil rights protest march and sit-in in Orangeburg. I was a student at South Carolina State College at the time. Attorney Perry chose me as his star witness because my parents, a minister and beautician, were immune from economic retribution from the white establishment since they didn't serve any white clients. That case launched what would be a lifelong friendship.

In 1961, Attorney Perry moved home to Columbia to join his childhood friend, Lincoln Jenkins, in opening a law firm. He was the attorney on three cases that have left a significant mark on South Carolina—the cases that resulted in the integration of Clemson University and the University of South Carolina and the 1972 lawsuit that created single-member districts for State House elections, which resulted in quadrupling the number of African Americans in the South Carolina Legislature.

Matthew Perry was a beloved figure and was even drafted in 1974 to run for Congress. However, the climate wasn't yet right for an African American to be elected from South Carolina.

In 1976, Senator Strom Thurmond nominated him to serve on the U.S. Military Court of Appeals. He was unanimously confirmed and became the second black to serve on that judicial panel. Just three years later, Senator Ernest Hollings tapped him as a U.S. District Judge for the state of South Carolina, which brought him back to Columbia. He was the first African American to serve in that capacity. He moved into senior status on the federal bench in 1995 and remained active until the end of his life.

In 2004, I had the honor of being with Judge Perry for the dedication of the Matthew J. Perry, Jr. Federal Courthouse in Columbia. I sponsored the legislation that named the building in his honor, and it was among my proudest moments in public life. It took ten years from the passage of the law until the edifice was complete, but it was well worth the wait, and I am so pleased that Judge Perry had the opportunity to work in the courthouse for a number of years. On a personal note, he swore in my daughter, Mignon Clyburn, as a member of the Federal Communications Commission in the Perry Courthouse, and it reminded me of when he presided over my ceremonial swearing-in when I became the first African American elected to Congress from South Carolina since the 19th century.

Because of his tremendous stature in the legal community, Judge Perry earned a number of honors and awards. Among them was South Carolina's highest civilian honor, the Order of the Palmetto, in 1986, and he was inducted into the South Carolina Hall of Fame in 2007. He earned the distinguished alumnus award from South Carolina State University in 1972 and 1980, and he was selected the South Carolinian of the Year in 1977. He received the William R. Ming Advocacy Award, which recognizes outstanding success as a lawyer representing causes important to the NAACP. He also held honorary doctorates from Princeton University, South Carolina State College, the University of South Carolina, Voorhees College, Francis Marion University and Lander College.

He was a lifelong member of Zion Baptist Church in Columbia and was married to the former Hallie Bacote of Timmonsville for 63 years. They had one son, Michael.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to rise today to honor the contributions of this national treasure. Matthew J. Perry, Jr. was a humble man who would never seek out recognition for his extraordinary contributions to civil rights and the legal profession; he just saw it as his life's work. He has left an indelible mark on this country, and his legacy lives on in so many, including myself, who have benefited from his passion and his persuasion. Judge Perry was a gentle giant, whose likes we will never see again.

HONORING VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize General James E. Cartwright for his forty years of accomplished military service. His unparalleled dedication to our troops and his visionary leadership in defense of our national security have left an indelible mark.

We have been extremely grateful over the past five years to have benefited from his thoughtful and candid advice and recommendations, and are grateful for his testimony at many Congressional hearings on our nation's security and the future of our Armed Forces.

General Cartwright hails from Rockford, Illinois. He graduated from the University of Iowa in 1971 and was commissioned a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps shortly thereafter. The General served as a Naval Flight Officer in the F–4 and as a pilot in the F–4, OA–4 and the F–18. His flying career also included command of the First Marine Aircraft Wing in Okinawa, Japan.

After an assignment as the Director for Force Structure, Resources and Assessment (J–8) on the Joint Staff, then Lieutenant General Cartwright was promoted to General and became the first Marine Corps officer to lead United States Strategic Command.

During his dedicated tenure as head of STRATCOM, General Cartwright led the development of strategies to counter a changed security environmental and rapidly emerging new threats, particularly in the critical areas of nuclear proliferation, cyber, space, and missile defense. His vision and leadership were essential to ensure that we are able to successfully and reliably meet the new challenges of a post-Cold War era.

We are grateful for his service during the last four years as the eighth Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The General's leadership also contributed directly to the integration of technologies that enabled, as an example, the destruction of a failing satellite by a missile for the first time, and the successful and historic raid against Osama Bin Laden.

