United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2011 No. 141

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 21, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM MCCLINTOCK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

PAY A FAIR SHARE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, I was initially very supportive of the President's proposed Buffett tax based on the premise that no millionaire or billionaire should pay a lower tax rate than a checkout clerk at the Albertsons supermarket or a small business owner who only earns $40,000 a year. It seemed fair to me. But, you know, then I started listening to the Republican response, and it's pretty heavy and it really gives you pause to think about whether or not this is a good idea for our country. It's class warfare. It will hurt job creation. You know, these are arguments. It won't raise money. These are arguments that certainly are very, very telling.

In fact, I have some direct quotes from one Representative: ''This is really the Dr. Kevorkian plan for our economy. It will kill jobs, kill businesses, and yes, kill even the higher tax revenues that these suicidal tax increasers hope to gain.''

Another Representative: ''Class warfare may win political campaigns, but it doesn't spur economic growth. Raising the capital gains tax may garner political capital, but it will not create any jobs.''

And then, finally, of course: ''When are we going to get it? We do not have a revenue problem in this Congress; we have a spending problem.''

Those are heavy criticisms. And just think if they proved true what a disaster it would be for America. Now, of course, these criticisms were all leveled in 1993, the last time we had a Democratic President propose that millionaires and billionaires should pay a fair rate of taxes in this country.

The first one was from Representative Christopher Cox, a total idiot who ran the Securities and Exchange Commission while Wall Street gambled our economy into the tank. He said the part about killing jobs, and we wouldn't get jobs and we wouldn't get higher revenues.

Well, actually, with the Clinton tax increases, we did get higher revenues, we did balance the budget, we did pay off debt, and we had 3.8 percent unemployment. And we were asking the job creators, the millionaires and billionaires, to pay a fair share. I guess Chris was wrong.

Well, let's see, the second one was from former Representative Pryce of Ohio about political capital not creating any jobs. Well, we already addressed that. We had 3.8 percent unemployment.

What have they done to create a single job so far this year? Nothing. In fact, they eliminated jobs. But, you know, that's because we want to give the job creators a break. We don't want to tax them, all to protect tax cuts.

And then, finally, the final quote about we don't have a revenue problem; we have a spending problem is from then Representative BOEHNER, now Speaker BOEHNER.

Now, of course, our taxes are at 15 percent of our gross domestic product, considerably lower than the percent of taxes that were levied in the Reagan era. And, you know, we do have a revenue problem, $5 trillion of tax cuts over the last decade, $5 trillion, 5 thousand billion dollars of tax cuts, heavily oriented toward the job creators—the millionaires and the billionaires.

Where are the jobs? Where are the jobs?

It doesn't work. First it was 8 years of Bush tax cuts, then 2 years of Bush-Obama tax cuts, and now we have President Obama's further proposed tax cuts.

Tax cuts don't create jobs.

Now, I think, actually, now I have considered their arguments, the President's right. Billionaire hedge fund speculators on Wall Street, let's think about it. Their rate of taxation is 15 percent on billions of dollars of income. A small business owner, $50,000 a year, whoa, more than twice that. Army captain, just back from defending America in Afghanistan, whoa, more than twice that.

Who gives more value to this society, the parasite on Wall Street who is speculating and driving up the price of our fuel and making billions of dollars doing it or the Army captain or the small business owner, the real job creators?

We can, by levying a fair rate of taxes on the millionaires and billionaires under the Buffett tax—the best

Printed on recycled paper.

investor in this country, who thinks this is the direction we should go—we can both create jobs, stabilize the economy, get down the deficit, and continue to fund critical programs. Ironically, in the grand deal that was adopted back here a month ago that I voted against, there was only one specified cut, one cut specified in that bill—graduate student financial aid. That's because at the country club they don't meet anybody who can't put their kids through medical school.

We need doctors. We need other professionals. We need to help the next generation succeed, education and infrastructure investment, and we need money to help pay for it.

GENERAL AVIATION

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to talk about how our President has systematically and relentlessly attacked the general aviation industry.

You know, this is one of the few last great manufacturing gems left in America. It creates $1.2 million jobs—the gentleman before me was speaking about jobs—1.2 million jobs in America and $150 billion worth of income and a tremendous amount of exports.

This industry is enormously important to my district, but not just my district, the air capital of the world, but all across the country. These are good jobs. These are middle class jobs. They are jobs for machinists and welders and riveters and managers and purchasing people who make some of the finest airplanes in the world.

But instead of supporting the general aviation industry and welcoming those jobs, the President has attacked it. At the very least, he could just leave it alone. But this is part of his larger class warfare effort.

He demonizes general aviation users. He calls them corporate fat-cat jet owners at every turn. But it's not impacting the folks who use those as business tools; it's impacting the people who build these airplanes. They are productive. They are working to grow their businesses, and they are growing jobs.

His rhetoric kills sales of American manufactured goods and, with them, the jobs that are created when those airplanes are built. You know, he has attacked it in multiple ways.

Most recently the Department of Transportation issued something called BARR. It's a program which has long ensured basic privacy rights for general aviation users by allowing them to opt out of being tracked by everybody with an Internet connection. But on August 2, the FAA changed that rule and said, no, now anyone with an Internet connection can find out and violate the privacy rights of anybody who decides to fly in an airplane all across the country unless they specifically opt out and can state a valid security threat.

This is an unprecedented step. It will facilitate serious violations of privacy, and it doesn't help create jobs in America.

I have introduced a piece of legislation called the BARR Preservation Act, along with Kansas Senator PAT ROBERTS, and I would urge my colleagues to support that legislation. It will create jobs in America.

Now the President most recently announced, as part of his efforts to reduce the deficit, user fees on general aviation aircraft, over $100 per flight, not to mention the enormous bureaucracy it will take to collect this set of taxes. At a time when America has got unemployment of one in six or more, it's no time to add taxes on folks who are trying to fly their airplane around this country to get from Topeka to Des Moines, to get to small towns to support American manufacturing. This President wants to put taxes on general aviation users.

□ 1010

Finally, let me just talk for a moment about the taxes and the rhetoric. Mr. President, this industry is not asking for a handout. This President mistakes hardworking people for folks who are looking for something from the Federal Government. All we ask is to be left alone. We don't want the bailouts that the city of Detroit received and that the automotive folks received. We're not asking for tax favoritism. All we're asking is that you respect the hardworking people of Kansas and all across America who build the finest airplanes in the world. This is, Mr. Speaker, failed leadership.

We have $4 trillion in additional debt and a loss of 2 million jobs under this President. Don't give us a bailout; don't give us a handout. We don't want special favors. Simply leave us alone to grow and create good, middle class, hardworking people's jobs right in Kansas and right in America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

LACEY ACT PROTECTS AMERICAN JOBS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last week in a speech before the Economic Club of Washington, Speaker BOEHNER used this tried and true Republican applause line: ''Excessive regulations are making it harder for our economy to create jobs.'' But then he followed up with a real-life example. ''Last month, Federal agents raided Gibson Guitar factories in Tennessee. Gibson is a well-respected American company that employs thousands of people. The company's costs were $2 million to $3 million. Why? Because Gibson bought wood overseas to make guitars in America. Seriously.''

Well, seriously, Mr. Speaker, you were seriously—well, not necessarily you, I know you can't write all of your speeches, but you were done a disservice by your speech writers who could have done a little more research about the background of what was happening there. The Federal Government was involved with enforcing the Lacey Act which actually makes it easier to protect American jobs and manufacture here at home.

In 2008, I was pleased to be part of leading an effort working with the Bush administration in a bipartisan fashion to amend the Lacey Act, which bars trade in illegally harvested species to include trade in illegally harvested timber. Illegal logging threatens some of the world's richest and most vulnerable forests, but more important, it threatens tens of thousands of jobs right here in the United States. Over 50 trade associations, nonprofits, and unions representing the entire range of the U.S. economy signed statements supporting this amendment to the Lacey Act and its proper implementation.

This is serious business. People who cheat by knowingly using wood products that are bought illegally overseas cost American jobs. The estimate was over $1 billion every year in lost opportunities and lower prices because of the illegal logging. We wanted to increase American jobs here at home, so we created a mechanism so that people would have an incentive to stop cheating, to stop competing unfairly against American businesses that are following the rules.

It's interesting to note that in 2009 when Gibson was first brought to the attention of the enforcement agencies and a process started, because of concerns that they may have taken illegal timber from Madagascar, on the floor of the House, over 400 Representatives voted in favor of a resolution I had condemning illegal logging in Madagascar.

We find there are people right here in the United States who understand this dynamic. The success of the Lacey Act rests on a simple principle: rewarding companies that follow the law while shedding light on bad actors. It ensures that American business using foreign wood, like guitar makers, pay attention to the sources of their wood. We had very powerful testimonies of what happens in illegal logging. It doesn't just destroy fragile ecosystems and threaten a scarce and dwindling supply of rare species of wood, it destabilizes those countries. The people who are engaged in the traffic of illegal timber threaten, they corrupt, and sometimes they kill. It is possible to figure this out. People need to pay attention.

Guitar makers like C.F. Martin Guitar are strongly supportive of the law. I quote: ''I think the Lacey Act is a wonderful thing. I think illegal logging is appalling,'' the company's CEO,

Chris Martin, said in a recent interview. ''It should stop, and if this is what it takes to stop unscrupulous operators, I'm all for it.''

Mr. Speaker, this is serious business. Being able to have protections to protect American manufacturers from unfair competition by people who skirt the rules, people who cheat, is in everybody's interest. Let's let the process ongoing right now work its way out. Let's see if there's a problem. But by all means, we ought to protect the integrity of the Lacey Act, which is designed to save these tens of thousands of jobs here at home and the environment abroad.

CREATING JOBS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) for 2 minutes.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to emphasize one more time that the Federal Government doesn't create jobs; it's small businesses and entrepreneurs. You just heard my friend talk about Gibson Guitar and vilify Gibson Guitar because they purchased wood from a foreign operator, an operator that violated a law of another country and brought that wood to America for Gibson Guitar, one of the oldest American producers of guitars today. Gibson Guitar employs people in America. Gibson Guitar has done things that may be reprehensible to some. Obviously to those who are employed by that company, it's not.

As we move along, you know, we need to remember what jobs are created by small manufacturers. What is the Federal Government supposed to do? This Federal Government not only raided Gibson Guitar, told them to close down their lines, laid people off from work—or hey, they have a better idea: Why don't you just move your operation to another country? That's what this administration's message is to manufacturers and the job creators in America. If you don't like it, just go ahead and move to another country. Take those jobs and give it to someone else other than Americans.

I think we are wrongheaded in our approach. We look at regulations as an end-all to everything, just not commonsense solutions. When we talk about creating jobs in America, I have gone across my district, and I ask the job creators, the small businesses: What can we do in D.C. to help you?

And they said: Mr. Congressman, just get out of our way. Allow us to do the things that we need to do to create jobs here in America.

□ 1020

THE TRAIN ACT

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the House this week will take up a bill called the TRAIN Act. The acronym stands for Transparency and Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation. It is quite a mouthful, but what it's going to do, very specifically, is delay the implementation of two very important Clean Air Act standards that protect human health and the environment. Now, we can have a lot of arguments about proper regulation, which ones are good and which ones are bad, but can we really argue about the necessity of taking appropriate action to protect the air we breathe?

The Clean Air Act has been very successful in improving air quality around this country. Obviously, much more needs to be done. But the two provisions that are under attack by the so-called TRAIN Act are:

One regulation that regulates cross-State air pollution. Now, if you live in one State and there is a coal-burning plant in another State, the law of air motion means that the pollution is going to follow the path that the air travels, and people in a State that are on the receiving end of polluted air ought to have some protection. This has a significant impact on health. It is not as though you can have appropriate regulatory safety without having the Federal Government have some role, since air does travel according to the law of physics, not according to an act of Congress.

A second provision is the power plant emissions of mercury limitation. Mercury is a known carcinogen. It is extremely dangerous to our health, particularly that of infants. And the success that we've had in limiting mercury pollution has had dramatic impacts—positive impacts—on our health. Why? Why would we delay the implementation of a mercury regulation that is going to have significant and immediate benefit?

There may be some cost to this; that's true. But what about the cost in lives? What about the cost in health care expenditures by allowing pollution to occur?

When we do something and price it cheaply by ignoring what the external impacts of allowing something to be theoretically cheap, in the terms of lives lost, in terms of health care expenses incurred, we're not saving anybody money. We're making some money for the owners of the polluting entity, but we are not making money for society, and we are certainly not protecting it.

We have to have careful regulation. We should always be willing to look at them to get rid of things that don't make sense and aren't getting the job done, but we also need proper regulation. And when it comes to health and safety, clean air and mercury, those are two provisions that should not be delayed. This legislation would do that. It's harmful to our health, and it will be harmful to our economy.

HONORING SENATOR MALCOLM WALLOP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heart that is both heavy and full of pride. On September 14, former U.S. Senator Malcolm Wallop passed away at the age of 78. Senator Wallop brought to the Congress his considerable influence, outspoken conservatism, and keen intelligence. The word ''statesman'' only begins to scratch the surface of Malcolm Wallop's accomplishments.

After serving in the Wyoming Legislature for several terms, Malcolm Wallop was elected to the United States Senate in 1976, a seat he held for 18 years. In the Senate, he served on numerous committees. He was the ranking member of Energy and Natural Resources and was the first nonlawyer in the history of the Senate to serve on the Judiciary Committee.

His efforts on the Judiciary Committee led to the enactment of the first international parental kidnapping statute, protecting children from being abducted overseas by noncustodial parents.

Through his work on Finance, Congress cut inheritance and gift taxes in 1981, which, among other things, ensured that ranching families could continue their operations upon the death of a family business partner.

He was also a tireless promoter of free trade, making new numerous trips abroad to promote GATT to reduce tariff barriers.

Due to his service on the Intelligence and Armed Services Committees, Senator Wallop served on the Helsinki Commission, which was charged with negotiating a number of complex arms control treaties, including SALT I, II, and III. Senator Wallop was one of the first persons outside of the old Soviet Union to meet with Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn while he was still a prisoner in the gulag.

In the Cowboy State, Senator Wallop was a champion of protecting the western way of life, including an amendment to the 1980 Clean Water Act prohibiting Federal usurpation of State water rights and an amendment to the Surface Mining Control Act that directed the Federal Government to compensate owners of mineral rights for the loss of the right to mine.

Senator Wallop was one of the first legislators to lead the charge against the ''War on the West,'' which subordinated States' rights and severely limited multiple use of our public lands. In 1984, the Republican Senator partnered with Democrat John Breaux of Louisiana to author the Wallop-Breaux Sport Fishing Restoration Act to promote boat safety and fish habitat conservation along with enhancing fishing opportunities, including those for the handicapped.

Senator Wallop was also committed to education and volunteerism. In 1979,

Congress passed his legislation establishing the Congressional Award Program, which is privately funded and is the only volunteer award given in the name of Congress. Wyoming is proud to have the most active participation in that program.

Upon his retirement from Congress, Senator Wallop founded Frontiers of Freedom, a conservative think tank promoting freedom, fewer Federal regulations, and smaller government.

He was a man of supreme integrity, incredible intellect and a quick wit, humble to a fault and exceedingly kind. I am told he always had time to ask a Capitol Hill elevator operator or police officer about their family on his way to a vote. He had a tremendously devoted staff, many of whom worked for him for the full 18 years of his tenure in the Senate.

Finally, Malcolm Wallop was the descendent of an entrepreneurial pioneer family who had roots in Wyoming and the British Isles as well. Senator Wallop's grandfather served not only in England's Parliament but the Wyoming Legislature. The first polo field in the United States was built on the Wallop family ranch at Big Horn, Wyoming.

Senator Wallop was a man blessed with four wonderful children, many grandchildren, and his wife, Isabel. My thoughts and prayers are with his family. In their time of sadness, let them be comforted in the knowledge that Wyoming stands strong today because of Senator Wallop's untiring love of, and commitment to, our great State.

GOOD RIDDANCE TO ''DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL''

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a truly historic day in our country's struggle for equal rights for all people. Leaders of the United States Army sent a notice to soldiers serving around the globe that simply said the following: ''Today marks the end of 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell.' The law is repealed. From this day forward, gay and lesbian soldiers may serve in our Army with the dignity and respect they deserve. Our rules, regulations, and politics will apply uniformly without regard to sexual orientation, which is a personal and private matter.''

Mr. Speaker, 18 years after this hideous policy was first implemented, it is now gone. And the thousands of soldiers who were shamefully discharged under Don't Ask, Don't Tell may apply for reenlistment.

To the men and women whose service and sacrifice have made us so proud, we say, as of yesterday: ''You no longer have to live a lie.'' To them, we say: ''You no longer have to choose between your personhood and your patriotism.'' To them, who have had the courage to do right by America, we now say: ''Your Nation now has the courage to do what is right by you.''

Air Force Lieutenant Josh Seefried, a leader among gay and lesbian servicemembers, describes the oppressive nature of this policy in this way. He said: ''It consumes your thought process, it consumes your future, because of the fear of getting caught.''

Mr. Speaker, it is incomprehensible to me that anyone—in particular, brave, selfless members of our military—should live any day in fear of ''getting caught.'' This step is hugely welcomed, and it is long overdue.

□ 1030

''Don't ask, don't tell'' was opposed by an overwhelming majority of Americans because it violated the values we claim to stand for as a Nation. It was not only tearing at our moral fabric; it was undermining our military readiness and national security as well. At a time when we're asking so much of our servicemembers, putting them on the front lines of two wars, we owe them, at the very least, and we have finally brought them the dignity of a discrimination-free workplace.

I salute President Obama, and I salute our military brass for their leadership in reversing this injustice. I salute the Members of Congress, Democrat and Republican, who voted for the repeal. And of course we all owe a debt of gratitude to those who serve with honor and integrity, those who defended American rights and freedoms even when America wouldn't afford them the same rights and freedoms.

So, Mr. Speaker, now there will be no sanctioned bigotry or homophobia in the Armed Forces of the greatest country on Earth. Our military will accept everyone who demonstrates their fitness to serve. Their sexuality will be irrelevant. They may be as open about it or as discreet about it as they choose.

Good riddance to ''don't ask, don't tell.'' Our country will be stronger, safer, and fairer without it. And while we support our troops by eliminating this wrong-minded policy, let's take the next step and support all of our troops, regardless of their sexual orientation, by bringing them home from Iraq and Afghanistan.

PUERTO RICO INVESTMENT PROMOTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, the coming months represent a defining moment for our Nation. Responsible leaders from both political parties understand that we must come together on behalf of the American people to create jobs for millions of unemployed workers and to put our Nation on the path to fiscal stability.

President Obama has transmitted the American Jobs Act to Congress, and I hope its key components will be enacted into law. The supercommittee has begun its work of proposing responsible ways to grow our economy while reducing our deficits. The work that lies ahead will not be easy, but it must be done.

With this as backdrop, I rise this morning to discuss the Puerto Rico Investment Promotion Act, which I will introduce tomorrow. The bill is designed to attract investment to Puerto Rico and to create jobs on the island, where the unemployment rate over the last decade has consistently stood six to eight percentage points above the national average. At the same time, the bill seeks to generate new revenue for the Federal Government and to encourage job-creating investment in the 50 States, where unemployment now exceeds 9 percent.

This bill is endorsed by Puerto Rico's Governor, Luis Fortuno, the leaders of Puerto Rico's two main political parties, and the island's business community.

At the outset, it is important to explain why I'm promoting legislation of this sort. Like the States, the U.S. territory of Puerto Rico faces serious economic challenges. However, the economic problems of Puerto Rico have proven to be structural and chronic, not cyclical and temporary.

I believe that Puerto Rico's economy will never unleash its tremendous potential under its current political status. And I support statehood for the island in part because history shows that every territory that joins the union experiences substantial increases in its economic activity and standard of living. However, until a majority of Puerto Rico's people express a desire for statehood and Congress welcomes the island as a full member of the American family, it is incumbent upon me to take all reasonable steps to strengthen the island's economy within the severe constraints imposed by the current territorial status.

My aspiration for Puerto Rico is that it will enjoy the political, social, and economic equality that only statehood offers; and I look forward to the day when it will no longer be necessary for Puerto Rico's leaders to petition the U.S. Congress for customized, island-specific legislation to encourage job-creating investment, and to compensate—at least somewhat—for the countless ways in which our political status does damage to our people. But until that day arrives, we must be as pragmatic about the present as we are hopeful about the future.

To explain the bill, a little background is in order. Currently, nearly all of the large U.S. firms that conduct business in Puerto Rico are organized as controlled foreign corporations, CFCs. A CFC's earnings are not subject to any Federal taxation until they're distributed, usually in the form of a dividend, to its U.S. parent, a process known as repatriation. CFCs in Puerto Rico and in foreign countries have little incentive to repatriate because

those earnings, once received by the parent, are subject to full Federal taxation. As a result, billions of dollars in CFC earnings remain in foreign banks, where they generate no Federal revenue and create no American jobs.

My legislation seeks to integrate Puerto Rico companies into the U.S. tax system. It would authorize, but not require, companies that are incorporated in Puerto Rico and that earn at least 50 percent of their income on the island to operate as domestic U.S. companies. The bill would promote consistency and uniformity by bringing the treatment of an electing Puerto Rico company in line with the current treatment of a Puerto Rico individual under section 933 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Specifically, an electing company would be subject to Federal taxation on its worldwide income, except on the income it earns in Puerto Rico. Because it is a domestic rather than a foreign firm, the Puerto Rico corporation could distribute its earnings to its U.S. parent in the form of a dividend under section 243 of the Tax Code, which allows the parent to deduct a substantial amount of a dividend, depending on the parent's ownership stake in the subsidiary. Therefore, profits that were previously kept outside of the United States are now more likely to be brought back into this country, where they may be subject to a reduced, but still meaningful, level of taxation under section 243 and used to create jobs in America.

Moreover, as I already noted, under this legislation, electing corporations that have income derived from sources outside Puerto Rico—whether in the States or foreign countries—would become subject to Federal taxation on that income. This will generate additional revenue for the U.S. Treasury, since CFCs with non-Puerto Rico-source income currently pay no Federal tax on that income.

I hope my colleagues will support this bill.

This legislation is a substantial improvement over earlier proposals put forward by leaders in Puerto Rico with the goal of encouraging job-creating investment on the Island. Those proposals were carefully considered by the Federal Government and were met with resistance, even by Members of Congress and other Federal officials sensitive to Puerto Rico's unique circumstances. The primary shortcoming of those proposals is that they sought benefits without burdens. My legislation, by contrast, is balanced. It would benefit both Puerto Rico and our Nation. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support it.

REBUILD THE AMERICAN DREAM JOBS FRAMEWORK

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, this summer I took part in the Speak Out for Good Jobs Now! Rebuild the American Dream tour. Thousands of concerned Americans packed rooms across this country to share their stories of hardship, unemployment, and struggle. From these stories, my colleagues in the Congressional Progressive Caucus and I wrote the Rebuild the American Dream Jobs Framework, which outlines how we will put America back to work and get our economy moving again. I wanted to take some time today to share some of the stories and realities that we heard on this tour.

My first story is from Kimberly Lawrence from my State of Arizona. She says, ''I waited more than 30 years to finally receive a modest inheritance from my grandmother's property. I used the money to make improvements on my home that my husband and I were buying, and to open my own childcare business. It happened that the year I opened is the same year the economy failed. I struggled to hold on, but when the new Governor of Arizona stripped away childcare subsidies and at the same time raised licensing fees by 200 percent, I lost nearly all of my clientele.

''I lived in a town that relied on hospitality jobs, which, coupled with all else, crippled the local economy and forced me out of business. My husband was laid off from his cabinet-maker job. And now, after struggling, our home is in foreclosure and set for auction. Everything I hoped for had finally taken shape, just to be ripped away. I have since left my husband and am now searching for a job in California. I have been applying and sending resumes for 6 months now and have had only two interviews. I am 50 years old, sleeping on my sister's couch, with nothing to look forward to in my retirement. I suppose I simply won't have that pleasure.''

The next story comes from Bhisma Ramdass of Florida:

''I live in Palm Beach County. I work for the largest hospital corporation in the world. I also had another job to make ends meet.

□ 1040

''I had a daughter that was born premature. The economy got bad. I lost money from the other job. Took time off to care for my wife and baby. Unable to make full payments to Chase for the mortgage, they eventually foreclosed my home. My wife and three girls moved out. Chase got money from the Federal Government for my house, and they got my house. Do I owe them money if they sell my house for less than I owe? Is that fair? I have worked hard since I was 15 years old. I have provided for my family and gladly pay my taxes. Is that fair?''

The final story is also from Arizona, Thom Reiser:

''I'm retired and moderately well off financially. I've been doing a great deal of research on the economy and the history of these United States. I believe the middle class has suffered very much in the past 30 years. There's been a great shift of wealth. However, my greatest concern is for the present economy. We need to put people back to work. A second stimulus is needed, but aimed directly at the jobless. Much of these funds should be given to states for immediate relief. Teachers, police, firefighters, and many others have lost their jobs, plus others that have to create jobs and infrastructure on our roads. Also, those unemployed should be retrained to do useful work while they're unemployed. Thank you for listening.''

The American people are demanding we do something to get America back to work. These were just three of the stories we heard. I hope that we listened, and I hope that all of Congress listened. The urgency is jobs. The demand from the American people is jobs. And our responsibility is to provide the American people with the opportunities of employment and a secure future.

THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY AND ISRAEL

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge President Obama to take a strong stance against the Palestinian Authority's efforts to seek unilateral recognition for statehood from the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, Israel is our ally, an ally that has proven, time and again, a devotion to freedom, democracy, peace, and economic stability. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, Israel is our greatest ally in the turbulent Middle East, and we need to support their efforts to resolve their issues with the Palestinians. The President must show that America is resolute in support of Israel and that he is determined that we find real solutions for peace in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, solutions between Israel and the Palestinians will come through good-faith negotiations and cooperation. Solutions and peace come through both sides sitting at the table with equal determination to reach an agreement.

I hope that the President realizes all of this, and that he will show America's support for Israel and be a strong voice for peace reached through negotiations and partnership. The President should make clear to the Palestinian Authority that the way to a bright and stable future for the Palestinian people will be through talking to Israel, not unilaterally seeking statehood through the U.N.

I urge all of my colleagues in this House and the Members of the Senate to join me in this call.

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 43 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Judith Wright, First Parish Unitarian Universalist Church, Northborough, Massachusetts, offered the following prayer:

We gather this afternoon, a rich tapestry of faith woven together by diverse religious and spiritual beliefs.

In the midst of this theological diversity, may we choose acceptance and love towards one another and strive to live harmoniously and respectfully with all people of our great country and all living beings on our fragile, cherished planet.

May that which guides us towards the highest within ourselves lead us on this precious day, as well as every day of our lives, to embrace compassion, love, and equity in all relations.

May we respect the inherent worth and dignity of every person and grasp our profound interconnectedness with all.

May we ceaselessly help those who suffer, for as they suffer, so do we.

May people everywhere live in peace with each other and all living creatures without disturbing one another.

In the name of all that is holy.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. MCGOVERN 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND JUDITH WRIGHT

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Reverend Judith E. Wright, who is serving as the House guest chaplain today.

For the past 9 years, Reverend Wright has served as the minister of the First Parish Unitarian Universalist Church in Northborough, Massachusetts. During this time, Reverend Wright has played an integral role in our community, engaging her parishioners and encouraging their support for vital safety net programs in central Massachusetts.

Under her leadership, the First Parish has directly supported many social action programs, including the Community Meals Program and Habitat for Humanity. As we continue to emerge from a damaging recession, it is more important than ever to encourage support for these organizations that assist our neighbors by helping to provide food for those who are hungry and shelter for those who are homeless.

Reverend Wright's dedication to assisting the most vulnerable members of our community is laudable, and I am deeply inspired by her work to better the lives of the people of central Massachusetts.

It is one of Reverend Wright's parishioners, Stephanie Sullivan, who first approached my office about the possibility of Reverend Wright serving as the guest chaplain. Stephanie's profound respect and admiration for the work of Reverend Wright motivated me to nominate her to serve as our guest chaplain today.

I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Reverend Wright to the Chamber and in celebrating her lifetime of service.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

ONE YEAR LATER, PIRATES ON THE LAKE NOT PROSECUTED

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it's been almost a year since David Hartley was gunned down by Zeta pirates on Falcon Lake in Texas. The Hartley family still has no suspect, no body, and no justice. David's wife, Tiffany, can't get any answers from our government since it apparently has abandoned the investigation of her husband's murder, so she has actually sued the government to get information.

When ICE Agent Jaime Zapata was murdered in Mexico, the United States quickly pressured Mexico to investigate the homicide, as it should. But why is our government silent about finding who is responsible for killing David Hartley and other Americans murdered in lawless Mexico?

On Monday, at a border forum I held in Brownsville, Texas, Tiffany Hartley said: ''The men who murdered David are right across the river. They aren't in Afghanistan; they aren't in Iraq. They're in our own backyard.''

The United States hunts down terrorists around the globe. It's time we hold Mexico accountable for finding the narcoterrorists in their country who murder Americans.

And that's just the way it is.

THE END OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the end of the military's Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy. For 18 years, it forced thousands of servicemen and -women from our Armed Forces and discouraged countless other patriotic Americans from enlisting. The policy weakened our military by removing highly skilled, trained, and capable servicemembers from the ranks at a time when we were sending our men and women in uniform on multiple deployments to fight two wars.

Today, our country is stronger because we all benefit from a military that takes advantage of all the talents our Nation has to offer.

This policy ended because of the work of many, including my predecessor, Congressman Marty Meehan, who introduced the first bill in the House of Representatives to repeal this policy.

Our servicemen and -women are, first and foremost, Americans protecting freedom throughout the world. Today, at last, all these brave people no longer have to hide who they are in order to serve their country.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND ISRAEL

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, Israel is America's best and only reliable ally in the Middle East. Now the national security of Israel is being threatened by the Palestinians' rejection of the Oslo Peace Accords as they seek recognition directly from the United Nations.

America stands firmly with Israel and believes that peace in the Middle East can only be achieved through a negotiated solution.

I call on the Palestinian Authority to make peace with the democracy of Israel and the free world and to reject the terrorists of Hamas.

Prime Minister Netanyahu should be applauded for his efforts to restart direct, one-on-one negotiations with

President Abbas without the influence of outside organizations.

Today, President Abbas should abandon Palestine's push for a vote on statehood and reengage with Israel to forge a lasting peace accord.

REPEAL OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today under the dome of our Nation's Capitol to applaud the final repeal of the discriminatory policy known as Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

The men and women who fight for our country as members of our Armed Forces fight for what's right, what's fair, and what's just. They fight without asking at what cost, without asking why and how long they must endure.

This September 11 marked 10 years since that fateful day when our country was attacked. As I returned home from Chicago, boarded my plane and landed safely in Washington, I marveled at the dome that still sat, untouched by those who would do us harm, because of those who had no fear, those who gave their last full measure of devotion.

And today, I'm emboldened further by the fact that these same soldiers who have continued to fight and die for our safety can now do so without having to hide who they are or who they love. Our soldiers fight for what's right, what's fair, and what's just. Finally, we have managed to provide the same to them.

□ 1210

NO NEW TAXES

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's plans to raise taxes on small business across America will hurt the economy and kill jobs. Small business creates 70 percent of the jobs in America. Unemployment is 9 percent in the country and even higher in my State of Florida.

The threat of a double-dip recession is greater than ever. The last thing we should be doing is raising taxes on job creators.

The White House claims the $1.6 trillion tax increase won't affect small businesses and jobs. But as someone that's been in business 30 years and created thousands of jobs, they're wrong.

Millions of small businesses file their individual taxes through an individual tax code, and that means that their taxes will go up. In fact, 48 percent of small business income will face higher tax rates under the President's plan.

We need to enact pro-growth policies that create jobs, not kill them. I urge my colleagues to reject the administration's tax hikes on job creators.

DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL REPEAL

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to note that the sun indeed came up in America today even after we've allowed people who are gay and lesbian to serve in our military.

We had a discussion for about 18 years, and now we have finally taken a step forward to liberty and freedom and equality again as we have so many times in American history.

Now we need to make sure that those new families that are serving in the military get their benefits like everyone else, and that's the next thing we need to work on.

Then we have to realize that the day will come when we recognize full marriage equality in this great country as another step forward just like we had yesterday. And when that great day comes, the sun will come up in the morning in America because we were continuing our quest to be a more just, more equal society.

NEW TAXES WILL NOT CREATE NEW JOBS

(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, raising taxes on hardworking American families in this economy will not create new jobs. The President already explained that raising taxes in a down economy does not make sense.

Washington's financial problems are not caused by a shortage of revenue. Washington's financial problems are a direct result of skyrocketing wasteful spending such as $16 muffins for the DOJ. Promises like the failed stimulus bill have been revealed as empty slogans, failing the promise of holding unemployment below 8 percent. Twenty-five million Americans are still seeking full-time jobs.

The best way to promote jobs is to offer solutions focused on getting Americans back to work. Providing certainty with regard to tax reform while easing the burden of unnecessary regulations will enable job creators to hire once again.

House Republicans have sought to achieve this goal by passing legislation aimed at cutting redtape involved with running small businesses. Reforms are being blocked by liberals with the threat of a Presidential veto.

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

REPEAL OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the end of a shameful and discriminatory policy, the policy of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, and to honor our brave military men and women who have served under it for almost two decades.

As Thomas Jefferson wrote in our Declaration of Independence, ''Our country was conceived on the promise that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.''

Through nearly two-and-a-half centuries, these words have guided our Nation and made our society even more free. Repealing Don't Ask, Don't Tell is one more step towards full equality, but there is still so much work to be done.

Regrettably, because of the Defense of Marriage Act, servicemembers will continue to face disparities for family programs and benefits even though they've made the same sacrifices as their fellow members of the armed services. This is not right. Let us be guided by the words of Thomas Jefferson and provide these men and women with the benefits they've earned in service to our country.

I commend President Obama for bringing an end to this divisive policy and the senior members of our Nation's military who have begun to implement the change, and congratulate my colleagues here in Congress.

I'm proud to honor the service of all of our men and women in uniform who serve in harm's way and to mark the end of Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER 4 DAVID R. CARTER

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a soldier who made the ultimate sacrifice and laid down his life for our freedom, United States Army Chief Warrant Officer 4 David R. Carter.

Chief Warrant Officer Carter dedicated himself to over 24 years of military service. As a member of the Colorado Army National Guard, he deployed to Afghanistan last summer. On August 6, 2011, he was piloting a CH–47 helicopter on a mission to reinforce a unit under attack in Wardak Province. On that tragic day, he was one of 30 Americans lost when their helicopter was brought down by enemy fire.

Dave Carter was regarded as one of the most highly trained aviators in Colorado, with multiple combat deployments and over 4,000 flight hours.

He is also remembered for the tremendous impact he had on his family, friends, and community. Friends recall that he was never too busy to help out with a problem.

Chief Warrant Officer David Carter personifies the honor and selflessness of service as a citizen soldier. His bravery and dedication to duty will not be forgotten.

As a Marine Corps combat veteran, my deepest sympathies go out to his family, his fellow soldiers, and all who knew him.

REPEAL OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to come before this body today to celebrate the end of the discriminatory Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy.

For too long, American service men and women selflessly fought to protect our freedoms without receiving the same freedoms and protections in return. Under this flawed policy, we dismissed 14,000 patriots from our forces, and we turned away countless more Americans who simply wanted to volunteer to defend the country that we share.

Today our Nation shows the world that we can rise above prejudice and fear and take a long overdue step towards protecting our servicemembers and reducing discrimination in America.

But I am sad to say that this weekend, we received a terrible reminder that our work is not done. A 14-year-old boy from my community who was teased by his classmates about his sexual orientation took his own life. This heartbreaking tragedy was needless and should be a reminder to all of us that there are many more like Jamey Rodemeyer who are made by some to believe that it's not okay to be who they are.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of how far we've come, but I know that there remains a long road ahead of us. I am committed to continuing this fight for full equality for all Americans and implore my colleagues to do the same.

''NO'' VOTE NEEDED BY U.N.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, Palestinian Authority President Abbas plans to seek recognition of a Palestinian state before the United Nations. A vote in the U.N. will bypass bilateral peace negotiations between Israel and the P.A. and will threaten the success of a mutual solution.

Leaders in the United States, Israel, and the P.A. have long worked toward a mutual solution, and the P.A., seeking unilateral recognition from the U.N. is not only harmful to these efforts, but also to the security of the State of Israel.

It's also important to note that the action coincides with a period of extreme volatility between Israel and their Middle Eastern neighbors. Israel's alliance with Turkey has continued to unravel over the past year, and its peace agreement with Egypt is in jeopardy.

The Palestinian Authority's move to circumvent direct talks with Israel will undermine Israel's right to exist. I call for President Abbas to withdraw his request for a U.N. vote and instead finally agree to sit down at the negotiating table with the U.S. and Israel to develop a mutual, legitimate solution.

REPEAL OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

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

Mr. PETERS. As a former lieutenant commander in the United States Navy Reserve, I rise to applaud the repeal of the discriminatory Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy.

This backward policy has turned away over 14,000 able-bodied men and women from our military while our Nation is fighting two wars. It wasted over $1.3 billion taxpayer dollars through investigations, legal proceedings, and wasted training for fighter pilots, mechanics, medics, and even Arabic translators.

I am proud to have fought for this necessary change and feel privileged to have been able to cast my vote to make this misguided policy a relic of the past. Our military can now recruit and train qualified patriotic and courageous Americans who want to serve our country regardless of their sexual orientation.

During my service in the United States Navy Reserve, I served with many dedicated men and women who were always ready to serve their country. I was never concerned about their sexual orientation. Implementation of repeal marks not just an increase in military readiness but a significant step forward for civil rights and equality.

□ 1220

RECOGNIZING THE HISTORY AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE KANSAS SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the history and accomplishments of the Kansas School for the Deaf as we prepare to celebrate the school's sesquicentennial this week. It was 150 years ago that Philip A. Emery began teaching deaf students in a small two-room schoolhouse in Baldwin City, Kansas, using the techniques of Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet.

Throughout the years, the Kansas School for the Deaf has been noted for its academic excellence in pre-college preparation and its career and transition program, leading to job placement upon graduation.

Along the way, the school has had many exciting moments, including almost being destroyed in Quantrill's infamous sacking of Lawrence, Kansas, and even boasts of beating the University of Kansas baseball team twice, in 1897 and 1900.

As the oldest educational institution in the State of Kansas, the Kansas School for the Deaf continues to provide a world-class education to young students, and I am proud in the United States Congress to represent the school and its many families and students.

CELEBRATING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, September is the month in which we celebrate the many contributions Latinos have made and continue to make to our great country.

Hispanic Americans are our teachers, religious leaders, doctors, lawyers, health care providers, astronauts, scientists, small business owners, and entrepreneurs. They are local and national officials providing leadership in the face of unprecedented challenges both at home and abroad.

But perhaps our greatest pride comes from our impressive record of service to this country. When grave threats imperil America's freedom, Latinos answer the call. This is highlighted by the fact that Latino servicemen and -women have earned more medals and commendations per combatant than any other ethnic group.

As we celebrate the contributions Latinos have made to our country, let us not forget our future. The stories of our Nation's Latino trailblazers serve as an inspiration to young Latinos; but like all American children, they must have the opportunity to develop their talents and reach their full potential to keep our country great.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure all of America's children are prepared to lead. Only then can America realize its promise in the 21st century.

THE OFFICIAL REPEAL OF ''DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL''

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the historic, official repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Today, nearly two decades after its enactment, our lesbian, gay, and bisexual servicemembers can finally serve and defend the country they love without the fear of being discharged. Never

again will members of our military be forced to serve in the shadows, to lie about their identities, or to be afraid to talk about the people they love.

Let us remember the 14,000 loyal servicemembers who were discharged under this discriminatory policy over the years; for now they can serve alongside their military friends and family with dignity and honor. Let us also remember those individuals who served in silence and sacrificed their lives so that we, as Americans, could live freely.

As vice-chair of the LGBT Caucus in Congress, I see the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell as another step towards ensuring that all citizens, both inside and outside of the military, are never subject to discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. Today signifies a crucial milestone in history and is a victory, not just for the LGBTQ community, but for America as a whole.

IN CELEBRATION OF HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, September is Hispanic Heritage Month, and we celebrate as members of the Hispanic community the contributions that have been made to the United States throughout our history.

The story of Hispanic Americans is truly the American story. Our dream is the American Dream. In America, if you work hard, play by the rules and dream big, there is no limit to what you can achieve.

Succeeding in all walks of life and serving as patriots in the American Armed Forces, Hispanics have enriched in so many different ways our way of life. Their advances in universities from their knowledge and talent have continued to play a vibrant role as we strengthen the fabric of America. Hispanic Americans' commitment to faith, family, hard work, and perseverance adds to that rich diversity and vibrancy. It makes our country a melting pot like no other place in the world.

Today and every day, we should take time to note and to celebrate the wonderful contributions of the Hispanic community in the San Joaquin Valley and across America.

''DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL'' IS FINALLY NO MORE

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, two decades after its enactment, ''Don't Ask, Don't Tell'' is finally no more. At last, gay men and women can now openly serve in our military without having to hide who they are.

Eliminating this practice is a historic step forward in our pursuit of a more perfect Union. With this progress, our country's military can now become a shining example of equality—an example to be followed by all sectors of our society.

Just as important, this change will make our Armed Forces stronger. Young Americans who had previously been deterred from joining our military will now step forward, enlist, and serve the country they love. Many formerly discharged servicemembers will reenter the armed services to serve alongside friends and family. Ultimately, our military will benefit from a broader and deeper pool of talent. Now, as we move forward in fully implementing this change, we must ensure that same-sex families receive the same benefits as other military couples.

Mr. Speaker, although our work continues, today we are one step closer to the ideal that we are all created equal.

''DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL'' IS HISTORY

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, last year, I read on the House floor a letter from an active duty servicemember in Afghanistan. He shared how he and his partner of 10 years had managed the hardship that comes along with three deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan. Despite their shared sacrifices, his partner received no support from the military and would not be officially informed of his death.

While serving on active duty, he became aware of a number of other soldiers who were gay. In one case, it was only after a friend died of wounds from an IED, and he received a letter from the deceased soldier's partner, expressing how much he had loved the Army. Of course, this letter had to be sent anonymously because, until yesterday, its very existence could have led to the soldier's discharge.

The indignity of concealing who you are and who you love in order to protect your country has ended. No longer will we subject the brave men and women who volunteer to serve our Nation to a shameful vow of silence, asking them to lie about themselves. This policy was wrong; and now it's history, and our Nation and our military are stronger as a result.

To all who serve our Nation in uniform, we are so proud of each and every one of you.

□ 1230

SUPPORTING WORKERS OF THE USPS

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 685,000 workers of the United States Postal Service who are facing a very devastating future without our action. If Congress doesn't act now, we could potentially lose 120,000 jobs, imagine that, that are in jeopardy today.

The United States Postal Service offers a very affordable system, but right now they are in jeopardy. Why? Because back in 2006, they were, I would say, in a discriminating way, required to pay $5.5 billion in overcharge into benefits that are not incurred at this time. Based on long-term projections, they have an estimated surplus—imagine that in this time—of $55 billion to $75 billion. Without this mandate, the USPS would actually have a $611 million benefit that could help out in this tough economy.

Mr. Speaker, there are 685,000 workers who are not at fault for this requirement, and this $5 billion requirement needs to stop now so our postal service can continue.

THE GREATEST HITTER WHO EVER LIVED

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ted Williams, the last baseball player to hit .400 or better for a season, a feat he accomplished 70 years ago this very month, September 1941, which has never been equaled. Ted wasn't just a remarkable baseball player; he was a remarkable American who also served his country as a Marine Corps pilot in World War II and the Korean War.

Ted Williams once said: ''A man has to have goals—for a day, for a lifetime—and that was mine, to have people say, 'There goes Ted Williams, the greatest hitter who ever lived.' ''

Not only did he have a goal, but he also harnessed the determination and hard work necessary to succeed. Today I honor a man who was a friend, a constituent and a great American on the anniversary of his greatest achievement. He will always be remembered as baseball's greatest hitter.

OFFICIAL REPEAL OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to thank my colleagues in the LGBT Equality Caucus, Leader PELOSI, Congresswoman BALDWIN, Congressman FRANK, everyone today as we celebrate the end of a discriminatory era against gay and lesbian servicemembers in America with the official repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

For too long, this failed policy unfairly denied fundamental human rights to highly qualified individuals who wish to serve our country. As a vice-chair of the congressional LGBT

Equality Caucus, I am pleased that the tireless work of our congressional colleagues, the administration, and the LGBT community resulted in the end of Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

Although this is a remarkable step forward, we still have a long way to go to attain full equality. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered people continue to be targets of discrimination in our policies, our laws, and our society. I have always said that discrimination is un-American, and we as a Nation must continue to fight for policies that bring us closer to fulfilling the principles we espouse.

I encourage all of us to stay committed to ensuring that sexual orientation and gender identity are no longer a cause for inequality.

HONORING LATINOS IN THE MILITARY

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, this week I introduced House Resolution 404, a resolution honoring Latinos in the military; and I rise today to recognize all the great contributions and service that Latinos have given to this country.

In fact, Latinos have fought in every United States military conflict that we have had, and today nearly 163,000 Latinos—and Latinas—serve in the regular components of the Armed Forces. The contributions and sacrifices that they make to defend our Nation are often overlooked. So I encourage the Secretary of Defense to increase promotion opportunities for Latinos in the Armed Forces.

It's my firm belief that the military should invest in outreach to minority communities and to work to mitigate the barriers that hinder more Latinos from advancing up the career ladder in our Armed Forces, because our Armed Forces need Latinos. Latinos, like all those who serve, continue to sacrifice their lives daily in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation New Dawn. We have lost lives of Latinos also, 539.

I salute the dedication of our Latino servicemembers.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112–57)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice, stating that the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2011.

The crisis constituted by the grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, including the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in New York and Pennsylvania and against the Pentagon, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on United States nationals or the United States that led to the declaration of a national emergency on September 23, 2001, has not been resolved. These actions pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism, and maintain in force the comprehensive sanctions to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 21, 2011*.

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.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL TO AWARD CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 28

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

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENT TO AWARD THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for an event on November 2, 2011, to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution honors those brave and courageous Japanese Americans who served in the U.S. Army's 100th Infantry Battalion and 442nd Regimental Combat Team, as well as those who served in the indispensable Military Intelligence Service.

The 100th Infantry Battalion fought valiantly in the treacherous Italian campaign, earning their nickname the Purple Heart Battalion because of their bravery and sacrifice.

The 442nd Regimental Combat Team was formed in 1943 from Japanese Americans living in relocation camps. A week after D-day, the 100th Battalion and the 442nd were merged into a single unit, which fought heroically in Europe, as seen in their rescue of the famous ''Lost Battalion'' in France near the German border.

□ 1240

These Japanese American units suffered enormously high casualty rates and received over 18,000 individual decorations, including 9,486 Purple Hearts. For their service in eight major campaigns in Italy and France, the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442nd Regimental Combat Team earned eight Presidential Unit Citations.

Members of the Military Intelligence Service were Japanese Americans who served this country by intercepting radio messages, translating documents, writing leaflets encouraging opposing troops to surrender, and helping our forces understand the enemy we were fighting. In fact, according to General MacArthur's intelligence officer, Charles Willoughby, the efforts of the Military Intelligence Service ''shortened the war by 2 years.''

Mr. Speaker, Second Lieutenant DANIEL INOUYE, who received a battlefield commission in November 1944, was

one of these brave men. Gravely wounded in April 1945, Lieutenant INOUYE received the Distinguished Service Cross. It is fitting and proper that our distinguished colleague in the other body sponsored this legislation, and I'm honored to speak in support of it here today.

I ask my colleagues to support this resolution authorizing use of Emancipation Hall in November for this Congressional Gold Medal ceremony.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, September 19, 2011.

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I write to formally notify you that the Committee on House Administration hereby waives further committee consideration of S. Con. Res. 28, a concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II, in order that the legislation may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

Sincerely,

DANIEL E. LUNGREN,
Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

On October 5, 2010, President Obama signed into law S. 1055, a bill granting the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service the Congressional Gold Medal. This concurrent resolution authorizes use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center to award the Congressional Gold Medal to these brave service men and women in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

The 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service were compromised predominately of Japanese Americans during World War II. At that time, many of the soldiers' families were subject to internment and discrimination, yet these courageous Americans fought with distinction and valor.

Collectively, the 100th Infantry Battalion and 442nd Regimental Combat Team became the most highly decorated unit of its size and length in the history of the United States Army, receiving seven Presidential Unit Citations, 21 Medals of Honor, 29 Distinguished Service Crosses, 560 Silver Stars, 4,000 Bronze Stars, 22 Legion of Merit Medals, 15 Soldier's Medals and over 4,000 Purple Hearts.

The contributions of Japanese Americans were not limited to the front line. The Military Intelligence Service provided critical classified information that was vital to the success of the United States military in the Pacific theater.

The recognition of these Americans is overdue, and Emancipation Hall is a befitting place to bestow this award for the sacrifice and dedication that was shown in the face of discrimination.

Join with me today in supporting this concurrent resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for allowing me to speak on this important resolution.

On behalf of our chairwoman, JUDY CHU, and our Asian Pacific Caucus, I rise today in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 28, a resolution that would authorize the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II. I want to personally thank Senator DANIEL INOUYE for sponsoring this resolution, and I thank also my fellow Members of Congress and colleagues who join me in support of this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, as a Vietnam veteran and also as a former member of the 100th Battalion, 442nd Infantry Reserve Unit out of Honolulu, Hawaii, I am proud to say that we must recognize Senator DANIEL INOUYE and also the late Senator Spark Matsunaga, both of Hawaii, who distinguished themselves in battle as soldiers with the 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry during World War II.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, after the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, there was such an outrage and cry for all-out war against Japan, days afterwards our President and the Congress officially declared war against Japan. Out of this retaliation against Japan, however, tens of thousands of Americans were caught in the crossfire. These Americans just happened to be of Japanese ancestry.

The Federal Government immediately implemented a policy whereby over 100,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry—men, women, and children—were forced to live in what we called relocation camps but were actually more like prison or concentration camps. Their lands, their homes, their properties were confiscated by the Federal Government without due process of law. It was a time in our Nation's history when there was so much hatred, bigotry, and racism against our fellow Americans who just happened to be of Japanese ancestry. Despite all of this, Mr. Speaker, over 10,000 Japanese Americans volunteered to join the U.S. military, despite the fact that their wives, their parents, their brothers and sisters are in prison behind barbed wire fences in these relocation camps.

As a result of such volunteerism, two combat units, the 100th Battalion and the 442nd Infantry Combat Group, were organized and immediately sent to fight Nazi Germany in Europe.

In my humble opinion, history speaks for itself in documenting that none have shed their blood more valiantly for our Nation than the Japanese American soldiers who served in these two combat units. These units suffered an unprecedented casualty rate of 314 percent. They emerged as the most decorated combat units of their size in the military history of the U.S. Army. The 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry received over 18,000 individual decorations for bravery and courage in the field of battle, many awarded posthumously. They were awarded 53 Distinguished Service Crosses, 560 Silver Stars, 9,486 Purple Hearts, and 7 Presidential Unit Citations, the Nation's top award for combat units. And yet, ironically, only one Medal of Honor was awarded to these soldiers.

It was not until 1999 that Congress took corrective action by mandating a reexamination of why just one Medal of Honor was awarded to these Japanese American soldiers. As a result of the review process, President Clinton awarded 20 additional Congressional Medals of Honor to these brave Japanese American soldiers. And Senator INOUYE was one of the recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

We should also note that while the 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry were fighting on the front lines, thousands of Japanese Americans also joined the first military foreign language school, the Military Intelligence Service, where they learned Japanese.

During the war, about 6,000 MIS agents fought in all Army units in the Pacific and were assigned to Allied forces in Australia, Britain, China, Canada, and India. They staffed theater-level intelligence centers, and their duties included the 442nd infantry.

On October 5, 2010, President Obama granted the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, as well as the 6,000 Japanese Americans who served in the Military Intelligence Service during World War II.

I believe that each one of these American heroes should be recognized for this high honor here in the heart of our Nation's capital, the U.S. Capitol, for their bravery, their patriotism, and their selfless service. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution to honor these men and women who valiantly served our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Chairwoman CHU, the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, Congresswoman HIRONO, Congresswoman HANABUSA, and Congressman HONDA,

I rise today in support of S. Con. Res. 28, a resolution that would authorize the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II. I thank Senator DANIEL INOUYE for sponsoring this resolution, and I thank my fellow members of Congress who join me in support of this important bill.

As a Vietnam veteran and also a former member of the 100th Battalion, 442nd Infantry Reserve Unit in Honolulu, Hawaii, I am especially proud to say that we must recognize Senator DANIEL INOUYE, and also highly-respected, the late Senator Spark Matsunaga of Hawaii, who distinguished themselves in battle as soldiers with the 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry during World War II.

As we all know, after the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, there was such an outrage and cry for an all out war against Japan and days afterwards our President and the Congress officially declared war against Japan. Out of this retaliation against Japan, however, tens of thousands of Americans were caught in the crossfire. These Americans just happened to be of Japanese ancestry.

The Federal Government immediately implemented a policy whereby over 100,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry were forced to live in what were called relocation camps, but were actually more like prison or concentration camps. Their lands, homes and properties were confiscated by the Federal Government without due process of law. It was a time in our Nation's history when there was so much hatred, bigotry and racism against our fellow Americans who happened to be of Japanese ancestry.

Despite all this, over ten thousand Japanese Americans volunteered to join the U.S. military, despite the fact that their wives, parents, brothers and sisters were imprisoned behind barbed wire fences in these relocation camps. As a result of such volunteerism, two combat units, the 100th Battalion and the 442nd Infantry Combat Group, were organized and immediately sent to fight Nazi Germany in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, history speaks for itself in documenting that none have shed their blood more valiantly for our Nation than the Japanese American soldiers who served in these two combat units. These units suffered an unprecedented casualty rate of 314 percent. They also emerged as the most decorated combat unit of their size in the history of the United States Army. The 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry received over 18,000 individual decorations for bravery and courage in the field of battle, many awarded posthumously. They were awarded 53 Distinguished Service Crosses, 560 Silver Stars, 9,486 Purple Hearts, and 7 Presidential Unit Citations, the Nation's top award for combat units. And yet, only one Medal of Honor was awarded at the time.

It was not until 1999 that Congress took corrective action by mandating a reexamination of why just one Medal of Honor was awarded to these Japanese Americans. As a result of this review, President Clinton awarded 20 additional Congressional Medals of Honor to these brave Japanese-American soldiers.

It was while fighting in Europe that Senator INOUYE lost his arm while engaged in his personal battle against two German machine gun posts. For his heroism, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross. Senator INOUYE was also one of those recipients of the Medal of Honor and I was privileged to witness this historical moment at a White House ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, we should also note that while the 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry were fighting on the front lines, thousands of Japanese Americans also joined the first U.S. military foreign language school, the Military Intelligence Service (also known as the M.I.S.), where they learned Japanese.

During the war, about 6,000 M.I.S. agents fought in all Army units in the Pacific and were assigned to allied forces in Australia, Britain, Canada, China, and India. They staffed theater-level intelligence centers and their duties included translating captured documents, interrogating prisoners of war, and listening to all enemy radio communications.

At Bougainville in 1942 an M.I.S. agent translated an uncoded Japanese radio transmission describing Admiral Yamamoto's inspection schedule of the bases around the Solomon Islands, thereby leading to the successful interception of Yamamoto's aircraft. This victory resulted in a boost in morale for the Allies in the Pacific since Admiral Yamamoto had directed the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

In 1944, the M.I.S. also translated the Japanese Imperial Navy's "Z-Plan," which outlined defense strategies in the Pacific. The translation of this vital document made it possible for the U.S. Navy to gain victory in the Marianas, the Philippines, and in other areas of the Pacific.

At war's end, the M.I.S. facilitated local surrenders of Japanese forces as well as the occupation. Working in military government, war crimes trials, censorship, and counterintelligence, these silent warriors contributed to the occupation's ultimate success.

Though many would only come to know of these stories decades later, these brave Americans earned the respect of our Nation's military leaders at a time when many Americans saw them as enemies. President Harry Truman called the Japanese Americans in the M.I.S. the "human secret weapon for the U.S. Armed Forces" and General Willoughby, MacArthur's intelligence chief credited the M.I.S. Nisei with shortening the war by two years and saving possibly a million American lives. President Truman was also so moved by the bravery of the 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry in the field of battle, as well as that of African American soldiers during World War II, that he issued an Executive Order to finally desegregate all branches of the Armed Services.

On October 5, 2010, President Barack Obama granted the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion and 442nd Regimental Combat Team as well as the 6,000 Japanese Americans who served in the Military Intelligence Service during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that each one of these American heroes should be recognized for this high honor here in the heart of our nation—the United States Capitol—for their bravery, patriotism, and selfless service. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution to honor these men and women who valiantly served our Nation.

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

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to President Obama's signing into law S. 1055 on October 5 of this last year, which grants the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service the Congressional Gold Medal and also authorizes the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center to award this medal to the brave service men and women in recognition of their service during World War II, which my husband was a participant of.

For too long, we tended to ignore the contributions of our military men and women simply because they don't look traditional.

□ 1250

I know that in California, we did the same thing with the fishing village in San Pedro that had been ignored. They lost everything and were put into camps during the war.

On another matter, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to address an issue that is very, very disconcerting to many of us, especially those in the Latino community.

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

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I yield the lady 1 additional minute.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I thank the gentleman.

Mental health in our Latino community has been ignored for too long, especially in all minority communities but mostly in Hispanic. It's an issue that we need to take the stigma out of, because we don't want to hear it, we don't want to see it, and we certainly don't want to speak about it. Suicide is the third leading cause of death for Hispanic Americans aged 15 to 24, the 13th leading cause for Hispanics of all ages. To quote Mia St. John, three-time world boxing champion, Latina, affected by mental illness growing up and a strong mental health advocate, "I was the first generation in my family born in America. All I wanted to be was American. I had stress and depression symptoms that professionals could have recognized as anxiety or psychosis. By the time I was 18 I was homeless and contemplating suicide."

We have H.R. 751, the Mental Health in Schools Act, onsite mental health delivery services for our youth, which will save lives and give hope and shares the message to never be afraid or be ashamed to ask for help.

I ask for support for mental health and H.R. 751.

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

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a very proud honorary member

of the Nisei vets, the group that you are honoring today and in support of this resolution.

Seattle was the site of a roundup of thousands of Americans. Ordinary Americans, had businesses, had truck farms, kids were going to high school and were going to college. One of them, a young man named William Nakamura, was an 18-year-old kid at Garfield High School who was rounded up and taken out to the middle of Idaho to a camp out there. And then the government said, if you'd like to come back and join the military and serve, you can.

There was lots of debate among the people in the camps about whether they should come back or not. And as you heard, 10,000 came back and were the most decorated unit in the history of the United States military. They distinguished themselves beyond any group that has ever served for this country.

William Nakamura took out two machine gun nests and was himself killed, and the courthouse in Seattle is now named after him as a memorial to what this country really stands for. The Japanese Americans, the Nisei vets, set an example for this country we must never forget.

As we look at our Muslim brothers, and we sometimes can't distinguish just exactly—you hear ugly talk that's reminiscent of what went on in this country in the early 1940s. We must never let us act again as we did against these Japanese Americans. They proved that an American is an American, no matter what his face looks like or her face looks like, they are Americans. They deserve that respect and they deserve the due process of law. They lost all their property in Seattle, unless they could give it to someone and say, would you take care of this? Some people did get it back at the end because other, Caucasian Americans, took it and held it for them and gave it back after the war. They did not receive due process of law. There were all kinds of violations of their civil rights. And that's why this memorial is important for us to remind ourselves of how real Americans act, no matter where they came from, and how much they're willing to give to make this country the strong place that it is.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Again, I urge all Members to support this resolution. I'm extremely proud myself to support it. My father was a member of the United States Marine Corps that served in the Pacific theater, and I'm sure he was very proud of the Japanese men and women that were out there supporting and helping him.

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

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. Con. Res. 28, which will allow the use of Emancipation Hall in the U.S. Capitol for a Medal of Honor Ceremony.

During World War II, many members of University of Hawaii's Reserve Officers Training Corps, ROTC, were Nisei, the American-born sons of Japanese immigrants. After the attack on Pearl Harbor, these brave men aided the wounded, buried the fallen, and helped defend vulnerable areas in Hawaii.

Despite their bravery and loyalty to the United States, in January of 1942 the U.S. Army discharged all Nisei in the ROTC unit, deemed them ineligible for service, and segregated all Japanese-Americans out of their military units. Meanwhile, over a hundred thousand Japanese-Americans were forcibly moved from their homes to internment camps. This forced ouster forever changed the lives of these Japanese-Americans, many of whom lost their land and other property.

Nonetheless, members of the Hawaii Provisional Infantry Battalion, made up of Japanese-Americans, joined the 100th Infantry Battalion, also comprised of Japanese-Americans, to train as soldiers. President Roosevelt admired their bravery and determination, and decided to allow Nisei volunteers to serve in the military again, where they were incorporated into the 442nd Regimental Combat Team.

Members of the 100th and the 442nd risked their lives to fight for our country and allies in Europe. The 442nd "Go for Broke" unit was sent repeatedly to the front lines. The 4,000 men who started in April 1943 needed to be replaced more than three times. The unit became the most decorated in U.S. military history for its size and length of service, with the 100th Infantry Battalion earning the nickname "The Purple Heart Battalion." The 100th and the 442nd received seven Presidential Unit Citations, 21 Medals of Honor, 29 Distinguished Service Crosses, 560 Silver Stars, 4,000 Bronze Stars, 22 Legion of Merit Medals, 15 Soldier's Medals, and more than 4,000 Purple Hearts, among numerous additional distinctions. One of these Medal of Honor recipients is Hawaii's own senior Senator, DANIEL K. INOUYE, the sponsor of today's resolution.

The Army's Military Intelligence Service, MIS, was composed of about 6,000 Japanese-American soldiers who conducted covert intelligence missions, including translating enemy documents, interrogating enemy prisoners of wars, intercepting radio transmissions, and persuading enemy combatants to surrender. The contributions of the MIS have only recently come to light and been publicly acknowledged.

Last year Congress passed and President Obama signed into a law a bill to collectively award the Medal of Honor to Japanese American Veterans of the 442nd Regiment, the 100th Infantry Battalion, and the Military Intelligence Service. It was a distinct honor to be present at the bill signing and meet several of these heroes in person.

Today's resolution allows the use of Emancipation Hall on November 2, 2011 in the U.S. Capitol for a ceremony to present the Medal of Honor to these brave Japanese-American veterans for their service and sacrifice during World War II. Many veterans from Hawaii or their next-of-kin will travel a great distance to attend this ceremony.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. Con. Res. 28, the concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II. This resolution awards well deserved recognition and the honor of the Congressional Gold Medal to the brave soldiers who dedicated their lives to service during World War II.

Emancipation Hall, located in the Capitol Visitor Center is a fitting location for recognizing these courageous patriots; in Emancipation Hall there stands a replica of the Statue of Freedom, the statue that sits atop the Capitol dome. The Statue of Freedom is described by Thomas Crawford, its creator, as an allegorical figure of freedom, "triumphant in both war and peace." Triumphant in both war and peace. I can think of no place more appropriate to honor the brave men of the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service. They chose to enter into military service, made a commitment to this country and to each other, fought for freedom, and were triumphant in war and peace.

The Congressional Gold Medal is an award bestowed by Congress for outstanding deeds or acts of service to the security, prosperity, and national interest of the United States. The Congressional Gold Medal is the highest civilian award. The men and women of the Armed Forces, past and present, devote their lives to the security, prosperity and national interest of the United States. It is a great honor and privilege to be able to recognize the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, for their dedicated service during World War II.

In 1944, the 100th battalion and the 442nd battalion merged to fight against Germany and defend freedom and democracy in Europe. Among the members of these battalions were many Hawaiians and Japanese Americans. Mr. Speaker, these are exemplary examples of bravery and the extraordinary measure of these men, who rose to meet a challenge and answered a call to defend the Nation. Their courage showed the world, and shows us today, that as a nation, our capacity to overcome may well be limitless.

The men of the Armed Forces in World War II fought to defend the very ideals on which our Nation was founded. The 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the MilitaryIntelligence Service risked their lives to defend that which Americans cherish, liberty, democracy, and the basic freedoms of the Constitution. They gave this Nation more than their support, they gave it their strength, and some gave their lives, in what Abraham Lincoln called "the last full measure of devotion."

Mr. Speaker, the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service deserve this honor, as they deserve our respect, our admiration, and our enduring gratitude. Their legacy of selfless patriotism lives on today, and serves as an example for all Americans. I am proud to support S. Con. Res. 28, a concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal,

collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II. I am pleased to join my colleagues in supporting this very worthy resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 28.

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. HARPER. 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.

CHRISTOPHER S. BOND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 846) to designate the United States courthouse located at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, as the Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 846

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

SECTION 1. CHRISTOPHER S. BOND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States courthouse located at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the ''Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 846.

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

There was no objection.

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

Senate bill 846 would designate the newly constructed federal courthouse at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, as the ''Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse.''

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Senator BLUNT of Missouri for introducing this legislation. I want to thank his colleague, Senator MCCASKILL, also of Missouri, for cosponsoring this bill.

Senator Bond has honorably served the State of Missouri and this Nation for many decades. He was born in St. Louis, Missouri, and went on to pursue his undergraduate degree at Princeton University and his law degree at the University of Virginia. After law school, he clerked for the Honorable Elbert Tuttle, who was then the Chief Judge of the United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in Atlanta, Georgia.

After a brief time of private practice in Washington, DC, he moved back to Missouri, where he was elected as Missouri State auditor in 1970. Two years later, Senator Bond was elected Governor of Missouri, making him the youngest Governor in State history. He served two terms, from 1973 to 1977 and from 1981 to 1985.

In 1986, Senator Bond ran successfully for the United States Senate, where he represented citizens of Missouri for 24 years until his recent retirement after the 111th Congress.

During his time in the Senate, he served on several committees and was chair of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship from 1995 to 2001.

I believe it is appropriate that we honor Senator Bond's dedicated service for his State and country. I support passage of this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 846, a bill that names the United States courthouse located at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, as the ''Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse.''

Senator Kit Bond is a sixth-generation Missourian with a long and distinguished career in public service spanning over 40 years, serving in many different capacities as an elected official at both the State and federal levels. Senator Bond served as a law clerk to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, as a Missouri Assistant State Attorney General, Missouri State auditor, Governor of Missouri, and finally in his longest-serving post, as United States Senator from 1987 to 2010 from the State of Missouri.

□ 1300

In the Senate, Senator Bond served on the Committees on Appropriations, Commerce, Science, Transportation and Intelligence. As ranking member of the Select Committee on Intelligence, Senator Bond played an important role as Congress crafted its anti-terror policies in the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks.

Senator Bond also worked well with Members across the aisle on many issues, including perhaps one of his proudest legislative accomplishments as a cosponsor of the Family Medical Leave Act, signed into law by President Bill Clinton in 1993.

Finally, Senator Bond was a vigorous advocate for the State of Missouri, proudly championing and pursuing Federal investment in support of public housing, university research, defense, agriculture and infrastructure throughout the State. Senator Bond and I worked very closely on a number of projects for Missouri and Illinois and the St. Louis region, including the new Mississippi River Bridge, which is under construction now.

In January 2009, Senator Bond announced that he would not run for reelection in 2010, noting that in 1973, at 33 years old, he had become the youngest Governor ever to be elected in Missouri and that he had no desire to become Missouri's oldest Senator.

Naming the Federal courthouse in Jefferson City as the Senator Christopher ''Kit'' Bond Courthouse is a fitting tribute, and I support the passage of Senate bill 846, which honors his service to our country and to this great institution.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the chairman for bringing this bill forward.

I am so excited to be here today and so proud to support Senate bill 846, which renames the new Federal courthouse in my district of Jefferson City the Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse. This is such a fitting tribute to a great Missourian, who I have had the privilege of knowing and working with over the years.

Senator Bond was first elected in 1986 to the U.S. Senate and served over 24 years representing our State here valiantly in the United States Congress. And before he came here to the Senate, he served two terms as Governor and was also State auditor.

He is known for accomplishing many things—and there's not enough time to share all of them—but one thing he is certainly noted for is that he started the Parents as Teachers program and took it statewide. That has benefited thousands of children in Missouri and across this country, and certainly I participated with our daughter. It's a wonderful, wonderful program.

He is also a great supporter of free trade. He had been a champion of building highways and infrastructure, which has enabled vital investments in our roads and bridges in Missouri. He was vice chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and he worked for bipartisan support to renew the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

He is a strong defender of our military and our national defense. As part of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, he worked to continue operation of Boeing's F–15 production

line in a plant next to the St. Louis airport. And we always heard about how proud he was of his son's service in the military.

But being from the farm, I appreciated Senator Bond's support of agriculture. He was certainly a leader in making Missouri a leader in agricultural research. He is a leader whose service has improved the lives of thousands of Missourians, an example of patriotism that has inspired future leaders to follow in his footsteps.

Every time now that Missourians will drive by this courthouse, they will be inspired to serve their fellow man—service above self—just like Kit Bond has done all of these years.

I want to close with some words that Kit said himself about his service, and I think it's an example for all of us in Missouri and across this country. He said: ''Serving Missouri has been my life's work. I have walked the land, fished its rivers, and been humbled by the honesty and hard work of our people. The highest honor is to receive and safeguard the public trust.''

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

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 846, which would designate the name of the United States courthouse in Jefferson City, Missouri as the Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse. We would like to congratulate Mr. Bond on behalf of our office for this prestigious honor.

Mr. Bond served the State of Missouri for over 4 decades, beginning as the Assistant Attorney General in 1969, where he led the Consumer Protection Division. He then went on to be elected Missouri State Auditor in 1970 until 1973. Later in 1973, at the age of 33, he was elected Governor of Missouri, making him the youngest Governor in the State's history. He served as Governor from 1973 until 1977, and again from 1981 until 1985. Mr. Bond then went on to serve as a United States Senator from 1987 until his retirement in January of 2011.

Kit Bond has served our State and our Country with dedication, and naming the United States Courthouse after him is an appropriate manner in which to show our appreciation for all of his hard work over the last 40 years for the people of Missouri and all Americans. Once again, on behalf of our office and the entire State of Missouri, we would like to congratulate him and we wish him the best.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 846.

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. DENHAM. 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.

SHORT-TERM TANF EXTENSION ACT

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2943) to extend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs through December 31, 2011.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2943

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 ''Short-Term TANF Extension Act''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES PROGRAM AND RELATED PROGRAMS THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2011.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Activities authorized by part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act (other than under subsections (a)(3) and (b) of section 403 of such Act) shall continue through December 31, 2011, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2011, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose. Grants and payments may be made pursuant to this authority on a quarterly basis through the first quarter of fiscal year 2012 at the level provided for such activities for the corresponding quarter of fiscal year 2011.

(b) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—Section 409(a)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or 2012'' and inserting ''2012, or 2013''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''2012''.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 2943, legislation to temporarily extend the authorization of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and related programs.

Since it replaced the New Deal-era welfare program in 1996, TANF has been successful at cutting welfare dependents by 57 percent through the end of last year. Even more importantly, by promoting work among single parents, who are the most common welfare recipients, it helped significantly reduce child poverty in female-headed families over time.

Even at today's elevated unemployment rates, TANF continues to promote more work and earnings and less poverty. But despite this general progress, TANF can and should be strengthened to do more, especially to help more low-income families work and support themselves in the years ahead. Unfortunately, too many parents are exempted from work requirements today for a variety of reasons we learned at a recent hearing held by the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources, which I am privileged to chair.

But given the current administration's support for only a straight 1-year extension of current law, which is a view shared by the other body, there are limited prospects for making needed changes to TANF before the program expires at the end of this month. That's the reason for the short-term extension before us today.

This 3-month extension will provide an opportunity for Congress, including the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, to review TANF alongside other entitlement programs this fall. Important questions need to be asked, including what is the proper funding level for these programs and how can they best be focused on engaging low-income parents in work and other productive activities so more can support themselves in the long run.

Another thing this additional time will let us do is to take action to close what some call the ''strip club loophole.'' This refers to an outright abuse of taxpayer trust permitted under current law when adults on welfare spend taxpayer funds on liquor, gambling, tattoos, or even visits to strip clubs. As recent exposes have revealed, too many welfare recipients access taxpayer funds at cash machines in casinos, liquor stores, strip clubs, and even on cruise ships.

Some States have already taken action to close this loophole by blocking access to welfare EBT cards at such establishments. There is bipartisan legislation to require all States to do that, and doing so is something of particular interest to our colleague, Senator COBURN. I share his commitment to getting this done this fall and urge all my colleagues to support action that we will take to close this loophole.

The legislation before us is designed to provide time for a closer review of and action on these sorts of issues. Importantly, it does not add to our deficit since it simply continues current TANF funding for 3 months. I note that TANF is a fixed block grant, which is not adjusted for inflation.

I wish we were debating legislation today that extended and actually improved TANF programs so that they work better; but given the impediments before us, the bill before the House today offers the best chance that we will be able to do that in the near future, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1310

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill, which I fully support, but it is important to understand what this bill does and what it does not do. It is important to understand which provisions we agree upon and which ones we accept as only being better than the alternative of allowing this important law and all those who count on it to expire next week.

Last week, the Census Bureau reported that more Americans were poor in 2010 than at any time on record. Regrettably, my home State of Texas was leading the way with one of the highest poverty rates anywhere in America.

The Texas Center for Public Policy Priorities, a nonpartisan group, recently reported that ''The heart of the American Dream is at risk in Texas.'' For the first time in generations, there are more people falling out of the middle class than joining its ranks. And what a struggle it is for those families trying to hold on.

In a neighborhood near downtown San Antonio, Andrew Ramos and his wife, Nina, are struggling just to keep food on the table for themselves and their 2-year-old daughter. Andrew lost his job, and Nina works at a local pizza parlor where she makes about $200 a week. There are so many families just like the Ramos family—almost one in five in poverty in Bexar County.

As John Turner at the Capital Area Food Bank concludes: Hunger is a result of lack of income and of a livable wage. It affects too many of our neighbors, he says, under the current Texas economic model.

The demands on our food banks, which serve as effective public-private partnerships, are immense. The Capital Area Food Bank, this year, is delivering 50 percent more food to poor people than it did 3 years ago.

But I don't really hear anyone facing up to this harsh reality—not our Governor in Texas, not the President of the United States, and certainly not the leadership here in the House. In fact, the Administration has shown little interest and almost no guidance in reforming this legislation.

Rather than respond to rising deprivation and declining opportunity, this legislation continues for another 3 months, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Act. This is a program that today provides direct assistance to only one in every five children living in Poverty in America. That's the lowest level of poor children receiving direct assistance since 1965. And of course in Texas it's much worse, where only one in every 20 poor children receive direct assistance from TANF.

The bill before us also does not address a program agreed to originally when the Welfare Reform Act was enacted—a bill that I voted for to address the particular needs of high poverty States like Texas and many in the South—called TANF Supplemental Grants. Their name is really a misnomer because they're not a supplement; they're essential to the work of States that have higher poverty rates.

Ever since that time of the Welfare Reform Act, Texas and those States have depended on supplemental TANF. It is not included in today's legislation, and that means that Texas will lose about $50 million every year that it relies on to work with child care, with preventing pregnancy, with other issues like school dropouts, programs that rely on these funds today.

Allowing these grants to expire is in sharp contrast to what happened in 2001 when Governor Rick Perry wrote to then-Whip Tom DeLay urging the extension of TANF supplemental grants, saying: ''These grants have played an important role in helping hardworking men and women in Texas achieve independence from public assistance. Congress designed the supplemental grants to address the critical program needs of States.'' Those were words of Governor Rick Perry, who is silent on this matter today about how we enable more Texans to move from welfare to work.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow the funding for TANF to expire next week, and so I join wholeheartedly with this renewal legislation. But we also need to move past doing the very least that we can do and start responding to the mounting challenges that families not just in Texas but across our country face. TANF has not been adequately responsive to the increased level of needs during these bad economic times.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I think also of the words of Claudia Herrington, who works at El Buen Samaritano, dealing largely with Latino families. She writes: ''This is not the American Dream I believe in. This is not the American Dream my father believed in when he emigrated from Cuba here in the 1960s. I know our country is better than that, regardless of political affiliation. And I know that investment in our people and their ability to earn a decent living is a worthwhile policy.''

We need a policy that is more safety net than hole, and I hope eventually we can work together to achieve that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion that this legislation should be amended to revive the TANF Supplemental Grants program.

TANF supplemental grants expired in June 2011 in accordance with legislation Democrats crafted last year that President Obama signed into law. These payments have now expired and are not payable under current law. Extending them would mean spending more money to revive the program, which is beyond the scope of what we're doing today in maintaining only current TANF programs.

Since TANF supplemental grants were first paid, about $4 billion in extra TANF programs have been paid out only to a minority of States. At some point, we have to ask when such supplemental spending should come to an end. The last Congress, which, again, was led by Democratic majorities, said the end should come this past June. I respect that judgment.

The committee is obviously aware of Mr. DOGGETT's bill to extend these payments yet again, but we don't know how he would pay for that since the bill he introduced includes no pay-for. That would mean increasing our current historic deficits even more.

All States received a share of $5 billion in special welfare funds in the 2009 stimulus bill. That was on top of almost $17 billion in TANF block grant payments all States receive each year, including those that previously collected supplemental grants. The States that collected supplemental grants received about $913 million of that $5 billion in one-time funds, or the equivalent of almost three years of supplemental grant payments.

I appreciate the gentleman's argument for extending these payments by reviving the now-ended Supplemental Grants program. The legislation before us does not do that, since it simply extends current law programs. But I know he and I will continue to have fruitful discussions and work together about this and other TANF funding and related issues, and I appreciate his continued input and effort.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would yield myself 15 seconds to say that under Democratic leadership we extended the supplemental TANF program that Governor Rick Perry was so proud about in 2001. We extended it four times. The only reason that it existed in the spring of this year was because of our extensions. It should be extended once again, and I hope in the process we can do that.

I would now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. I come to the floor on this noncontroversial bill and as a proud member of the Ways and Means Committee to show the Congress and the country that we are concerned about more than just taxes.

I want to thank Mr. DAVIS for his leadership in this area and especially

my friend Mr. DOGGETT, who have stuck with the committee in trying to make certain that we improve the life of those people who are so vulnerable in our society.

To think that one out of five children in America, the United States of America, is living in poverty, to recognize that 46 million people, a family of four makes less than $22,000 is certainly not what has inspired so many people to get out of poverty and move into the middle class, which is the heart of America and the heart of our economy.

This bill does just that. It comes to us to look to give authority to the States to see what works, to make certain that people don't have to stay on welfare, that they can have a goal in being fully employed. And it takes a way the image that we have, as a country, that we applaud people who are being executed, that we applaud those people that don't have health insurance.

No, America is more than that. And during these hard times, we have to make certain that we do as the members of this committee, a classic example is Mr. DOGGETT, is Mr. DAVIS, both on a hardworking committee, but care enough about the people in our country to show that this is bipartisan. And the people that are poor, the people that are in need, the people that are without homes and without hope are not Democrats; they're not Republicans. They are people in our country. And we have an obligation to show that there is a need for government. There is a need for caring.

And I am proud to be a member of this committee and a Member of this Congress to show that's what our country is all about.

□ 1320

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State, the former chair of this subcommittee, Mr. MCDERMOTT.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I want to say just a few words about this. Obviously, I support the extension of the TANF. But I think that there is a real need—and we've been extending it 1 year at a time, 1 year at a time, 1 year at a time for some time—there really is a need to re-look at the whole concept of what this safety net really needs to be.

We wiped out welfare as we know it, as was the phrase in 1996, at a time when the economy in this country was going straight up. Anybody could find a job if they looked for one. And it was very clear that there were efforts in that bill to push people off the rolls and out into the work market. Now, it was possible to do that.

Today, however, you have a situation where there are four people that are looking for every job that's out there. You have many middle class families who have exhausted 99 weeks of unemployment and have nothing in this country except food stamps.

Now, it sort of depends on whether or not we're going to have a middle class in this country when we have a downturn like this and we decide whether we're going to help the middle class make it. We've got foreclosures that won't quit. And we've had no proposals out of the House to do anything about foreclosure prevention.

So you have middle class people who've lost their job, their unemployment is gone, they are now having their house foreclosed, and they look to their government for a safety net and find nothing but food stamps.

In my belief, there is a time when we should help the middle class in this country be able to go through what may be another year or two, we're not quite sure how long it will be, but it should not be that there is no program available to help middle class people who have fallen on very difficult times.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the House should approve this important bipartisan legislation today. To fail to approve this modest extension would cause even more people to suffer with the expiration of these programs next week.