He reduced the loss of American lives in combat by facilitating the rapid delivery of much-needed new capabilities to the battlefield. Specifically, I would like to recognize his contribution to leading the MRAP program which resulted in a remarkable fifty percent decrease in deaths attributed to Improvised Explosive Device attacks. General Cartwright has been a bulwark in honoring the dedication and sacrifice of the 2.4 million active, guard and reserve members of the Armed Forces and their families, has steadfastly advocated for our wounded warriors, and kept the memory of those who made the ultimate sacrifice on our battlefields in our hearts and minds.

General Cartwright's vision, dedication and invaluable leadership will prove a lasting legacy for the Armed Forces and for our country.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2644, THE AVIATION JOBS AND SAFETY ACT OF 2011

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 4,000 workers of the Federal Aviation Administration who were furloughed on July 22nd. For this reason, I urge the immediate passage of H.R. 2644, the Aviation Jobs and Safety Act of 2011, which will provide a clean extension and end this nonsense.

Republicans claim to focus on jobs, but time and time again, we see them cut, delay, and disable every program that comes their way. The partial shutdown of the Federal Aviation Administration has become the primary tactic of the Republican Party, which would rather send people home than send them to work.

The failure to pass a clean FAA extension is the latest example of this tactic. Since 2007, Congress has passed 20 short term extensions without controversial provisions. Breaking that precedent, House Republican leadership decided to attach policy riders to weaken unions and kill jobs, knowing full well it would never be approved by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the 4,000 furloughed FAA employees are non-partisan career civil servants who in many cases have spent more than two decades working to provide the public with safe, modern and efficient air travel in this country.

The Republican-led FAA shutdown has caused the FAA to issue 217 stop-work orders on $11 billion worth of air traffic control and safety-related contracts, and that number will continue to grow.

Because of this, nearly 86,000 construction jobs are now in jeopardy around the country. That's 90,000 people waiting to work, needing to pay their mortgages and feed their families.

Contracts are waiting to be honored and work is waiting to be done, but the Republicans are held up on issues such as subsidies to rural airports, which cost about $200 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, in just 10 days, the FAA shutdown has already cost the American taxpayer $300 million. Every day the Republican leadership holds out costs this country $30 million in lost airport fees.

Also troubling is how the airlines have reacted to the FAA shutdown. Instead of passing cost savings on to air travelers, almost every one of the airlines raised their ticket prices and pocketed the money. The situation was there and they took advantage of it.

My Republican colleagues are fond of saying that cutting taxes and dismantling government bureaucracies will streamline business and result in greater value to the consumer, but I fail to see the airlines acting on that principle.

On July 26th I joined my Democratic colleagues in the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee in introducing H.R. 2644, which will end this job-killing standoff immediately. I call on my Republican colleagues to pass a clean extension so we can return to the business of negotiating a long-term authorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is incredibly unfair to hold thousands of American jobs hostage while we battle over promises we have already made and signed into law. This is exactly the same tactic that we saw Republicans employ with their threatened shutdown of the federal government in March and their senseless debate over the debt-ceiling which threatened the entire economy.

I remain committed to passing an authorization bill that adequately funds critical components of our transportation infrastructure, such as the implementation of the Next Generation Air Traffic Control system, and I am concerned that reckless cuts necessitate the firing of many safety personnel and put the flying public at risk. Right now the workers who should be moving these projects forward are sitting at home worried about the money they are not able to earn.

Mr. Speaker, we must pass H.R. 2644 immediately. Every day we wait costs our country money. This pointless shutdown erodes confidence of the hundreds of small businesses who contract for the federal government, and puts nearly 90,000 jobs in needless jeopardy.

I urge my colleagues to for a clean funding extension of the FAA before we leave Washington for the district work period. Thousands of jobs and livelihoods hang in the balance.

THE GREATEST LOVE IN HONOR OF AN AMERICAN HERO CORPORAL TODD S. LOVE 1ST RECON MARINE, THE UNITED STATES MARINES

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a strong son of the south, Corporal Todd Love of Acworth, Georgia of the United States Marines. On October 25, 2010, while on foot patrol in Sangin Afghanistan, Corporal Love stepped on an IED, gravely wounding himself. Losing both his legs and part of his hand and lower arm. His will to win and his recovery are the stuff that movies are made of. Incredible, is his will to live, and his smile and can do attitude teaches all about the meaning of the words faith and courage. He makes every United States Marine whoever wore the uniform proud. And with the help of his family he is miles ahead of his recovery. I ask that this poem penned in honor of valor by Albert Caswell be placed in the RECORD.