Mr. Speaker, it may not be in vogue to discuss the problems of poor people in America today, but we need to hear more about it in this House. We need to hear more about it in Washington, DC.

Certainly we want to support and encourage the middle class in America—very, very important—but we need to create more opportunity to broaden that middle class. For the many people who struggle and hope that lives will be better for their children and that they will face less obstacles than their parents have faced, we need to provide that temporary assistance to needy families. The current program leaves out too many and forgets too many of those families in their struggle.

The omission of TANF supplemental grants, which we renewed four times in the last two Congresses, is not being renewed here, which means that in Texas and in so many high-poverty States, we will not have the support that Governor Rick Perry once called for. We will have a broadened gap and a lack of services.

Many of the dollars that we've received in that program in Texas have gone into child protective services to protect abused and neglected children. They will no longer have that assistance. I hope in the course of the legislative process of the renewal of this legislation, we might eventually get TANF supplemental grants into the bill.

Today we see so many who are losing the opportunity to share in the American Dream. We have an opportunity to continue at least a minimal level of support to them. We should do that, but we should commit ourselves to doing even more.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2943 simply is a short-term continuation of Welfare to Work programs that have successfully cut welfare dependence and promoted work. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to work with us to design a long-term reauthorization bill that fixes flaws in the system, fixes broken processes and allows agencies to communicate in a more holistic way as we address this to eliminate waste of taxpayer dollars and ultimately to design a long-term reauthorization bill that further promotes work and independence from welfare.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2943, "The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Extension Act," which extends the authorization of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) state block grant program for three months, through December 31, 2011. Under current law, the program's authorization is set to expire on October 1, 2011, at the end of FY 2011. H.R. 2943 authorizes "such sums as may be necessary" to carry out the program at the same level as FY 2011 or $16.48 billion according to CRS and extends funding for the basic block grant, healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood competitive grants, mandatory child care grants, and certain other funds.

As Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I am keenly aware that the youngest among us often suffers the most when programs, like TANF, are underfunded. We must take a proactive role in protecting children from lives of abject poverty.

I represent the 18th Congressional district in Houston, Texas. In my district, more than 190,000 people live below the poverty line. Programs like TANF are vital to these families. At a time when the Census Bureau places the number of Americans living in poverty at the highest rate in over 50 years.

Across our nation the poverty rate has climbed to 14.3 percent in 2009, the highest level since 1994 and is likely to continue to climb. At this time children are again bearing the brunt, more than one in five children lived in families with incomes under the official poverty level which was $22,050 for a family of four in 2009. Similarly more than one in five children lived in households that did not always have the resources to purchase food.

In 2008, there were 15.45 million impoverished children in the nation, 20.7% 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% of households in the state struggle with food insecurity.

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. This has resulted in nearly one in three Texas children living with a parent who does not have 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 TANF 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 wellbeing and damage the Texas economy by taking money out of the private economy for critical local businesses such as grocery stores and medical providers.

Although TANF is not perfect, I believe that is an essential part of the safety net for very low-income families with children. These benefits do not provide families with the ability to live a lavish life style, they do provide a life line to families at a critical time in their lives, such as periods of unemployment or disability, or when a newborn joins a family. The goal of TANF is to be a temporary safety net and to help families in need to regain their balance, when a hard time causes them to lose their balance.

TANF provides access to paths out of poverty through services such as job training or counseling for mental health issues. State also uses the block grants for a wide range of work supports, including child care and transportation. For these reasons I support H.R. 2943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2943.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES IMPROVEMENT AND INNOVATION ACT

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2883) to amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to extend the child and family services program through fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2883

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 ''Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act''.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES PROGRAMS

SEC. 101. STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES CHILD WELFARE SERVICES PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 425 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 625) is amended by striking ''2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''2012 through 2016''.

(b) MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) RESPONSE TO EMOTIONAL TRAUMA.—Section 422(b)(15)(A)(ii) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)(15)(A)(ii)) is amended by inserting '', including emotional trauma associated with a child's maltreatment and removal from home'' before the semicolon.

(2) PROCEDURES ON THE USE OF PSYCHOTROPIC MEDICATIONS.—Section 422(b)(15)(A)(v) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)(15)(A)(v)) is amended by inserting '', including protocols for the appropriate use and monitoring of psychotropic medications'' before the semicolon.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES TO ADDRESS DEVELOPMENTAL NEEDS OF VERY YOUNG CHILDREN.—Section 422(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (16);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (17) and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(18) include a description of the activities that the State has undertaken to reduce the length of time children who have not attained 5 years of age are without a permanent family, and the activities the State undertakes to address the developmental needs of such children who receive benefits or services under this part or part E.''.

(4) DATA SOURCES FOR CHILD DEATH REPORTING.—Section 422(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 622(b)), as amended by paragraph (3) of this subsection, is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (17);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (18) and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(19) contain a description of the sources used to compile information on child maltreatment deaths required by Federal law to be reported by the State agency referred to in paragraph (1), and to the extent that the compilation does not include information on such deaths from the State vital statistics department, child death review teams, law enforcement agencies, or offices of medical examiners or coroners, the State shall describe why the information is not so included and how the State will include the information.''.

(c) CHILD VISITATION BY CASEWORKERS.—Section 424 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 624) is amended by striking the 2nd subsection (e), as added by section 7(b) of the Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006, and inserting the following:

''(f)(1)(A) Each State shall take such steps as are necessary to ensure that the total number of visits made by caseworkers on a monthly basis to children in foster care under the responsibility of the State during a fiscal year is not less than 90 percent (or, in the case of fiscal year 2015 or thereafter, 95 percent) of the total number of such visits that would occur during the fiscal year if each such child were so visited once every month while in such care.

''(B) If the Secretary determines that a State has failed to comply with subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year, then the percentage that would otherwise apply for purposes of subsection (a) for the fiscal year shall be reduced by—

''(i) 1, if the number of full percentage points by which the State fell short of the percentage specified in subparagraph (A) is less than 10;

''(ii) 3, if the number of full percentage points by which the State fell short, as described in clause (i), is not less than 10 and less than 20; or

''(iii) 5, if the number of full percentage points by which the State fell short, as described in clause (i), is not less than 20.

''(2)(A) Each State shall take such steps as are necessary to ensure that not less than 50 percent of the total number of visits made by caseworkers to children in foster care under the responsibility of the State during a fiscal year occur in the residence of the child involved.

''(B) If the Secretary determines that a State has failed to comply with subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year, then the percentage that would otherwise apply for purposes of subsection (a) for the fiscal year shall be reduced by—

''(i) 1, if the number of full percentage points by which the State fell short of the percentage specified in subparagraph (A) is less than 10;

''(ii) 3, if the number of full percentage points by which the State fell short, as described in clause (i), is not less than 10 and less than 20; or

''(iii) 5, if the number of full percentage points by which the State fell short, as described in clause (i), is not less than 20.''.

(d) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 423(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 623(b)) is amended by striking ''per centum'' each place it appears and inserting ''percent''.

SEC. 102. PROMOTING SAFE AND STABLE FAMILIES PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION OF FUNDING AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 436(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629f(a)) is amended by striking all that follows ''$345,000,000'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2016.''.

(2) DISCRETIONARY GRANTS.—Section 437(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(a)) is amended by striking ''2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''2012 through 2016''.

(b) TARGETING OF SERVICES TO POPULATIONS AT GREATEST RISK OF MALTREATMENT.—Section 432(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629b(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (8);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) describes how the State identifies which populations are at the greatest risk of maltreatment and how services are targeted to the populations.''.

(c) REVISED PURPOSES OF FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES AND TIME-LIMITED FAMILY REUNIFICATION SERVICES.—

(1) FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES.—Section 431(a)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629a(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'family support services' means community-based services designed to carry out the purposes described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) PURPOSES DESCRIBED.—The purposes described in this subparagraph are the following:

''(i) To promote the safety and well-being of children and families.

''(ii) To increase the strength and stability of families (including adoptive, foster, and extended families).

''(iii) To increase parents' confidence and competence in their parenting abilities.

''(iv) To afford children a safe, stable, and supportive family environment.

''(v) To strengthen parental relationships and promote healthy marriages.

''(vi) To enhance child development, including through mentoring (as defined in section 439(b)(2)).''.

(2) TIME-LIMITED FAMILY REUNIFICATION SERVICES.—Section 431(a)(7)(B) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629a(a)(7)(B)) is amended by redesignating clause (vi) as clause (viii) and inserting after clause (v) the following:

''(vi) Peer-to-peer mentoring and support groups for parents and primary caregivers.

''(vii) Services and activities designed to facilitate access to and visitation of children by parents and siblings.''.

(d) UNIFORM DEFINITIONS OF INDIAN TRIBE AND TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—Section 431(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629a(a)(5) and (6)) is amended by striking paragraphs (5) and (6) and inserting the following:

''(5) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian tribe' has the meaning given the term in section 428(c).

''(6) TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The term 'tribal organization' has the meaning given the term in section 428(c).''.

(e) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS OF STATE SUMMARIES OF FINANCIAL DATA; PUBLICATION ON HHS WEBSITE.—Section 432(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629b(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking all that precedes ''shall'' and inserting the following:

''(c) ANNUAL SUBMISSION OF STATE REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary''; and

(2) by adding after and below the end the following:

''(2) INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED.—The compilation shall include the individual State reports and tables that synthesize State information into national totals for each element required to be included in the reports, including planned and actual spending by service category for the program authorized under this subpart and planned spending by service category for the program authorized under subpart 1.

''(3) PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY.—Not later than September 30 of each year, the Secretary shall publish the compilation on the website of the Department of Health and Human Services in a location easily accessible by the public.''.

(f) GAO REPORT ON MULTIPLE SOURCES OF FEDERAL SPENDING AND FAMILY ACCESS TO SERVICES.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies alternative sources of Federal funding that are being employed by States or other entities for the same purposes for which funding is provided under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act; and

(2) assesses the needs of families eligible for services under such program, including identification of underserved communities and information regarding—

(A) the supports available for caseworkers to appropriately investigate and safely manage their caseloads;

(B) the length of the wait time for families to receive substance abuse and other preventive services; and

(C) the number of families on waiting lists for such services and the effect of the delay on healthy, successful reunification outcomes for such families.

(g) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—

(1) Section 432(a)(8)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629b(a)(8)(B)) is amended in each of clauses (i) and (ii) by striking ''forms CFS 101–Part I and CFS 101–Part II (or any successor forms)'' and inserting ''form CFS–101 (including all parts and any successor forms)''.

(2) Section 433(c)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629c(c)(2)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''FOOD STAMP'' and inserting ''SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS''; and

(B) by striking ''benefits benefits'' each place it appears and inserting ''benefits''.

SEC. 103. GRANTS FOR TARGETED PURPOSES.

(a) EXTENSION OF FUNDING RESERVATIONS FOR MONTHLY CASEWORKER VISITS AND REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP GRANTS.—Section 436(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629f(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking ''433(e)'' and all that follows and inserting ''433(e) $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2016.''; and

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking ''437(f)'' and all that follows and inserting ''437(f) $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2016.''.

(b) REVISION IN USE OF MONTHLY CASEWORKER VISITS GRANTS.—Section 436(b)(4)(B)(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629f(b)(4)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''support'' and insert ''improve the quality of''; and

(2) by striking ''a primary emphasis'' and all that follows and inserting ''an emphasis on improving caseworker decision making on the safety, permanency, and well-being of foster children and on activities designed to increase retention, recruitment, and training of caseworkers.''; and

(c) REAUTHORIZATION OF REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP GRANTS TO ASSIST CHILDREN AFFECTED BY PARENTAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE.—

(1) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 437(f)(3)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(f)(3)(A)) is amended by striking ''2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''2012 through 2016''.

(2) REVISIONS TO PROGRAM.—Section 437(f) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(f)) is amended—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''METHAMPHETAMINE OR OTHER'';

(B) in each of paragraphs (1), (4)(A), (7)(A)(i), and (9)(B)(iii), by striking ''methamphetamine or other'';

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) REQUIRED MINIMUM PERIOD OF APPROVAL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A grant shall be awarded under this subsection for a period of not less than 2, and not more than 5, fiscal years, subject to clause (ii).

''(ii) EXTENSION OF GRANT.—On application of the grantee, the Secretary may extend for not more than 2 fiscal years the period for which a grant is awarded under this subsection.

''(C) MULTIPLE GRANTS ALLOWED.—This subsection shall not be interpreted to prevent a grantee from applying for, or being awarded, separate grants under this subsection.'';

(D) in paragraph (6)(A)—

(i) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (ii);

(ii) by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) 70 percent for the sixth such fiscal year; and

''(v) 65 percent for the seventh such fiscal year.'';

(E) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking ''shall—'' and all that follows through ''(A) take'' and inserting ''shall take'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A)(iv), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period;

(iii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(iv) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iv) of subparagraph (A) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively, and moving each of such provisions 2 ems to the left; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF THE SECRETARY.—Not more than 5 percent of the amounts appropriated or reserved for awarding grants under this subsection for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2016 may be used by the Secretary for salaries and Department of Health and Human Services administrative expenses in administering this subsection.''.

(3) EVALUATIONS.—Not later than December 31, 2012, and not later than December 31, 2017, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall evaluate the effectiveness of the grants awarded to regional partnerships under section 437(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(f)) and shall publish a report regarding the results of each evaluation on the website of the Department of Health and Human Services. Each report required to be published under this subsection shall include—

(A) an evaluation of the programs and activities conducted, and the services provided, with the grant funds awarded under such section for fiscal years 2007 through 2011, in the case of the evaluation required by December 31, 2012, and for fiscal years 2012 through 2016, in the case of the evaluation required by December 31, 2017;

(B) an analysis of the regional partnerships awarded such grants that have, and have not, been successful in achieving the goals and outcomes specified in their grant applications and with respect to the performance indicators established by the Secretary under paragraph (8) of such section that are applicable to their grant awards; and

(C) an analysis of the extent to which such grants have been successful in addressing the needs of families with methamphetamine or other substance abuse problems who come to the attention of the child welfare system and in achieving the goals of child safety, permanence, and family stability.

SEC. 104. COURT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) GRANT PURPOSES.—Section 438(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''; and'' and inserting '', including the requirements in the Act related to concurrent planning;'';

(B) in subparagraph (B), by adding ''and'' at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) to increase and improve engagement of the entire family in court processes relating to child welfare, family preservation, family reunification, and adoption;''; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(4)'';

(B) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding after and below the end the following:

''(B) to increase and improve engagement of the entire family in court processes relating to child welfare, family preservation, family reunification, and adoption.''.

(b) SINGLE GRANT APPLICATION.—Section 438(b)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) SINGLE GRANT APPLICATION.—Pursuant to the requirements under paragraph (1) of this subsection, a highest State court desiring a grant under this section shall submit a single application to the Secretary that specifies whether the application is for a grant for—

''(A) the purposes described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a);

''(B) the purpose described in subsection (a)(3);

''(C) the purpose described in subsection (a)(4); or

''(D) the purposes referred to in 2 or more (specifically identified) of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of this paragraph.''.

(c) AMOUNT OF GRANT.—Section 438(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) AMOUNT OF GRANT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to each of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of subsection (b)(2) that refers to 1 or more grant purposes for which an application of a highest State court is approved under this section, the court shall be entitled to payment, for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2016, from the amount allocated under paragraph (3) of this subsection for grants for the purpose or purposes, of an amount equal to $85,000 plus the amount described in paragraph (2) of this subsection with respect to the purpose or purposes.

''(2) AMOUNT DESCRIBED.—The amount described in this paragraph for any fiscal year with respect to the purpose or purposes referred to in a subparagraph of subsection (b)(2) is the amount that bears the same ratio to the total of the amounts allocated under paragraph (3) of this subsection for grants for the purpose or purposes as the number of individuals in the State who have not attained 21 years of age bears to the total number of such individuals in all States the highest State courts of which have approved applications under this section for grants for the purpose or purposes.

''(3) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

''(A) MANDATORY FUNDS.—Of the amounts reserved under section 436(b)(2) for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allocate—

''(i) $9,000,000 for grants for the purposes described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a);

''(ii) $10,000,000 for grants for the purpose described in subsection (a)(3);

''(iii) $10,000,000 for grants for the purpose described in subsection (a)(4); and

''(iv) $1,000,000 for grants to be awarded on a competitive basis among the highest courts of Indian tribes or tribal consortia that—

''(I) are operating a program under part E, in accordance with section 479B;

''(II) are seeking to operate a program under part E and have received an implementation grant under section 476; or

''(III) has a court responsible for proceedings related to foster care or adoption.

''(B) DISCRETIONARY FUNDS.—The Secretary shall allocate all of the amounts reserved under section 437(b)(2) for grants for the purposes described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).''.

(d) EXTENSION OF FEDERAL SHARE.—Section 438(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(d)) is amended by striking ''2002 through 2011'' and inserting ''2012 through 2016''.

(e) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Effective as if included in the enactment of the Safe and Timely Interstate Placement of Foster Children Act of 2006, section 8(b) of such Act (120 Stat. 513) is amended by striking ''438(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 638(b))'' inserting ''438(b)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629h(b)(1))''.

SEC. 105. DATA STANDARDIZATION FOR IMPROVED DATA MATCHING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part B of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 621–629i) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Subpart 3—Common Provisions

''SEC. 440. DATA STANDARDIZATION FOR IMPROVED DATA MATCHING.

''(a) STANDARD DATA ELEMENTS.—

''(1) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with an interagency work group established by the Office of Management and Budget, and considering State perspectives, shall, by rule, designate standard data elements for any category of information required to be reported under this part.

''(2) DATA ELEMENTS MUST BE NONPROPRIETARY AND INTEROPERABLE.—The standard data elements designated under paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable, be nonproprietary and interoperable.

''(3) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—In designating standard data elements under this subsection, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate—

''(A) interoperable standards developed and maintained by an international voluntary consensus standards body, as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, such as the International Organization for Standardization;

''(B) interoperable standards developed and maintained by intergovernmental partnerships, such as the National Information Exchange Model; and

''(C) interoperable standards developed and maintained by Federal entities with authority over contracting and financial assistance, such as the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council.

''(b) DATA STANDARDS FOR REPORTING.—

''(1) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with an interagency work group established by the Office of Management and Budget, and considering State government perspectives, shall, by rule, designate data reporting standards to govern the reporting required under this part.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The data reporting standards required by paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable—

''(A) incorporate a widely-accepted, non-proprietary, searchable, computer-readable format;

''(B) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles; and

''(C) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary.

''(3) INCORPORATION OF NONPROPRIETARY STANDARDS.—In designating reporting standards under this subsection, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate existing nonproprietary standards, such as the eXtensible Business Reporting Language.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2012, and shall apply with respect to information required to be reported on or after such date.

SEC. 106. PROVISIONS RELATING TO FOSTER CARE OR ADOPTION.

(a) EDUCATIONAL STABILITY FOR EACH FOSTER PLACEMENT.—Section 475(1)(G) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 675(1)(G)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''the placement'' and inserting ''each placement''; and

(2) in clause (ii)(I), by inserting ''each'' before ''placement''.

(b) FOSTER YOUTH ID THEFT.—Section 475(5) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 675(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (G);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (H) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(I) each child in foster care under the responsibility of the State who has attained 16 years of age receives without cost a copy of any consumer report (as defined in section 603(d) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act) pertaining to the child each year until the child is discharged from care, and receives assistance (including, when feasible, from any court-appointed advocate for the child) in interpreting and resolving any inaccuracies in the report.''.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF ADOPTION SPENDING.—Section 473(a)(8) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 673(a)(8)) is amended by inserting '', and shall document how such amounts are spent, including on post-adoption services'' before the period.

(d) INCLUSION IN ANNUAL REPORT OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON CHILD VISITATION BY CASEWORKERS.—Section 479A(6) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 679b(6)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A); and

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

''(B) the total number of visits made by caseworkers on a monthly basis to children in foster care under the responsibility of the State during a fiscal year as a percentage of the total number of the visits that would occur during the fiscal year if each child were so visited once every month while in such care; and''.

SEC. 107. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, this title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 2011, and shall apply to payments under parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act for calendar quarters beginning on or after such date, without regard to whether regulations to implement the amendments are promulgated by such date.

(b) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) is required in order for a State plan developed pursuant to subpart 1 of part B, or a State plan approved under subpart 2 of part B or part E, of title IV of the Social Security Act to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this title, the plan shall not be regarded as failing to meet any of the additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. If the State has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

TITLE II—CHILD WELFARE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 201. RENEWAL OF AUTHORITY TO APPROVE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS DESIGNED TO TEST INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES IN STATE CHILD WELFARE PROGRAMS.

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

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) LIMITATION.—During fiscal years 2012 through 2014, the Secretary may authorize demonstration projects described in paragraph (1), with not more than 10 demonstration projects to be authorized in each fiscal year.''.

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

''(3) CONDITIONS FOR STATE ELIGIBILITY.—For purposes of a new demonstration project under this section that is initially approved in any of fiscal years 2012 through 2014, a State shall be authorized to conduct such demonstration project only if the State satisfies the following conditions:

''(A) IDENTIFY 1 OR MORE GOALS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The State shall demonstrate that the demonstration project is designed to accomplish 1 or more of the following goals:

''(I) Increase permanency for all infants, children, and youth by reducing the time in foster placements when possible and promoting a successful transition to adulthood for older youth.

''(II) Increase positive outcomes for infants, children, youth, and families in their homes and communities, including tribal communities, and improve the safety and well-being of infants, children, and youth.

''(III) Prevent child abuse and neglect and the re-entry of infants, children, and youth into foster care.

''(ii) LONG-TERM THERAPEUTIC FAMILY TREATMENT CENTERS; ADDRESSING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—With respect to a demonstration project that is designed to accomplish 1 or more of the goals described in clause (i), the State may elect to establish a program—

''(I) to permit foster care maintenance payments to be made under part E of title IV to a long-term therapeutic family treatment center (as described in paragraph (8)(B)) on behalf of a child residing in the center; or

''(II) to identify and address domestic violence that endangers children and results in the placement of children in foster care.

''(B) DEMONSTRATE READINESS.—The State shall demonstrate through a narrative description the State's capacity to effectively use the authority to conduct a demonstration project under this section by identifying changes the State has made or plans to make in policies, procedures, or other elements of the State's child welfare program that will enable the State to successfully achieve the goal or goals of the project.

''(C) DEMONSTRATE IMPLEMENTED OR PLANNED CHILD WELFARE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT POLICIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The State shall demonstrate that the State has implemented, or plans to implement within 3 years of the date on which the State submits its application to conduct the demonstration project or 2 years after the date on which the Secretary approves such demonstration project (whichever is later), at least 2 of the child welfare program improvement policies described in paragraph (7).

''(ii) PREVIOUS IMPLEMENTATION.—For purposes of the requirement described in clause (i), at least 1 of the child welfare program improvement policies to be implemented by the State shall be a policy that the State has not previously implemented as of the date on which the State submits an application to conduct the demonstration project.

''(iii) IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW.—The Secretary may terminate the authority of a State to

conduct a demonstration project under this section if, after the 3-year period following approval of the demonstration project, the State has not made significant progress in implementing the child welfare program improvement policies proposed by the State under clause (i).'';

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

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) INAPPLICABILITY OF RANDOM ASSIGNMENT FOR CONTROL GROUPS AS A FACTOR FOR APPROVAL OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—For purposes of evaluating an application to conduct a demonstration project under this section, the Secretary shall not take into consideration whether such project requires random assignment of children and families to groups served under the project and to control groups.

''(7) CHILD WELFARE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT POLICIES.—For purposes of paragraph (3)(C), the child welfare program improvement policies described in this paragraph are the following:

''(A) The establishment of a bill of rights for infants, children, and youth in foster care that is widely shared and clearly outlines protections for infants, children, and youth, such as assuring frequent visits with parents, siblings, and caseworkers, access to attorneys, and participation in age-appropriate extracurricular activities, and procedures for ensuring the protections are provided.

''(B) The development and implementation of a plan for meeting the health and mental health needs of infants, children, and youth in foster care that includes ensuring that the provision of health and mental health care is child-specific, comprehensive, appropriate, and consistent (through means such as ensuring the infant, child, or youth has a medical home, regular wellness medical visits, and addressing the issue of trauma, when appropriate).

''(C) The inclusion in the State plan under section 471 of an amendment implementing the option under subsection (a)(28) of that section to enter into kinship guardianship assistance agreements.

''(D) The election under the State plan under section 471 to define a 'child' for purposes of the provision of foster care maintenance payments, adoption assistance payments, and kinship guardianship assistance payments, so as to include individuals described in each of subclauses (I), (II), and (III) of section 475(8)(B)(i) who have not attained age 21.

''(E) The development and implementation of a plan that ensures congregate care is used appropriately and reduces the placement of children and youth in such care.

''(F) Of those infants, children, and youth in out-of-home placements, substantially increasing the number of cases of siblings who are in the same foster care, kinship guardianship, or adoptive placement, above the number of such cases in fiscal year 2008.

''(G) The development and implementation of a plan to improve the recruitment and retention of high quality foster family homes trained to help assist infants, children, and youth swiftly secure permanent families. Supports for foster families under such a plan may include increasing maintenance payments to more adequately meet the needs of infants, children, and youth in foster care and expanding training, respite care, and other support services for foster parents.

''(H) The establishment of procedures designed to assist youth as they prepare for their transition out of foster care, such as arranging for participation in age-appropriate extra-curricular activities, providing appropriate access to cell phones, computers, and opportunities to obtain a driver's license, providing notification of all sibling placements if siblings are in care and sibling location if siblings are out of care, and providing counseling and financial support for post-secondary education.

''(I) The inclusion in the State plan under section 471 of a description of State procedures for—

''(i) ensuring that youth in foster care who have attained age 16 are engaged in discussions, including during the development of the transition plans required under paragraphs (1)(D) and (5)(H) of section 475, that explore whether the youth wishes to reconnect with the youth's biological family, including parents, grandparents, and siblings, and, if so, what skills and strategies the youth will need to successfully and safely reconnect with those family members;

''(ii) providing appropriate guidance and services to youth whom affirm an intent to reconnect with biological family members on how to successfully and safely manage such reconnections; and

''(iii) making, when appropriate, efforts to include biological family members in such reconnection efforts.

''(J) The establishment of one or more of the following programs designed to prevent infants, children, and youth from entering foster care or to provide permanency for infants, children, and youth in foster care:

''(i) An intensive family finding program.

''(ii) A kinship navigator program.

''(iii) A family counseling program, such as a family group decision-making program, and which may include in-home peer support for families.

''(iv) A comprehensive family-based substance abuse treatment program.

''(v) A program under which special efforts are made to identify and address domestic violence that endangers infants, children, and youth and puts them at risk of entering foster care.

''(vi) A mentoring program.

''(8) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'youth' means, with respect to a State, an individual who has attained age 12 but has not attained the age at which an individual is no longer considered to be a child under the State plans under parts B and E of title IV, and

''(B) the term 'long-term therapeutic family treatment center' means a State licensed or certified program that enables parents and their children to live together in a safe environment for a period of not less than 6 months and provides, on-site or by referral, substance abuse treatment services, children's early intervention services, family counseling, legal services, medical care, mental health services, nursery and preschool, parenting skills training, pediatric care, prenatal care, sexual abuse therapy, relapse prevention, transportation, and job or vocational training or classes leading to a secondary school diploma or a certificate of general equivalence.'';

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

''(d) DURATION OF DEMONSTRATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), a demonstration project under this section may be conducted for not more than 5 years, unless in the judgment of the Secretary, the demonstration project should be allowed to continue.

''(2) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—In no event shall a demonstration project under this section be conducted after September 30, 2019.'';

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''(which shall provide,'' and all that follows before the semicolon;

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

(C) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

''(7) an accounting of any additional Federal, State, and local investments made, as well as any private investments made in coordination with the State, during the 2 fiscal years preceding the application to provide the services described in paragraph (1), and an assurance that the State will provide an accounting of that same spending for each year of an approved demonstration project; and'';

(4) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h);

(5) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

''(f) EVALUATIONS.—Each State authorized to conduct a demonstration project under this section shall obtain an evaluation by an independent contractor of the effectiveness of the project, using an evaluation design approved by the Secretary which provides for—

''(1) comparison of methods of service delivery under the project, and such methods under a State plan or plans, with respect to efficiency, economy, and any other appropriate measures of program management;

''(2) comparison of outcomes for children and families (and groups of children and families) under the project, and such outcomes under a State plan or plans, for purposes of assessing the effectiveness of the project in achieving program goals; and

''(3) any other information that the Secretary may require.

''(g) REPORTS.—

''(1) STATE REPORTS; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each State authorized to conduct a demonstration project under this section shall—

''(A) submit periodic reports to the Secretary on the specific programs, activities, and strategies used to improve outcomes for infants, children, youth, and families and the results achieved for infants, children, and youth during the conduct of the demonstration project, including with respect to those infants, children, and youth who are prevented from entering foster care, infants, children, and youth in foster care, and infants, children, and youth who move from foster care to permanent families; and

''(B) post a copy of each such report on the website for the State child welfare program concurrent with the submission of the report to the Secretary.

''(2) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate—

''(A) periodic reports based on the State reports submitted under paragraph (1); and

''(B) a report based on the results of the State evaluations required under subsection (f) that includes an analysis of the results of such evaluations and such recommendations for administrative or legislative changes as the Secretary determines appropriate.''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(i) INDIAN TRIBES OPERATING IV–E PROGRAMS CONSIDERED STATES.—An Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium that has elected to operate a program under part E of title IV in accordance with section 479B shall be considered a State for purposes of this section.''.

TITLE III—BUDGET PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 2883, the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act, a bill that continues a tradition of bipartisanship in crafting child welfare legislation.

The bill we're considering today reauthorizes two important child welfare programs, incorporating a series of improvements developed during hearings held by the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources over the past few months.

In addition to continuing and making improvements to two major child welfare programs, this bill also renews authority for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to approve child welfare waivers during the next 3 years. Past waivers have allowed States to test new and better ways of helping children at risk of abuse and neglect.

Earlier this year, the House unanimously passed legislation renewing this authority, but the Senate has not followed suit.

This bill, which our colleagues in the Senate also support and which was favorably reported by the Senate Finance Committee yesterday, will allow innovation to continue and may yield information to improve child welfare programs in the future. The bill will also establish a process to create needed data standards in child welfare programs. This language is a first step towards improving collaboration between social service programs.

We have often heard in hearings that States and programs within States have difficulty coordinating services because of difficulty sharing data, and that this lack of coordination increases costs and decreases effectiveness. This bill directs the Secretary of HHS to work with the States to establish national data standards so that all State child welfare programs are speaking the same language.

To show the wide support for this bill, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert letters of support into the RECORD from the following organizations: The National Conference of State Legislatures; the American Public Human Services Association; the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators; the American Institute of CPAs; the American Humane Association; the North American Council on Adoptable Children; Voice for Adoption; the Association on American Indian Affairs; the National Indian Child Welfare Association; Youth Villages; First Focus Campaign for Children; Zero to Three (The National Center for Infants, Toddlers and Families); the National Foster Care Coalition; the Child Welfare League of America; the Children's Defense Fund; the Center for the Study of Social Policy; and the Public Children Services Association of Ohio.

NATIONAL FOSTER CARE COALITION,
Washington, DC, September 13, 2011.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Member, Senate Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BAUCUS, RANKING MEMBER HATCH, CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: The National Foster Care Coalition extends its support to the reforms made through the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act of 2011.

In these challenging times we still believe important reforms can be made with the child welfare system. Waiver provisions provide an opportunity for states to strengthen their child welfare systems in some very important ways.

We appreciate and support the inclusion of important provisions we highlighted including: Greater attention placed on the care and the development of infants and toddlers who come into contact with the child welfare system. Continuation of the substance abuse grants and that these grants will have a broader substance abuse focus. Funding for child welfare workforce development and the accompanying requirements on monthly visits to children in foster care. Additional clarification on the state tracking and reporting of the adoption maintenance-of-effort provisions as enacted by PL 110–351 will provide a greater assurance that more funds are re-invested into state child welfare systems. Clarification of the education protection for children in foster care. Provisions that will help address issue young people in foster care face with identity theft. Attention to youth rights, participation in transition planning, and connections with birth family members.

We also support the increased attention to tracking the use of psychotropic medications, the increased focus on addressing trauma, the new study on the recruitment of foster, adoptive and kin parents and we want to extend our assistance in addressing the challenges of making improvements to data collection and data matching.

We appreciate your efforts to move the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act of 2011 forward in a bipartisan/bicameral way by the end of September. The National Foster Care Coalition will promote this legislation among its membership and is pleased to provide any assistance in moving the legislation forward.

Sincerely,

THE NATIONAL FOSTER CARE COALITION.

PCSAO,
Columbus, OH, September 14, 2011.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommitte on Human Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Member, Senate Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommitte on Human Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BAUCUS, RANKING MEMBER HATCH, CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: Public Children Services Association of Ohio supports The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act of 2011.

As a state that has shown improved outcomes related to our budget neutral Title IV–E Protect Ohio Waiver (Ohio leads the nation with a 43% Safe Reduction in the number of children in foster care between 2002–2010; AFCARS data), we strongly support Congress' recognition that children and families in other States can also benefit from Title IV–E Waivers allowing flexible funding. We encourage you to consider broader child welfare funding reform in the near future.

Ohio's child welfare system is also extremely supportive of reauthorization of the Stephanie Tubbs Jones Child Welfare Services and Promoting Safe and Stable Families programs under the present funding. Ensuring funds to strengthen families—keeping them intact, reunifying or finding and supporting alternate permanent families—is essential for our children's well being. We know that children grow best in stable, permanent families.

The Court Improvement Program in Ohio has aided in reforming our system. Courts play a critical role in decision making and oversight related to child safety and permanency, and the CIP in Ohio has focused on timeliness, improving procedures, focused well being oversight and adapting court philosophy and procedure as more children are raised by kinship families.

Ohio is struggling with too many children coming into foster care due to pervasive addictions to prescription pain killers, heroin, and other substances—we support the substance abuse grants part of this bill, and appreciate the broader application for various substances, to allow time-limited treatment services so children can safely reunify with recovered parents.

Ohio is ready to embrace other bill provisions such as addressing issues for foster children and youth including prevention of identity theft and improving transitional youth planning, improving educational outcomes, strengthening sibling connections, and addressing the developmental needs of infants and toddlers in foster care. Our Child Fatality Review system already strives to review all available data and apply lessons and recommend improved policy to prevent future child deaths, and Ohio is dedicated to re-investing saved funds as more children become eligible for Title IV–E Adoption Assistance funds.

We appreciate your efforts to move The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act of 2011 forward in a bipartisan/bicameral way by the end of September, 2011. As elected and representative Trustees of Public Children Services Association of Ohio, we urge Congress to promptly pass this important legislation.

Please contact PCSAO's Executive Director, Crystal Ward Allen, at 614–224–5802 or crystal@pcsao.org with any questions, concerns or requests.

Sincerely,

CRYSTAL WARD ALLEN,

Executive Director, PCSAO on behalf of Public Children Services Association of Ohio, 2011 Board of Trustees:

Chip Spinning, President/Director, Madison Co. Dept. of Job & Family Services;

Denise Stewart, Vice President/Director, Mahoning County Children Services;

Randall Muth, JD, Secretary/Director, Wayne County Children Services;

Moira Weir, Treasurer/Director, Hamilton Co. Dept. of Job & Family Services;

Scott Ferris/Director, Allen County Children Services;

Andrea Reik/Director, Athens County Children Services;

Dwayne Pielech/Director Belmont Co. Dept. of Job & Family Services;

Kate Offenberger/Director, Carroll Co. Dept. of Job & Family Services;

Catherine Hill/Director Hocking County Children Services;

Teresa Alt/Director, Huron Co. Dept. of Job & Family Services;

June Cannon/Director, Miami County Children Services;

Gary Crow/Director, Lorain County Children Services;

Corey Walker/Director Paulding Co. Dept. of Job & Family Services;

Lisa Wiltshire/Director, Scioto County Children Services;

John Saros, JD/Director, Summit County Children Services.

FIRST FOCUS
CAMPAIGN FOR CHILDREN,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2011.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, U.S.Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Member, Senate Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BAUCUS, RANKING MEMBER HATCH, CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: I am writing on behalf of First Focus, a bipartisan advocacy organization committed to making children and their families a priority in federal policy and budget decisions, to thank you for your leadership and commitment to moving forward The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act of 2011 in a bicameral and bipartisan manner by the end of September 2011. We are pleased that the bill reauthorizes the Stephanie Tubbs Jones Child Welfare Services Program and the Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) Program, and restores waiver authority to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. We hope that Congress will follow your lead and swiftly pass this critical legislation.

First Focus is dedicated to the long-term goal of substantially reducing the number of children entering foster care, while working to ensure that our existing system of care protects children and adequately meets the needs of families in the child welfare system. We are especially concerned with increasing our federal investments in prevention efforts and providing supports and services for at-risk families to ensure they never enter the child welfare system in the first place.

As you know, initially created in 1993, PSSF was reauthorized in 1997 under the Adoption and Safe Families Act. The program was amended in 2001 and again in 2005 as part of the Deficit Reduction Act. The 2006 Child and Family Services Improvement Act extended funding for the program until 2011. It is currently authorized through September 30, 2011. The program supports a number of critical State (and eligible tribal) child welfare activities, including family preservation services, family support services, time-limited family reunification services, and adoption promotion and support services.

PSSF is a relatively small funding stream compared to the open-ended entitlement for foster care under SSA Title IV-E, but is still critical to the work of State social service agencies given that it may be used to provide services to children and families in need and to help keep families together. In contrast to the bulk of federal child welfare funding, which is targeted solely at foster care, PSSF seeks to prevent child abuse and neglect, avoiding the removal of children in the first place while supporting timely reunification. These funds are often combined with other State and local resources as well as private funds, and support a range of services, including parenting classes that promote competencies and positive relationship skills; home-visiting services for at-risk parents as well as other family-based services; respite care for caregivers of children with special needs; and a range of other innovative programs and services for at-risk families. According to the FY 2009 National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS), states reported that they provided prevention services to more than three million children. PSSF allowed states to pay for services to 30 percent of those children. These are critical services and we believe that the reauthorization of PSSF will only strengthen the program and its core goals, ensuring its success for years to come.

We also applaud your efforts to ensure that child welfare waiver demonstration projects are reauthorized and remain a critical vehicle for promoting flexibility while fostering innovation in practice at the state level. We are especially pleased that the bill authorizes ten new demonstration projects annually for a duration of five years. While we would urge you to consider extending waiver authority beyond FY 2014, we are encouraged by your efforts to ensure that demonstrations projects continue in the near term. Absent a broader reform of the child welfare financing structure, states are in need of greater flexibility in the use of available federal child welfare funds. In addition to title IV-B programs, child welfare waiver demonstration projects are a critical vehicle for providing a broad array of support services to children and families, and promote flexibility and foster innovation in practice at the state level.

Among other provisions, we are pleased that The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act includes new requirements for states to address the emotional trauma experience by children in foster care, adopt protocols for prescribing and monitoring psychotropic medications, and describe their efforts to address the developmental needs of young children in care and reduce their length of stay in care. The bill also continues grants to address substance abuse in families with children at-risk of entering into foster care, continues funding for the Court Improvement Program, and provides needed clarification with respect to a provision in the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act related to ensuring the educational stability of foster children for each foster care placement.

First Focus stands prepared to work with you to ensure swift passage of The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act. We thank you for your leadership on this and other issues impacting children and families, and look forward to working with you to ensure better care for our nation's most vulnerable children.

Sincerely,

BRUCE LESLEY.

CWLA,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2011.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources, Longworth, Washington, DC.

Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources, Longworth, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: On behalf of the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) and our public and private member agencies that work directly with abused, neglected, and vulnerable children, youth, and their families, this letter is in support of the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (HR 2883) to reauthorize Title IV–B of the Social Security Act and restore the authority of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to authorize demonstration projects via a waiver of Title IV–E. CWLA members are located in all fifty states and provide a range of child welfare services from prevention to placement and permanency services including child protection, family support and preservation, adoptions, foster care, kinship care, and treatment services provided in residential settings. As a non-profit leadership and membership-based child welfare organization, CWLA is committed to engaging people everywhere in ensuring that all children and youth have the support that they need to grow into healthy contributing members of society.

Part I, Child Welfare Services (CWS) provides critical flexible funding for a broad range of services designed to support, preserve, and/or reunite children and their families. While we know that prevention services are underfunded, in light of current austerity we acknowledge that the maintenance of this program's $325 million authorization is positive. However, with the expectation of further cuts to discretionary funding levels over the next decade, it is critical to reiterate within this context that vulnerable children and families should be held harmless in all budget balancing strategies.