The . . .
The Greatest Love . . .
Your Greatest Gift, as like from our Lord up above . . .
So selfless Todd, this!
The Greatest Love . . .
To march off to war . . .
All for God and Country Todd, as was your burden bore!
To walk into The Valley of Death . . .
All for our Nation, to so bless!
But, ready to die for your Brothers In Arms . . . so yes!
Is The Greatest Love!
Armed, with only but your fine courage so left!
All in your Most Magnificent Shades of Green . . .
As moving ever forth, as out into the face of evil you were so seen!

To give up your two fine legs and arm . . .
And not to worry about what may come to you . . . such harm!
The . . .
The Greatest Love!
To come back home . . .
As all of this pain and heartache, you now so own!
As that most magnificent face of courage, to you now so belongs!
As you rebuild, but with only your iron will!
The Greatest Love!
As you so Teach Us Todd, as you so would!
As You So Beseech Us Todd, as you so could!
As Out To All of Our Hearts, You So Reach Us Todd, create such good!
As The Title of Hero Todd, you now so own!
As our Lord God Walks with you, Todd your not alone!
The Greatest Love!
As you make me weep!
With all of that splendid courage, all in your heart so very deep!
For Heaven So Holds A Place!
All For Such Magnificent Men as you, of such Grace!
Who somehow will not so lose their faith!
No matter what the darkest of all days!
As you but bring tears to our face . . .
As to Heaven one day Todd, you will come home . . . and fine your place!
As an Angel in The Army of Our Lord . . . his blessed son for all you've faced!
All because of you, and your Greatest Love!
Amen!

REINTRODUCTION OF THE GEOTHERMAL PRODUCTION EXPANSION ACT

HON. JAY INSLEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, today, Representative MIKE SIMPSON and I reintroduced the bipartisan Geothermal Production Expansion Act, a companion to S.1149, introduced by Senators WYDEN, CRAPO, RISCH and MERKLEY. Our bill will ensure that geothermal resources that are near federal lands are developed, creating American jobs in rural areas. I thank my colleagues for their leadership and working together on this important bill.

As we work to develop American energy resources and become more energy independent, it is extremely important that we remove barriers to the production of domestic, clean, renewable resources that have been discovered and can be financed in the private market. This legislation will help remove a significant barrier to deploying geothermal energy and creating the accompanying jobs.

Currently, proven geothermal developers are not producing clean, reliable geothermal electricity, despite specific valid geothermal discoveries in the west that adjoin federal lands. The Geothermal Production Expansion Act would ensure that if a developer has made the upfront investments to discover and validate a geothermal resource that is adjacent to federal lands, there will be reasonable certainty that they will be able to secure a lease for a small parcel of the adjoining land necessary to develop and produce geothermal energy. Taxpayers would be compensated for the fair market value of the lease, and would receive increased royalties for the increased geothermal production.

Already under EPACT 2005 amendments, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is allowed to issue three different non-competitive leases for geothermal resources. Our legislation simply creates a fourth category whereby the BLM may issue a non-competitive geothermal lease for only these qualified companies who hold legal rights to develop geothermal leases on certain adjoining lands.

This legislation would spur immediate economic development in rural areas and ensure that developers who have invested substantial capital and made high risk investments can secure and develop geothermal discoveries. It will also add renewable, domestically produced energy resources to the American electricity supply. In the 111th Congress, the House Natural Resources committee held a hearing on the Geothermal Production Expansion Act, and I offered and passed this legislation as an amendment to the Consolidated Land, Energy, and Aquatic Resources Act of 2010 (H.R. 3534), but unfortunately did not reach the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. I urge Congress to pass this bill into law this year.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. JACK MCKEON

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Jack McKeon, a native of South Amboy, New Jersey and a member of the All-American Amateur Baseball Association (AAABA) Hall of Fame's Class of 2011. The AAABA established the Hall of Fame in 1994 and continues to induct a new class of prestigious individuals every August. This year they induct Mr. McKeon, an outstanding individual who has dedicated his life to the game of baseball. His performance on and off the field are worthy of this body's recognition.

Jack McKeon, nicknamed "Trader Jack", began his baseball career in 1948 as a participant in the AAABA Tournament and later signed with the Pittsburgh Pirates in 1949. Mr. McKeon nobly served in the United States Air Force from 1950 to 1951 but quickly returned to his baseball career in 1952 as a minor league player. He maintained a starting position with various minor league teams for three more years. By the age of twenty-four, Mr. McKeon began as a player's manager from 1956 through 1959 and continued managing in the minor leagues for the next seventeen years. As a result of his outstanding efforts, he was the recipient of four 'Manager of the Year' Awards for his performance in the Minor Leagues.

Jack McKeon made his Major League Baseball debut in 1973 as Manager with the Kansas City Royals and remained a member of this club for three consecutive seasons. He has also been recognized as Manager with the Oakland Athletics, Manager and General Manager of the San Diego Padres, and Major League Scout and Manager for the Cincinnati Reds. Mr. McKeon is most notably known for leading the San Diego Padres to a National League pennant win in 1984. He also led the 2003 Florida Marlins to the World Series, winning the Championship later that year. Consequently, he was named '2003 Manager of the Year'. Jack McKeon is the only manager in history to win 1,000 games in both the minor and major leagues. In 2005, Jack McKeon retired as Manager of the Florida Marlins and currently holds a position as special advisor to the owner.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in congratulating Mr. Jack McKeon for his numerous accolades and congratulate him for his acceptance as a member of the All-American Amateur Baseball Hall of Fame's Class of 2011.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, August 2, 2011 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

AUGUST 3

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Securities, Insurance and Investment Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the housing finance system, focusing on the to-be-announced market.

SD–538

10 a.m.

Finance

To hold hearings to examine dually-eligible beneficiaries, focusing on improving care while lowering costs.

SD–215

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Wendy Ruth Sherman, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Political Affairs, and Robert Stephen Ford, of Vermont, to be Ambassador to the Syrian Arab Republic, both of the Department of State.

SD–419

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 1268, to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Government by providing for greater interagency experience among national security and homeland security personnel through the development of a national security and homeland security human capital strategy and interagency rotational service by employees, S. 1409, to intensify efforts to identify, prevent, and recover payment error, waste, fraud, and abuse within Federal spending, S. 743, to amend chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the disclosures of information protected from prohibited personnel practices, require a statement in nondisclosure policies, forms, and agreements that such policies, forms, and agreements conform with certain disclosure protections, provide certain authority for the Special Counsel, S. 1379, to amend title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, to revise certain administrative authorities of the District of Columbia courts, and to authorize the District of Columbia Public Defender Service to provide professional liability insurance for officers and employees of the Service for claims relating to services furnished within the scope of employment with the Service, S. 1444, to provide for the presentation of a United States flag on behalf of Federal civilian employees who are killed while performing official duties or because of their status as Federal employees, S. 384, to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and the nominations of Mark D. Acton, of Kentucky, and Robert G. Taub, of New York, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission.

SD–342

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine cybercrime, focusing on updating the ''Computer Fraud and Abuse Act'' to protect cyberspace and combat emerging threats.

SD–226

2 p.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine debt financing in the domestic financial sector.

SD–538

2:30 p.m.

Environment and Public Works

Children's Health and Environmental Responsibility Subcommittee

To hold an oversight hearing to examine Federal actions to clean up contamination from uranium mining and milling operations.

SD–406

Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine S. 1024, to designate the Organ Mountains and other public land as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System and the National Landscape Conservation System in the State of New Mexico, S. 1090, to designate as wilderness certain public land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee, S. 1144, to amend the Soda Ash Royalty Reduction Act of 2006 to extend the reduced royalty rate for soda ash, S. 1149, to expand geothermal production, and S. 1344, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to take immediate action to recover ecologically and economically from a catastrophic wildfire in the State of Arizona.

SD–366

AUGUST 4

10 a.m.

Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 657, to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, and the nominations of Morgan Christen, of Alaska, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Scott Wesley Skavdahl, to be United States District Judge for the District of Wyoming, Sharon L. Gleason, to be United States District Judge for the District of Alaska, Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, and Richard G. Andrews, to be United States District Judge for the District of Delaware.

SD–226

2 p.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Richard Cordray, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

SD–538

2:15 p.m.

Foreign Relations

African Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine responding to drought and famine in the horn of Africa.

SD–419

Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine ''The American Indian Probate Reform Act'', focusing on empowering Indian land owners.

SD–628

2:30 p.m.

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine Federal leased property, focusing on if Federal agencies are getting a bad deal.