State Child Welfare Services Plans serve as a lynchpin for the continuum of strategies designed to prevent and ameliorate maltreatment. Through requirements encompassing case reviews, permanency planning, program development, agency administration, and systems collaboration activities, fundamental protections and core service provision is ensured for the vulnerable populations served with these funds. CWLA commends the subcommittee for strengthening these plans. H.R. 2883 requires the plans to respond to identified emotional trauma needs associated with maltreatment and removal, strengthens oversight of prescription medication monitoring protocols, encourages activities to reduce time in foster care and address developmental needs especially for children younger than five, and mandates the reporting of child maltreatment deaths.

Part II, Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) is an important funding stream for the operation of specific service categories. Although the services overlap, the four specified categories in PSSF create important distinctions in types of families in need. The additional targeted activities bring attention and resources to pressing needs including caseworker visits, substance abuse, court improvement, and mentoring for children of prisoners. CWLA supports the way that HR 2883 maintains this structure. Again, while we see a need for additional resources, we recognize the nation's strained financial condition. Therefore, we appreciate

the continuation of $200 million in discretionary funds and the room appropriators have to fully fund the program. In recognition of the difficulty of increasing funding, we think it is important that HR 2883 amends the reporting requirements to Congress to include actual spending in addition to planned spending by service category. We believe that increased tracking of these funds will further reveal that they are supporting necessary and effective programs for vulnerable children and families.

Courts are an integral component of the child welfare system, providing pivotal decisions of maltreatment findings and approval of permanency changes. PSSF is one of the few places in child welfare law where funding is provided for the courts. We appreciate your receptiveness to our suggestions for the continuation of the $30 million annual set-aside for the Court Improvement Program and the dedication of $1 million specifically for tribal courts and are pleased to see them both included in HR 2883. In addition, we support the way the bill bolsters court improvement plans by clarifying that they should include requirements related to concurrent planning and increasing and improving the engagement of the entire family in court processes. CWLA also applauds the enhancement of the substance abuse and mentoring grants under HR 2883. Because all children affected by parental substance abuse, regardless of the particular substance used, deserve assistance, CWLA strongly agrees with the removal of the provision giving greater weight to applicants addressing methamphetamine abuse specifically.

CWLA welcomes the bill's data standardization and improved data matching section. We understand that the administration has undertaken efforts in this direction and appreciate the recognition in both branches of government of the critical importance of sharing information across systems. CWLA is also very pleased to see the changes HR 2883 makes related to foster care and adoption, including the clarification of the educational stability requirement for children in care, the efforts to address any credit issues for foster children at least 16 years of age, and the requirement for states to document savings from the de-link of adoption assistance payments. Furthermore, we support the related requirement to document spending on post-adoption services. This is a strong recognition of the importance of supporting lasting permanency.

Title II of the bill restores the ability of HHS to authorize demonstration projects through Title IV-E waivers designed to increase permanency, improve outcomes, and prevent abuse and neglect. CWLA believes that waivers can be helpful in testing and evaluating innovative approaches within the child welfare system that have promising potential. However, CWLA does not believe that the restoration of waiver authority constitutes a comprehensive solution to the problems facing the child welfare system. More ambitious approaches to reforming the federal financing structure should be undertaken. Accordingly, CWLA supports the bill's three-year restoration of waiver authority while consensus on more comprehensive approaches is being developed. CWLA specifically supports the eligibility requirements included in HR 2883. The policy conditions have the power to encourage states to implement practices that will improve their child welfare systems and the lives of those within them.

CWLA appreciates your leadership in crafting this important legislation. HR 2883 makes positive improvements to IV–B and IV–E of the Social Security Act and we support its passage. If you have any follow up questions, feel free to contact Sean Hughes, Director of Congressional Affairs at 202–590–8772 or Suzanne Ayer, Policy Associate at 202–688–4178.

Sincerely,

CHRISTINE JAMES-BROWN,
President/CEO.

SEPTEMBER 19, 2011.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: We write in support for the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (H.R. 2883) and specifically to express our appreciation for the provisions that would promote the positive development of very young children in the child welfare system. Our organizations have worked together to identify ways that all levels of government could better address the developmental needs of infants and toddlers who have been abused or neglected. This work resulted in the publication last spring of A Call to Action on Behalf of Maltreated Infants and Toddlers, which advocates for child welfare policies and practices that view the care of young children through a developmental lens. We are so pleased that the legislation you have introduced would take important steps toward infusing child welfare policy with that developmental approach.

We particularly appreciate the provision requiring state child welfare plans to include a description of activities to address the developmental needs of young children. Early brain development occurs at life-altering speeds, making infants and toddlers particularly vulnerable to the effects of abuse and neglect. Maltreatment can literally alter the chemistry of the brain, weakening its architecture and placing young children at significant risk for later cognitive, social, and emotional deficits. If child welfare practices are not oriented toward supporting this sensitive stage of development, as well as families' ability to nurture their children, they can compound the effects of maltreatment. Ensuring that child welfare practices are informed by what we know from the science of brain development can promote early intervention that will improve the outlook for these babies and avoid the costs to both child and society resulting from developmental impairments.

The significance of the legislation you have authored becomes clear when we consider that infants and toddlers represent a quarter of children who are abused and neglected and almost a third of children entering foster care. We believe it will encourage states to reexamine how they are addressing child welfare cases involving young children and consider steps to systematically promote positive development for vulnerable babies.

We appreciate your leadership in highlighting the needs of young children within federal child welfare law. We stand ready to help the Congress, the Administration, and the states in building a child welfare system that helps all young children realize their potential.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION,
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL POLICY,
CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND,
ZERO TO THREE.

ZERO TO THREE
Washington, DC, September 19, 2011.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: On behalf of Zero to Three, I write to offer our support for the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (H.R. 2883) approved by the Ways and Means Committee last week. Zero to Three is a national nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting the healthy development of infants and toddlers. We believe this legislation will help ensure the well-being of our most vulnerable children: infants and toddlers in the child welfare system. We particularly appreciate the provision requiring state child welfare plans to include a description of activities to address the developmental needs of young children. This provision is a tremendous step forward for children whose development is threatened by maltreatment and, at times, foster care practices that are not informed by the science of early brain development. Other provisions adding services to enhance child development and facilitate family visitation will also promote child well-being and healing parent-child relationships.

These steps are particularly important, because infants and toddlers are the most vulnerable to maltreatment and comprise 31% of children entering foster care. The first three years of life are a time of rapid brain development, when the foundation for all learning that follows is created. Relationships are the context within which early development unfolds, so it is not surprising that babies are particularly sensitive to the effects of maltreatment. Maltreatment can literally alter the chemistry of the brain, weakening its architecture and placing young children at risk for later cognitive, social, and emotional deficits. Maltreated infants and toddlers are four to five times more likely than other young children to have developmental impairments. The removal of babies from their parents' care, coupled with foster care practices that often are not guided by their developmental needs, can compound the effects of maltreatment. The good news is that intervening early with practices that support healthy development can improve the outlook for these babies and avoid the costs to society that accompany developmental impairments.

Last spring, Zero to Three joined with American Humane Association, Center for the Study of Social Policy, Child Welfare League of America, and Children's Defense Fund to issue A Call to Action on Behalf of Maltreated Infants and Toddlers. This publication advocates for child welfare policies and practices at all levels of government that view the care of young children through a developmental lens. This legislation is the first step in answering that call. We believe it will spur states to bring the science of early brain development into their child welfare systems. We applaud your leadership in infusing this perspective into federal child welfare law and promoting positive development for vulnerable babies.

Thank you for all you do for young children who face great adversity in their lives.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW E. MELMED,
Executive Director.

□ 1330

I also want to thank the ranking member of the Human Resources Subcommittee, Mr. DOGGETT of Texas, for working with me on this legislation and for his efforts to improve how we serve children and families across the country.

Finally, I want to note that this legislation does not add to the deficit since it simply extends current funding levels of the programs that are extended.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman, Mr. DAVIS, is correct. We have worked on this together. We have participated in hearings and have learned together and cooperated on this very important subject to which we may bring differing perspectives but a common goal of wanting to respond to the needs of America's most vulnerable children.

I believe that this bipartisan legislation which I do fully support, is important; however, it is also important to understand what we support and where we have differences and to understand what this legislation accomplishes and what it fails to accomplish. This bill is certainly preferable to allowing two very important laws to expire next week.

Each year, over 700,000 children here in America become victims of abuse and neglect, perpetrated by the very people who are supposed to love and care for them. I think most Americans, as do my wife, Libby, and I, when we're back home in Texas and surrounded by Clara, Zayla, and Ella, our three granddaughters, believe it's just almost incomprehensible that parents or grandparents could cause harm to a member of their own families. Yet that is the reality that too many of our children face. One expert came to our committee during the hearing and suggested that, once every 6 hours of every day, a child dies in America as a result of abuse.

I agree that both the Child Welfare Services and the Promoting Safe and Stable Families laws should be renewed for another 5 years. I disagree that these programs should be continued at their current baseline funding levels since, with need growing and funding limited, too many of our most vulnerable children cannot access the services that they so desperately need. These are the children whose neglect not only produces problems for them, but will produce more problems for all of American society in the future. They are the children we should be helping today so that we are not incarcerating them after they have done harm to someone tomorrow.

Less than half of the children in foster care in America today receive federal assistance to help with the room and board. Today, 40 percent of children who are found to be victims of abuse and neglect don't receive any follow-up or intervention at all. That is a very big gap that will likely only grow over the course of the next 5 years with the legislation that we are renewing.

In my home State of Texas, the Promoting Safe and Stable Families Act accounts for a very significant source of funding to help our youngest Texans. According to one of our witnesses in committee, Dr. Jane Burstain of the Center for Public Policy Priorities in Austin, funding from this program accounted for $2 of every $3 supporting child abuse and neglect prevention programs last year. In San Antonio, for example, these programs provide important resources to help vulnerable families through the Bexar County Child Welfare Board.

This bill also grants States support for parental substance abuse programs. My friend Darlene Byrne, a district judge in Austin, Texas, who helped establish the Family Treatment Drug Court that was partially funded by dollars from this act that we're renewing, writes that she has seen new babies who are not drug positive, moms and couples reunify with their families, and workers receive their GEDs or high school diplomas and find employment. Those are the people that these programs help.

In short, she says that this program has contributed in transforming lives and in helping to stop the cycle of drug abuse, poverty, and violence in Texas. It is important both to those who benefit directly and to all of us who have a stake in having folks participate to the full extent of their God-given potential, not posing dangers to the rest of our society.

Today's legislation also includes, as Mr. DAVIS indicated, some modest policy changes that strengthen the States' abilities to respond to at-risk children. Mr. Speaker, the bill, I believe, leaves too many problems unresolved. I think, though, in this current climate that the renewal of the legislation as it's proposed is the best that we can do for our at-risk children. This bill reauthorizes help to at least some children who become victims of maltreatment. It provides family support and activities to some vulnerable families, and it promotes adoption services for those children who cannot safely return to their biological parents.

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield 4 minutes to the former chair of this Subcommittee on Human Resources, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill to renew the Nation's child welfare programs. I'm glad to see this happening as it has in the past by unanimous consent, and it's important not just to keep these programs funded and renewed. With more than one in five children in the country living in poverty and with so many odds stacked against foster kids, we need to do more. We need to make progress. That's why I'm so supportive of this bill, because it is not just an extension of the program; it has some important and targeted innovations.

Some States, especially my home State of Washington, have some truly new ideas about how they can do more to prevent children being put into foster care even in tough economic times. One of the real innovations of this bill is to give States waivers for some governmental funding restrictions so that they can test these innovative interventions in their child welfare programs. If the States can maintain their current quality and if the innovations they want to try meet solid criteria, the Federal Government should be a partner in making real progress. That's what these new waivers do.

Washington State is one of the leaders in innovating child welfare policy, and it has some things it has been eager to try out. Right now, the law doesn't allow for this kind of experimentation, but this bill gives States a way to begin. Washington State is not alone. There is room for 10 States to have these kinds of programs. There are some States already ready to make these moves.

Now, the Department of Health and Human Services allowed this kind of thing in the past, but it was allowed to lapse. This is really an extension of something we've had before. HHS was allowed to give out a number of waivers in the past, and some progress was made in a number of States. This bill restores that limited waiver authority and sets out criteria to keep the integrity and level of effort they need to have. We need to allow these States to do it.

In addition to extending the program and making more room for innovation, the bill does something else that's really important. In 2008, we passed the Fostering Connections and Increasing Adoptions law. This Fostering Connections law did a lot of good in helping foster kids have a better chance of truly making it in this country. Among other things, it addressed the health concerns of foster children who moved from home to home and from health care setting to health care setting, and it required States to develop health coordination plans for these kids so that they had some continuity of care. These plans had to include oversight of prescription medications, including psychotropic drugs.

As a psychiatrist who has worked with children in child welfare and the juvenile justice system, I am very concerned about the use of psychotropic drugs. It has bothered me for a long time. In the fostering care population, it is a particularly vulnerable group because of this question of continuity of care. You want somebody to be monitoring what's happening as they move from home to home to home. We need

to do more. We need to get a clearer picture of what is happening with these kinds of medications in the foster kids, and we need to make sure they are being used properly and are not overly prescribed.

□ 1340

One of the parts about this whole law that's crazy is that when a kid gets to 18 they could be on a medication. When they hit 18, they're done. Their Medicaid ends. They have no continuity of the drugs. They go off cold turkey. So there's some real questions that we need to answer here.

This bill takes the 2008 requirements another step forward and it requires States to adopt protocols for using and monitoring psychotropic medications among foster children.

Mr. Speaker, I speak strongly in favor of the bill and urge my colleagues to say ''yea.''

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from California (Ms. BASS), one of the leaders on this subject of foster children, who came and testified to our committee based on her long experience working in the State of California in the assembly on this subject.

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2883, the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act. As cochair of the bipartisan Congressional Caucus on Foster Care, I am proud to stand with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in support of this important legislation.

Youth in the child welfare system fight for what so many of us take for granted—a family. In California, my home State, the Nation's largest foster care system in any given year, as many as 100,000 children can be placed in temporary out-of-home care. Foster parents and relatives are the frontline caregivers for children when their parents are unable to care for them.

A pool of dedicated, loving foster parents is critical for our Nation's foster youth as they wait to be reunited with their parents or achieve permanency with a relative caregiver or adoptive family. However, there is a significant shortage of foster parents.

In May, I introduced legislation calling for a study to find out how to best recruit and retain foster parents. This was included in the original House bill reauthorizing title IV–B child welfare programs introduced in August. I'm pleased that the modified bill before us today includes a provision that encourages States to develop and implement a plan to improve the recruitment and retention of high-quality foster family homes.

H.R. 2883 builds on some of the best practices that were shared with me as I've traveled California hearing from youth, child welfare workers, and parents. The bill also appropriately addresses challenges facing the child welfare system by requiring States to address emotional trauma in foster children and to adopt protocols for using and monitoring psychotropic medications.

I am very pleased with the comments of my colleague, Mr. MCDERMOTT, who talked about the use of psychotropics, and I would just add that, in too many cases, the children are prescribed multiple medications. And in talking with a number of youth up and down the State of California, one of the things that many youths said to me was, Can you please help me get off the medication.

I would like to thank Ways and Means Chairman CAMP, Ranking Member LEVIN, Human Resources Subcommittee Chair GEOFF DAVIS, and Ranking Member DOGGETT for their unwavering commitment to our most vulnerable youth.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who has been very active in a Foster Youth Financial Security Act.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act.

This bill includes a provision from the Foster Youth Financial Security Act that I introduced with my colleague from California (Mr. STARK) to address disturbingly high rates of identity theft among foster youth. I, along with many others, was absolutely outraged to find that foster children are disproportionately victims of identity theft since their personal information passes through so many hands.

Mr. Speaker, as I saw firsthand when my parents welcomed foster youth into our home over many years, they already faced tremendous obstacles without the increased threat of having their identity taken and their credit ruined, which prevents them from finding a place to live, accessing credit on their own, or obtaining other basic needs.

This bill would ensure that each foster youth over 16 years of age receives free credit checks before leaving the system and assistance clearing any inaccuracies that may have come to light. Reports have shown that if done effectively, the cost is minimal.

I want to thank, Mr. Speaker, the committee for their interest in this issue and the many advocates who have championed this cause. This is only the first step in providing foster youth the tools that they need and deserve to succeed, and I look forward to our continued work together on this issue.

As I pointed out so many times, the kids in foster care already face significant challenges of their own of a personal nature. It is a shame that their identity is stolen and they're further victimized. This bill would identify problems early on and clear up the inaccuracies so they can start their adult life with a fresh start with their credit intact.

I thank both gentlemen, the chair, and the ranking member for their outstanding support of this provision.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, some in this House have suggested earlier in the year that the programs embodied in this legislation, and everything else that opens opportunities through government support from Pell Grants to Title I funding for education to the school lunch program to Head Start, that all of these are ''welfare'' and should be cut. Fortunately, that approach is not being taken here today. We are reauthorizing, in a bipartisan way, these two very important programs that would expire next week.

Mr. Speaker, however, it should be noted that, much like somebody might be flatlined, we are flat funding the renewal of these programs, meaning that in 5 years we are authorizing the same amount of money for these programs, if it can be appropriated, that existed last year. That means that there are many needs in our country that will not be fully addressed in this legislation. It means that last year, if less than half of those in foster care received support for food and board, they will be in the same situation over the course of this legislation. It means that the 40 percent of children who are subject to abuse and neglect are unlikely to be able to access services as they were last year.

But renewing this legislation remains, despite those deficiencies, an important accomplishment in the current political environment. And, as Mr. DAVIS and a number of other speakers have noted, we have made some modest improvements.

Another of those not touched on yet is our work in this legislation to ensure that children in foster care can stay in the schools that they started in, even though they may be moved between families. That's an important part of adding a little certainty to the lives of children who have been abused or neglected and find themselves with a great deal of uncertainty.

It is for the improvements in this act and the recognition of what harm would be done if this act were not adopted here in a bipartisan way that so many child advocacy groups have joined in supporting it—the Child Welfare League of America, First Focus, Zero to Three—as well as groups of those organizations that are involved in administering some of these funds: the National Conference of State Legislatures, the American Public Human Services Association, and the Conference of State Court Administrators.

□ 1350

I believe this legislation is important. It's important to get it adopted promptly. I hope the Senate will respond to our bipartisan approval today, as Mr. DAVIS has suggested they have already begun to do in the committee process, and move forward to see it fully adopted by next week. I urge all of my colleagues to join in supporting this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), for working with me to bring this measure to the floor today and thank him and thank both the majority and minority staffs for their hard work on this effort. H.R. 2883 is a bipartisan, bicameral, no-cost effort to extend and make modest adjustments to programs designed to help ensure the safety and well-being of children at risk of abuse and neglect. We need to do all we can to ensure more children remain safely in their homes, and this bill will help to do so.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE
OF STATE LEGISLATURES,
September 13, 2011.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, House Ways & Means, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. SANDY LEVIN,
Ranking Member, House Ways & Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP AND REPRESENTATIVE LEVIN: On behalf of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), we urge you to support H.R. 2883, a bill to renew the authority of the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to approve demonstration projects designed to test innovative strategies in state child welfare programs and reauthorizing the Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) program. Congressmen Geoff Davis and Lloyd Doggett have fashioned bipartisan legislation that helps create opportunities to enhance the state-federal partnership to assist our nation's most vulnerable children.

NCSL supports reinstating and expanding federal waiver authority so that states can test the results of increased funding flexibility on the development of service alternatives and on the overall delivery of child welfare services. This allows states to target programs to address the needs of their youngest citizens. By renewing and extending Title IV–E waiver authority through 2014, H.R. 2883 will give states an enhanced ability to provide early intervention and crisis intervention services that will safely reduce out-of-home placements and improve child outcomes.

NCSL supports the reauthorization of the PSSF program. The PSSF program enhances state efforts to develop additional family preservation, family reunification, and family support programs. We appreciate the flexibility provided to states in H.R. 2883 and that the legislation does not preempt current state laws.

H.R. 2883 will allow states to improve the quality of their child welfare interventions and reinvest savings in their programs. It will also provide both state and federal legislators tools to develop innovative an effective approaches to transform the lives of children who are at risk of abuse and neglect. We applaud Congressmen Davis and Doggett for crafting this legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM T. POUND,
Executive Director, NCSL.

NATIONAL INDIAN
CHILD WELFARE ASSOCIATION,
Portland, OR, September 13, 2011.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS, *Chair,*
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT, *Ranking Member,*
House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources.
Hon. MAX BAUCUS, *Chair,*
Hon. ORRIN HATCH, *Ranking Member,*
Senate Finance Committee.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES DAVIS AND DOGGETT AND SENATORS BAUCUS AND HATCH: The National Indian Child Welfare Association (NICWA) writes this letter in support of the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (HR 2883/S 1542) which would reauthorize programs under Title IV–B of the Social Security Act—Stephanie Tubbs Jones Child Welfare Services; Promoting Safe and Stable Families; Regional Partnerships on substance abuse; and the Court Improvement Program.

Committee staff on both sides of the aisle has been most open to meeting with us, and we thank them for their hard work and interest in more heavily involving Indian and Alaska Native communities in these programs. We especially thank Sonja Nesbit, Ryan Martin, Diedra Henry-Spires, and Becky Shipp.

NICWA has worked on several reauthorizations of Title IV–B, notably in 2006 when a number of improvements were enacted regarding tribal participation. The 2006 Act increased tribal allocations and provided common sense flexibility for tribal administration of the programs.

In fiscal year 2011, 170 tribes/tribal organizations received $6.2 million from the Child Welfare Services Program and 126 tribes/tribal consortia received $11 million from the Promoting Safe and Stable Families Program. In addition, tribes are the lead grantee in six of the 53 Regional Partnerships substance abuse grants.

The Title IV–B program that has bypassed tribes is the Court Improvement Program and we are most grateful for the breakthrough on this matter in the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act. The bill would, for the first time, make tribes eligible to apply for competitive grants for this program and would allocate $1 million annually for this purpose. There is a great need in Indian Country for assistance for tribal courts work in the area of child welfare. We also appreciate the provision which would allow tribes operating Title IV–E (Foster Care and Adoption Assistance) programs to apply for waivers for child welfare demonstration projects.

Again, thank you. We look forward to continuing to work with you on child welfare matters.

Sincerely,

TERRY L. CROSS,
Executive Director.

YOUTH VILLAGES,
September 13, 2011.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS, *Chairman,*
Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT, *Ranking Member,*
Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: On behalf of Youth Villages, I am writing in support of your bill, H.R. 2883, and to thank you for your leadership on this issue. This legislation provides for the extension of the important Promoting Safe and Stable Families program as well as critical authority for the Department of Health and Human Services to extend the Title IV–E waiver program, which has demonstrated substantial impact since creation in 1994. These waivers provide states with greater flexibility in the use of Federal funds for alternative services and supports that promote safety, permanency and well-being for children in the child protection and foster care system.

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

As a result of the flexibility afforded by the Title IV–E waiver, intensive reunification and targeted prevention services are given greater focus in the state's child welfare service approach. Without the award of the waiver, it would have been difficult for Youth Villages to expand its Intercept program into the state to serve the child welfare population. In the three years that Youth Villages has been operating in Florida, we have served over 300 children across the Central and Southern regions of the state at a significantly lower cost than traditional child welfare placement services. More importantly, they have achieved such outcomes as: over 70% of children still at home, over 80% having graduated or actively engaged in school, and over 80% having had no trouble with the law six months after discharge from services.

Youth Villages pledges its full support of H.R. 2883, as this legislation has the ability to transform the child welfare system from one that incentivizes out-of-home placement to a system that promotes in-home treatment and family unification.

Regards,

PATRICK LAWLER,
CEO, Youth Villages.

VOICE FOR ADOPTION,
Washington, DC, September 14, 2011.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Hart Senate Office Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Longworth House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Hart Senate Office Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Cannon House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMEN BAUCUS AND DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBERS HATCH AND DOGGETT: On behalf of Voice for Adoption's members I am writing to thank you for your leadership and your bipartisan and bicameral effort to introduce the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (S. 1542/H.R. 2883). Voice for Adoption (VFA) is a membership advocacy organization; we speak out for our nation's 107,000 waiting children in foster care. Our members, who are spread across the country, recruit families to adopt children and youth with special needs. VFA members also provide vital support services both before and after adoption finalization to

help adoptive families through the challenges they often face raising children with painful pasts.

Voice for Adoption supports this legislation, which acts to reauthorize two major child welfare programs, the Stephanie Tubbs Jones Child Welfare Services Program and the Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) program. Under the PSSF program the adoption promotion and support services category provides funding to recruit and support families for children who are waiting to be adopted.

We commend the authors of this bill for not only acting in a bipartisan/bicameral manner, but also for making potentially impacting improvements in the reauthorization of these programs. We applaud the strengthening of language that requires states to document the use of dollars saved from the federal adoption assistance de-link, created under the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–351). Voice for Adoption hopes that through future guidance States are encouraged to spend a portion of these adoption delink funds on post-adoption support services. VFA also supports other important improvements made in the bill including: the requirement for better reporting on post-adoption services spending and transparency to access this data, the requirement of States to address the developmental needs of young children and reducing their amount of time spent in foster care, the requirement of States to address emotional trauma and the clarification of educational protections for children in foster care, the requirement for state protocols and procedures relating to the use of psychotropic medications, ID theft issues for foster youth, inclusion of state waivers and measures that include quality of care improvements for foster children.

Voice for Adoption is proud to support this bipartisan/bicameral legislation, as it exists to reauthorize programs that protect children and families and promote both permanency and support for children in foster care. We are also happy to inform and encourage our members to support this bill.

Sincerely,

NICOLE DOBBINS,
Executive Director.

ASSOCIATION ON
AMERICAN INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Rockville, MD, September 14, 2011.

Re H.R. 2883 and S. 1542.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS, *Chair,*
Hon. ORRIN HATCH, *Ranking Member,*
Senate Finance Committee.
Hon. GEOFF DAVIS, *Chair,*
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT, *Ranking Member,*
House Ways and Means Committee, Subcommittee on Human Resources.

DEAR SENATORS BAUCUS AND HATCH AND REPRESENTATIVES DAVIS AND DOGGETT: Thank you for your introduction of H.R. 2883 and S. 1542, the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act. The Association on American Indian Affairs (AAIA) strongly supports this legislation.

AAIA is an 89 year old Indian advocacy organization located in South Dakota and Maryland and governed by an all-Native American Board of Directors. We have been involved with Indian child welfare issues for decades, including working closely with the House and Senate on tribal provisions in the Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006 and the Fostering Connections to Success and Promoting Adoptions Act of 2008.

We are particularly supportive of the provisions in both bills that would allocate $1 million for competitive Court Improvement Program grants to Indian tribal courts and allow tribes operating Title IV–E programs to apply for waivers for child welfare demonstration projects. We also appreciate and support the language that would make the definition of Indian tribes consistent in both Parts 1 and 2 of Title 1V–B.

Once again, thank you for your support of this legislation and these tribal issues and to the House and Senate staff (Sonja Nesbit, Ryan Wilson, Diedra Henry-Spires and Becky Shipp) that have been so helpful in this process.

Sincerely,

JACK F. TROPE,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION,
September 14, 2011.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources, House of Representatives.
Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Finance Committee, U.S. Senate.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources, House of Representatives.
Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Member, Finance Committee, U.S. Senate.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS, CONGRESSMAN DOGGETT, CHAIRMAN BAUCUS AND SENATOR HATCH: American Humane Association extends its support to the reforms made through the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act.

Through the joint efforts of the House and Senate and the leadership of both parties, we believe you have written a strong bill to reauthorize the Child Welfare Services and Promoting Safe and Stable Families programs (Title IV–B part 1 and part 2).

In testifying last June in the United States House of Representatives, the American Humane Association outlined a number of important changes that could be made through this reauthorization. We appreciate and support the inclusion of many of those recommendations as well as several other provisions in this legislation that we believe will assist children and families touched by the child welfare system. Some of the key provisions of this bill that we see as particularly important include:

The greater attention placed on the care and the development of infants and toddlers who come into contact with the child welfare system;

The continuation of the substance abuse grants and that these grants will have a broader substance abuse focus;

The bill's continued funding for child welfare workforce development, the stronger language on workforce support and the accompanying requirements on monthly visits to children in foster care;

The clarification on the state tracking and reporting of the adoption maintenance-of-effort provisions as enacted by PL 110–351 (Fostering Connections Act);

The clarification on access to education for children in foster care;

The continuation of court improvement funding; and

The attention paid to the problem of identity theft for children and youth in foster care.

In addition there are several other improvements in this legislation in regard to reports by the Department of Health and Human Services and the extension of waiver authority which we have also talked positively of in past statements to both the House and Senate Committees.

Once again we restate our appreciation of your efforts to move this forward in a bipartisan fashion with all due speed. Please feel free to reach out to the American Humane Association for any additional assistance in moving forward with this legislation and other matters before your committees.

Sincerely,

JOHN SCIAMANNA,
Director, Policy and Government Affairs, Child Welfare.

NORTH AMERICAN COUNCIL
ON ADOPTABLE CHILDREN,
St. Paul, MN, September 16, 2011.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Longworth House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Cannon House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES DAVIS AND DOGGETT: On behalf of the North American Council on Adoptable Children (NACAC), I am writing to express our support for the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (H.R. 2883). We are grateful for your leadership in introducing this important legislation and strongly believe it will improve the lives of vulnerable children and their families.

NACAC is an adoption support and advocacy organization with more than 1,000 members nationwide. We represent adoptive and foster parents, adoptees, adoption professionals, parent support groups, and adoption agencies and organizations. Since 1974, we have supported the right of every child to have a permanent, loving family and advocated for adoptive families to receive necessary supportive services.

NACAC strongly supports the Stephanie Tubbs Jones Child Welfare Services Program and the Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) program. In particular, we are happy that the PSSF program has required states to designate at least 20 percent of the funds to adoption support and promotion services. These funds have been used across the country to recruit families for foster children who cannot return home and to support families raising these children with special needs.

We were pleased that H.R. 2883 will continue these valuable efforts while also adding several enhancements. We strongly support requiring states to document how they spend the funds reinvested as a result of the maintenance of effort provision of the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008, which expanded federal eligibility for Title IV–E adoption assistance. In addition, however, NACAC would recommend that the legislation require states to spend a portion of these reinvestment funds on post-adoption services. Since special needs adoptions generate this additional revenue for states, it is reasonable to request that a specific portion of the funds be invested in post-adoption services. As you well know, the majority of children adopted from foster care have significant special needs, and post-adoption services ensure these children have the best chance of being adopted and for living successfully in safe and stable families.

Again, we thank you for your commitment to children and families through your introduction of the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act.

Sincerely,

JOE KROLL,
Ececutive Director.

AMERICAN PUBLIC
HUMAN SERVICES ASSOCIATION,
September 16, 2011.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Member, Senate Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BAUCUS, RANKING MEMBER HATCH, CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: On behalf of the American Public Human Services Association (APHSA), I write to thank you for your leadership in introducing the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act of 2011. This legislation addresses the importance of prevention programs and support of community-based services for children and families at risk or in crisis, including through extending grant authority to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) for new child welfare waivers through 2014. This legislation also reinforces Congress's recognition of the need for state flexibility and accountability to enable public agencies to be good stewards of public funds and to manage performance, self-correct, innovate and enhance their ability to achieve positive outcomes.

The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act reauthorizes two essential prevention and family support programs and outlines key improvements to child welfare practices designed to improve outcomes for at-risk children, youth and families. APHSA members appreciate the changes to the current methodology for calculating monthly caseworker visits. These provisions are closely linked with the recommendations that APHSA and The National Association of Public Child Welfare Administrators (NAPCWA) presented before the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources during the ''Hearing on Protecting At-Risk Youth.'' The change in calculation will not only better reflect states' performance on this indicator, but also highlight the diligent efforts made by casework staff.

APHSA and our member agencies fully support the efforts to address children's emotional and behavioral health needs and welcome stronger, more collaborative partnerships with other agencies across the human service continuum to meet the enhanced data and tracking provisions outlined in the bill.

APHSA also fully supports the renewal and expansion of the HHS Secretary's authority to grant waivers for states to flexibly use IV–E funds to test innovative strategies in child welfare programs. Earlier this year, APHSA provided comments, concerns and recommendations to the previous House and Senate proposed waiver bills (H.R 1194 and S. 1013) and are pleased to see that the current bill includes provisions consistent with our member states' practices, as well as new provisions that conform to our member states' views.

APHSA members are pleased to see the time period to operate a waiver expanded to five years. We are also pleased to see that states can apply for a waiver by implementing two program improvement areas and that only one of them needs to be a new program. APHSA also appreciates the clarification that states currently operating waivers and successfully achieving outcomes will be allowed to continue those improvements as this bill expands the program to 10 new demonstration projects. In these current budgetary times, it is critical for new waiver states to innovate their practices and service array, while current waiver states increase the knowledge and evidentiary base for programs and practices that work.

APHSA also fully supports reauthorization of the Court Improvement Program. The Court Improvement Program allows our member agencies to work in close partnership with their state and local judicial system to meet the safety, permanency and well-being needs of children in a timely and complete manner. This program also supports the essential cross-system training of judges, attorneys and other legal representatives in child welfare cases.

Once again, we look forward to continuing the work of improving services and outcomes for at risk children. We continue to be available as a resource as regulations and guidance is developed to meet the provisions of the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovations Act of 2011.

Sincerely,

TRACY L. WAREING,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CPAS,
Washington, DC, September 20, 2011.

Re The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act, H.R. 2883.

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: On behalf of the 377,000 members of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), I am writing in support of your legislation, H.R. 2883, the ''Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act.'' The bill calls for grantees of Federal funds under the Child Welfare Services program and the Safe and Stable program to report certain data to the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), and for DHHS to develop a rule designating standard data elements and data reporting requirements for the information to be reported. The legislation specifies that DHHS ''shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate existing nonproprietary standards, such as eXtensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL).''

The use of data tagging to enhance both the transparency and the ability to analyze financial and other data has been proved time and time again. XBRL provides a detailed yet customizable approach to gathering data and will provide significant transparency to the Federal government and the American people regarding the use of taxpayer funds.

XBRL has been used for a number of years by the Federal government in areas such as Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation call reports and public company financial reporting to the Securities and Exchange Commission. Importantly, such standardized business reporting is also expanding in both the United States by state governmental agencies and worldwide, where data standards are being leveraged to significantly reduce the compliance reporting burden and, at the same time, enhance the usability and transparency of reported information. Including provisions to require reporting of information under the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act will make the reporting process more efficient and enhance comparability of such information for DHHS, the Congress, and other stakeholders who need to monitor and analyze the use of these funds.

Thank you again for your leadership on this important issue. We are also happy to discuss with you additional areas where implementation of data standards can further enhance reporting and make it more valuable to all types of stakeholders of data. If you have any questions, or if we can be of any further assistance, please contact Diana Huntress Deem.

Sincerely,

BARRY C. MELANCON, CPA,
President and CEO.

CONFERENCE OF CHIEF JUSTICES,
CONFERENCE OF STATE COURT ADMINISTRATORS,
Washington, DC.

Re Child and Family Services Act (HR 2883).

Hon. GEOFF DAVIS,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: On behalf of the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators, we write to support the Child and Family Services Act that includes reauthorization of the three Court Improvement Program (CIP) grant programs through FY 2016 at the current $30 million level. The three Court Improvement Program (CIP) grant programs are critical for state courts as they provide the only federal funds to state courts for the purpose of improving state court oversight of abuse and neglect cases; and have been invaluable in assisting courts to improve and expedite our processes and procedures. These funds have resulted in abused and neglected children moving more expeditiously to safe and permanent homes and improved outcomes for children in need of protection. Our work, however, is not complete, so the reauthorization of these funds will allow us to continue our work to improve results for these children.

We appreciate the new purpose which would allow CIP funds to be used ''to increase and improve engagement of the entire family in court processes relating to child welfare, family preservation, family reunification, and adoption''. This new purpose provides state courts with greater flexibility in the use of the funds. We also support the provision that would allow state courts to submit a single application for the three CIP grants. This will allow state courts to eliminate duplicative paperwork and reporting, which will free up time for reform efforts. While the legislation reduces the amount of funds available to state courts, we do understand the need to also provide financial assistance to tribal courts.

Thank you again for your efforts on behalf of state courts. If we can provide you with additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us or Kay Farley, who is with the Government Relations Office of the National Center for State Courts.

Sincerely,

CHIEF JUDGE ERIC T. WASHINGTON,
President, Conference of Chief Justices.
ROSALYN W. FRIERSON,
President, Conference of State Court Administrators.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Child and Family Services Improvement

and Innovation Act (H.R. 2883). This legislation shows that we can work together across the aisle to improve our child welfare system. Yet this bill is just one step in our ongoing efforts to fix the foster care system. In this time of unacceptable poverty and inequality, we must continue to support families in order to prevent kids from being neglected or abused. As we debate how to shrink our debt, we must also ensure that preserving and improving the safety net that protects our children is a higher priority than protecting special interest tax breaks.

Despite the fact that I am not on the Human Resources Subcommittee for the first time in many years, I am pleased that my colleagues still listen to some of my ideas. Last year, Congressman LANGEVIN and I introduced a bill to reduce the high number of foster youth who are victims of identity theft and are unable to secure student loans or even get a credit card. Today's legislation includes a provision from our bill that will provide youth who are about to age out of foster care with a copy of their credit report as well as resources to help clear up any credit issues. This provision is what I hope is the first movement toward ensuring that foster youth leave the system with a clean financial slate and a chance to succeed.

There are many important provisions in today's bill: maintaining a set-aside to support caseworker visits with foster children; decreasing the overuse of psychotropic drugs on foster youth, and improving education stability for children in care.

Children in foster care are our collective responsibility. The reforms made in this bill will make children safer. I thank the Chairman, the ranking Member, and all the staff involved in crafting this legislation and I urge my colleagues to support it today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2883, ''The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act,'' which reauthorize Title IV–B of the Social Security Act, including the Promoting Safe and Stable Families and Child Welfare Services programs, while also reinstating the authority of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to authorize States to implement innovative demonstration programs through Title IV–E waivers.

As Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I have been a stalwart supporter of protecting the health and welfare of children and families. Today there are more than 463,000 children and youth that are in out-of-home care. Every day, more than a half million U.S. children are in the foster care system with over 120,000 waiting to be adopted. With no permanent legal guardians, they are our Nation's children, and we have a responsibility to ensure a bright future for those who are handed a rough start in life. Foster children like all children deserve a safe environment to grow and nourish in. This piece of legislation is a step in the right direction in addressing the needs of our Nation's children when they need our help the most. There are many silent heroes who have opened their homes and taken on the role of foster parents, social workers, mentors, caregivers and volunteers to the children in this Nation. These young kids need to know someone is looking out for them and supporting legislation like the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act provides these silent heroes with additional resources and requirements to meet the needs of children in care.

There are an estimated 12 million foster care alumni in the U.S. representing all walks of life. Each and every one of the 12 million alumni has a story of their struggles, challenges and success. The Foster care system is supposed to ensure that children are cared for by members of our communities on a full-time or temporary basis when their parents are unable to provide adequate care. Often the natural parents cannot provide for a child's care for a variety of reasons such as due to incarceration, physical or mental illness, behavioral difficulties, or problems within the family environment. These issues may include child abuse, alcoholism, extreme poverty, or crime. These children often become wards of the State and we have the responsibility to protect their interests and to ensure they are provided with the care they need.

If even a single child continues to be abused or neglected while under state supervision then that is one child too many. This legislation, although not ideal, is a valid attempt to address the needs of families in crisis. In 2001, an estimated 903,000 U.S. children were found to be victims of abuse or neglect. This number is above the estimated 879,000 child maltreatment victims in 2000 but below the annual estimated highs of more than 1 million child maltreatment victims recorded through the mid-1990s. For the year 2001, States reported 59 percent of these victims experienced neglect, compared to 63 percent in 2000 and 58 percent in 1999. The percentage of physical abuse and sexual abuse victims has declined over the past 5 years but held constant between 2000 and 2001. These children need our protection. There are over 500,000 children in foster care and with this economic downturn I hope this number does not keep on rising. But hope is not enough, we need to continue to fund programs to help these children and their families.

The size of the foster care caseload rises or falls depending upon both the number of entries to foster care—children who are removed from their homes in a given year—and the number of exits in that same year—children reunited with their families, adopted, emancipated, or placed in another permanent setting. The number of entries to foster care has outpaced the number of exits for two decades.