SD–342

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

SEPTEMBER 7

10 a.m.

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 958, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program of payments to children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs, S. 1094, to reauthorize the Combating Autism Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–416), and any pending nominations.

SD–106

SEPTEMBER 21

2 p.m.

Judiciary

Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine Google, focusing on consumers and competition.

SD–226

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5155–S5199

Measures Introduced: Twelve bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1455–1466, S. Res. 247–249, and S. Con. Res. 27. **Pages S5191–92**

Measures Reported:

S. 277, to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care to veterans who were stationed at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, while the water was contaminated at Camp Lejeune, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 112–42)

S. 1458, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System. (S. Rept. No. 112–43)

S. 894, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2011, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans. (S. Rept. No. 112–44)

Page S5191

Measures Passed:

Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays: Senate passed S. 1466, to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays. **Pages S5197–99**

Consumer Product Safety Commission: Senate passed H.R. 2715, to provide the Consumer Product Safety Commission with greater authority and discretion in enforcing the consumer product safety laws.

Page S5199

House Messages:

Debt Limit Increase Bill: Senate continued consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 627, to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays, taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S5156–58, S5158–84**

Pending:

Reid motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill, with Reid Amendment No. 589, to cut spending, maintain existing commitments, and for other purposes.

Page S5156

Reid Amendment No. 590 (to Amendment No. 589), to change the enactment date. **Page S5156**

Reid motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on the Budget, with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 591, to change the enactment date. **Page S5156**

Reid Amendment No. 592 (to the instructions (Amendment No. 591) on the motion to refer), of a perfecting nature. **Page S5156**

Reid Amendment No. 593 (to Amendment No. 592), of a perfecting nature. **Page S5156**

Appointments:

United States Commission on Civil Rights: The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 98–183, as amended by Public Law 103–419, appointed the following individual to the United States Commission on Civil Rights:

David Kladney of Nevada vice Alice C. ''Dina'' Titus of Nevada. **Page S5199**

Debt Ceiling Bill—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that when the Chair lays before the body the House message to accompany S. 365, to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act, that the Majority Leader be recognized to move to concur in the House amendments; that the time until 12 p.m., Tuesday, August 2, 2011, be for debate on the motion to concur, equally divided, between the two Leaders, or their designees; at 12 p.m., Senate vote

on the Reid motion to concur; that the motion to concur be subject to a 60 vote threshold; and that no amendments, points of order or other motions be in order to the message prior to the vote.

Pages S5183

Messages from the House: Pages S5190–91

Measures Referred: Page S5191

Executive Communications: Page S5191

Executive Reports of Committees: Page S5191

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S5192–93

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S5193–97

Additional Statements: Pages S5189–90

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S5197

Privileges of the Floor: Page S5197

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 7:47 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, August 2, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5199.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Matthew G. Olsen, of Maryland, to be Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 75 public bills, H.R. 2715–2789; and 8 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 69–73; and H. Res. 385–387 were introduced. Pages H5882–85

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H5888–89

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 384, providing for consideration of the bill (S. 365) to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (H. Rept. 112–190) and

H.R. 1751, to amend the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 to require that weather radios be installed in all manufactured homes manufactured or sold in the United States (H. Rept. 112–191). Page H5882

Recess: The House recessed at 10:18 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. Page H5817

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 304 yeas to 115 nays with 1 voting "present", Roll No. 688.

Pages H5817, H5839–40

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to toll, during active-duty service abroad in the Armed Forces, the periods of time to file a petition and appear for an interview to remove the conditional basis for permanent resident status: H.R. 398, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to toll, during active-duty service abroad in the Armed Forces, the periods of time to file a petition and appear for an interview to remove the conditional basis for permanent resident status, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 426 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 684; Pages H5819–21, H5829–30

Amending the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the requirements for admission of nonimmigrant nurses in health professional shortage areas: H.R. 1933, amended, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the requirements for admission of nonimmigrant nurses in health professional shortage areas, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 407 yeas to 17 nays, Roll No. 685;

Pages H5821–22, H5830

Administrative Conference of the United States Reauthorization Act of 2011: H.R. 2480, amended, to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Administrative Conference of the United States for fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 382 yeas to 23 nays, Roll No. 691; and Pages H5822–23, H5867–68