Accountability is key, children who received ''services from Child Protective Services died as a result of abuse 16 times more often than children in the general population 16.3 percent of all fatalities were children who had received services or were 'known to the system'. These children were already in a high risk category however, we must do our best to transform these numbers and ensure their safety. Currently at least 716 thousand children received ''services'' (28 States reporting) or 1 percent of the general population. If CPS intervention had no effect, 1 percent of this group would have suffered a fatality; if CPS intervention had made an improvement, the percentage would be less than 1 percent. However, it is 16.3 times that amount. (18 States reporting)

At this time children are again bearing the brunt of families in crisis. When a household falls into poverty, children are exposed to increased parental distress, inadequate childcare arrangements, and poor nutrition. This will lead to an increase of families needing child welfare services. For these reasons I support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2883, 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. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2608, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 405 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 405

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2608) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 399 is laid on the table.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 405 provides for a closed rule for the consideration of H.R. 2608. It's a temporary continuing resolution that will fund the operations of the

United States Government through November 18 of this year. It is important to note that the funding levels in this CR are the very same fiscally responsible levels that this Congress and President Barack Obama approved in the Budget Control Act just 1 month ago. This is not a departure from our path of restoring fiscal sanity, Mr. Speaker. We are committed to continuing on that path. But, unfortunately, the actions of the other body leave us no choice but to consider this continuing resolution today.

I take no pride, Mr. Speaker, in sharing with you—actually, that's not true. That's not true at all. I take great pride in sharing with you what the House has done over the last 6 months, 7 months, 8 months; but I take no pride at all in pointing out what has not happened on the other end of this Capitol to do the work that needs to be done.

Constitutionally, we are required to fund the operations of the government. June 2 of this year, the House passed the Homeland Security appropriations bill. To date, the Senate has not.

On June 14 of this year, the House passed the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs bill. This is the one bill that our friends in the Senate have passed as well.

June 16, the House passed the Agriculture appropriations bill. To date, the Senate has taken no action at all.

July 15, the House passed the Energy and Water appropriations bill. To date, the Senate has not.

July 22, the House passed the Legislative Branch appropriations bill. To date, the Senate has not.

Mr. Speaker, I did not run for Congress last November, I did not show up here as a freshman to continue business as usual, passing continuing resolution after continuing resolution after continuing resolution. And I know my friends on both sides of the aisle believe that's a process which has long since exceeded its usefulness.

I am so proud that we as a body have begun to pass those appropriations bills one by one by one. And what have we gotten because of that? We've gotten oversight. We've had the opportunity to discuss line by line by line what are our priorities as the House. Now, those priorities differ from time to time between my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle and my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, but we have an opportunity at least to discuss those priorities.

When the other body fails to pass the appropriations bills, what choices do we have left? What choices are available to me as a new freshman Member of the House? I could choose to abrogate responsibility. I could choose to say no. No, we're just going to wait, and if the Senate fails to act, then so be it. Let the government shut down and let the chips fall where they may. That's not the kind of operation I want to run. That's not why I came to the United States Congress. I came to the United States Congress because this is the people's House. This is where thoughtful discussion of the people's priorities takes place.

What brings me to the floor today is to consider this continuing resolution that for just 1½ short months, through November 18, will extend the operations of the government so we can continue that thoughtful discussion that I know so many of the Members here came for.

With that, I urge my colleagues to thoughtfully consider this rule today, thoughtfully consider the underlying bill; and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my colleague for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because our colleagues in the Republican majority have failed. They failed the most basic responsibility of this institution, as my colleague has mentioned, to pass regular and routine bills to keep the government's doors open, to keep retirement checks in the mail, and vital government services available to the American people.

In a few days the fiscal year will end; and without a stopgap measure, funding for essential government services will run out. Despite 9 months of claims from the Republican majority that things have changed and despite a pledge to America that promised a different Washington, and despite endless calls for a regular appropriations process, not a single appropriations bill has been enacted for the upcoming fiscal year which begins October 1.

Throughout this failed process, the majority has blamed everyone but themselves. They have pointed fingers at President Obama, complained about our colleagues in the Senate, and blamed the Washington status quo that they say they can't control. Throughout the process, the one group of people they won't lay responsibility with is themselves.

After 9 months with not a single bill successfully making its way through Congress, finger-pointing rings hollow. Not only has no appropriations bill been enacted, but half of the necessary appropriations bills haven't even been brought to the floor for a vote. The majority controls this body and has used their powers to pursue sideshow legislation and dangerous games of default, but they can't schedule a vote for the most fundamental pieces of legislation that we consider every year.

As I stand here today to vote on a billion-dollar Band-Aid that will allow us to scrape by until November, the hope is by November the majority will be able to do the job they failed to do all year. Growing up, every child hopes for such a homework extension. By the time we are elected to Congress, however, we should know that our work must be handed in on time.

□ 1400

Sadly, today's legislation isn't even the biggest failure of leadership that we are facing in the House. If the press reports are accurate, we may be headed for an even bigger failure in November. In recent days, reports have surfaced that the majority plans to fund the entire Federal Government with one massive, trillion-dollar omnibus bill.

This bill would explicitly break a promise that the Republican majority made to the American people. In the Pledge to America, their leadership included a goal entitled ''advance legislative issues one at a time.'' In the document they explain, ''we will end the practice of packaging unpopular bills with must-pass legislation to circumvent the will of the American people. Instead, we will pass major legislation one issue at a time.''

During a speech at the American Enterprise Institute in 2010, Speaker BOEHNER affirmed the need to consider appropriations legislation one bill at a time, saying he wanted to do away with the concept of comprehensive spending bills. On the eve of assuming the majority in the House, Speaker BOEHNER elaborated, saying, ''I do not believe that having 2,000-page bills serves anyone's best interest. Not the House, not for the Members and not the American people.'' But, if press reports are correct, a 2,000-page bill or more is what we will get.

Let's be clear. The prospect of omnibus funding is happening for two simple reasons: First, our colleagues on the other side will not work in a bipartisan manner. There are no Democrat fingerprints on any bills that come to the floor to make the compromise necessary to reach consensus. They continue to pass legislation filled with special interest favors and ideological pursuits that the American people never asked for and don't want. As a result, the legislation is built to fail, and fail it does—over and over again.

Secondly, instead of doing the tough, unglamorous, work of the House, we have spent most of the time on ideological quests and political games. Instead of fulfilling the pledge to uphold the Constitution, the majority has worked to fulfill campaign pledges to Grover Norquist and the far right. Instead of creating jobs, our colleagues on the other side have spent months on end pushing a partisan agenda that has covered everything from the trivial to the very real dangers of default.

Instead of funding the Department of Energy, the majority has tried to micromanage our lightbulbs. Instead of funding the Nation's schools, they tried to eliminate Big Bird. Instead of funding the EPA, they tried to sell the land surrounding the Grand Canyon to the state-owned mining companies of Russia and South Korea. Instead of funding cancer research conducted by the NIH, they have tried, repeatedly, to repeal health care reform. And instead of setting a responsible budget for the next fiscal year, they brought our economy to the brink of default and led to the first-ever downgrade of our Nation's credit.

Even today, our colleagues on the other side are injecting politics into a stopgap CR. Today we are considering legislation that will only provide disaster relief to hurricane victims if billions of dollars are taken from a successful alternative energy program that has created 39,000 jobs to date and is poised to create 60,000 more. We were told in the Rules Committee that this was money simply lying there.

In effect, the other side of the aisle is telling the American people that Congress will either help rebuild shattered communities or Congress will create new green jobs, but we refuse to do both. This immoral approach reflects a House of Representatives that is void of responsible leadership from those in charge.

Today I'll do the little bit that I can to provide leadership sorely lacking from those in charge. Mr. Speaker, if we can defeat the previous question at the end of this debate, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that disaster victims get the help they need. My amendment will allow Representative DINGELL to offer a motion to strike the unacceptable House language that says all disaster aid must be offset and substitute the bipartisan Senate approach.

Since 2004, American taxpayers have spent over $3.4 billion on infrastructure in Afghanistan and even more in Iraq. Not a single one of those $3.4 billion was held hostage or offset by any program in our budget. But now, as many Americans are struggling to rebuild and get their lives back to normal, the majority refuses to help unless they are allowed to defund a successful program they happen to dislike. Remember, what this says is that the American public is financing the reconstruction of Afghanistan and Iraq with taxpayer money, but taxpayer money without an offset will not be used to help the American taxpayer. That takes a lot of explaining.

Because the majority decided that pursuing a partisan agenda was more important than meeting the basic needs of the country, we face the prospect of a trillion dollar, 1,000-page bill to keep the government running because the other side will not stop playing politics and start governing as we are all expected to do. This failure is a disservice to the American people, an abdication of our responsibilities as legislators, and a shame to the expectations, responsibilities and duties of the House.

The majority rode into Washington vowing to change the ways of the past, but over the last 9 months, the American people have witnessed a case study in abandoned responsibilities and misguided priorities. Until the Republican majority begins to govern with responsibility, I fear this Congress will continue to live up to the low regard our Nation has for it, which brings shame on us all. I urge my colleagues on the other side to stop serving their political interests, start doing bipartisan bills, and start serving our country.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on today's rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 5 minutes to a gentleman who has presided over the most open Rules Committee in recent memory, not just a chairman, but my chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding and congratulate him on his stellar management of this very important rule.

Mr. Speaker, I've been listening to the remarks of my very good friend and distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the gentlewoman from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and I have to say that as I listen to the remarks, I'm going to keep my hands to my side. I'm not going to point the finger of blame at anybody. I'm simply going to state a few facts that I think are important for all the Members of this House to look at.

It's true, the last 9 months under this Republican majority have been very difficult, very painful, and very challenging for us as we've been tackling the challenge of job creation and economic growth. There's a reason that we have had such a difficult time in the last 9 months here in this Congress. And the reason is very simple: Last year, for the first time in nearly three decades since the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Act was established, we didn't even have a budget proposed from the then-majority.

And the fact that there was no budget proposed in the last Congress to deal with the very important spending priorities that we, as a Nation, needed to address, and the fact that we had not one single appropriations bill, not one single appropriations bill, completed in the last Congress—we inherited at the beginning of this year, and Democrats and Republicans alike will acknowledge it, we inherited a hell of a mess. It was a big mess that we inherited. And guess what? We decided that we were going to tackle that mess in a bipartisan way.

My friend who has just talked about the need for bipartisanship, we began in dealing with the appropriations process with, as Members will recall, being here for hours and hours and hours because Democrats and Republicans alike were able to put their mark—their mark—on this spending bill which we, because of the lack of action in the last Congress, inherited in this 9 months.

And so my friend is absolutely right. The last 9 months have not been easy. They've not been easy at all. And I appreciate the fact that she has worked in a bipartisan way in a number of areas, because as she knows very well, the bill that we're going to be considering this week, the regulatory relief bill, we make every amendment that complied with the rules of the House in order. So many more Democratic amendments have been made in order than Republican amendments on a number of pieces of legislation, and that's so that we can do exactly what my friend has said hasn't happened, and that is work in a bipartisan way.

Now I think that probably the single largest bipartisan achievement that we've had in this past 9 months has been the agreement that we came to at the end of July, and that was an agreement that Democrats and Republicans alike recognized had to be addressed, we needed to increase the debt ceiling.

□ 1410

We didn't like the fact that there had been so much spending that had taken place, but we recognized that it had to be done. So Democrats and Republicans came together to make that happen.

We have further opportunities for bipartisan agreement coming right down the pike. Democrats and Republicans, alike, have said we need to open up new markets around the world for us to create union and nonunion jobs so that we can export more manufactured products from the United States of America into these markets. And we have three pending trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea that will go a long way towards doing what it is Democrats and Republicans, alike, want to do.

I'm not going to accuse a single Democrat of not wanting to create jobs in this country. Everybody wants to make sure that their constituents aren't hurting, that their constituents aren't losing their homes, their jobs, their businesses. I know that everybody, Democrat and Republican, alike, wants to make that happen. We will have an opportunity, in a bipartisan way, to do just that, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to these market-opening agreements in these very, very, very important countries that will help us again create union and nonunion jobs.

And I think when it comes to the issue of job creation and income growth, we need to look at the unfortunate mischaracterization that has been made time and time again of things like the tax cuts that have enjoyed bipartisan support, what I call the Bush-Obama tax cuts.

First, the '01 tax cuts, I will acknowledge, were not real growth creators, but the '03 tax cuts generated economic growth that actually enhanced the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury. And that's not my speculation. All one needs to do is simply look at the raw numbers.

In 2003, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Treasury had $1.782 trillion in revenues from all sources. That was in '03. At the time we saw those tax cuts put into place, $1.782 trillion in revenues. Up until the economic downturn in 2007, we saw an increase of 44 percent in the flow of revenues that came into the

Federal Treasury to $2.567 trillion. Now, that's an increase, Mr. Speaker, of $785 billion that came in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

That, Mr. Speaker, was a 44 percent increase, increasing by $785 billion the flow in revenues from the '03 revenue flow of $1.782 trillion to the '07 revenue flow of $2.567 trillion.

The reason I use these numbers is that we all are focused on job creation and economic growth. We all know that increased gross domestic product will go a long way towards dealing with our deficit challenges and the difficulties that we face. And, Mr. Speaker, what I want us to do is recognize that, as my friend from Lawrenceville very generously said, I presided over more open rules than we had in the Republican Congress in the past and certainly than we had in the 4 years that preceded this. And I'm proud of that. I'm very proud of the fact that we've been able to make so many amendments in order that my Democratic colleagues have offered. We have a Hastings amendment that we made in order on the bill that we're going to be considering later. I'm happy that we've done that. We will have a chance to debate these issues and I hope come to a bipartisan agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I will just say in closing that we have had a difficult 9 months. My friend from Rochester is absolutely right. It's been a challenging 9 months. And as long as Americans are hurting, it's going to always be difficult for us here. But being able to establish priorities, to come together in a bipartisan way, is important.

This measure that we're considering today is being done at the request of the bipartisan leadership of our colleagues in the other body who want to be able to move this continuing resolution through as expeditiously as possible to, as my friend from Lawrenceville said, recognize that between now and November 18 we simply want to ensure that the resources are there.

I see my friend from Vermont, and I will say to my friend that I read and looked at the photographs of the flooding that has taken place in Vermont. It has been devastating. I've looked at the disasters that have taken place across this country. My State of California suffers from earthquakes, fires, flooding, lots of disasters. An earthquake was felt in this Capitol during the month of August. We know that disasters occur. We must do everything we can to address those. But calling for an $8 billion increase in spending beyond the $1.43 trillion that this continuing resolution calls for is not the answer.

We need to prioritize to ensure that those who are really suffering can, in fact, have their needs addressed, and I believe that this House, in a bipartisan way, can and should and, I hope, will do that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today the Republican majority has made a mockery of both the process for and the content of this short-term continuing resolution.

Over the past several weeks, wildfires, floods, tornados, and earthquakes have brought tragedy to so many Americans, and, as it always has, the United States Government is responding with vitally needed resources and support. The Senate has already passed a disaster relief bill twice as large as the package contained in this CR and with the appropriate emergency designation. But House Republican leaders have decided to cut the Senate amount in half and tie it to an ideologically driven offset that takes modern technology off the table for U.S. car and vehicle manufacturers and which could cost thousands of current and future jobs.

And please don't tell me that it's all about balancing the budget and ending emergency spending that isn't paid for. The continuing resolution that we're debating today includes money to continue the misguided war in Afghanistan to the tune of $10 billion each month. None of it is paid for, not a penny. It's never been paid for. It's always been borrowed money that each week adds billions to the deficit. If my Republican friends believe we don't need to offset billions of dollars for war, then why are they demanding that we offset disaster aid for families who were flooded out by a hurricane or whose homes were burnt to the ground by a wildfire?

Mr. Speaker, we've been in Afghanistan for 10 years. We know how much it costs. Its funding is as predictable as it gets, yet each and every year money for the war receives a so-called ''emergency'' designation, but responding to unpredictable natural disasters does not? It makes no sense. And if the Republican leadership has figured out a way to accurately predict the next tornado or earthquake, I would like to hear it.

The American people are tired of the hypocrisy and tired of the Republican priorities that make it easier to invest overseas and nearly impossible to help people here at home.

I urge my Republican friends to put the American people first. I urge my colleagues to oppose this closed rule and oppose the underlying bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. LEVIN. We've heard a lot of rhetoric the first 10 minutes, or whatever, on the majority side, but rhetoric cannot mask, cannot obscure reality. The reality is this is an antijobs bill.

In '07, we put forth the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program. It has worked. Tens of thousands of jobs have been created as a result of that program in Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Louisiana, and Florida. And so now the majority says they're going to pay for this bill. How? By ending a program that has created jobs. That's the reality. It cuts it off, even though there are applications pending that will create thousands of more jobs in the manufacturing base of this country, in Indiana, Missouri, Ohio, California, Michigan, and other States.

It's inexcusable. It's inexcusable.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

You may have some information that we did not have in the Rules Committee. My understanding is that this program, which has billions that were appropriated in 2008 and have not yet been spent, not only can——

Mr. LEVIN. You've been misinformed. There are millions and millions of dollars that are already in the pipeline to be spent and applications for the balance of that money. That's a fact.

□ 1420

So if you've been misinformed, I suggest that you go back to the Rules Committee and take another look at this. This is an anti-jobs bill when we need jobs in the United States of America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to speak to what's inexcusable here. And I hate that that's where we have to end up.

The truth of the matter is what we have down here today is the re-litigation of something that we already litigated in July and August, and that is that this bill today funds just until November 18 at the level that we, as a body, agreed to. You may not like it, I may not like it, but we agreed to it: a level that's 1043, $1.043 trillion. That's a big number. That is a big number.

This resolution today, this continuing resolution to get us through November 18, does not re-litigate that decision. We spent a lot of time on that in July and August, and again, we come from different places on whether or not that's the right number. I probably say it's too high, you may say it's

too low, but this is simply a resolution that implements the will of this House.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. LEVIN. There is nothing in that decision, nothing in that action that paid for a continuing resolution that will take away jobs from the businesses and workers of the United States of America, purely and simply.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time from my friend, you're absolutely right that this bill does not define where those $1.043 trillion go, and I take issue with that too.

I go back to what you called rhetoric, the 10 minutes that we spent at the beginning where we went through line by line to talk about, golly, the work I'm so proud of that you and I have done together, the individual appropriations bills that you and I have worked through together, doing what was supposed to be done in this House. That was the time to do these things, one by one, and, golly, we did. We did.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. LEVIN. So now you're saying we're paying for it by taking away jobs from businesses and workers. That's what this does. You can't hide that fact.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, as I'm not the chairman of the committee, I will quote the chairman of the committee, who tells us that not only can we use this offset here today, but there remains not millions, but billions of dollars in the account to be used for this purpose; dollars that were appropriated, Mr. Speaker, in 2008, 3 years ago. They remain unspent, but we leave them there just in case. Just in case.

And what I would say to my friend is, if we can just get around to doing this process right again, and I have great hope that we can, if we can get back to doing the process right, we'll have this discussion not on a $1.043 trillion continuing resolution, and not even on a half-trillion dollar continuing resolution, but on the Energy and Water appropriations bill. We'll be able to get back to it, and I have that great wish for this House, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield myself 10 seconds to say that I said in my opening statement that this program has already yielded 39,000 jobs, on its way to 60,000, which will not be able to be met because you are using this as the offset.

I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who suffered great damage in the hurricane.

Mr. PASCRELL. Look, we're all Americans. We're not Democrats, Republicans.

You had 5,000 people evacuated in my district. When you see the damage in small towns and large towns, then you can appreciate it. The President came, the Governor of the State, who is not of my persuasion, came. They saw it firsthand. Homeland Security came. Mr. Fugate from FEMA came. They saw it firsthand. The damage is deep, and it's not going to be taken away and remedied within 2 weeks, 2 months, or 2 years because the ground was so saturated that trees fell without any wind, and are still falling.

Now, we are only one of 51 districts affected in 15 States, and we're talking about over 30 million people. And for the first time since I've been a Member of Congress, the other side, your side, wants to make this conditional, the aid, so that we carve out from either this program or that program, which is immaterial at this point, the money to help these very people.

The estimates are very clear as to how much this is going to cost, beyond our wildest dreams. We don't stop and ask those folks in Joplin, who had a huge tornado, where 160 people were killed, we don't say, wait till we go and rob Peter in order to respond to your emergency.

The fires in Texas—we have never done this on an emergency. This is an absolute disgrace because we're all Americans. We're not Democrats or Republicans.

Why didn't we do this, for crying out loud, in 2001 when we went to war? We didn't say, let's take from this program or that program. That was an emergency. We came up with the money and we sure as hell didn't pay for it, did we? And now look where we are economically.

We're talking about an emergency in our own country here, in our own neighborhoods. We need both sides to come together, and that's why we formed the coalition of Democrats and Republicans. And Republicans are not going to vote for this either. I'm telling you right now. So why don't we come together. They passed a clean bill in the Senate.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman another 10 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. This coalition is going to stay strong because America is more important than either party, and we need to help our brothers and sisters who are hurting right now, many that will not return to their homes. They can't. Think about that.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, to correct what may be a misunderstanding about the swiftness with which this Congress is reacting to those tragedies, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who has moved immediately on these issues, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As to the point, Mr. Speaker, of whether or not we offset these emergency bills, over the last 10 years, we have used offsets in over half of the emergency spending bills and supplementals, over half, 15 of 30, actually, including war supplementals, emergency supplementals, military construction, defense supplementals, disaster relief and recovery, in 2008, for example, and on and on.

Using offsets to pay for disaster relief is the rule here. This is not an exception. And we're only offsetting $1 billion of it. In fact, when the Homeland Security bill passed a few months ago, it included this very offset, and the bill passed by bipartisan support throughout the body. You've already voted for this, and, I might add, successfully.

Now, on that green car fund—I'm going to call it that—there's over $4 billion this minute sitting idle in that account, and it's been sitting idle for 3 years. The $1.5 billion rescission in subsidies we propose will not have a significant impact on the program, contrary to what some people say. All applications for those loans in late-term stages and negotiations will not be affected. Talk to the agency downtown, which we have. They will not be affected.

The factory in Michigan or Indiana will not be affected. In total, eight pending applications for loan guarantees totaling over $6 billion will not be impacted by this offset. Michigan has the largest stake: four applications totaling $4.7 billion in loan guarantees, which are free and clear.

□ 1430

Other States with applications in the queue that are safe from this round of cuts include Indiana and Louisiana.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill contains $3.65 billion for immediate disaster relief, which our people need and deserve. As this bill works its way through the process until November 18, no doubt FEMA will have by then completed their surveys and investigations of disasters and can tell Congress, through the White House, how much more money is needed; and we'll provide it. It's covered in the debt ceiling bill that passed this body a few weeks ago.

I'm telling you the Appropriations Committee will provide whatever relief is required when we get the documentation, which is traditional, as all of the Members of this body know because they helped prepare those investigations.

So this is a clean bill. This merely extends the time for us to work with the Senate to perfect a continuing bill for the balance of 2012. It gives us 5 or 6 weeks, but only 3 or 4 of those weeks will be available because both bodies will not be here all that time. This is a clean bill. And it provides disaster relief in the appropriate way. And there's plenty of money there for the immediate needs that we've been told about by FEMA.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York, a

member of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. HINCHEY.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and more broadly to the manner in which the House has dealt with disaster relief funding.

This year, our country has experienced some of the worst natural disasters in more than a generation. The cost of Hurricane Irene alone is estimated to be over $1.5 billion and Tropical Storm Lee's costs are still being tallied.

Yet despite these overwhelming needs, the disaster aid included in this bill is grossly inadequate and would not sufficiently help the millions of Americans who are recent victims of floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, and wildfires.

My district took a one-two punch from Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee. In the southern tier of New York, we've just seen the second 500-year flood in 5 years both in Broome and Tioga counties. Scores of homes were completely destroyed, and there are over a hundred people who are still living in an emergency center in Binghamton not knowing when they'll be able to return to their homes, if they can return ever at all.

Major companies have been shut down because their facilities are flooded. The total cost to rebuild the region will likely exceed $250 million.

In the Hudson Valley, Hurricane Irene caused massive power outages and record flooding. In Ulster County, 60 percent of residents lost power; seven bridges were destroyed. In fact, two of those bridges were just washed away and not found.

Vegetable farmers in Ulster, Orange, and Sullivan Counties suffered devastating losses; and because the crop insurance program remains wholly inadequate for them, these farmers may get no assistance at all. Ulster and Orange Counties alone have an estimated $62 million in agricultural losses. Yet this bill does nothing for these farmers.

And just when some of these communities began building from Irene, a second round of flooding from Lee washed away much of their hard work. Now they need to start the recovery work again.

The Senate has already passed a $7 billion standalone disaster bill that funds the President's FEMA budget request and provides additional emergency assistance for the Department of Agriculture and other agencies that are seeing their disaster funds dwindle. This is absolutely necessary.

This bill that we are dealing with here today is a half job. It's playing politics with the lives of people who are desperate and are begging us to set aside games and get this done. Let's put an end to it now so that we can take up the Senate's bill so that we can adequately deal with this problem and solve the problems for all of these people in so many ways.

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

To get back on the topic of this continuing resolution today, that is, this number that we agreed on just a month ago, $1.043 trillion, to fund the operations of this government.

Mr. Speaker, I go back and I look at emergency requests that this body has made. Now, I'm a freshman. I was just elected in November, began my service in January. But over the last 10 years, there have been 30 emergency and supplemental bills passed.

Now, what I would say to my friends who have been here longer than I have is perhaps if you have to do it three times a year, it's really not a surprise. Perhaps we ought to be able to budget for it.

And to his great credit, and to the committee's great credit, and candidly I would say to the House's great credit, we are trying for the first time in a long time to say you know what, we can't prevent tragedy. Tragedy is going to happen. But we can plan ahead for tragedy so that the American people have the security of knowing the money's going to be there when they need it.

And when I look, Mr. Speaker, at the way we're pouring money out of this body, I worry will the money be there when the American people need it. This budget makes sure that it does.

Mr. HINCHEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HINCHEY. Thank you very much. I deeply appreciate it.

The situation that we're dealing with here is critically important. It's harming huge numbers of people.

What the Senate has done is an adequate solution to this problem. They've provided the adequate funding that is going to deal with this. There have been at least seven Republicans over there in the Senate who supported that bill and voted for it. Why are you not dealing with an adequate solution to this problem? Why are you insisting on half ways, not dealing with the kinds of issues that need to be dealt with?

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will suspend.

The gentleman from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Because I hope where my friend was going to go was an acknowledgment that this process has provided twice the amount of disaster funding that the President requested, twice that amount in FY11, plus it forward-funds FY12.

Mr. Speaker, again, I am proud that we are trying to grapple with these issues. There is not a person on the floor of this House that is saying ''no'' to Americans in distress. What folks are saying is ''yes'' to making sure that when those distresses come again, we budgeted for it.

I would now like to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Let me just reiterate.

The $1 billion in the fiscal '11 portion of this bill is two times the amount the President requested. We doubled it. The amount that's in the bill for fiscal 2012, $2.65 billion, is more than the initial request that was made to us by the White House. We're here to tell you—and I've repeated this now four times—whatever the amount is needed that we see FEMA coming to us requesting, we're going to provide. Now, we've got until November 18 by this extension, by this CR, and during that period of time we will get the documentation from the White House and from FEMA about additional funds that are requested.

I assure the gentleman from New York who spoke, your concerns will be addressed during these next few weeks, and the money will be there that's documented from the White House and from FEMA for disaster relief. We will not let our people hurt.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I'm going to give myself another second here just to say I keep hearing that we're all set for next year in the budget, but who's going to tell Mother Nature just how much we can afford and hope that we don't get more than that?

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

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

□ 1440

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, America has had an economic disaster and a natural disaster. The economic disaster is 15 million people unemployed, and then we had the natural disasters of August. This bill tries to help the natural disaster get solved by making the economic disaster worse. It takes a program that has produced 39,000 private sector jobs and cripples it.

Now, the ostensible purpose for this is that we want to offset the spending to help deal with the natural disasters we had around this country in August; but on multiple occasions in the last 7 years, different administrations came to the Congress and asked for infrastructure spending to help rebuild Iraq—$3.7 billion worth of it to help rebuild Iraq and not a penny of offset.

Ladies and gentlemen, if we can vote to spend the public's money to rebuild roads and bridges in Iraq, let's not require an offset to rebuild roads and bridges in New York and Vermont and New Jersey. The right vote is ''no.'' Rewrite this bill, and do so in a way without worsening our economic disaster.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH). We watched Route 4 in Vermont crumble like a cookie in the rain and wash away.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

This bill is not about the offset. This bill is not about whether we're going to pay for emergency spending. We must and we will. What this bill is about is whether we're going to help 427 residents of Pittsfield, Vermont, who were in the wake of the wrath of Hurricane Irene.

That flood came down and ripped their road to the north and ripped their road to the south, and the water went in the middle, taking out homes and taking out public buildings. That's the selectboard—volunteers. It was that volunteer fire department—volunteers. They didn't have time to have an argument about offsets. They had to find out how they could get an excavator in there, and if they didn't have one, they had to borrow one. They had towns that weren't leveraging some disputes they might have had about whether they would turn back an excavator or earthmoving equipment to help them out. They did it. They had their school running the next day, not because they had a school that was functional—their kids couldn't even get out. They did one thing first, and that was to set up school on the green. They set it up on the green. Two days after this hurricane, the kids were going to school, and their parents were making them feel secure. They couldn't get to a passable road for several days. What did they do? They cut a path through the woods so that, for half a mile, kids could walk and get to transportation.

Now, they're going to have a tab even if we help them, and they know they have to pay for it; but, you know, if your neighbor's house is on fire and if you've got a boundary line dispute, you can use the leverage of his urgent necessity to get that fire hose and hold off and get it on condition that he cave—or you can do the right thing.

Every time this Congress has had an opportunity to come to the aid of your district or mine, we've stepped up. No Vermonter has ever complained to me that we used his tax dollars to help out in Texas, to help out in Ohio, to help out on the gulf coast; and we didn't make it conditional in getting our way—my offset, what might be Afghanistan, and yours might be some environmental program. We knew that was not the time to do it. We are in this together.

This Congress has an obligation to the American people. I have an obligation to the folks in your district, as you do in mine, to do the right thing when an act of God requires for its remedy an act of Congress. Let us act, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say that we have the distinguished Appropriations chairman here on the floor, who has said, not only have we doubled the President's request here, but there is a commitment to making the dollars available to everyone who is in need in these disasters. That's the kind of commitment this Nation has always made to its citizens. That's the kind of commitment that this bill continues to make to America's citizens.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

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

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the President signed the patent reform bill; but before the ink is dry on the patent reform bill, the agreement that led to the passage of it that all of the fees that are collected by the Patent and Trademark Office will be used by the Patent and Trademark Office is reneged on in this continuing resolution.

This is a job-creating bill, an innovation-creating bill, and because we have been taking the money of the Patent and Trademark Office for years and diverting it to the general fund, we have, in effect, imposed a tax on innovation in this country. The appropriators promised us that they were going to correct this problem, but there is nothing in this bill to address that promise. I don't see how I can support a continuing resolution that does not honor the commitment that was made in our patent reform bill.

Just last Friday, the President signed the America Invents Act (AIA), a bipartisan bill that promises to stimulate innovation and create jobs and add fuel to our economy. The AIA created a mechanism for USPTO, beginning in FY2012, to access all of the fees it collects by allowing USPTO to notify Congress that the Office will need the excess fees to support its operations and hire the staff required to reduce the staggering backlog of patent applications. Now, despite this hard fought deal—one which I opposed precisely because it depends upon an annual commitment to honor and implement the deal—the CR before us fails to put the USPTO on the firm, stable footing we all agreed was necessary for it to dig out of the backlog, avoid a tax on innovation, and stimulate job growth.

Under the current CR, for at least 7 weeks the USPTO will be held to a spending rate based on last year's FY11 appropriations, a rate that ignores Congress's directive and authorization that the USPTO be able to use the fees it collects in order to support implementation of the act and that those funds not be diverted to pay for wars, government waste and other Federal Government operations. I will resist the temptation to say, "I told you so," because that would not advance the debate or solve the serious problem I have identified before and identify again today. What is most compelling is that ensuring that the PTO has access to all of its funds costs nothing to the American taxpayer. It is, therefore, confusing why we are again facing such a heavy lift to simply give the PTO access to the funds it earns through its operations. But what is clear to me is that, without a provision to ensure adequate funding for the PTO, the bill the President just signed will not serve the important purposes it was designed to serve. This CR does not provide such funding, and I cannot support the CR. I urge my colleagues who say they believe in reducing the tax burden on businesses, large and small, those who fought to ensure that the independent engines of economic growth run at full throttle, I urge them to vote no on the rule and against this CR and work to get the funding the USPTO needs and that this Congress promised it would have.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill is brought to us by people who know the cost of everything and the value of nothing. The hard fact of the matter is they've fought two wars on the credit card. This is one of the few times that we've ever found that they have required offsets for emergencies, so now we're trying to fix a bad bill.

I want to make the observation that we have a serious problem. We have a natural emergency, and we have people who have a lasting unemployment situation that is going to destroy the country and destroy families and people in this country.

Having said that, I am baffled as to why we are considering a measure that is going to cut funding for the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program. This is a loan program that has created or saved over 40,000 jobs so far, and if it's left alone and not destroyed, as would be done here, it will create another 10,000 more by year's end.

For all the talk in Washington on that side of the aisle about creating jobs, we find that they're out to kill jobs again, and killing ATVM just plain makes no sense. It is going to prevent job creation. The Economic Policy Institute just released a report that my home State of Michigan has lost nearly 80,000 jobs to China since 2001, where they sustain and support their industry and where we do not. If we cripple this loan program, Michigan and the rest of the country can expect to lose even more jobs and their ability to compete globally in the 21st century.

I understand we're living through tough economic times and have to squeeze every penny to make sure it counts, but I want to remind everybody here present that there are more applications in the pipeline than there is money to participate in this particular program. So we are essentially robbing Peter to pay Paul, but it is going to come at an enormous cost to the economic future of your constituents and mine.

Now, it comforts me that many of my colleagues have seen through this rascality and have observed it for what it is. Over 100 of them have signed on to a letter by my friends Mr. PETERS and Ms. ESHOO in opposition to gutting ATVM.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for what is right by defeating the previous question and by adopting my amendment. If we can't do that, let's vote

this rule down and let's vote this bill down, and let's go about the Nation's business in a wise and sensible fashion which will create jobs and not strangle economic opportunity for our people.

I want to thank the distinguished gentlewoman from New York for her leadership on this matter; but I want to denounce the behavior that I see on the other side, where they are walking into one of the most important issues that this country confronts with their eyes completely closed.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

□ 1450

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, there is a not-so-thin line between being frugal and fiscally responsible and then downright cheap and stingy, and this bill demonstrates the difference.

To say to somebody who was in a disaster, to say to somebody who might lose everything, where the waters are rising, the fires are burning, the storms are knocking things down, to say, you know what, we can only help you if we cut somewhere else, is the most stingy, shortsighted, poorest form of representative government I have ever seen. It is outrageous to tell Americans facing disaster that you don't get any help unless you can find how to squeeze it out somewhere.

Americans help Americans. Americans stand up for each other at time of crisis. This is a hallmark of who we are, and it doesn't matter whether you are Republican or Democrat, whether you are from the north, the south, the east or the west, whether you are black, white, Latino, wherever you come from, when Americans are in trouble, Americans respond. And we don't reach inside and say, well, if I can afford it, we will help you out. We just jump forward and we help out.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLISON. No, I will not yield, and I won't cede any of my time, so you don't need to ask again.

I am also just absolutely appalled, appalled, that the Republican bill will cost at least 10,000 good-paying American manufacturing jobs and perhaps tens of thousands more by cutting the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program, which is putting Americans to work at producing cleaner American cars.

This provision, perhaps more than any other, demonstrates the fraudulent nature, fraud, fraud, of claiming that the Republicans are trying to produce jobs. They are not trying to make jobs.

They run around saying that rich people are job creators, they are profit creators. And you know who is absolutely not a job creator? Anyone who votes ''yes'' on this bill.

Vote ''no,'' absolutely ''no'' on this bad piece of bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that we have been able to have a conversation with one another and yield that time throughout the day.

In order to continue that, I yield 1 minute to the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you for yielding.

The previous speaker doesn't understand the bill. The $2.65 billion in the 2012 portion of the bill is not offset, only the portion for fiscal 2011 is required to be offset. And I would remind the gentleman, as well as everyone else, many of whom voted for the Homeland Security bill a few months ago, it included this provision.

The disaster relief money, twice what the President requested of us, we doubled his request. That part is offset, the fiscal 2011 moneys, but the bulk of the money in this bill, the $2.65 billion for fiscal 2012, it's not offset. So the gentleman is incorrect.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I come from the Greater Detroit area, which has been especially hard hit from this recession.

When many wanted to let the auto industry fail, I stood with President Obama, and now the Big Three auto companies are once again earning profits and creating jobs in our region.

Today, however, the House Republicans are trying to pass job-killing cuts to our auto industry by eliminating section 136 loans. We have the support of the Big Three auto manufacturers, as well as several labor unions and environmental groups but, sadly, the Tea Party can't even say ''yes'' to a program that has created and protected 41,000 jobs. In fact, according to experts, this program is directly responsible for bringing manufacturing of the Ford Focus automobile from Mexico to Michigan, with American workers making the Ford Focus.

We absolutely need to fund disaster relief for communities affected by the recent natural disasters, but that doesn't mean we need to cause an economic disaster for our workers.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule and ''no'' on the continuing resolution because we need to be working to create more American manufacturing jobs, not destroying them.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it would seem that we would come to the floor of the House at this time and celebrate a continuing resolution in the backdrop of Tropical Storm Lee and Hurricane Irene, the enormity of the tragedy in Vermont.

I know that my colleagues from that area are in pain and still suffering from the devastation. I noticed upstate New York, Prattsville in particular, a city that is full of pain with individuals who are at loss of why their town is no longer.

But in that instance, as my colleagues know, my Republicans friends know, although we have had some moments that we have not been proud of, such as in the gulf region when we were not prepared for Hurricane Katrina, we have still risen to the occasion thereafter and said to the American people that if you are in a disaster, this Nation will come to your aid.

Unfortunately, this CR does not in any way befit the American way, for here we have a fix that is really a broken fix.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Rather than declaring disasters what they are, emergencies, and providing the dollars that we need, we are, in essence, if I might use the old-fashioned term, nickel and diming our responsibilities. It is patently unfair to put the American people in the crosshairs of our politics about having an offset for emergency funding.

Do you want to tell that, if we look back at 2005 to the thousand-plus that died in Hurricane Katrina, you have to have an offset? Let's think about whether we're going to send you any money.

Now, I know that there is a need for this legislation to pass, but once we concede the idea that the American people will be put in the pickle of an offset, that means that disaster knocks at your door, not at your invitation, and the Federal Government, which is, in fact, the umbrella on a rainy day, it will not be there. I will not be able to tolerate that.

What we should be doing is passing a CR that declares emergency funding what it is—to be there for the American people. And this next thing we should be doing is passing the President's jobs bill, for that is how we will ensure that we are doing the job that the American people want.

This CR is a bunch of smoke and mirrors, and I will not tell the American people that they are second-class citizens. If I can find the dime to pay for your misery, I will look for the dime. That is not the American way.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for yielding again. I'll be very brief.

The gentlewoman who just spoke mentioned Katrina and that we should not offset expenses of emergency disaster spending. In fact, in 2006 that's exactly what we did do. We required offsets for aid for Katrina and other matters, $33.5 billion in offsets in Katrina aid in 2006. And then again in 2007, we offset $939 million in offsets for, among other things, Hurricane Katrina recovery.

As I have said before, over the last 10 years, we have offset more than half of

the disaster emergency relief bills we have passed here. It's not unusual, and the gentlelady is mistaken that we did not request offsets for Katrina. We did.

Mr. WOODALL. I say to my friend to from New York, I have no more speakers and am prepared to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order a motion to strike the unacceptable House disaster funding language and substitute the bipartisan Senate approach.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' defeat the previous question, and if we are successful in defeating the previous question and offering our amendment, then we will get on with the underlying House amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

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

I think one thing that unites us as Republicans and Democrats, and actually unites us as Americans, is when we face adversity, we say: Can we do better? Can we do better? You know, it's one thing to muddle through, but it's something else to learn from that experience and come back the next time and do better.

Now, I'm proud to be here as part of a freshman class, Mr. Speaker; 89 new Republican freshmen, 10 new Democratic freshmen. Ninety-nine Members of this House are brand new this year; 99 Members of this House. And so we look back. We look back on profligate spending where even though American families are asked to prioritize their spending each and every day, for some reason the Congress didn't. Even though small businesses are asked to prioritize their spending every day, for some reason Congress didn't.

What this new Congress has done, Mr. Speaker, this 112th Congress has done, is to say: Can we do better? And the answer is yes. Why are the American people so cynical about Congress, Mr. Speaker? Why are our approval ratings in the tank? It was less than 2 months ago, less than 2 months ago we agreed that for next year we should spend $1.43 trillion. And we're already talking about that we've got that number wrong and we want to spend more. Folks, we have to make those priority decisions. Thirty times, Mr. Speaker, thirty times in the last 10 years we came up with emergency spending. Thirty times, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just ask you, the Defense Iraq-Afghanistan supplemental in 2004, is anybody surprised that it took more money in those places than we had budgeted? Anybody think that's a surprise? I'm not surprised by that, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't here, but I'm not surprised. What I wish we could have done was budgeted better for that. Did we know in 2004 that it was going to take more money? Of course we did. But what did we do? We gamed that system.

What is this Appropriations Committee doing? What is this Appropriations Committee doing? They're saying that they know tragedy is going to befall Americans. They don't know what; they don't know when; but they know that it's going to happen. And so they're going to budget for it. Why? Because we tell Americans day after day after day that programs that they count on might not be there tomorrow. Why? Because we're broke. We tell Americans every day something that they might want to do, something they thought might be available, it might not be available. Why? Because we're broke.

But I agree with my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, when folks are facing disaster, they don't want to have to ask that question. When folks are facing personal tragedy, they don't want to have to ask that question: Will there be money there? Will there be help there?

No, in our communities, we know the help is going to be there. We know our neighbors are going to be there for us, and we know our families will be there for us. And for the first time in a long time, Mr. Speaker, we now know that the American Congress is going to be there, too, because we are changing business as usual.

We asked the question: Can we do better? And the Speaker and the committee chairmen said, Yes. Yes, we can. I encourage support for the rule, and I encourage a vote on the underlying resolution.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 405 OFFERED BY MRS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, after expiration of debate on the motion to concur specified in the first section of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the motion to amend printed in section 4 of this resolution. That motion may be offered only by Representative Dingell of Michigan or his designee, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against that motion are waived.

SEC. 4. The motion to amend referred to in section 3 is as follows:

''(1) Strike sections 125 and 126 of the House amendment (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly).

''(2) At the end of the House amendment, before the short title, insert the following:

''SEC. __ Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, there is hereby enacted into law the provisions of division B of the amendment adopted by the Senate on September 15, 2011, to House Joint Resolution 66 (112th Congress), relating to emergency supplemental disaster relief appropriations.''.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

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

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

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools

for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. 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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 405, if ordered, and suspending the rules with regard to Senate Concurrent Resolution 28 and S. 846.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 188, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 715]

YEAS—237

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
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
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
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
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
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—188

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

NOT VOTING—8

Baca
Bachmann
Giffords
Lewis (GA)
Luetkemeyer
Paul
Reichert
Sutton

□ 1530

Messrs. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. FUDGE, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. MYRICK changed her 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 185, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 716]

YEAS—238

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
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
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
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
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg

Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—185

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

NOT VOTING—10

Baca
Bachmann
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Hastings (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Paul
Reichert
Sutton
Welch

□ 1537

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL TO AWARD CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 717]

YEAS—424

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
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
Green, Gene
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
Hinchey
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)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
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
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
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
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Baca
Bachmann
Giffords
Lewis (GA)
Paul
Reichert
Sires
Slaughter
Sutton

□ 1546

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTOPHER S. BOND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (S. 846) to designate the United States courthouse located at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, as the Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse, 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 California (Mr. DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 2, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 718]

YEAS—407

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
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
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
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
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
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
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)
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
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
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.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—2

Harris
Rigell

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Garrett
Mulvaney

NOT VOTING—22

Baca
Bachmann
Cardoza
Connolly (VA)
Davis (KY)
Giffords
Gohmert
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Lewis (GA)
Paul
Payne
Reichert
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott, David
Sewell
Slaughter
Sutton
Webster
Welch
Woodall

□ 1552

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.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2608.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 405, I call up the bill (H.R. 2608) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and have a motion at the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Business Program Extension and Reform Act of 2011''.

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

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the Act entitled ''An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration'', approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109–316; 120 Stat. 1742), as most recently amended by section 2 of the Small Business Additional Temporary Extension Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–17; 125 Stat. 221), is amended by striking ''July 31, 2011'' each place it appears and inserting ''July 31, 2012''.

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

SEC. 3. REPEALS AND OTHER TERMINATIONS.

(a) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—A repeal or other termination of a provision of law made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2011.

(2) RULE.—Nothing in this section shall affect any grant or assistance provided, contract or cooperative agreement entered into, or loan made or guaranteed before October 1, 2011 under a provision of law repealed or otherwise terminated by this section and any such grant, assistance, contract, cooperative agreement, or loan shall be subject to the applicable repealed or otherwise terminated provision, as in effect on September 30, 2011.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF TEMPORARY EXTENSIONS.—A repeal or other termination of a provision of law made by this section shall have effect notwithstanding any temporary extension of programs, authority, or provisions under the Act entitled ''An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration'', approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109–316; 120 Stat. 1742).

(4) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Any savings resulting from this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be returned to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

(b) POLLUTION CONTROL LOANS.—Paragraph (12) of section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(A) The Administration'' and inserting ''The Administration''; and

(2) by striking ''research and development'' and all that follows and inserting ''research and development.''.

(c) SMALL BUSINESS INSTITUTE.—Subparagraph (E) of section 8(b)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(b)(1)) is repealed.

(d) DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE GRANTS.—Paragraph (3) of section 21(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (R) by adding ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (S) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (T).

(e) CENTRAL EUROPEAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION.—Section 25 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 652) is repealed.

(f) PAUL D. COVERDELL DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE PROGRAM.—Section 27 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 654) is repealed.

(g) PILOT TECHNOLOGY ACCESS PROGRAM.—Section 28 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 655) is repealed.

(h) NATIONAL VETERANS BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 33 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657c) is repealed.

(2) CORPORATION.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the National Veterans Business Development Corporation and any successor thereto may not represent that the corporation is federally chartered or in any other manner authorized by the Federal Government.

(i) LEASE GUARANTEES AND POLLUTION CONTROL.—Part A of title IV of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 692 et seq.) is repealed.

(j) ALTERNATIVE LOSS RESERVE.—Paragraph (7) of section 508(c) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 697e(c)) is repealed.

(k) SMALL BUSINESS TELECOMMUTING PILOT PROGRAM.—Subsection (d) of section 1203 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (15 U.S.C. 657h) is repealed.

(l) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.—Section 411(i) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 694b(i)) is amended to read as follows:

''(i) Without limiting the authority conferred upon the Administrator and the Administration by section 201 of this Act, the Administrator and the Administration shall have, in the performance of and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties conferred by this part, all the authority and be subject to the same conditions prescribed in section 5(b) of the Small Business Act with respect to loans, including the authority to execute subleases, assignments of lease and new leases with any person, firm, organization, or other entity, in order to aid in the liquidation of obligations of the Administration hereunder.''.

(2) TITLE 10.—Section 1142(b)(13) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and the National Veterans Business Development Corporation''.

(3) TITLE 38.—Subsection (h) of section 3452 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''any of the'' and all that follows and inserting ''any small business development center described in section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648), insofar as such center offers, sponsors, or cosponsors an entrepreneurship course, as that term is defined in section 3675(c)(2).''.

(4) VETERANS ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999.—Section 203(c)(5) of the Veterans Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development Act of 1999 (15 U.S.C. 657b note) is amended by striking ''In cooperation with the National Veterans Business Development Corporation, develop'' and inserting ''Develop''.

SEC. 4. TERMINATION OF EMERGING LEADERS PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective October 1, 2011, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration may not carry out or otherwise support the program referred to as ''Emerging Leaders'' in the document of the Small Business Administration titled ''FY 2012 Congressional Budget Justification and FY 2010 Annual Performance Report'' (or any predecessor or successor document).

MOTION TO CONCUR

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

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Rogers of Kentucky moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2608 with an amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2011 and under the authority and conditions provided in such Acts, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this Act, that were conducted in fiscal year 2011, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2011 (division A of Public Law 112–10).

(2) The Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (division B of Public Law 112–10).

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) is hereby reduced by 1.503 percent.

SEC. 102. (a) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for (1) the new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2011 or prior years; (2) the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2011 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P–1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R–1 line item that includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2011.

(b) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. Except as otherwise provided in section 102, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2011.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this Act shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this Act.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2012, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this Act shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this Act; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2012 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) November 18, 2011.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this Act shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this Act may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this Act may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2012 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this Act that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This Act shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the Act shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2011, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2011, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2011 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2011, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), each amount incorporated by reference in this Act that was previously designated as being for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 3(c)(2) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal

year 2010, is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that such amount shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates such amount and transmits such designation to the Congress. Section 101(b) of this Act shall not apply to any amount so designated.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts for ''Department of Justice—Federal Bureau of Investigation—Salaries and Expenses''.

SEC. 115. During the period covered by this Act, discretionary amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2012 that were provided in advance by appropriations Acts shall be available in the amounts provided in such Acts, reduced by the percentage in section 101(b).

SEC. 116. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts made available by this Act for ''Department of Defense—Operation and Maintenance—Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' may be used by the Secretary of Defense for operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq and security assistance teams, including life support, transportation and personal security, and facilities renovation and construction: Provided, That the authority made by this section shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act: Provided further, That section 9014 of division A of Public Law 112–10 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding section 101, funds made available in title IX of division A of Public Law 112–10 for ''Overseas Contingency Operations'' shall be available at a rate for operations not to exceed the rate permitted by H.R. 2219 (112th Congress) as passed by the House of Representatives on July 8, 2011.

SEC. 118. The authority provided by section 127b of title 10, United States Code, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 119. The authority provided by section 1202 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364; 120 Stat. 2412), as extended by section 1204(b) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4623), shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ''Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board—Salaries and Expenses'' at a rate for operations of $29,130,000.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading ''District of Columbia Funds'' for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 2434 (112th Congress), as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under ''District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses'' as included in the Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request Act of 2011 (D.C. Act 19–92), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 122. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for the necessary expenses of the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board, to carry out its functions under title XV of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5), at a rate for operations of $28,350,000.

SEC. 123. (a) Section 9(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(m)) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for ''September 30, 2011''.

(b) Notwithstanding section 9(n)(1)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(n)(1)(A)), the Small Business Technology Transfer Program shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

(c) Notwithstanding section 9(y)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(y)(6)), the pilot program under section 9(y) of such Act shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 124. Section 8909a(d)(3)(A)(v) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''September 30, 2011'' and inserting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 125. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, of the unobligated balances remaining available to the Department of Energy pursuant to section 129 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2009 (division A of Public Law 110–329), $500,000,000 is rescinded, $774,000,000 is hereby transferred to and merged with ''Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency—Disaster Relief'', and $226,000,000 is hereby transferred to and merged with ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies'': Provided, That the amounts made available by this section for the Corps of Engineers-Civil shall be for emergency expenses for repair of damage caused by the storm and flood events occurring in 2011: Provided further, That the amounts transferred by this section shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That each amount transferred by this section is designated as an emergency pursuant to section 3(c)(1) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

SEC. 126. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ''Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency—Disaster Relief'' at a rate for operations of $2,650,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide a full accounting of disaster relief funding requirements for such account for fiscal year 2012 not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and for fiscal year 2013 in conjunction with the submission of the President's budget request for fiscal year 2013.

(b) The accounting described in subsection (a) for each fiscal year shall include estimates of the following amounts:

(1) The unobligated balance of funds in such account that has been (or will be) carried over to such fiscal year from prior fiscal years.

(2) The unobligated balance of funds in such account that will be carried over from such fiscal year to the subsequent fiscal year.

(3) The amount of the rolling average of noncatastrophic disasters, and the specific data used to calculate such rolling average, for such fiscal year.

(4) The amount that will be obligated each month for catastrophic events, delineated by event and State, and the total remaining funding that will be required after such fiscal year for each such catastrophic event for each State.

(5) The amount of previously obligated funds that will be recovered each month of such fiscal year.

(6) The amount that will be required in such fiscal year for emergencies, as defined in section 102(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(1)).

(7) The amount that will be required in such fiscal year for major disasters, as defined in section 102(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)).

(8) The amount that will be required in such fiscal year for fire management assistance grants, as defined in section 420 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5187).

SEC. 127. Any funds made available pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Homeland Security may be obligated at a rate for operations necessary to sustain essential security activities, such as: staffing levels of operational personnel; immigration enforcement and removal functions, including sustaining not less than necessary detention bed capacity; and United States Secret Service protective activities, including protective activities necessary to secure National Special Security Events. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the authority provided in this section.

SEC. 128. The authority provided by section 532 of Public Law 109–295 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 129. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 130. Section 550(b) of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for ''October 4, 2011''.

SEC. 131. Sections 1309(a) and 1319 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016(a) and 4026) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for ''September 30, 2011''.

SEC. 132. Section 330 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (42 U.S.C. 1701 note), concerning Service First authorities, shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 133. Notwithstanding section 101, section 1807 of Public Law 112–10 shall be applied by substituting ''$374,743,000'' for ''$363,843,000'' and ''$10,900,000'' for ''$3,000,000''.

SEC. 134. The second proviso of section 1801(a)(3) of Public Law 112–10 is amended by striking ''appropriation under this subparagraph'' and inserting ''appropriations made available by this Act''.

SEC. 135. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ''Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission—Salaries and Expenses'' at a rate for operations of $14,510,000.

SEC. 136. Sections 399AA(e), 399BB(g), and 399CC(f) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i(e), 280i–1(g), 280i–2(f)) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for ''September 30, 2011''.

SEC. 137. Notwithstanding section 101, section 2005 of division B of Public Law 112–10 shall be applied by substituting ''$0'' for each dollar amount.

SEC. 138. The Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635 et seq.) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for ''September 30, 2011'' in section 7 of such Act of 1945.

SEC. 139. Section 209 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6436) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for ''September 30, 2011''.

SEC. 140. Commitments to guarantee loans incurred under the General and Special Risk Insurance Funds, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–3 and 1735c), shall not exceed a rate for operations of $25,000,000,000: Provided, That total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, may be apportioned through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act, at $80,000,000 multiplied by the number of days covered in this Act.

SEC. 141. (a) RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.—

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

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

(b) PAYGO COMPLIANCE.—The budgetary effects of this section, 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 section, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on July 26, 2011.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall not be subject to any other provision of this Act.

This Act may be cited as the ''Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 405, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the floor the continuing appropriations resolution to keep the Federal Government operating until November 18 of this year. For procedural reasons, this is being done as an amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2608 to speed passage through the Senate, at their request; but in substance, this is the same as the continuing resolution, H.J. Res. 79, that I introduced on September 14.

This CR, Mr. Speaker, will give Congress the time needed to complete fiscal year 2012 appropriations and to adequately fund vital government programs and services by working to put Federal spending on a more sustainable course. Just as significantly, this bill provides desperately needed funding for disaster recovery and relief.

I would have preferred to have completed the appropriations process in regular order, and I believe the House made great strides in doing so. The Appropriations Committee moved on 11 of the 12 annual appropriations bills, and six bills have cleared the House; but we still need time to collaborate with our colleagues in the Senate in order to complete this work, and a short-term bill will allow us to do so.

As we saw last year and into the spring, the threat of a government shutdown causes dangerous economic instability, and at this precarious time, we need to bolster American public confidence that their representatives in Washington are working for them and are not letting politics come before people.

The CR continues government operations at a rate of $1.043 trillion—the total amount agreed to by the Congress and the White House in the Budget Control Act. It's clean of most policy provisions to ensure swift passage, but we've provided small changes for safety, security, and continuity of essential programs.

For instance, we've extended Federal flood insurance availability and the availability of defense survival equipment for our troops abroad. In addition, this CR will help meet the needs of the thousands of families, businesses, and communities burdened by recent natural disasters by providing an immediate $1 billion in emergency 2011 funding now as well as an additional $2.65 billion for the next year. We are helping our citizens get back on their feet.

The $776 million in the bill for the FEMA Disaster Relief Fund, which is $276 million more than the President or the Senate proposed, is time-sensitive and critical. That fund is now below $250 million and is running out of money fast. Unless we provide additional funding, within a matter of days the Disaster Relief Fund will soon be empty, leaving millions of people in the lurch.

The $1 billion in emergency funding for fiscal year 2011 has been offset by a cut to the Department of Energy's Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program, which has more than $4 billion in unspent idle funds in the pipeline. It has been there for 3 years. Now is the time to use those idle dollars for true and immediate purposes: aiding our fellow citizens in their times of greatest need as they cope with the aftermath of wildfires, tornadoes, earthquakes, and hurricanes—an unprecedented string of disasters in this country.

Now, the notion of offsetting emergency spending has gotten a lot of attention as of late. Let me be very clear that offsetting emergency spending is not a unique practice. In fact, over the last 10 years, the Congress has used offsets in at least 15 of 30 emergency supplemental spending bills—half of them. In total, the Congress has passed over $60 billion in emergency offsets in the last 10 years, most of which had a large amount of support on both sides of the aisle, including the support of former Speaker PELOSI.

The loan program used as an offset in this bill has had excess funds for years, and taking the money will not negatively affect that program. All entities in final loan stages will still get the funding they've worked for. Furthermore, this offset is identical to the one already passed by the House in June as part of the Homeland Security appropriations bill. We've already voted for it.

□ 1600

In addition, the committee will continue to consider additional disaster funding over the next few weeks as we bring the fiscal year 2012 appropriations process to a close, hopefully by November 18, including reviewing estimates that are still coming in from recent disasters so that families and communities can get the assistance they need while making sure that every dollar is well spent.

The Budget Control Act, which both Houses in Congress and the White House agreed to, provides for 2012 disaster funding in that capacity. But with respect to this continuing resolution, at this time we do not have all of the necessary information on the cost of the recent disasters nor the time to work out a final comprehensive agreement with the White House and the Senate.

As Members of this body know, back in their home districts, the FEMA administration works to survey the damage and report that to the White House who, in turn, makes the request to Congress for disaster funds. That's the normal procedure in which we are involved now, and I assure the Members that, as we get those estimates from the White House in the next few weeks and months, they will be addressed and monies will be available.

Therefore, we must meet the most immediate need and provide additional funding now for FEMA to keep that program going for the next several months. That's what this continuing resolution does and why we, the House and Senate, have to pass this bill immediately.

This CR lives up to the guidelines set in the Budget Control Act, as well as our commitment to responsible and reduced levels of spending. We can ride our fiscal ship while still supporting the essential government programs and services and disaster aid.

With this in mind, it is my intention that Congress complete the fiscal year 2012 appropriations work without any further delay. The sooner we pass this CR, the sooner we can focus on this long-term appropriations legislation and get it done before November 18.

I urge my colleagues in both Chambers to support this bill so we can send it to the President as soon as possible.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the continuing resolution. For the most part, it is a clean CR. It provides funding at $1.043 trillion through November 18. The amount reflects the Budget Control Act cap on FY 2012 appropriations. The CR continues funding as provided in FY 2011 with a 1.503 percent across-the-board cut to come down from approximately 1.059 to 1.043.

The CR adds a handful of anomalies requested by the administration through OMB, including provisions to cut back on overseas contingency operations funds from the level of 2011 down to the level that was passed in the Defense appropriations bill, which is approximately 118; authorize DHS work on national special security events; extend flood insurance; and delay the Postal Service payment obligation. The last provision will allow mail service to continue while Congress pursues legislative reforms.

The matter that concerns me and the Democratic Caucus is the way the majority has provided disaster relief funding. FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund is precariously short on money in FY

2011. Americans are trying to rebuild their lives after the devastating effect of floods, wildfires, and hurricanes in a record year of natural disasters, and FEMA is running out of resources to help them.

FEMA has deferred funding for all long-term rebuilding projects to focus on immediate needs. The administration requested a $500 million supplemental appropriation for the remaining days in the fiscal year. They requested 2011 emergency funds. They did not recommend an offset. This has been the practice for supplemental disaster relief.

Since 2002, Congress appropriated $95 billion in supplemental disaster relief. All of it was designated as an emergency, and none of it was offset. Some other emergencies may have been paid for during the Clinton administration; however, during the Bush administration, this was not so for disaster relief. Now, there were other categories of emergency spending and other supplementals that were offset but not disaster relief.

For fiscal years 2002 through 2006, President Bush requested supplemental disaster relief funding eight times. Each of the eight times was designated as an emergency and none were offset. With Republicans in the majority, some of the Bush emergency disaster relief bills, without offsets, were approved by voice vote and some were considered under unanimous consent.

Nonetheless, House Republicans today insist on departing from this practice. They take $1.5 billion from the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program at the Department of Energy to pay for $1 billion in disaster relief, disaster and emergency relief. We have discussed compromise with the other side. They have been unwilling to accept our suggestions.

The Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program was started in 2008 to reinvigorate American manufacturing. To date, this program has awarded $3.5 billion of credit subsidy to promote energy efficient advanced vehicles and their component parts. The Department of Energy estimates that loan guarantees have created or maintained, in total, 39,000 jobs in California, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan, Missouri, and Tennessee.

Some have suggested that this program has been slow to spend emergency funding provided in the FY 2009 CR. I say the loan review process is and ought to be strenuous. One company, Tesla, originally applied under a different loan program in 2006 and received an ATVM loan in 2010. It required 4 years of due diligence and review to qualify for the loan.

Having read many of the press releases that went out when there was another DOE program that ran into difficulties, I didn't note anybody there saying we shouldn't take time for due diligence. Due diligence is required.

By the way, the company in question, Tesla, employed about 400 workers before receiving the loan. Today, they have 1,400 employees in the fields of engineering research and development, design, manufacturing, assembly, maintenance, service, sales, and support.

The ATVM program has an additional 18 loan applications in progress that are projected to create 50,000 to 60,000 more jobs, in total, in California, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, and Ohio. One pending application would support investments at 11 plants in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio. The company employs over 56,000 workers, and they are adding nearly 9,000 new workers since 2009. Some of the jobs will be at risk by using this offset.

This is not the time to put American manufacturing jobs at risk. If you want to make it in America, you can't take away this funding.

□ 1610

If there is one thing we've learned on the economic forefront, it's that we need a growth policy, we don't need a cut policy. Cut and grow just ain't so.

I would point out that we need to get people back to work. And the way you do that is programs like this that are going to hire people instead of fire people. We have been doing a lot of firing, and it hasn't worked. When are we going to wake up? When is the majority party going to realize that we have to do something to create growth and stimulate the economy and put people back to work? The only way we're going to get the deficit down is to bring unemployment down.

This is an employment program. It should be supported. We should defeat the continuing resolution and come up with—either take this out or come up with another offset that doesn't hurt job creation in our country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The gentleman mentioned in his statement that we had not used offsets to fund disaster relief; I beg to differ. In 2001, emergency supplemental, offset; 2002, emergency supplemental, offset; 2004, disaster relief for wildfire and others, offset. And in 2005, offset for relief for the tsunami. In 2006, relief for Katrina, offset. In 2008, disaster relief and recovery, $20 billion in offsets. I could go on. There are many times where we have used the offsets to pay for supplementals. In fact, over the last 10 years, 15 of the 30 emergency spending bills and supplementals were offset, for a total of $60 billion over the last 10 years.

Now, on this offset that has been mentioned, over $4 billion sits idle in that account and has so for 3 years now as the administration has been slow to obligate that money. The $1.5 billion rescission in subsidies we propose will not have a significant impact on the program. This is the same rescission, Madam Speaker, that we used in the 2012 Homeland Security appropriations bill that passed this House with bipartisan support in June. Exactly the same. And yet the Senate didn't act and that billion dollars was not available for disaster relief.

States with applications in the queue in this program, like Indiana, Louisiana, Ohio, Michigan, Florida, Missouri, California and many others, will still receive their due diligence just like before and could receive awards as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, the fact that we are even debating the substance of this continuing resolution is a telling statement about the priorities of the current House majority.

FEMA's disaster relief fund, after all, is operating on fumes. Since late August, the agency has deferred funding for all long-term rebuilding projects in order to have enough resources to meet the most pressing emergency needs. This means that critical rebuilding efforts in over 40 States—Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, Iowa, North Dakota, Tennessee, Missouri, Alabama, my own State of North Carolina and others—are on hold. Thousands of people who would currently be earning a good paycheck by working on rebuilding efforts are not, and communities that are still recovering from past disasters are being told to move to the back of the line to make way for those affected by the more recent disasters.

Madam Speaker, this Congress has a responsibility to make good on our promise to these communities by ensuring that FEMA has enough resources to respond to all major disasters. Regardless of where and when they occurred, we must not pit one State or one region against the other.

The administration has made clear what it will take: a $500 million supplemental appropriation for the remainder of this fiscal year, and an increase of $4.6 billion above its initial request for fiscal year 2012. This CR includes $1 billion in supplemental fiscal 2011 funding, and a $2.65 billion downpayment toward fiscal 2012. But I'm not satisfied with either the amount or with the price of inclusion.

Since 2002, Congress has appropriated $95 billion in supplemental funding for the disaster relief fund and additional disaster funding for the Corps of Engineers. Those are the two accounts we are talking about here, and that has all been designated as an emergency and none of it offset.

Now, at a time when communities up and down the eastern seaboard are still reeling from the aftermath of Hurricane Irene, at a time when millions of Americans are still struggling to find a good job, House Republicans are telling us that this time around, FEMA won't get any more disaster relief funding for the current year unless we take money from another Federal agency. This is a

radical departure from the way in which both parties have treated emergency disaster relief over the past decade, and it will undermine our economic recovery.

The Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program which our Republican colleagues propose to cannibalize, that program stands to add tens of thousands of good paying jobs in an industry that will be critical to our future economic competitiveness. This is a bad precedent, and it's bad policy.

It's no wonder the American people are fed up with Congress. Once again the majority is putting partisan ideology ahead of the dire needs of the American people by telling our communities they won't get relief until we wage yet another budget battle here in Congress.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this approach and instead support the disaster relief measure approved by the Senate which would fully fund FEMA's needs without requiring yet another fight over spending offsets.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), chair of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the full Appropriations Committee for yielding, and, Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this must-pass resolution.

Not only does this CR provide the necessary funds and authority to keep the government open, it also provides an immediate and a substantial infusion of vital funding to both FEMA's disaster relief efforts and the Corps of Engineers' flood control and coastal emergency account, and it does all of this in a fiscally responsible way. This resolution before us today complies with the recently enacted Budget Control Act and provides the Appropriations Committee of the House and Senate ample time to do our work on the FY 2012 budget.

For the hard-hit communities all across the country, including my home State of Alabama, which was hit hard back in April, and those devastated by fires, floods, tornadoes, and hurricanes over the past 12 months, this CR will sustain FEMA's disaster relief and recovery efforts and help the Corps with additional funding for emergency flood control projects.

As I mentioned, my home State of Alabama was hit hard back on April 27, so if anyone is interested in sustaining FEMA's disaster relief, it would be me. And I do believe this bill does the job, and just that.

The duration of this CR will provide the time to review and scrutinize FEMA's preliminary damage estimates for Hurricane Irene, estimates that are based on historical projections rather than actual data and claims that are still in the process of being collected. This oversight will enable the Appropriations Committee the time to properly and responsibly address the administration's full supplemental request, a request that was submitted to Congress only about 2 weeks ago. And while Congress has an undeniable obligation to thoroughly address our Nation's disaster relief needs, we can no longer afford to simply throw money at calamities and then ask the hard questions later on. We have to get our funding priorities right the first time, and that is exactly what both Chairman ROGERS and I have repeatedly said when it comes to appropriations for homeland security.

Madam Speaker, this CR is the right tool for the right time, and I urge my colleagues to support this vital resolution and responsibly address our Nation's most pressing needs.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

□ 1620

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. The gentleman is the chair of the Homeland Security Subcommittee which funds FEMA.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Exactly.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Now, you passed a bill back in June that provided $1 billion for FEMA for disaster relief; is that right?

Mr. ADERHOLT. We passed that.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. What happened to that bill?

Mr. ADERHOLT. It passed the committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I mean, after it passed the House.

Mr. ADERHOLT. And it passed the House and was sent to the Senate.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. And what happened then?

Mr. ADERHOLT. And that's where it's sitting.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Nothing has taken place in the Senate since June?

Mr. ADERHOLT. Absolutely.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. And your bill would have provided $1 billion today for disaster relief, and the other body hasn't acted?

Mr. ADERHOLT. We did that, as you say, back well before June. It passed the House in June, and it sits over there even today.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. No wonder they're operating on fumes.

I'm talking about FEMA.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I rise to oppose the taking of the $1.5 billion from the advanced technology vehicle manufacturing account to offset a portion of the Army Corps disaster needs estimated to be $2.256 billion instead of declaring this matter an emergency.

I do think as a matter of policy this institution and the Congress as a whole needs to have the intestinal fortitude to understand that we have natural disasters every year, and we need to set aside moneys to fund those and not to take money out of investment accounts that create jobs in the United States of America.

We have two problems that we're discussing today. One is a natural problem. We have had tornadoes, we have had floods, we have had hurricanes, we had an earthquake, and we have had wildfires. So what is new?

The fact is in every year save two since 1997, the Congress has recognized the need for emergency funds to respond to the impacts of natural disasters on our Nation's water resources infrastructure. Since 2001, the Congress has provided more than $24 billion in emergency funds to the Army Corps of Engineers for this very purpose. And according to the Corps of Engineers, we have spent $5.12 billion on an emergency basis in Afghanistan and Iraq on economic infrastructures.

Now, some suggest all of this has to be offset because we have a fiscal crisis. I would point out that those emergency declarations for water emergencies in 1998 occurred and the budget of the United States was balanced. There was an emergency declaration as far as those water projects in 1999, and we had a balanced budget. There was not an emergency declaration in 2000, and we balanced a budget. In 2001 we had an emergency declaration for water disasters, and we balanced the budget. That's not an argument not to meet the human crisis that people are facing in this country.

I certainly think that my colleague from Washington covered the account as far as vehicle manufacturing very well and the investment it represents and the jobs maintained and created that are represented again in this account.

And certainly Chairman ROGERS makes a point, and rightfully so, that many of these dollars have now been allocated to specific loan programs and others, eight specifically, will be resolved by the end of this year. Again, this offset would not impact those, and the chairman is absolutely correct. However, I do point out to my colleagues that the remaining 10 projects are in the stage of due diligence, the same words that my colleague from Washington used, to compete for the remainder of the $1.5 billion with approximately 10,000 jobs at stake.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Isn't it true that the industrial States are the ones that are getting most of this money because that's where the automobile industry has over the years been located?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. The gentleman is correct. But I would broaden that to suggest the United States of America is getting that money, and people who want to make things in the United

States of America and manufacture things in the United States of America are getting that money.

Mr. DICKS. Isn't it true we already know this program works, this program received $7.5 billion, and $3.5 billion of it has been obligated and is out there as loans? I think it tripled under the loan guarantee program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DICKS. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

And so we are seeing that this program actually works. I mean, if there was some question that it was something that hasn't worked, but it is creating jobs and it will create jobs in the future. And there is a whole bunch of people in there making applications from many of these States that you and I just talked about.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Right. We have 10 pending, and I would not be on the floor if I did not believe we've maintained and created jobs and we have potentially 10,000 more jobs than we can create with the $1.5 billion that is pending; and I would point out, again, I would broaden your observation to the entire United States of America.

I mentioned two problems we face. The second is manufacturing in the United States of America. In 1977, we had over 18 million Americans engaged in manufacturing. Last year, we had over 11 million. The real hourly wage for what an American worker is paid for 1 hour's worth of their physical labor, whatever they may do in this country, is 53 cents less in 2010 than it was in 1977. That's not the country I want to leave the children of this world, and I'm convinced it's because of the loss of those manufacturing jobs.

If it's good enough to declare an emergency and build a children's hospital in Basra, Iraq, we ought not to take money out of an investment account that creates jobs in the auto industry to help people in Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

If it is good enough to declare an emergency to have generators installed in Kandahar, Afghanistan, by the Army Corps of Engineers, we ought not to take money away from job-creating programs to help people in Springfield, Massachusetts. If it's good enough to build a hydroelectric dam in Afghanistan on an emergency basis, we ought to declare an emergency to help people in Smithville, Mississippi.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I think I have made my point. I think the gentleman has, and I think this is the wrong policy. Again, institutionally we need to come to grips with natural disasters, set those moneys aside; but in the alternative and in the intermediate term, we need to recognize them for what they are and not rob the future of this Nation economically to do so.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of Appropriations, the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill to fund the continuing operations of the Federal Government until November 18. I appreciate the leadership of Chairman ROGERS in addressing the responsibilities of this Congress.

Passing this stopgap measure will give Congress time to complete the fiscal year 2012 appropriations process. In spite of our late start, the Appropriations Committee was still able to move 11 of the 12 appropriations bills this year. However, the committee still needs time to collaborate with the Senate.

The continuing resolution funds vital government programs and services and allows essential bills to be paid. It reduces spending to the levels agreed to by the Congress and the administration in the Budget Control Act that was signed into law in August. And it avoids controversial policy riders in order to ensure swift passage.

There are many reasons Members should support this bill. Perhaps one of the most important is what this bill does for our military. Without a CR, our servicemembers and their families don't get paid. They would have to continue to do their work protecting the country, but they would have to do it while worrying about whether they would be able to pay their bills or mortgage.

Our brave men and women in uniform already faced that possibility earlier this year. They deserve better. They need to know that the United States Congress stands behind them. This bill addresses disaster relief, and it funds it in a responsible way.

□ 1630

I urge my colleagues to support this bill so it can be enacted as soon as possible and the Appropriations Committee can complete its work without any further delay. This is a responsible action for us to take to go forward. The American people expect the Congress to do our jobs. The Appropriations Committee must complete its work.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. I thank my distinguished chairman and the ranking member for this conversation.

Madam Speaker, Congress has found the money over the years for disaster relief for all other parts of the country time and time again, whether it was forest fires in the West, droughts in the Southwest, flooding in the Midwest, tornados in the South. Now the Republican majority in the House of Representatives says that when the Northeast suffers devastating flooding as a result of Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee, you won't get enough to cover all of your damages and we're going to have to cut other investments in programs that create manufacturing jobs in America. That's simply outrageous.

I saw firsthand the devastation that occurred in my district in northeastern New Jersey. Thousands of my constituents lost their possessions, were forced to evacuate from their homes or were without power for days, and critical infrastructure was damaged. Recovery efforts are beyond the means of the State and local governments. Our neighbors, our local communities, our local businesses need Federal help to rebuild and they need it now in full, just like every other part of the country in all the years past.

This is not a partisan matter in the Northeast. My Republican Governor, Governor Chris Christie from New Jersey, said our people are suffering now and they need Federal support now, and he was right.

It is time to meet the disaster needs of American citizens in New Jersey, in northeastern United States of America, to do so now and in full. And the Republican majority should get rid of the bill it has now—which I'm going to vote against—and give full relief to the American people from New Jersey. We've been paying the tab for others for a long time. We need the help now.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 9½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Kentucky has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a very hardworking member of our committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise to urge support of H.R. 2608, the Continuing Resolution Act of 2012.

Frankly, I had hoped not to be here in this particular capacity. I had hoped by this point this year we would have been able to restore complete regular order and move our appropriations bills through in a normal fashion. And, frankly, thanks to the leadership of Chairman ROGERS and the cooperation of Chairman DICKS, we've made a lot of progress in doing just that, and hopefully next year we'll be able to complete that progress and build upon what's been accomplished this year. However, there is a genuine need for this continuing resolution at this particular time for a number of reasons.

First, with all due respect, our friends on the other side of the aisle didn't write a budget this year, and that took up quite a bit of time earlier this year getting ready for 2011. Second, we all know we had a prolonged debate over the debt ceiling. That took

up a lot of time. And finally, with all due respect to our friends on the other side of the Rotunda, the Senate operates at a rather leisurely pace these days when it comes to budgeting and appropriating—and, frankly, has for several years. That needs to change.

Some people in this Chamber will oppose this bill because it ''doesn't have enough money for disaster relief.'' The reality is it does. And we can add to that, once the continuing resolution is completed and the appropriations process moves forward, as necessary with due diligence.

Frankly, a lot of this talk about not having enough relief is simply a ruse to spend more money in other areas without being responsible and offsetting expenses from existing revenue. Some on my side of the aisle will oppose this legislation because it spends too much. And, frankly, I have a good deal of sympathy with that. We all would like to lower spending while taking care of legitimate disaster relief.

But this agreement is one that operates under a total spending level. It's been worked out and it's a compromise, and it's one that we ought to honor, honestly, on both sides of the aisle. And my friends who oppose it because it spends too much will only end up triggering additional spending if this legislation doesn't pass. It's a responsible bill.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COLE. In closing, Madam Speaker, it's a responsible piece of legislation. We ought to act on it.

Frankly, it shouldn't be a partisan football. We can take care of people that need relief fully and expeditiously, we can exercise our responsibilities in appropriate oversight fashion, and we can continue to work toward deficit reduction in the long term if we pass this continuing resolution.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the ranking Democratic member of the Natural Resources Committee, Congressman ED MARKEY of Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman from Washington State.

We're having 100-year floods every year. We're having tornados rip through Joplin. We have floods in Vermont, in New Jersey, New York. We have hurricanes all across the country. We have 48 States who have had emergency declarations so far this year. The planet is warming; the weather is worsening.

What is the response of the Republicans? They have to find the money—they say all of a sudden—for disaster relief for people who are suffering, for people who are desperate, for people whose lives have been altered permanently.

They say we have to cut something. Now, do they say we're going to cut the nuclear weapons program because America doesn't need any more nuclear weapons? No. Are we going to cut the breaks that we give to oil and coal? No, we're not going to touch those things. Where are we going? What does the Republican Party do? What does the Tea Party want? I ask what the Tea Party wants.

The Tea Party wants to cut the Clean Car Factory Fund. Now, what is that? Well, that's the fund that we have that's going to invent the automobiles and the trucks that go 60, 70, 80, 90 miles per gallon without having to use oil. Now, why is that important? Two reasons: One, it's the oil that's being burnt that creates the greenhouse gases that are warming up the planet, causing all of these weather conditions that are leading to these disaster relief programs that have to have more money in them as each year goes by; and, two, it is so that we can tell the OPEC ministers, We don't need your oil any more than we need your sand.

So what are they doing here today? They're taking the one program that is central to the health and well-being of our country and to our national security—so that we alter our relationship with OPEC—and they are slashing it. They are slashing the one program that reinvents the vehicles that we drive. They are slashing the one program that gives young people in our country some hope that we are going to invent our way out of this problem.

You don't have to be Dick Tracy to figure out what's going on here. The oil industry, the coal industry, all of the polluting industries are saying kill the program that makes sure that the vehicles we get in 20 years get 75 or 100 miles per gallon without using one gallon of oil.

Vote ''no'' on this terrible bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chair of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

I just want to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this continuing resolution.

This body has been doing a lot of things to try to get the economy moving again, to try to put people back to work, create jobs. One of the ways we can do that is to change this culture of spending into a culture of saving. Quit crowding out the private sector so that the private sector can come in and do the job creation that we know they can do.

□ 1640

We've taken some giant steps on stopping all the spending that's gone on here. Last year we did some good things. Eventually we funded the government at less than last year's level, and this year we hoped that we would come in and do the individual Appropriations subcommittees. In the House we passed six of those through the full House. Unfortunately, the Senate only passed one, and so we find ourselves now in a situation where we have to pass a continuing resolution.

But, again, all the subcommittees that came before this full House funded their subcommittees at less than last year's level. We now have a continuing resolution that has funding that's less than last year. It's been agreed to by the House, agreed to by the Senate, and agreed to by the President.

And we can argue about the process. We can argue about whether it should be a little more or a little bit less. But we'll give ourselves until November 18 to finalize all the work that needs to be done. And so I think it's appropriate that we pass this, move forward, and continue to try to get a handle on the spending to help get our economy moving again.

Mr. DICKS. May I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 10½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chair of the Labor-HHS Subcommittee, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG).

Mr. REHBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Speaker, there is no phrase that better embodies the fact that something here in Washington is broken than ''government shutdown.'' Yesterday we heard those words for the second time in a year, and that tells us the old ways of doing things simply don't work anymore. It's time for a new direction.

Every month we're faced with new unemployment numbers, new market losses, and new deficit figures. We can never forget that behind those numbers are people. Unemployment isn't just a number; it's people who worry about how they will fill their gas tanks or put food on their table.