Providing the Consumer Product Safety Commission with greater authority and discretion in enforcing the consumer product safety laws: H.R. 2715, to provide the Consumer Product Safety Commission with greater authority and discretion in enforcing the consumer product safety laws, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 421 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 683. Pages H5823–28, H5829

Recess: The House recessed at 1:10 p.m. and reconvened at 2:02 p.m. **Page H5828**

Call of the House: The Speaker called the House to order and ascertained the presence of a quorum (419 present, Roll No. 689). **Pages H5865–66**

Making a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002: The House passed S. 365, amended, to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, by a recorded vote of 269 ayes to 161 noes, Roll No. 690. **Pages H5831–39, H5840–66**

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in H. Rept. 112–190 shall be considered as adopted. **Page H5840**

H. Res. 384, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 249 yeas to 178 nays, Roll No. 687, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 242 yeas to 184 nays, Roll No. 686. **Pages H5831–39**

Privileged Resolution: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 70, correcting the enrollment of S. 365. **Page H5867**

Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Representative Smith (NJ), Chairman. **Page H5868**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow, August 2nd. **Page H5868**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Seven yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5829, H5829–30, H5830, H5838, H5839, H5839–40, H5866, H5867–68. There was one quorum call, Roll No. 689, which appears on pages H5865–66.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9.25 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee continue markup of H.R. 2189, the "Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2011". The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

TO MAKE A TECHNICAL AMENDMENT TO THE EDUCATION SCIENCES REFORM ACT OF 2002 (BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011)

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on S. 365, to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002. The Committee granted, by voice vote, a closed rule providing one hour of debate with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, 15 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 15 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution shall be considered as adopted. The rule provides that the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, AUGUST 2, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Business meeting to consider the nominations of Mark P. Wetjen, of Nevada, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and Brian T. Baenig, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Time to be announced, S–216, Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to receive a closed briefing on cyber issues, 2:30 p.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: To hold hearings to examine housing finance reform, focusing on national mortgage servicing standards, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: With the Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety, to hold joint hearings to examine a review of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) near-term task force recommendations for enhancing reactor safety in the 21st century, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Francis Joseph Ricciardone, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey, Norman L. Eisen, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Czech Republic, and Robert Stephen Ford, of Vermont, to be Ambassador to the Syrian Arab Republic, all of the Department of State, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: To hold hearings to examine health reform and health insurance premiums, focusing on empowering states to serve consumers, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Select Committee on Intelligence: To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of August 2 through August 6, 2011

Senate Chamber

On *Tuesday,* the Majority Leader is expected to make a motion to concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to S. 365, Debt Ceiling Bill, with a vote on the Reid motion to concur, at approximately 12 noon.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: August 2, business meeting to consider the nominations of Mark P. Wetjen, of Nevada, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and Brian T. Baenig, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Time to be announced, S–216, Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services: August 2, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to receive a closed briefing on cyber issues, 2:30 p.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: August 2, to hold hearings to examine housing finance reform, focusing on national mortgage servicing standards, 10 a.m., SD–538.

August 3, Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance and Investment, to hold hearings to examine the housing finance system, focusing on the to-be-announced market, 9:30 a.m., SD–538.

August 3, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection, to hold hearings to examine debt financing in the domestic financial sector, 2 p.m., SD–538.

August 4, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Richard Cordray, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, 2 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: August 3, Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests, to hold hearings to examine S. 1024, to designate the Organ Mountains and other public land as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System and the National Landscape Conservation System in the State of New Mexico, S. 1090, to designate as wilderness certain public land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee, S. 1144, to amend the Soda Ash Royalty Reduction Act of 2006 to extend the reduced royalty rate for soda ash, S. 1149, to expand geothermal production, and S. 1344, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to take immediate action to recover ecologically and economically from a catastrophic wildfire in the State of Arizona, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: August 2, with the Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety, to hold joint hearings to examine a review of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) near-term task force recommendations for enhancing reactor safety in the 21st century, 10 a.m., SD–406.

August 3, Subcommittee on Children's Health and Environmental Responsibility, to hold an oversight hearing to examine Federal actions to clean up contamination from uranium mining and milling operations, 2:30 p.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: August 3, to hold hearings to examine dually-eligible beneficiaries, focusing on improving care while lowering costs, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: August 2, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Francis Joseph Ricciardone, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey, Norman L. Eisen, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Czech Republic, and Robert Stephen Ford, of Vermont, to be Ambassador to the Syrian Arab Republic, all of the Department of State, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

August 3, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Wendy Ruth Sherman, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Political Affairs, and Robert Stephen Ford, of Vermont, to be Ambassador to the Syrian Arab Republic, both of the Department of State, 10 a.m., SD–419.