Market losses aren't just lines on a graph; it's the retirement savings of seniors across the country who struggle to afford medicine they need. And deficit isn't just borrowed money; it's the future being stolen from our children and our grandchildren.

As subcommittee chairman of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations, I support this continuing resolution. Not only does it prevent a government shutdown, it gives us time to finish working on the remaining appropriations bills in an open and transparent way.

I look forward to my subcommittee introducing and debating their work. Let me tell you a little bit about it. As we've been crafting this bill, I've worked closely with you, Members of this body, and listened to folks from Montana and throughout the country. We want it to be a balanced plan that fundamentally improves how the government spends its money, the hard-working money of taxpayers.

We want to make government more accountable and efficient, saving as much as possible on top of the savings from earlier this year. In addition to eliminating inefficient programs, we'll improve the remaining government by defunding enforcement of unnecessary and overreaching regulations. These regulations cost jobs and hamper economic recovery.

By spending strategically, we can maintain critical funding for things like education and biomedical research. To be successful in tomorrow's economy, our children need to be prepared for the skilled jobs that are going unfilled today. We also need to invest in basic research so the U.S. can continue to be a leader in biomedical advancements. Our subcommittee wants to do that.

Our legislation will keep the promise we made to rein in government spending and government growth. It's the next step, not the final one. We still have a long way to go, but by finding ways to do more with less, we are changing the direction in Washington. That's what the American people want, and I'm confident that by passing this continuing resolution it will give us the time to do it in the open and do it right.

With that, I hope you'll vote for this continuing resolution.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding to me, and I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2608, the Continuing Appropriations Act of 2012. I oppose playing political games with FEMA disaster funding while American citizens are recovering from recent natural disasters that have wiped out homes, businesses, and lives.

In an unprecedented move, the Republican majority requires an offset for FEMA funding. FEMA must be fully funded so that my constituents can continue recovering from the devastation of Hurricane Irene. By requiring this offset, we're playing politics with the lives of those who need our assistance most.

Let me tell my Republican colleagues that if you want an offset, let's get rid of the Bush tax cuts for the rich. That's an offset that you won't want to get rid of.

This bill presents a false choice: that we need to cut off one hand to save the other. The bill slashes funds from a program that would reinvigorate the manufacturing sector and decrease our reliance on foreign oil to fund FEMA. We can do both, and we need not buy in to this ridiculous logic. In times of disaster, we must always take care of our citizens and our country first, period.

Try telling my constituents who are struggling in the aftermath of a hurricane, sorry, you'll have to wait till we find an offset. Sorry, we really don't care about your problems. We have other pressing things to do.

Reasonable Democrats and Republicans maintained the practice of helping constituents in the past. Why this policy has changed is beyond me.

Madam Speaker, disasters are not associated with one political party, and helping our citizens should be a top priority of both.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the CR, and urge the majority to bring a bill to the floor that fully funds FEMA and doesn't harm job creation and does the right thing.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Does the gentleman realize that back in June, in this body we passed, with bipartisan support, the Homeland Security bill, which contained $1 billion for FEMA, sent it to the Senate, and it's been laying there for the last 3 months? Did the gentleman know that?

Mr. ENGEL. I do know that. Unfortunately, it's been difficult passing things in the Senate because, quite frankly, the minority filibusters everything to death, and getting the 60 votes is very, very difficult.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very hardworking chair of the Interior subcommittee on appropriations, the gentleman whose subcommittee held more hearings than any other, I think 22 different hearings—we had 150 committee-wide, but he won the award for the most hearings—the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, many Members of Congress, myself included, recognize that if we want to get our economy going again we need to take steps to get our fiscal house back in order and provide certainty to the marketplace so small business and job creators can begin hiring again.

Until we finish the regular appropriations process for the coming year, we won't be able to implement the necessary spending reductions and policy reforms needed to get our economy moving again.

While the House has come close to passing all of the appropriation bills out of committee and many of the bills on the floor, the Senate has passed only one bill so far. This CR gives us time to complete that work, while cutting current spending. To me, that seems like a much more reasonable solution than threatening another government shutdown, which will only hurt the economy.

Congress has one responsibility each year, and that is to pass the 12 appropriations bills by the beginning of the year. That job has been made harder this year by the fact that the previous majority did not complete their work by the end of 2010.

But I've got to tell you, in all honesty, this debate has almost been bizarre to me today. People have asked me whether we need to offset emergency spending, and I said emergency spending does not have to be offset. But if you can find the offsets to do so, why not do so? And that's what we've tried to do in this bill.

This debate seems to me almost devoid of the fact that we are $1.5 trillion in debt this year. The gentlelady from Texas, in the debate on the rule, said, we're nickel and diming those that are suffering from disaster, and that we shouldn't be nickel and diming.

I don't know, but in Idaho, $1.5 trillion, or the $1 billion that we're offsetting here, is not nickels and dimes.

The gentleman from New Jersey said people need relief now in New Jersey. They are going to get relief when we pass this bill.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) said, we are cannibalizing the program that we are taking the money out of. In full committee, this amendment was offered on the Homeland Security bill. This amendment was offered. There was no objection to it. It passed on a voice vote. And now we are cannibalizing the program?

We need to pass this so that we can get on and finish our appropriations bills.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 5¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 5 minutes remaining.

□ 1650

Mr. DICKS. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Democratic whip, my good friend, Mr. HOYER, from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this bill.

Now, all of us are for a continuing resolution which keeps the government in business. In the past, on both sides of the aisle, we have talked about clean CRs, clean CRs in the short term—this going to November 18—to keep government running. I was hopeful that we would have such a CR this time so we would not continue to give to the American public the feeling that we can't come to agreement.

I was not in the Appropriations Committee. The gentleman, my good friend from Idaho, said this was an amendment that was not opposed in committee. I don't know whether Mr. PRICE would agree with that. I don't know what the facts on that were. But let me say this:

This is a pay-for that is extraordinarily controversial on our side of the aisle, extraordinarily controversial because the message we got from America as we were home, and as we get today, is we need to create jobs. We need to grow the economy. We perceive on this side of the aisle as having selected a pay-for, which, by the way, pay-for for FEMA disaster aid, as I understand it from staff, has never happened before. No precedent for doing this.

Let me give you an example that we all ought to all understand.

Your water heater goes out at 2 a.m. in the morning. Your family is going to get up the next day and they need to take a shower and they need to get ready, and you need a water heater right away. So what do you do? You go out and buy the water heater. What do you do? You charge it. Because it's an emergency, you've got to get it online.

We have a lot of people who have suffered an emergency assault by hurricane, by tornado, by fire, by earthquake, and they need help now. And historically, we have given help now and have not gotten into a debate about what priority do we undermine in that process. We respond to the true emergency.

Now, we've had a lot of emergencies, and Mr. ROGERS and I have been here a long time, that were not really emergencies. We claimed they were emergencies so we didn't have to pay for them under our rules.

But there is no one, I think, in this body or in this country who doesn't believe that Irene caused a legitimate emergency—not feigned, not used for the purposes of justifying where we may go. The longstanding precedent in both Chambers has been to respond to disasters immediately by getting victims the help they need.

Just as a family can't budget in advance for a car breaking down or the water heater or something as I mentioned, we have provided in the agreement that we just made just a few weeks ago for headroom for exactly these kinds of emergencies—$11 billion. However, we did not provide that for 2011. But, again, 2011 is when the emergency occurred and when the money is needed now.

The Senate just passed a disaster relief bill that adheres to this precedent, and it passed with significant bipartisan support. Unfortunately, Republicans here insist on breaking with this commonsense precedent and with their colleagues in the Senate and demand that responding to an emergency be offset by cutting elsewhere.

Now, again, let me precisely say, on emergency, FEMA funding directed at disaster relief.

Now, the problem we have is that the target for paying for this is what we perceive to be a job creator. So as a result, I would ask that we reject this bill.

We have some time left to do another CR that we ought to agree on in a bipartisan way, a clean CR, short-term, so that, yes, we can, as the gentleman from Idaho said, get on with our business.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 2 minutes to a very hardworking member of our committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BONNER).

Mr. BONNER. I appreciate the gentleman from Kentucky yielding time.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I rise in support of the continuing resolution that is before us today. This CR continues government operations at an amount agreed to by the Congress and the White House in the Budget Control Act just a few weeks ago, as was noted by the distinguished Democrat whip.

But make no mistake, the American people spoke loudly last November and the message was clear: We need to spend less. And both the House Budget Committee and the House Appropriations Committee have been at the vanguard of meeting that challenge.

But the other message that many of us receive when we go back home to our districts from our constituents is they want this institution to function. They want their elected officials on both sides to put aside the partisan differences and to work to create an environment that fosters job creation and economic growth and that reduces spending and puts our Nation back on a path towards fiscal solvency.

Naturally, I find it disappointing to now learn that some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are opposing this bill for purely political reasons after signalling their support just last week.

And to my friends in our own conference who believe we should make deeper cuts in this CR, I would say we agree. The House has voted to reduce spending further on multiple occasions, and this Appropriations Committee has reported many bills to do so as well.

Sadly, in this hyperpartisan political environment with the Republican majority in the House, a Democrat majority in the Senate, and a Democrat White House, the will of the House alone cannot rule the day simply because we wish to do so.

This is a reasonable bill which pays for the disaster funding it contains, and it holds the funding level at an agreed-upon amount and allows the committee the opportunity to do its work in the remaining days of this year before fiscal year 2012 kicks in.

I urge my colleagues to support this passage.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 2 minutes to a new member of our committee who's doing a great job, from the State of Arkansas, STEVE WOMACK.

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the gentleman, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for yielding and appreciate this time.

If I heard it once when I was back in my district, I heard it dozens of times, and that was the frustration of my constituents concerning our inability to get our business done, to get it done on time without the panic and anxiety associated with threatened shutdowns of government.

This vote today is an opportunity for us to do just that—fund government consistently with the amounts agreed to in the Budget Control Act, giving the necessary time to complete 2012 appropriations and save America from the threat of another government shutdown.

Now, as was articulated by the distinguished chairman a moment ago, I'm a freshman, and I realize I'm still learning the ropes of this Chamber and how things get done, but let's just go back in context.

This funds government at levels consistent with the Budget Control Act passed in this very room a few weeks ago. It addresses disaster funding and does so in a very responsible way. It is not unprecedented nor is it unique to find offsets. And this offset is exactly what this House passed in the Homeland Security appropriations bill.

So what has changed? I suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that the political strategies have changed, and the emotions and the hardships of the people affected by these disasters are really nothing more than a political prop in this entire discussion designed to make us look hard-hearted or insensitive. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Just a moment ago, the distinguished Democratic whip from Maryland talked about the water heater going out in the middle of the night. You just simply go charge one. What happens when you go to charge it and your credit is denied? You've maxed out on your credit card. As my friend MIKE SIMPSON said a moment ago, we're broke. We're a trillion and a half dollars in deficit.

Our plan, this CR, provides the necessary funding, does it responsibly and consistently with already agreed-upon numbers. I urge its passage.

□ 1700

Mr. DICKS. I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished Democratic leader from California, whose State has suffered a number of major disasters over the years, so she is well versed on this subject, Ms. PELOSI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I congratulate him on his tremendous leadership as the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee.

When he was speaking today, I was thinking back to when I was a relatively new Member of Congress—not even here 2 years—when we had the Loma Prieta earthquake in the San Francisco Bay Area. It was shocking to us. Of course, it was a complete surprise—a terrible natural disaster. The Bay Bridge was out of commission and cracked. The homes were on fire for days and days and days—a true natural disaster.

When I came to the floor when this issue was brought up by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Honorable Jamie Whitten of Mississippi, he came to the floor; and with his words of comfort and assurance to the people who were affected by this natural disaster, his comments made all the difference in the world. In listening to him, no one had any doubt

that the Federal Government was going to honor its commitment to the American people: that when in time of natural disaster, we will be there. We have a compact with the American people.

How different the conversation is today when we're talking about saying, when in a time of natural disaster—and by the way, there have been many more natural disasters than in the San Francisco Bay Area, the Loma Prieta, which stretched for long distances in northern California. Today, we've had hurricanes, earthquakes, tornadoes, floods, forest fires still raging out of control in some parts of the country—Texas, until recently, in that situation. I hope that it's under control now or that the rain we all prayed for there is coming.

And what do we do? We come to the floor and say, Now we're going to institute a new policy that says: in time of natural disaster, we're going to have to find some place to pay for it. Now, what's next? Where are we going next to pay for it?

The distinguished chairman has said, well, we've paid for emergencies before and, indeed, we have. I'm talking about something of a much different caliber. I'm talking about a natural disaster. I'm talking about the FEMA Disaster Relief Fund. With all of the disasters that are happening at once, we don't know when the next one will come; but what is frightening also is we don't know where this majority wants to go to pay for it.

I have serious objection to the pay-for in this legislation. I have a bigger objection that we would have to pay for a disaster. We never paid for the tax cuts for the rich. They never were paid for. We never paid for the wars in Afghanistan or Iraq. They were never paid for. But, all of a sudden, we have to pay to try to make whole these people who have been affected, who have lost everything. I've visited there. I wish you would. Maybe you have. But it's not that the joblessness story is finished. It's not that as we go to a new disaster, we're finished with the old one. It's just compounded.

Someone mentioned earlier in the election—people talked about this—that the American people, whether in election or out of election, want jobs; and exactly what this bill does is cut jobs. Instead of creating jobs, which is the number one priority of the American people, this Republican bill will cost good-paying jobs. It's amazing because the bill that we're debating here will cost at least 10 good-paying American manufacturing jobs—Make It in America—and perhaps tens of thousands more by cutting the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program.

I'm not even going to speak too much about it because our colleagues already have. They've talked about how this takes us to the next place in innovation and competitiveness for our country, the next place in technology for cars that will reduce emissions, which will help to stop some of these natural disasters. These loans are proven to be effective. They have already created 42,000 jobs, putting America to work making cleaner, more efficient American cars. We shouldn't have to choose between creating jobs and caring for those struggling in the aftermath of disasters like Hurricane Irene and the earthquake that preceded it and the floods that continue.

One of the speakers, a gentleman whom I respect, said this is a political move. Well, if there is anything that is not political in our country, it is a natural disaster. Do you want to talk politics when somebody is suffering a natural disaster? There is no place for that. At some place, we walk on a ground that is more hallowed than the normal terrain on which we debate, and that terrain is the terrain of the disaster that has affected the American people. If you looked in their eyes, you would feel so helpless that you could not make them whole. You may not be able to provide them the personal effects of their families. I've seen it so many times.

Will they economically be made whole? Will their homes be restored in a way that makes it the home it was before that they loved, that created a sense of community, one home after another? So we're at a very, very sad place for all of these people. We don't know who is next.

What makes me suspicious about what the majority has put into this—and I want you to know this—is we haven't paid for natural disaster assistance before. They're using this advanced technology vehicle manufacturing. They're taking $1 billion of it to pay for the disaster. There is a half a billion dollars left, and they're rescinding it in this bill. They're eliminating it. So this isn't about paying for the disaster. This is about destroying an initiative that is job-creating, that is innovative, that keeps America number one, that creates good-paying jobs in our country.

It's really hard to understand what the motivation is for that, but one thing is clear—they are using the disaster to eliminate that initiative, and that's just not right. But even if they had the best offset in the world, I still think it is wrong for them to go down a path that says, This time, for your disaster, we're using this technology program. What's next? With all of the disasters that we have, where do we have the room to say, On those days, at that specific time, this is how we'll pay for it?

Let's, instead, do something that gives hope to people, that creates an economic boomlet in these places that have been affected and not a discouragement that they are being treated differently than anybody else has been in time of natural disasters.

I heard the distinguished chairman use the term ''emergency.'' It's a different story. It's a different story. It is with great sadness that we try to meet the needs of people at this difficult time. It's in great sadness that we even have to have a debate about it. I urge our Republican colleagues to withdraw this bill. Come back clean. Let us vote together to address the natural disaster that has afflicted our country, recognizing that we don't know what's around the corner.

As one of my colleagues said, We said we're going to pay for everything.

We don't know what God has in store for us for the next disaster. We hope and pray that, whatever it is, we have the strength to meet the needs of our people in a way that has nothing to do with politics but everything to do with America.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote against this, reluctantly, because I would love for us to join together but not in its present form.

□ 1710

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this is a simple bill. This is a simple continuation of spending until November 18.

I would not want it on my record that I voted against helping the postal workers keep their routes until November 18. We take care of that problem in this bill. I wouldn't want to vote ''no'' on that if I could help it.

I wouldn't want to vote ''no'' to refuse to continue the government and all that the government does. I wouldn't want it on my record that I voted against helping people who are flooded, the subject of wildfires, earthquakes and all other sorts of calamities. A vote of ''no'' on this bill says no other help for those people.

Now, the gentlewoman who just preceded me, the former Speaker of the House, says that we should not use offsets to pay for at least a portion of these disaster funds. In fact, while the gentlewoman was Speaker of this House, we did just that.

We voted to offset the funding for Hurricane Katrina in 2006 and 2007. We voted for offsets for disaster relief in 2008, 2009; and, lastly, in 2010 we voted to offset $10 billion for what was called the Pelosi edu-jobs stimulus bill. The gentlewoman voted for that offset.

So I urge you to vote for this bill. We will have plenty of time during the negotiations with the Senate during the next 6 weeks to take into account the additional bills we are going to get for flooding and other disaster relief, and we will take care of the problem between now and then.

Vote ''yes'' on the bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, today's Continuing Resolution would fund federal government operations through November 18, 2011 at 98.5% of FY 2011 funding levels, reflecting the 1.5% across-the-board cut required to bring spending in line with the $1.043 trillion discretionary cap for FY 2012 in the recently enacted Budget Control Act of 2011.

Additionally, H.R. 2608 provides $3.65 billion in disaster relief funding, which is $1.8 billion below President Obama's request and

$3.25 billion less than the Senate allocation supported by ten Republican Senators. Of the $3.65 billion for disaster relief in today's legislation, $1 billion is made available in FY 2011 and the remaining $2.65 billion is designated as FY 2012 money. However, in a sharp break with precedent under previous administrations from both parties, the $1 billion in FY 2011 in emergency disaster relief is offset by a $1.5 billion cut in the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be holding emergency disaster relief hostage to political infighting in Washington, DC. And with unemployment still hovering above 9%, we certainly shouldn't be undermining a proven job creator like the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program that will help next generation vehicles get built in the United States rather than overseas.

Instead, we should put politics aside, pass a clean CR and get disaster relief where it is needed without undercutting innovation and job creation in an economy that needs more of both.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I rise today to provide explanation and clarification of the intended budget effects from the anomaly related to the U.S. Postal Service that is contained in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2608, the Continuing Resolution (CR) for Fiscal Year 2012.

The amendment would postpone from September 30, 2011 until November 18, 2011 the payment due from the Postal Service, which is off-budget, to an on-budget account managed by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM).

The Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act of 2006 requires the Postal Service to make a $5.5 billion payment to OPM by September 30, 2011 to pre-fund retiree health benefits. However, the Postal Service does not currently have adequate funds to make this payment. To address this issue, the CR includes a provision that will delay the payment to provide time for the Postal Service to work with Congress and the administration to develop a long-term solution.

If only the on-budget effects were counted, this delay would score as an increase in spending in 2011, but then produce savings in 2012, resulting in additional room for spending under the caps on discretionary spending established in the Budget Control Act of 2011. To prevent this unintended consequence, the House Budget Committee scored this anomaly on a unified basis, so that both the on-budget and off-budget effects were counted together. As the result, the 2011 cost and the 2012 savings offset each other and produce a score of zero in the CR. This decision has precedent. A similar provision was included in the FY 2010 short-term CR (P.L. 111–68) where the House scored that provision on a unified basis pursuant to section 426(b) of the 2010 budget resolution.

The off-budget status of the U.S. Postal Service creates significant complications for budget enforcement when the agency seeks timing shifts or bailouts from the U.S. Treasury due to financial distress. The House Budget Committee will continue to monitor this anomaly throughout the budget and appropriations process to ensure that it does not result in additional discretionary spending in FY 2012.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise to voice my strong opposition to HR. 2608, the short-term continuing appropriations measure on the floor today to fund government operations through November 18, 2011.

Hundreds of American communities have been devastated this year by hurricanes, droughts, floods, wildfires and tornadoes. Dozens of Governors—both Republicans and Democrats—have requested federal assistance from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to meet the needs of their states' residents. These federal funds are used by state and local response teams to house displaced families, provide crisis counseling to disaster victims, remove debris, and repair or replace critical bridges, roads and utilities.

With more than three months remaining, 2011 has already seen more billion dollar disasters than any year on record. Early cost estimates of this year's weather-related disasters are well above $20 billion. As a result, FEMA can no longer afford to help all those who need assistance. The Associated Press reported that FEMA's disaster funding is now so low that planned repairs to bridges, roads and schools in tornado-ravaged Joplin, Missouri have been stopped and the funds redirected to help the victims of Hurricane Irene.

Caring for Americans devastated by natural disasters has always been a basic American value. Unfortunately, House Republicans are turning disaster relief into a partisan political battle by under-funding these urgent needs and demanding that emergency funds be offset with cuts to a critical job-creating initiative.

The House legislation under debate today includes $3.65 billion in emergency aid—$1.8 billion less than what the Obama administration told Congress is needed. Even worse, H.R. 2608 cuts $1 billion from the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Program (ATVM). This public-private partnership helps U.S. auto makers and parts suppliers build next generation vehicles with technologies made in America, rather than imported from China and other foreign countries. The ATVM is a major success. It has already saved or created 41,000 American jobs and will save or create at least 35,000 additional jobs anticipated by the end of this year. The cuts demanded by House Republicans to this program threaten to destroy thousands of American jobs and undermine the global competitiveness of U.S. auto makers.

During the past decade, House Republicans voted time and time again for so-called emergency funding for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan without offsetting the costs. The hundreds of billions of dollars in deficit spending Republicans supported on these wars helped create the crippling debt our country now faces. And now, my House Republican colleagues are pretending to take a stand against deficits by threatening to shut down the U.S. government and deny assistance to American families who have had their lives destroyed by natural disaster.

I call on reasonable Republicans in the House to join with Democrats to reject this hypocritical and callous bill, and instead commit the necessary funding to rescue America's devastated communities.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2608, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution for FY 2012.

This legislation implements a 1.5%, nearly across the board reduction to current spending levels and pays for it by cutting the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Program (ATVM). This program is essential to keeping our auto manufacturing industry competitive.

I support the cuts to the Overseas Contingency Operations fund, which is used to fund our wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as other counterterrorism operations. But the rhetoric on cuts to war spending does not match the reality and cost of our policies abroad.

Last week, The New York Times highlighted the legal battle currently occurring in the White House over the use of lethal force, of targeted killings against militants abroad by ''drone strikes, cruise missiles or commando raids.'' We talk about ending the wars while planning to expand the use of lethal force—or committing acts of war—in other countries with little to no oversight from Congress. We impose faux deadlines to end the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and attach cost-savings estimates to them, while at the time same, continuing to push the deadline for withdrawal back. According to the Congressional Research Service, the cost of keeping U.S. troops in Afghanistan is $694,000 per soldier per year.

The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have cost the United States trillions of dollars and have played a major role in our economic insecurity. The war in Iraq was the first time in American history that the government cut taxes as it went to war, resulting in a war completely funded by borrowing. Soaring oil prices, the ballooning federal debt and the global economic crisis are all intimately linked to our policies of endless war. These are policies we are continuing today.

Any serious debate on scaling back spending must include not only cuts to defense spending, but also to the wars the U.S. is currently waging or attempting to expand in other countries such as Somalia, Yemen and Pakistan through our drone campaigns. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to debate H.R. 2608, ''The Small Business Program Extension and Reform Act of 2011,'' which provides for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 at the expense of job creating efforts.

Now . . . Now is not the time to trample on the needs of small business owners. Now is not the time to delay assistance to those who need support from FEMA. Now is not the time for a partisan position that will only cause more Americans to suffer while they have to wait on Congress to find balance. Now is the time for balance and reason.

Small businesses have long been the bedrock of our nation's economy. Even with the advent of modern-day multi-national corporations most of our day-to-day purchases take place at ''mom and pop'' small businesses.

This piece of legislation holds small businesses hostage in order to make a demand that has never been made by Republicans before. This demand changes their practice during previous administrations. In the past my colleagues declared disaster funding as emergency spending and did not require offsetting emergency spending.

This bill would offset the $1 billion in FY11 disaster relief funding using a program that is a proven job-creator, a program for small businesses. The very small businesses that are currently in need of access to loans and other

lines of credit in order to build their businesses and create jobs. The very small businesses that are the life blood of our economy. These businesses, the ''mom and pop'' shops across our nation are being held hostage by my colleagues across the aisle at the expense of jobs.

The future success of their businesses are being held hostage in order to demand offsets of funds that have not requires such an offset in the past. These funds would aid victims of natural disasters. To propose such a measure at a time when our economy is so fragile and when so many are struggling to survive is unfathomable. I support the bipartisan Senate language.

At a time when our nation needs every single job we can create. Before us is a job killing measure. We need job creation to help families survive on smaller and smaller pay checks. Before us is legislation that places a halt on this growth. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the first time in our nation's history has added to this piece of legislation a requirement that disaster aid be offset. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) needs the $6.9 billion in funding which has been approved in the Senate last week without requiring offset. These cuts cost Americans tens of thousands of jobs. Under the previous administration Republicans supported disaster relief without requiring an offset, on eight separate occasions but today they want to require cuts that will result in job loss.

As the Representative for Houston, which suffered severe damage in 2008 as a result of Hurricane Ike, I understand the importance of clean up and rebuilding in the wake of natural disaster. Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) addresses the challenges our communities face when we are confronted with a catastrophic event or a domestic terrorist attack. It is important for people to understand that our capacity to deal with hurricanes directly reflects our ability to respond to a terrorist attack in Texas or New York, an earthquake in California, or a nationwide pandemic flu outbreak.

The devastating hurricanes that struck Texas in past years because the response to those events demonstrated the need for significant improvement. During Hurricane Katrina, there were insufficient quantities of generators forced hospitals to evacuate patients. Local governments waited days for commodities like ice, water, MREs, and blue tarps. Evacuees from Texas arrived in Shreveport and Bastrop shelters that were grossly unfit for occupancy, and 2,500 people were forced to use the same shower facility.

We must prepare our first responders with the best information and training to quickly analyze and share information to understand alerts and warning systems, evacuation planning, mission assignments to other agencies, contingency contracting, pre-staged resources, Regional Hurricane Plans and exercises, communications support, citizen preparedness, disaster housing, and long-term recovery planning. In order to accomplish this we must fund FEMA, not at the expense of small business but because Americans come together at times of crisis. This should be what it has always been—emergency funding.

Emergency preparedness is not the exclusive responsibility of the federal government or individual agencies within it. State and local officials, nonprofit organizations, private sector businesses, and individual citizens must all contribute to the mission in order for our nation to succeed at protecting life and property from disasters. Recovery and mitigation are critical to protecting communities from future threats, and our ability to respond will suffer if we do not focus attention and resources on those missions.

On any given day the City of Houston faces a widespread and ever-changing array of threats, such as: terrorism, organized crime, natural disasters and industrial accidents. Cities and towns across the nation face these and other threats. Indeed, every day, ensuring the security of the homeland requires the interaction of multiple Federal departments and agencies, as well as operational collaboration across Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial governments, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector. This collaboration and cooperation undergirds our security posture at our borders and ports, our preparedness in our communities, and our ability to effectively react to crises. Consider the devastation that was brought by the tornadoes in Alabama and the Southern United States, the flooding that has impacted the entire Mississippi river region, from Montana to Tennessee, and tornado that claimed more than 100 lives in Joplin, Missouri, have shown us that there are disasters we cannot predict, and forces of nature for which we cannot plan.

This legislation is a job killer, it is an affront to growing small businesses and will destroy thousands of jobs. I have been firmly committed to supporting small businesses and this legislation as written will fail to help create the jobs we need at this time. We should not prevent the growth of small business in order to address the unrealistic demands related to disaster relief funding.

Moreover, 99 percent of all independent companies and businesses in the United States are considered small businesses. They are the engine of our economy, creating two-thirds of the new jobs over the last 15 years. America's 27 million small businesses continue to face a lack of credit and tight lending standards, with the number of small businesses loans down nearly 5 million since the financial crisis in 2008.

According to the U.S. Small Business Administration, these small businesses account for 52 percent of all U.S. workers. These small businesses also provide a continuing source of vitality for the American economy. Small businesses in the U.S. produced three-fourths of the economy's new jobs between 1990 and 1995, and represent an entry point into the economy for new groups. Women, for instance, participate heavily in small businesses.

The number of female-owned businesses climbed by 89 percent, to an estimated 8.1 million, between 1987 and 1997, and women-owned sole proprietorships were expected to reach 35 percent of all such ventures by the year 2000. Small firms also tend to hire a greater number of older workers and people who prefer to work part-time.

One strength that small businesses are known for is their ability to respond quickly to changing economic conditions. They often know their customers personally and are especially suited to meet local needs. There are tons of stories of start-up companies catching national attention and growing into large corporations. Just a few examples of these types of start-up businesses making big include the computer software company Microsoft; the package delivery service Federal Express; sports clothing manufacturer Nike; the computer networking firm America OnLine; and ice cream maker Ben & Jerry's.

We must always ensure that we place a high level of priority on small businesses. It is also important that we work towards ensuring that small businesses receive all the tools and resources necessary for their continued growth and development.

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

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

I have worked hard to help small business owners to fully realize their potential. That is why I support entrepreneurial development programs, including the Small Business Development Center and Women's Business Center programs. These initiatives provide counseling in a variety of critical areas, including business plan development, finance, and marketing.

We must consider what impact changes in this appropriations bill will have on small businesses.

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

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

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

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

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

Facts: Small business are important because they:

(1) Represent 99.7 percent of all employer firms,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Republicans appear to be on a mission to cut programs that help families and will buttress small businesses at a time when there are Americans faced with the perils which arise during cleaning up after a natural disaster. Now is not the time to force those Americans to wait on a partisan battle, to pick a fight that has not been fought in eight previous authorizations of funds for disaster relief. There needs to be a balance when determining which programs to cut and when. A balance to finding the funds that will address national disasters. A balanced approach to measures that will aid small business and to restore our economy.

I support small business and job creation. I will not support small business growth being held hostage to the unrealistic demands made by my Republican Colleagues. American families need legislation that are job growers rather than measures that are jobs killers.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 405, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the motion will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2883.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 195, nays 230, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 719]

YEAS—195

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

NAYS—230

Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Campbell
Canseco
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
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
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Flake
Fleming
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kucinich
Lamborn
Landry
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Baca
Bachmann
Blackburn
Giffords
Paul
Payne
Reichert
Sutton

□ 1744

Messrs. BISHOP of Georgia, RUSH, BURTON of Indiana, ROHRABACHER, TURNER of Ohio, MILLER of Florida, DUNCAN of Tennessee, BUCSHON and FINCHER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. STEARNS, GARY G. MILLER of California and Mrs. BLACK changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, I was absent from today's vote. If I had been here, I would have voted "no" on H.R. 2608, the Continuing Appropriations Act of 2012.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES IMPROVEMENT AND INNOVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2883) to amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to extend the child and family services program through fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes, 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 Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) 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 395, nays 25, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 720]

YEAS—395

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
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
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
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
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
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
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
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, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—25

Amash
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Chaffetz
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Flake
Foxx
Garrett
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Jordan
Labrador
Lamborn
Lummis
McClintock
Mulvaney
Poe (TX)
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Stutzman
Walsh (IL)

NOT VOTING—13

Baca
Bachmann
Blumenauer
Giffords
Gohmert
Grijalva
Loebsack
Paul
Payne
Reichert
Sutton
Tonko
Turner (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1751

Ms. FOXX changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. ROONEY 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.

Stated for:

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 720 I was unavoidably detained. I conducted a previously scheduled telephone town hall with constituents of the 21st Congressional District of New York. The telephone town hall addressed flooding concerns associated with recent disasters that impacted the district. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Mr. TURNER of New York. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 720 I was detained. Had I been present I would have voted ''yea.''

PALESTINIAN STATEHOOD U.N. VOTE

(Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, the Jewish State of Israel is essential to America's national security. The Jewish State of Israel guards the Mediterranean, the Suez Canal, and helps us with the oil and other activities in the Persian Gulf near Iran. Our relationship is mutually dependent, and so extremely important to both countries' vital national security.

But what's happening this week at the U.N., the Palestinians are going to the U.N. to avoid negotiating a peace agreement with Israel. The Palestinians want the U.N. to do what they won't do, negotiate a peace agreement.

Yet the Palestinians are made up of Hamas and Fatah. Hamas is a terrorist group with the blood of innocent Americans on their hands. Hamas' charter says they will never recognize Israel's right to exist.

Fatah is coming to the U.N. through their President Abbas, even though President Obama and the Congress have said, Go negotiate peace with Israel. Why would the Palestinians do that to the United States' vital national security interests and America's best friend in the region, the Jewish State of Israel? Because they are refusing to make an agreement to live in peace with the Jewish State.

The Congress has spoken. We will withdraw aid from the Palestinians, and the Palestinian people will suffer. The Palestinian leadership must withdraw from the U.N. and go to the negotiating table without pre-conditions with the Jewish State of Israel.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN BELARUS

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, it's been more than 9 months since the December 19 brutal and bloody crackdown on the opposition in Belarus. Human rights of ordinary Belarusan citizens continue to be denied. Nine political prisoners still exist. Nikolay Statkevich, Andrey Sannikaw, Dmitri Uss, Dmitri Bandarenka, Dmitri Dashkevich, Eduard Lobov, Pavel Severinetz, Ales Belyatsky and Mikalai Autukovich remain in prison, and President Lukashenka is using them to bargain for economic assistance with the international community.

Anatoly Lyabedska, leader of the United Civic Party, described the conditions in the KGB pre-trial detention facility as being cruel and inhumane, and the authorities' actions against opposition activities as being brutal.

For the first time in 17 years, people in Belarus are looking for a real alternative and asking for democratic

change. It is now time to invest in democracy in Belarus. The existing window for the opposition might be temporary. People in Belarus need our support, and we have to be with them until the end of this existing brutal regime.

NEWS FOR THE PALESTINIAN LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, as we speak now, in my hometown of New York, United Nations leaders from all over the world are coming in. The major issue is the Palestinian claim they're going to go to the United Nations to have a declared state of their own.

I have news for the Palestinian leadership. The only way they can have a state of their own is to sit down face-to-face with Israel in face-to-face negotiations and hammer out an agreement, an agreement which is the two-state solution, an Israeli Jewish state and a Palestinian Arab state.

The Palestinians cannot try to impose any kind of solution that doesn't work. If two adversaries want to hash out a disagreement to come to an agreement, then they need face-to-face negotiation. This has happened in the past. Each time Israel has accepted it, and the Palestinians have said no.

The United Nations should not discredit itself even more and continue to be the usual kangaroo court against Israel. I'm glad that the United States and the President are standing up and saying that we will veto a resolution if it comes before the Security Council.

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, what happens at the United Nations this week will have a profound and lasting effect on the prospects for peace in the Middle East. If the Palestinian Authority succeeds in obtaining U.N. recognition for a Palestinian state, it will only delay genuine efforts at a negotiated settlement.

Israel has, for many years, cooperated in good faith with Palestinian and international efforts to mediate peace and work toward a two-state solution. It has made many concessions, some of which were not always in Israel's best interest. The Palestinians, unsatisfied with these efforts at the negotiating table, are seeking an end-run around Israel in an attempt to gain statehood by means of the United Nations.

Watching this spectacle unfold, I was reminded of the time I spent in Namibia in the late eighties and early nineties, where the U.N. General Assembly had arbitrarily designated one of the political parties the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. That had the effect of delaying the negotiating process that ultimately led to Namibia's independence. The same designation was awarded several decades ago to the PLO, and it had a similar effect.

The U.S. Government should use all the tools at its disposal, fiscal and otherwise, to ensure that that same outcome is avoided here.

CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend each American who celebrated Constitution Day, which was last Saturday, September 17.

Over the past few decades, many Americans have expressed disgust with our out-of-control reach of government and erosion of the very freedoms that we claim to protect.

The powers of Congress are clearly laid out in article I, which is the most expansive article of the Constitution for a reason. Our Founding Fathers fully intended for power to rest with the people, in a legislative body.

I'm proud to say that during this Congress, the House has taken significant steps to restate its constitutional authority and has given an earnest attempt to returning to a constitutional government.

One example is the TRAIN Act on the floor this week, legislation intended to rein in the executive branch's gross regulatory overreach. From the debt limit debate to each spending bill considered on the floor, this process has been about more than just our need for fiscal reform. It's about the timeless principles of freedom, justice, and opportunity that have provided America with 224 years of prosperity and the future promise of our Nation, if we continue to hold these principles dear.

□ 1800

NOT YOUR GRANDFATHER'S MILITARY

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

Mr. PALAZZO. This morning I had the honor and privilege to spend 2 hours with 86 World War II veterans from Mississippi. These exceptional men and women inspired generations of Americans such as me to serve their country.

Sadly, though, when I returned to my office after honoring these American heroes, I saw many of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle congratulating themselves on the ill-conceived, lame brain, lame duck session repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Despite the questionable reports, surveys, and certifications, which I believe were flawed from the beginning, I have no doubt that we have taken a wrong turn.

The 111th Congress obviously failed the American people on so many levels. Repeal of DADT is just another glaring example of their failures. Social experiments like this repeal have no place in our military, and I for one apologize to those who have served and those who are currently serving.

God help us all.

ISRAEL AND PALESTINE

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Several years ago, my wife and I, accompanied by a number of other Members and their spouses, were privileged to be in the State of Israel at the time the Israeli Government made a very difficult decision to turn over Gaza to the Palestinian Authority.

It was a very controversial decision. The question was: Would this gesture of goodwill be reciprocated by the other side? Unfortunately, of course, it was not. As in other gestures by the Israeli Government, the response has been: Give us more and we will not commit to the existence of Israel, but you have to commit to the existence of a Palestinian state.

Let there be no mistake. It is a bipartisan support on the floor of the House for the State of Israel at this time of great need for them when they face all sorts of problems in the United Nations and elsewhere.

Let us be clear. We will not be divided on this. Republicans, Democrats, conservatives, and liberals here in the House of Representatives and the United States Senate support Israel in their effort to remain free and to not be forced into positions that are totally unfair.

A CELEBRATION OF HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to say that Democrats in Congress continue to work tirelessly to improve the lives of America's Latino families. During the 111th Congress, we passed historic legislation that made college more accessible and affordable and broadened the scope of health care for very many families.

When Democrats controlled the Congress, we increased the maximum Pell Grant, in a bipartisan vote, from $4,050 to the current $5,550, an increase of 37 percent. While I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Higher Ed, I proudly stood next to President Obama when he signed the historic Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 into law. This new law increased college aid for the 39 percent of Hispanic

college students who receive Pell Grants each year. In contrast, the proposed Republican budget will cut college aid for nearly 10 million students, slashing the maximum Pell Grant award by more than $2,500.

Today, I stand here with my colleagues in celebration of Hispanic Heritage Month to say that we must pass the DREAM Act.

We cannot turn our backs on these hard working, talented students who call America their home. Brought here as children and through no fault of their own, DREAM Act students deserve a chance to go to college and become U.S. citizens.

I am proud of my heritage. I am proud of my ancestors who came to this country from Mexico over one hundred years ago. I am proud of the contributions made by America's growing Latino community.

Today, I urge my colleagues in Congress to join us in celebrating Hispanic Heritage Month. Let us honor our great Nation. Let us all work harder to make the American Dream a reality for all.

ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ELLMERS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEUTCH. I appreciate the opportunity to be here following those series of speeches delivered that lead perfectly into the discussion that we're here to have.

This is a crucial moment for the State of Israel, for the United States, for the relationship that binds us together. This is an important moment for those who believe in democracy and for those who believe in peace. We will all be watching what transpires at the United Nations in the coming days as the Palestinians continue to move forward with an ill-fated attempt to create a state that can only be created by negotiation.

I appreciate the opportunity to engage in a discussion with some of my colleagues, and I would like to start by recognizing my neighbor and my friend, the gentlelady from Florida, Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you very much for putting together this important Special Order hour to give us an opportunity to come together in support of our ally and friend, the State of Israel.

I rise today in praise of President Obama's enduring, unequivocal support for our ally Israel and a vision for a peaceful world.