August 4, Subcommittee on African Affairs, to hold hearings to examine responding to drought and famine in the Horn of Africa, 2:15 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: August 2, to hold hearings to examine health reform and health insurance premiums, focusing on empowering states to serve consumers, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: August 3, business meeting to consider S. 1268, to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Government by providing for greater interagency experience among national security and homeland security personnel through the development of a national security and homeland security human capital strategy and interagency rotational service by employees, S. 1409, to intensify efforts to identify, prevent, and recover payment error, waste, fraud, and abuse within Federal spending, S. 743, to amend chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the disclosures of information protected from prohibited personnel practices, require a statement in nondisclosure policies, forms, and agreements that such policies, forms, and agreements conform with certain disclosure protections, provide certain authority for the Special Counsel, S. 1379, to amend title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, to revise certain administrative authorities of the District of Columbia courts, and to authorize the District of Columbia Public Defender Service to provide professional liability insurance for officers and employees

of the Service for claims relating to services furnished within the scope of employment with the Service, S. 1444, to provide for the presentation of a United States flag on behalf of Federal civilian employees who are killed while performing official duties or because of their status as Federal employees, S. 384, to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and the nominations of Mark D. Acton, of Kentucky, and Robert G. Taub, of New York, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission, 10 a.m., SD–342.

August 4, Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine Federal leased property, focusing on if Federal agencies are getting a bad deal, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: August 4, to hold an oversight hearing to examine ''The American Indian Probate Reform Act'', focusing on empowering Indian land owners, 2:15 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: August 3, to hold hearings to examine cybercrime, focusing on updating the ''Computer Fraud and Abuse Act'' to protect cyberspace and combat emerging threats, 10 a.m., SD–226.

August 4, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 657, to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, and the nominations of Morgan Christen, of Alaska, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Scott Wesley Skavdahl, to be United States District Judge for the District of Wyoming, Sharon L. Gleason, to be United States District Judge for the District of Alaska, Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, and Richard G. Andrews, to be United States District Judge for the District of Delaware, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: August 2, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

August 4, Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, August 3, Subcommittee on Rural Development, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture, hearing entitled Agricultural Program Audit: Examination of USDA Rural Development Programs, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

August 4, Subcommittee on Rural Development, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture, hearing to review the causes and consequences of government over-regulation of agricultural biotechnology, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Financial Services, August 3, Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity, hearing entitled ''Legislative Proposals to Determine the Future Role of FHA, RHS and GNMA in the Single- and Multi-Family Mortgage Markets, Part 2.'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

August 4, full Committee, hearing entitled ''Fixing the Watchdog: Legislative Proposals to Improve and Enhance the Securities and Exchange Commission,'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, August 2, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights, hearing on Hydrocephalus Treatment in Uganda: Leading the Way to Help Children, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, August 3, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, hearing entitled ''The Office on Violence Against Women at the U.S. Department of Justice.'' 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, August 3, full Committee, hearing on Impacts of the LightSquared Network on Federal Science Activities, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, August 3, full Committee, hearing entitled ''Innovative Approaches to Meeting the Workforce Needs of Small Businesses,'' 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

August 4, Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce, hearing entitled ''Helping Small Businesses Compete: Challenges within Programs Designed to Assist Small Contractors,.'' 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, August 3, Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures and Subcommittee on Oversight, joint hearing on the intersection of energy policy and tax policy, with a focus on the dual priorities of comprehensive tax reform and a sustainable energy policy that address our economic, security, and environmental needs, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

August 4, Subcommittee on Human Resources, hearing on the reauthorization of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, including how States engage recipients in work activities that move them toward self-sufficiency, 9 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, August 4, full Committee, hearing on Ongoing Intelligence Activities, 10 a.m., HVC–304. This is a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: August 2, to receive a briefing on Russian-United States cooperation in the fight against alcoholism, focusing on prospects for sharing experience, strength, and hope on treating alcoholism, 2 p.m., 2360, Rayburn Building.

Résumé of Congressional Activity

FIRST SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

EXECUTIVE DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 5 through July 31, 2011

	Senate	*House*	*Total*
Days in session	96	99	..
Time in session	679 hrs., 10′	668 hrs., 14′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	5,154	5,812	..
Extensions of Remarks	..	1,458	..
Public bills enacted into law	10	14	24
Private bills enacted into law	..	..	..
Bills in conference	2	2	..
Measures passed, total	209	207	416
Senate bills	20	8	..
House bills	16	82	..
Senate joint resolutions	3	3	..
House joint resolutions	2	4	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	11	3	..
House concurrent resolutions	9	13	..
Simple resolutions	148	94	..
Measures reported, total	*88	*165	253
Senate bills	57	2	..
House bills	3	101	..
Senate joint resolutions	1	..	..
House joint resolutions	..	2	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	2	..	..
House concurrent resolutions	..	2	..
Simple resolutions	25	58	..
Special reports	9	24	..
Conference reports	..	..	..
Measures pending on calendar	95	55	..
Measures introduced, total	1,749	3,239	4,988
Bills	1,454	2,714	..
Joint resolutions	23	74	..
Concurrent resolutions	26	68	..
Simple resolutions	246	383	..
Quorum calls	5	2	..
Yea-and-nay votes	122	162	..
Recorded votes	..	517	..
Bills vetoed	..	..	..
Vetoes overridden	..	..	..

*These figures include all measures reported, even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 41 reports have been filed in the Senate, a total of 189 reports have been filed in the House.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 5 through July 31, 2011

Civilian nominations, totaling 368, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	129
Unconfirmed	231
Withdrawn	8
Other Civilian nominations, totaling 1,540, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,070
Unconfirmed	465
Withdrawn	5
Air Force nominations, totaling 5,437, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,420
Unconfirmed	4,017
Army nominations, totaling 4,876, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	3,064
Unconfirmed	1,812
Navy nominations, totaling 2,143, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,325
Unconfirmed	818
Marine Corps nominations, totaling 1,248, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	636
Unconfirmed	612

Summary

Total nominations carried over from the First Session	0
Total nominations received this Session	15,612
Total confirmed	7,644
Total unconfirmed	7,955
Total withdrawn	13
Total returned to the White House	0

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Tuesday, August 2

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: The Majority Leader is expected to make a motion to concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to S. 365, Debt Ceiling Bill, with a vote on the Reid motion to concur, at approximately 12 noon.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Tuesday, August 2

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: The House will meet in pro forma session at 10 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Altmire, Jason, Pa., E1471
Andrews, Robert E., N.J., E1465
Bilbray, Brian P., Calif., E1469
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E1461, E1465, E1472
Boustany, Charles W., Jr., La., E1468
Brady, Kevin, Tex., E1480
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E1479
Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E1463
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E1466
Cardoza, Dennis A., Calif., E1459
Carter, John R., Tex., E1459
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E1480
Costa, Jim, Calif., E1469
Davis, Geoff, Ky., E1460
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E1460, E1462, E1464, E1467
Ellison, Keith, Minn., E1470
Foxx, Virginia, N.C., E1460
Gallegly, Elton, Calif., E1465
Gardner, Cory, Colo., E1479
Gingrey, Phil, Ga., E1481
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1463
Heinrich, Martin, N.M., E1461
Honda, Michael M., Calif., E1460, E1472
Inslee, Jay, Wash., E1478, E1482
Jackson, Jesse L., Jr., Ill., E1473, E1474
Keating, William R., Mass., E1471
King, Steve, Iowa, E1460, E1463, E1465, E1467, E1473
Lummis, Cynthia M., Wyo., E1462
McCarthy, Kevin, Calif., E1464, E1472
McDermott, Jim, Wash., E1468
McGovern, James P., Mass., E1470
McMorris Rodgers, Cathy, Wash., E1463
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1466, E1469, E1471, E1476
Manzullo, Donald A., Ill., E1478
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1477
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E1477, E1482
Paul, Ron, Tex., E1476
Peters, Gary C., Mich., E1468, E1471
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1467, E1469, E1471
Richardson, Laura, Calif., E1481
Schmidt, Jean, Ohio, E1478
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E1473, E1477
Shimkus, John, Ill., E1459
Shuler, Heath, N.C., E1461
Smith, Adam, Wash., E1481
Stearns, Cliff, Fla., E1459
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E1459, E1461
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E1470
Wasserman Schultz, Debbie, Fla., E1466
Wilson, Frederica S., Fla., E1476
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E1464, E1473, E1479
McMorris Rodgers, Cathy, Wash., E1463

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.