This morning at the United Nations, President Obama shared with an international audience his commitment to Israel's security in the midst of a challenging region and complex times. The administration approached this year's U.N. General Assembly standing strong with our ally in many respects. From once again boycotting the anti-Semitic activities surrounding the Durban Conference, to pledging to veto any Palestinian unilateral declaration of independence in the Security Council, to working all summer with our partners and allies against the unending efforts to criticize and delegitimize Israel at the U.N., President Obama has been a stalwart ally of Israel in this international forum. I'm so pleased that he continued in that vein this morning with his address to the General Assembly.

In his historic speech to this global audience, President Obama once again demonstrated his stalwart support for our friend and ally Israel. Importantly, President Obama used this opportunity at the United Nations to unambiguously state his support for direct, bilateral negotiations as the only way to solve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and create a Palestinian state.

As the President said, ''a genuine peace can only be realized between the Israelis and the Palestinians themselves. There is no shortcut to the end of a conflict that has endured for decades. Peace will not come through statements and resolutions at the United Nations. It is the Israelis and the Palestinians, not us, who must reach agreement on the issues that divide them: on borders and on security, on refugees and Jerusalem.''

President Obama made it resoundingly clear that unilateral action will never create a state and that we must continue to support a process between two peoples that recognize both security concerns and national aspirations. And that clarity has not gone unnoticed.

Prime Minister Netanyahu, speaking after the President's speech today, said that our President is wearing a ''badge of honor'' for his commitment to direct, bilateral negotiations as the only way to a Palestinian state.

As he has done so many times in the past, President Obama again put forth our country's unshakable commitment to Israel's safety and security as a central tenet to peace. The President reaffirmed our enduring friendship to our ally Israel noting the very real security concerns of being surrounded by hostile neighbors. He made clear to the world that he understands the very real threat Israelis face in constant rockets and suicide bombs and children coming of age knowing that, throughout the region, other children are taught to hate them. Only when Israel feels its security concerns are met will future generations of Israelis and Palestinians live side by side in pride and in peace.

With the international community assembled, President Obama stressed the difficult but vital efforts we must all make in our quest for peace, not only for Israelis and Palestinians, but also across the Middle East and all around the world.

He spoke of the accomplishments of revolutions that have brought burgeoning democracies to the Middle East and North Africa over the past year and the frustrated aspirations of many in the region where democracy is yet to come.

In praising the new free Libya and urging the international communities to join us in sanctioning Iran and Syria, the President affirmed his commitment to supporting those who wish to cast off tyranny. And in a world free from the terror of Osama bin Laden, President Obama emphasized our continued quest to end the religious, gender, and sexual persecution that prevents all people from achieving their true potential.

I am so proud of President Obama's unwavering support for Israel and his overall vision for peace that he laid out at the United Nations this morning.

Hopefully, hearing the strong message from the United States, the Palestinians will once again return to the negotiating table with Israel and work out a just and lasting solution between the two parties. In the meantime, we can stand tall with the exemplary efforts by this pro-Israel President as we continue to engage diplomatically over the coming weeks to ensure that bilateral negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians will resume.

Thank you, Mr. DEUTCH, for your unwavering support for our ally.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you very much. The same to you.

I would note the President also spoke today at some length about the need to recognize Israel's security interests. The fact that Israel is a country that is surrounded by enemies, that has faced rocket attacks, barrages, at times on a regular basis, that it is imperative that all of our allies around the world who understand the security threats that Israel faces, that they understand that it is in Israel's interest to take the action necessary to defend herself even as they move toward the negotiations with the Palestinians. That's something that every nation would understand.

I appreciate your bringing that up today.

□ 1810

It is my pleasure and my honor to yield time to the impressive and wonderful former chair and now the impressive and wonderful ranking member of the State, Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, Representative LOWEY from Westchester.

Mrs. LOWEY. I want to thank my good friend Mr. DEUTCH. You are a principled, strong supporter of the Israel-United States alliance for organizing this conversation at this very, very critical time, and I thank you very much.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Palestinian Authority's counterproductive and dangerous gambit to declare statehood unilaterally through the United Nations.

As we all know, a genuine and lasting peace between the Israelis and Palestinians can only be achieved through a negotiated settlement between the parties, themselves. A lasting peace cannot be imposed on Israel and the Palestinians by an outside country, like the United States, or an organization, like the United Nations. That is why it is so disturbing that the Palestinian Authority has chosen to discontinue direct negotiations with Israel and instead to pursue a unilateral declaration of statehood through the United Nations. This action will indisputably set back the prospects of a settlement between the parties and call into question the commitment of Palestinian leaders to genuine and lasting peace.

The Palestinian Authority receives more than $500 million in economic and security assistance from the United States each year because it is in our interest and that of Israel's to support the ability of the P.A. to provide security and basic services, but that assistance is predicated on the willingness of the Palestinian Authority to negotiate directly with Israel toward its own state. President Abbas has been warned repeatedly, and I remain firm, that this counterproductive action by the P.A. crosses a line and should lead to a reevaluation of this assistance.

Despite the provocative decision of the Palestinian Authority to abandon negotiations and to pursue instead a unilateral declaration of statehood, I remain optimistic that the administration, working in concert with the Quartet, can facilitate the conditions for a resumption of good-faith negotiations.

I commend President Obama and Secretary Clinton for standing firm in support of a negotiated settlement and for reaffirming the unbreakable bond between Israel and the United States. I support the administration's tireless work to prevent a unilateral declaration of statehood from coming to a vote before the United Nations and to defeat this gambit if a vote does occur.

As President Obama stated today before the United Nations, peace is hard, but we also know that it is very much worth the effort. I encourage President Abbas to make the hard choice to return to negotiations with Israel. It is the only way to achieve the lasting and genuine peace that both Israelis and Palestinians seek.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you, Congresswoman LOWEY.

There are few in this body who understand as well as you the importance of weighing the decisions to allocate United States' foreign aid and where that money goes. You have been such a vocal and passionate supporter of aid to Israel in order to give Israel the ability to defend herself. I think you spoke eloquently about the questions that will be raised if the P.A. continues to move forward on this gambit at the United Nations, calling into question their commitment to negotiation and ultimately raising the reevaluation of aid to the Palestinians.

I thank you very much for sharing that with us.

Mrs. LOWEY. I know how hard the administration is working. Every minute of the day has been spent trying to ward off what we think will be a real disaster. So, as an optimist—and I think it's on Friday that Abu Mazen is scheduled to speak—I hope that he is wise and thinks of that decision and gets back to the negotiating table.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank the gentlelady from New York.

It is now my honor to yield such time as she may consume to a colleague and friend who has often been described as the great pro-Israel Member of the United States House of Representatives, the Representative from Nevada, SHELLEY BERKLEY.

Ms. BERKLEY. I thank the gentleman from Florida very much for putting this Special Order together in order to discuss an issue that is very important and that is certainly front and center on the international scene today as it has been for the last several weeks. I also thank you, Mr. DEUTCH, for your extraordinarily steadfast support for the State of Israel and for the strong American-Israeli relationship that we work on and attempt to foster every day.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support our closest friend and ally, the State of Israel, and to support the peace process between Israel and the Palestinians. We must oppose Abu Mazen's misguided and dangerous effort to bypass negotiations with Israel and go to the U.N. with a unilateral resolution in order to create a Palestinian state. The ramifications of that are extraordinary. They could destabilize the entire Middle East, put Israel on the defensive at the International Criminal Court, and create a failed terrorist state right next-door to the State of Israel—controlled by the Iranians, I might add.

The Palestinians have claimed that they're going to the U.N. because they have no partner to negotiate with, but it is the Palestinians, not the Israelis, who refuse to negotiate. They demand—and they demand it time and again—that Israel cease all settlement growth in the West Bank before they would be willing to sit down and negotiate for peace and a Palestinian state with the Israelis.

I think it's time that we talk and remember the exact history—and it's not such ancient history either. Even a full settlement freeze is not enough for Abu Mazen. In the summer of 2009—if we can remember back to that time—the Netanyahu government, at great political risk, agreed to freeze all settlement growth for 10 months. Did Abu Mazen and the Palestinians sit down at the negotiating table with the Israelis? There were 10 months of a moratorium—certainly enough time to negotiate a peace agreement that would bring lasting peace to the Palestinian people and a Jewish State of Israel. Did he do that? No, he did not. He waited over 9 months to begin negotiating with Israel and only sat down at the table with weeks left on the Israeli moratorium. Then what did they do? The Palestinians demanded that the Israelis extend the moratorium. They did nothing for nine of the 10 months. Then they wanted to expand the moratorium.

This is not the behavior of a true negotiating partner. What type of negotiating partner invites Hamas, a terrorist organization, to join them and become part of the Palestinian Authority? Certainly not a peace partner that wishes to bring peace and a Palestinian state to the Middle East.

The Israelis, by contrast, have shown their commitment to negotiations and have repeatedly called on the Palestinians to join them at the negotiating table. When Prime Minister Bibi Netanyahu addressed the United States Congress in a joint session on May 24, he reiterated his willingness to make painful compromises in order to reach peace with the Palestinians, but the Palestinians have turned their backs on the negotiations or on any form of compromise and have gone to the notoriously anti-Israel body, the United Nations, where they believe they will receive more sympathy and, ultimately, success.

I appreciate the Obama administration's strong statements that they will veto any Palestinian statehood effort at the Security Council, but I am deeply concerned that the Palestinians will receive overwhelming approval at the General Assembly.

Today, the Palestinian Authority has tentatively agreed to merely introduce their resolution for a unilateral declaration of statehood in the Security Council and then ask that no action be taken until they negotiate with the Israelis. This concerns me greatly. What type of way is this to negotiate? Put a gun to Israel's head, and every time the Palestinians don't like the way the negotiations are going, the Palestinians can threaten that they're going back to the United Nations? I don't think this demonstrates a true interest in sitting down and negotiating for a Palestinian state.

□ 1820

Let me tell you, as I conclude, what I think we can do; and we should do it immediately.

Congress must act. We must send a clear signal to the Palestinians that we will not continue to support them with our foreign aid dollars if they choose to act unilaterally and avoid negotiations.

I will not continue to throw taxpayer money away at the Palestinians when they are refusing to negotiate in good faith for a Palestinian state.

I have introduced H.R. 1592, which would cut off funding to the Palestinian Authority if they unilaterally declare a state outside of negotiations. I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring this timely legislation. We must send a clear message to the Palestinians that their efforts to circumvent negotiations are unacceptable and the only way to statehood, the only way, is at the negotiating table.

Mr. DEUTCH, I thank you so much for allowing me to share my thoughts with you at this most delicate time in world peace.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you very much, Representative BERKLEY.

If there is going to be peace, you are absolutely right: that is peace that will come through negotiations. And I am not sure what type of negotiating tactic it is to, on the one hand, say that there is a commitment to negotiating, but at the same time to run to the United Nations to unilaterally declare a state in a way that only seeks to delegitimize your so-called peace partner.

Israel is committed to peace. We've seen that time and time again. Prime Minister Netanyahu is set, ready to negotiate. It is time that the P.A. moves forward with negotiations. I appreciate your insight and your commentary.

I would tell that you that as you spoke about Hamas, the P.A. made a decision also to move into a partnership with that terrorist organization, a terrorist organization that still holds Gilad Shalit captive and refuses to let the world see him, meet with him. He should be released.

This is a message that was given to Hamas, to the P.A. directly, in a meeting that I was privileged to participate in on a bipartisan trip to Israel some months back. I was pleased to be on that trip with our friend from California, Representative CARDOZA.

I am pleased to yield the gentleman as much time as he desires.

Mr. CARDOZA. Thank you, Representative DEUTCH. You are not just a friend but a great colleague.

Before she leaves the Chamber, I just want to associate myself with Congresswoman BERKLEY's remarks. The gentlewoman from Nevada has been a stalwart for the State of Israel. She is absolutely and unequivocally correct on this issue, and I will gladly cosponsor your bill.

Ms. BERKLEY. Thank you.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. DEUTCH, thank you for putting together this Special Order this evening. As you all know, the Palestinian Authority has stated that it will submit, or it's intending to submit, to the U.N. Secretary General Ban ki-Moon a resolution requesting recognition of Palestinian statehood.

As President Obama said today in his speech before the U.N. General Assembly, the bonds between the United States and Israel are unbreakable, as our commitment is to the security of Israel.

And as I and my colleagues in Congress expressed earlier this year, when there was an overwhelmingly passed House Resolution 268, the only path to a lasting peace is through direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians that leads to a two-state solution.

Lasting peace will not come by playing destabilizing and damaging political games at the United Nations. A unilateral approach to Palestinian statehood will surely fail at the United Nations. It will fail, and in failing it will harm the bilateral negotiation process that is the only way to bring about a lasting peace.

A lasting peace cannot be achieved while a contingent within the Palestinian Government does not recognize Israel's right to exist. A lasting peace cannot be achieved while rockets are being fired into Israel, threatening her children and her people.

I was there with Mr. DEUTCH just days after an anti-tank rocket was shot into a yellow school bus. I ask every American watching tonight and those around the world to think what they would do if the State of Mexico fired on a school bus in El Paso and the response that we as a country would pursue.

A lasting peace cannot be achieved while the same group firing those rockets into Israel is actively trying to define Israel's borders so that those rockets would then strike major populated areas.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a lasting peace cannot be achieved when one party fundamentally refuses to negotiate the terms of peace.

I call upon President Abbas to do what's right for both the Palestinian people, the Israeli people, and the world and to not put political gamesmanship ahead of a lasting peace. I call upon him to return to a negotiating table and to give up this spurious, dangerous, and damaging game.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend from California.

There are a lot of opportunities that we as Members have to participate in the process and to see the impact of the decisions that we make.

The opportunity that we had to spend some time in the community that had just been attacked with that rocket fire reminds us of what we are doing here this evening, what President Obama did at the United Nations earlier today, and what our allies throughout the world hopefully will do in standing up to support the one great democratic nation in the Middle East, why that is so vitally important.

Mr. CARDOZA. You are absolutely correct, Mr. DEUTCH, and the visions of those scared mothers talking to us in their community by the bus stop, a shelter that has to be reinforced by concrete so that they can somewhat protect their children on the way to school, is the reason why we must act for a lasting peace, if no other than that.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you for being here, Mr. CARDOZA.

It is my pleasure and honor to yield as much time as he may choose to utilize to my good friend from New York, Representative JOE CROWLEY.

Mr. CROWLEY. I want to thank my dear friend and colleague from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about one of the most important issues in our world, and that is peace in the Middle East.

For far too many years, many parts of the United Nations have been hijacked by states opposed to the ongoing existence of the State of Israel. Some states simply refuse or are not willing to acknowledge that Israel is a country surrounded by many who seek her destruction. They seem to believe that if the Israelis simply conceded, simply gave up, that peace would come to the region.

That view doesn't only show a lack of understanding; it is simply wrong. The truth is no country in the world would ever take action that undermines its ability to defend itself and neither should the State of Israel.

Day in and day out, the people of Israel face the threat of terrorism. From the moment that they wake up in the morning to when they go to sleep at night, Israeli citizens wonder if they or their families will be the target of attacks.

Dozens of suicide bombings and attacks have been carried out over the past 10 years, and there is no doubt that each and every day Hamas is planning and preparing for even more attacks.

Madam Speaker, we need peace in the Middle East, but these are not the conditions for peace. How can anyone make peace when enemies are seeking their destruction? And now we see this move at the United Nations to secure unilateral declaration of statehood. Instead of finally achieving the peace that is so desperately needed, so desperately wanted, this looks like a step to try to back Israel into a corner.

Let me assure you, this is not the path to positive change. It is a grave error by Abu Mazen to demand recognition of statehood at this time. The fact is, the day after any vote, the situation on the ground in the Middle East will not have changed.

□ 1830

All the same issues will remain in place. The difference will be the trust. Trust will forever be eroded, and for good reason. That's not the only difference, however. There is another issue that I believe we need to have more discussion about.

I believe that what the Palestinian Authority is doing calls into question our funding for their work. The United States supported the Authority as a way to support peace efforts, but this statehood drive undermines those very efforts. American dollars are meant to support efforts by the Palestinian Authority to secure peace and to diminish violence, but this is not a blank check.

We cannot support those who seek confrontation instead of reconciliation.

I believe it is time for a very, very serious review of our policy, the United States Congress and the United States' policy in its funding, not only for the Palestinian Authority but for any nation that seeks to undermine the State of Israel within the U.N., not just the Palestinian Authority but any nation that would vote to undermine the existence of the State of Israel.

I want to thank Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. HOYER and all of my colleagues for putting this effort together tonight. I and my colleagues will continue to stand firmly with the people of Israel.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank you, Mr. CROWLEY.

The most important point to make right now in listening to you and listening to Mr. CARDOZA and listening to the gentleman from California who spoke earlier from the other side, this is not a partisan issue. This is not a religious issue. This is a question of whether we stand together in support of democratic ideals, in support of the safety and security of our ally. That's what is at stake here, and I thank you for coming to so eloquently and passionately speak to that issue.

Mr. CROWLEY. Let me just make one point. There is partisanship. There are those who would use this opportunity to divide. Not here in the United States, not Republicans and Democrats, but around the world. This is a world forum we're talking about in the U.N., and what I want our allies to know and our friends to know is that we're watching—those who will stand with the State of Israel and those who will not.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank the gentleman. Efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel at the United Nations must be opposed at every capital in this world. I thank you very much.

It is my pleasure to recognize my friend and colleague, a passionate supporter of the State of Israel who hails from a community in Illinois with an equally passionate zeal for the safety and security of the State of Israel, Representative SCHAKOWSKY.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I want to thank you so much, Mr. DEUTCH, for organizing tonight's Special Order.

Today, President Barack Obama clearly restated the U.S. commitment to negotiated peace and protection of human rights. In his remarks to the General Assembly of the United Nations, the President emphasized the importance not just of peace but of human dignity and economic opportunity.

In particular, President Obama again demonstrated that he is a true and steadfast friend of Israel and reiterated that ''America's commitment to Israel's security is unshakeable, and our friendship with Israel is deep and enduring.''

Like the President, I am a strong supporter of a two-state solution. I look forward to a future in which a Palestinian state exists in peace alongside the Jewish State of Israel. But as the President emphasized at the U.N. today, a genuine, true, and lasting peace can only be reached through negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians themselves.

I strongly support the President's diplomatic leadership and efforts to convince the Palestinians and their international allies to abandon efforts to use the U.N. to bypass negotiations with Israel, and I join him in urging them to return to the talks with the Israelis. While we acknowledge that the conflict will not be resolved easily and that it will require difficult sacrifices from both parties, it is only through direct peace negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians themselves that a lasting solution can be found. There can be no substitute for such negotiations. As the President stated today in New York, ''Peace will not come through statements and resolutions at the United Nations.''

In his speech today, the President recognized the legitimate desires of the Palestinian people for a state with recognized borders and opportunities for economic growth. I share his commitment to working toward that goal. But, as he also emphasized, any peace agreement must acknowledge and address the ongoing security threats faced daily by Israel and the Israeli people and be based on a recognition that Israel is the historic homeland of the Jewish people.

Instead of appealing to the U.N., the parties simply need to return to the table. A lasting peace cannot and will not be imposed by any external party. It must be reached by the Israelis and the Palestinians themselves, with regional and international support, including that of the United States of America. The Palestinians should abandon this effort at the United Nations. Our allies should stand with the State of Israel and a real peace negotiation. That means the Palestinians have to return to the bargaining table.

I thank you, Mr. DEUTCH.

Mr. DEUTCH. And I thank you, Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY. Your talk about the President's statement today is important. Equally important is what the administration has been doing leading up to that speech today, in the way that the U.N. Ambassador has continued to press our allies, in the way that this administration has been clear throughout that if this movement goes forward, if the Palestinians continue to go to the Security Council, that the United States will veto that resolution because it is not a way to achieve peace. I appreciate your sharing those thoughts and raising those issues with us.

It is a great privilege for me now to turn over the floor and yield to my friend, who is one of the fiercest defenders of the U.S.-Israel relationship, one of the most outspoken Members of this body when it comes to standing up for the safety and security of the State of Israel and someone who has steadfastly remained engaged in this issue, even traveling to New York, before coming back to Washington, to speak directly to those who will be making decisions at the United Nations, a good friend and a great colleague, ELIOT ENGEL.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding, and before I talk about these issues, let me first compliment the gentleman from Florida. He hasn't been in Congress very long, but he certainly made his mark very strongly, particularly on the U.S.-Israel relationship. He has been a stalwart supporter and a very articulate spokesperson for the U.S.-Israel relationship. I know that Mr. DEUTCH has been very, very effective, and it is an honor to do this Special Order with him this evening.

Madam Speaker, I agree with everything that every one of my colleagues said. Let me first say, because we are Democrats having this Special Order, there has been a lot of fighting in Congress, but one thing we don't fight about, Democrats and Republicans, we agree that the U.S.-Israel relationship must remain strong. If there is one thing that unites this Congress and unites Democrats and Republicans, it's strong support for the U.S.-Israel relationship.

Many of my colleagues have made very, very good points, many of which I want to reiterate, but I think the most important thing to reiterate is this: If there is a dispute anywhere around the world, the only way you can resolve that dispute is getting the two adversaries face to face in direct negotiations to hammer out all of the areas of disagreement and hopefully come to a peace agreement.

That happened in Ireland, in Northern Ireland, a place that we never thought would get peace but did, because both sides made the commitment that they preferred peace over war and over misery that had gone on for far too long. So they sat down face to face, with a little prodding from other countries, including the United States, and were able to hash out an agreement. That, I'm convinced, is the way that the Middle East difficulties will come to fruition, only by face-to-face negotiations.

□ 1840

The Palestinians, in my estimation, have attempted to throw so many preconditions at Israel before they will even sit down and negotiate that it has made it impossible for Israel to be able to sit down and talk with them. Boundaries like 1967 boundaries or settlements or expansion of neighborhoods, all these are final status issues. These are not issues where one side says to the other side, you have to unilaterally agree with our position before we will even sit down and negotiate with you. That makes no sense whatsoever. So face-to-face negotiations are the only way that we can have peace.

I would argue that going to the United Nations by the Palestinians actually sets back the cause of peace because if the United Nations were to declare a Palestinian state, say on the basis of the 1967 lines, which is what the Palestinians want, well, that is a guarantee that there can never be peace with an agreement like that. First of all, if the United Nations were to agree to that, no Palestinian leader in the future could ever accept anything less. And the Israelis can never accept, and will never accept, a return to the 1967 borders, which were indefensible. Israel fought wars because those 1967 borders were not defensible. And so these preconditions, and this going to the United Nations, actually sets back the cause of peace.

Now I just think a little bit of history is important because it's so easy to go on college campuses or to try to delegitimize Israel and the United Nations or to have statements that aren't really true. The fact of the matter is that Israel has always been prepared to make painful concessions for peace. I was in this Congress during 2000–2001 when President Clinton helped negotiate what we thought was a peace, the Oslo Accords, and what we thought was a peace between Israel and the Palestinians. I remember in 1993 on the White House lawn with Yasser Arafat and Yitzhak Rabin shaking hands. I remember being there with my 8-month pregnant wife in 95-degree weather, and we all had such high hopes.

But what has happened? Abba Eban used to say the Palestinians never miss an opportunity to miss an opportunity. And there have been many opportunities for peace. In 2000–2001, Israel agreed to a peace. Arafat, who was the Palestinian leader, said no. And what did Arafat turn down at that time? He turned down a Palestinian state, part of Jerusalem, 97 percent of the West Bank and billions and billions of dollars of aid. Israel said yes. He said no. I think it's important to put that in perspective.

Then the Palestinians talk about the right of return. They want to flood Israel with Palestinian refugees—not refugees that left in 1948, when Israel was founded—but their descendants. And that's a pipe dream because that could never happen. It would undermine the essence of a Jewish State of Israel.

So if there is going to be peace in the Middle East, we need to go back to what the partition of Palestine in 1948, the original resolution, said in the U.N. It said Palestine is to be partitioned into an Arab state and a Jewish state. And here we are, some 63 years later, and the Palestinians and most of the Arab world won't even recognize Israel as a Jewish state. That's where the problem lies, not with Israel. And the attempt to go to the United Nations and sort of do an end game around Israel will not work.

Finally, and then I'd be happy to discuss this further with my colleague from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), let me just say this, and we have heard some rumblings about it with some of our colleagues here. This Congress will not continue to fund the Palestinian Authority. It's not going to be a blank check. If the Palestinian Authority doesn't want peace and doesn't show that it wants peace, we are not going to continue to fund them.

I introduced a resolution in the Foreign Affairs Committee which came before the State Department markup which passed unanimously on a roll call vote withholding money, ending money to the Palestinian Authority if they come to the United Nations for a vote. It passed unanimously—every Democrat, every Republican. And so this Congress is not going to be a fool. Either the Palestinians want peace or they don't. But they cannot have it both ways. They cannot say they want peace and refuse to sit down and talk to Israel face to face at a negotiating table.

So, Mr. DEUTCH, I want to thank you for doing this. I think it is very, very important that all people of good will, Democrats and Republicans, stand together in support of Israel. I think the President's speech today at the United Nations was a very good speech where he talked about the bond is unbreakable between the United States and Israel.

And we have to make sure that the Palestinians live up to their commitment. Israel is willing to live up to its commitments. Israel wants to live in peace. We're now waiting to see what the Palestinian and the Arab states want to do.

Finally, let me say this. There are two factions in the Palestinians: One is Fatah, which is Abbas' faction, and one is Hamas. Hamas controls Gaza. Hamas is a terrorist group. Hamas doesn't recognize Israel's right to exist. Hamas certainly doesn't recognize the right of a Jewish state to exist. How can we expect our ally Israel to sit, negotiate, and make peace with an entity that denies its very right to exist and an entity whose whole reason for being is to destroy the Jewish state?

We wouldn't ask that of ourselves. We shouldn't ask that of Israel.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ENGEL, if the Palestinians were serious about peace, they would abandon their unity with Hamas. They would abandon this plan to move forward at the United Nations, and they would return to the negotiating table. But this doesn't seem to be the case, as we've discussed here tonight. They seem intent on, in fact, making a mockery of the United Nations by using it as a platform to delegitimize Israel. But we will stand up to that effort. We'll stand up against it. The fact is from the vile ''Zionism is Racism'' resolution of the 1970s to the biased and misleading Goldstone Report, the United States has, time and time again, stood up against such delegitimization efforts, loudly voicing our opposition and declaring that we won't tolerate such bogus and malicious accusations. And we'll stand up again for Israel this week in New York, but not just today and Friday.

I would like to take a moment to talk about what is going to be happening tomorrow. When Mahmoud Ahmadinejad brings his campaign of hatred to the United Nations General Assembly, as he stands just miles from Ground Zero a mere 3 weeks after the 10th anniversary of the September 11 attacks and blasphemously declares that the U.S. Government orchestrated the attacks to reverse the declining American economy, as he did last year, we will stand up for those brave men and women who lost their lives that day and every day since fighting for freedom. And when he stands at the U.N. and celebrates the 10th anniversary of the Durban hatefest that was an anti-Semitic rant against Israel, we will stand up for the freedom and democracy that Israel represents, the freedom and democracy that Ahmadinejad so brutally represses in his own country. That's going to be our role just tomorrow. And I know that you will look forward to standing in strong opposition to those statements from one who wishes to see Israel wiped off the map, one who could probably be tried for incitement to genocide for his statements, you will stand with me, as you always have, in opposition to the rhetoric, the hateful rhetoric, that we will be forced to listen to tomorrow.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you, Mr. DEUTCH for pointing that out because, unfortunately, I said before that the U.N. had been a kangaroo court against Israel time and time again. Israel cannot get a fair shake in the United Nations. I do hope that we are able to block the votes in the Security Council where the United States, the Obama administration, has said that the President will do a veto of any kind of resolution, and I hope that it won't even come to that because I hope that they do not get the requisite number of votes to even pass it.

And then the Palestinians might then go to the General Assembly. They say they are going to do that. And while the General Assembly cannot admit a Palestinian state, it can upgrade their status, which would allow them to run around and harass Israeli leaders in the different international courts.

I just think the U.N. better be careful. It sits in my hometown of New York, and we have always been proud that the U.N. is in New York. But I think the U.N. is on the verge of discrediting itself very, very badly.

□ 1850

There was resolution 242, which talked about land for peace in the Middle East. I would say that the Palestinians, by trying to get recognition unilaterally in the U.N., they are repudiating the land for peace. They're certainly repudiating the Oslo Accords,

which said that both states have to sit down, the Palestinians and the Israelis have to sit down and hammer out an agreement. As I mentioned before, it even repudiates the very basis of the initial partition of Palestine in 1947 and '48 into a Jewish state and an Arab state.

And we talk about the Palestinian refugees. They have been used as pawns by the Palestinian leadership—and frankly by all the other Arab states in the world. And we ought to mention this because it's very, very important. Jewish refugees from North Africa and all over the world, from Europe, from all over the world, came to Israel and were integrated into Israeli society through the years. The Palestinian refugees could have and should have been integrated in the various Arab countries, but the Arab leaders decided to leave them in these horrendous conditions in these camps, to use the Palestinian refugees as pawns in the Palestinian camps.

It wasn't done by the Israelis. It was done by the Palestinians themselves and by the Arab nations themselves to use them as political pawns. So I think we should look at the people who are really suffering here and say why they're suffering. They're suffering because they've had a leadership that has failed them for more than 60 years.

So I'm very proud of the United States of America. I'm proud of our country for standing up for freedom. I'm proud of our country for standing with Israel. I'm proud that the President said the bond between Israel is unbreakable. We have to understand that this is not a fight between two groups that are sort of equal in being concerned about democracy. Israel shares our values. Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East. What's important to Israel is important to the United States. That's why we have to stand with Israel because if we don't do it, nobody else will. We've shown time and time and time again that the international community, particularly the United Nations, is biased against Israel; and unless the United States stands squarely with Israel, Israel will never get a fair shake.

So I am proud that we are doing that now at the United Nations. I am proud that we have taken a stand. I am proud of this Congress, on a bipartisan basis, for taking a pro-Israel stand. The United States—and I would say this to the people of Israel—will always stand with our friends and allies, Israel, who care for the basic human rights and concerns and democracy and democratic values that we care about as well.

So as we see this unfolding, I would just say to the Palestinians, if you really want your state, if you really want a two-state solution—which I believe you are entitled to—then sit down with Israel face to face across the negotiating table, no preconditions, and talk peace. The Israelis are ready to do it. We're still waiting for the Palestinians.

Thank you, Mr. DEUTCH.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank you very much, Mr. ENGEL, for your passionate words.

I think it's important, as we wrap this up, to think about why it is and to remind our colleagues and the American people why it is that we are so committed to this bond with Israel, and we do it because the bond with Israel runs deeper than our interests in Middle East affairs. It runs deeper than mutual security interests. Our bond is born out of the values that our two nations share, the values of freedom, of respect, of human rights. We as Americans share those values with the people of Israel. They are universal values, American values. They span religious and political parties. They bring people together from all walks of life. They are the things that some of Israel's neighbors are losing their lives fighting for, the values that Israel holds dear as a great democracy in the Middle East and in the world.

Israel faces one of its greatest challenges, a worldwide campaign to unilaterally declare a Palestinian state. The United States must continue to remind the world why it is that we stand in solidarity with Israel.

I urge our allies around the world to stand with us now in urging the Palestinians to abandon this misguided and dangerous quest. If Mr. Abbas seeks a state where the Palestinian people can truly prosper, a peaceful state, then he will look to Israel as a partner. He will understand why negotiations provide the only path to peace; and he will take his seat at the negotiating table.

To our whip, STENY HOYER, who helped us arrange this hour, and to my colleagues who participated, and to everyone who has tuned in even for a moment, I want to say thank you, thank you for giving us the opportunity to stand up at this most difficult and crucial moment in the history of the U.S.-Israel relationship and remind our allies from around the world—and every nation from around the world—just how strong and unbreakable the bond between our two nations is.

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

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, Palestinian Authority President Abbas has announced that this Friday he will formally seek statehood recognition at the United Nations.

While there are obstacles to achieving a lasting and peaceful two-state solution, the PA's attempt to seek recognition at the UN demonstrates that they are not truly interested in achieving peace.

Such a unilateral approach, will not lead to peace. This action violates the letter and spirit of the Oslo accords and deals a significant blow to future negotiations.

Recognizing a Palestinian state would also give legitimacy to Hamas given that the terrorist group currently is in control of the Gaza Strip—an area the PA claims for its state.

By granting recognition of a state, the international community will reward Hamas for its terrorist actions, rather than condemn them.

Furthermore, this reckless action at the UN could lead to widespread violence on the ground.

The only way to achieve a two-state solution is through direct negotiations leading to a peace treaty fully accepted by both governments and by both peoples.

A vote on a unilateral UN resolution will likely set prospects for peace in the region back years.

The United States needs to stand strong with Israel, and I am pleased that President Obama has called the Palestinian efforts at the UN a ''mistake'' and has stated that the United States will veto this resolution should it be brought before the Security Council.

We need a unified voice from the United States and our allies showing that this action is not the way to achieve a peace and that if such action is taken, there will be consequences.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to join with so many Members of the House to express our profound concern, and strenuous opposition, to the impending request by the President of the Palestinian Authority, Mahmoud Abbas, to seek a unilateral declaration of statehood at the United Nations later this week.

The Palestinian leadership says it wants peace with Israel, but their actions and words contradict their assertions. It is not at all clear President Abbas is even capable of making peace with Israel. He refused to enter direct negotiations last year even when Israel agreed to a settlement freeze. He refuses to accept a simple statement that he accepts Israel as a Jewish state. And, as a prelude to his bid for statehood from the United Nations, he wrote in the New York Times last May: ''Palestine's admission to the United Nations would pave the way for the internationalization of the conflict as a legal matter, not only a political one.'' Recognition of statehood by the United Nations, in other words, is simply another front in the conflict—and not a settlement of the conflict.

Any move towards statehood for Palestine in the United Nations is gravely flawed.

First, a unilateral declaration of statehood, by the Palestinians themselves or through the United Nations, constitutes a unilateral repudiation of the peace process. A Palestinian state can only emerge at the conclusion of a peace treaty with Israel. As President Obama told the assembled leaders of the world today at the United Nations: ''There is no short cut to the end of a conflict that has endured for decades. Peace is hard work. Peace will not come through statements and resolutions at the United Nations.''

Second, a unilateral declaration by the Palestinians will not bring a State of Palestine into existence. Without agreed borders, there is no agreed state. Without an agreed state, there is no lawfully constituted government of the state of Palestine.

Third, such action at the United Nations may well provoke violence in the West Bank and Gaza and possibly across the region. Excessive expectations among the Palestinians have been induced by the public campaign of the Palestinian Authority to seek statehood through the U.N. Reality cannot and will not meet those expectations—leading to immense frustration for Palestinians in the West Bank and elsewhere. In the past, this has led to successive uprisings targeting Israel. Such violence has been vicious and inhumane, with

immense loss of life—and it serves no purpose. It brings neither peace nor statehood any closer. But the threat of violence overhangs the Palestinian maneuvers at the U.N.

Fourth, unilateral action at the United Nations will be a major setback of incalculable duration to any meaningful resolution of the issues if there is to be a just and lasting peace with Israel, and the establishment of a Palestinian state. If the Palestinians seek to act on their own, what is there to negotiate with Israel? Where is the dialogue? What can possibly be the prospects for a meeting of the minds and a resolution of the issues of borders, security, Jerusalem, and refugees? A unilateral declaration of statehood is not a substitute for the peace process; it is a repudiation of the peace process. And that means the end to the peace process.

Fifth, a recognition of Palestine by the United Nations will lead to great legal vulnerability to Israel and its government's leaders by giving Palestine standing in several international institutions, such as the International Court of Justice. No settlement of any issues or grievances between the parties can be advanced by legal harassment of Israel in international organizations.

For all these reasons, I believe it is imperative that the United Nations reject any unilateral bid for statehood for Palestine.

The member states of the United Nations must understand that a vote against a resolution in the General Assembly is not a vote against a Palestinian State—it is a vote to get the parties into direct negotiations so that a Palestinian State can truly and successfully and legitimately arise.

As President Obama said today: "We will only succeed in that effort if we can encourage the parties to sit down together, to listen to each other, and to understand each other's hopes and fears. That is the project to which America is committed, and that is what the United Nations should be focused on in the weeks and months to come."

Last week, I was pleased to join with dozens of Members of the House in correspondence directed to several dozen foreign heads of state, in which we urged that their governments reject a unilateral declaration of statehood for Palestine by the United Nations.

I commend our correspondence to all our colleagues. We will continue our efforts at the United Nations and redouble our commitment to the re-commencement of direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians leading to a peace agreement between them.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
September 15, 2011.

We write on a matter of great urgency, on the eve of the United Nations General Assembly meeting. It is our understanding that the leadership of the Palestinian Authority will pursue a resolution at the United Nations—in either or both the Security Council and the General Assembly—to grant the Palestinians the equivalent of statehood and/or prejudge final issues, including borders and the status of Jerusalem. One of the major goals of this effort is for the Palestinians to better position themselves to petition the International Criminal Court, very possibly bogging down the court for the foreseeable future.

It is our strong belief that such unilateral action would have devastating consequences for the peace process and the Palestinians themselves. Accordingly, we urge you in the strongest terms not to support this effort.

We believe that the only way to achieve a two-state solution is through direct negotiations leading to a peace treaty fully accepted by both governments and by both peoples. A just and lasting peace cannot and must not be imposed on the parties. If the Palestinians pursue such a unilateral approach, it violates the letter and spirit of the Oslo Accords and will deal a significant blow to future negotiations. Given the expectations gap among the Palestinian public, such action could lead to widespread violence on the ground, jeopardizing the West Bank's impressive economic and security gains over recent years. There is also a substantial risk of more broadly inflaming the region and increasing violence at a time of already great instability. Finally, the United States will reconsider its assistance program for the Palestinian Authority and other aspects of U.S.-Palestinian relations if they choose to pursue such a unilateral effort.

We are confident that your government shares the United States' commitment to a comprehensive resolution of the conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians. That outcome can only be achieved through direct negotiations. A vote on a unilateral UN resolution will likely set prospects for peace back years.

Our bilateral relationship is based on certain fundamental values. We urge you to vote those values, and to stand with the United States in not supporting unilateral action at the UN that would impede the peace we all seek.

Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Democratic Whip Steny H. Hoyer; Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi; Rep. Gary Ackerman; Rep. Joe Baca; Rep. Shelley Berkley; Rep. Howard Berman; Rep. Madeleine Bordallo; Rep. Leonard Boswell; Rep. Dennis Cardoza; Rep. Russ Carnahan; Rep. David Cicilline; Rep. Emanuel Cleaver; Rep. Gerry Connolly; Rep. Jim Costa; Rep. Jerry Costello; Rep. Mark Critz; Rep. Joseph Crowley; Rep. Susan Davis; Rep. Rosa DeLauro; Rep. Ted Deutch.

Rep. Eliot Engel; Rep. Charlie Gonzalez; Rep. Gene Green; Rep. Janice Hahn; Rep. Brian Higgins; Rep. Kathy Hochul; Rep. Tim Holden; Rep. Steve Israel; Rep. William Keating; Rep. Larry Kissell; Rep. James Langevin; Rep. John Larson; Rep. Sander Levin; Rep. Dan Lipinski; Rep. Nita Lowey; Rep. Carolyn Maloney; Rep. James McGovern; Rep. Gregory Meeks; Rep. Michael Michaud; Rep. Chris Murphy.

Rep. Jerrold Nadler; Rep. Eleanor Holmes Norton; Rep. Bill Owens; Rep. Gary Peters; Rep. Steven Rothman; Rep. C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger; Rep. John Sarbanes; Rep. Janice Schakowsky; Rep. Adam Schiff; Rep. Allyson Schwartz; Rep. David Scott; Rep. Brad Sherman; Rep. Heath Shuler; Rep. Albio Sires; Rep. Betty Sutton; Rep. Edolphus Towns; Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz; Rep. Henry Waxman.

MEDICARE AND OBAMACARE

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I thank our majority leader for giving me the opportunity to take this time this evening to talk about two of the most important issues on the minds of every American, but especially on the minds of our seniors, and those two issues are, number one, Medicare, and, number two, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Now, if you go to the 11th Congressional District of Georgia, Madam Speaker, and you say, what do you think about the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that was passed on March 23, 2010—1½ years ago—in this body, they would say I don't know what you're talking about. What is PPACA, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act? And then if you said to the folks in the 11th of Georgia, well, ObamaCare, they would say yes, of course, now I know what you're talking about. So tonight I will use the term ''ObamaCare''—not in a pejorative way, but it's the term that's most recognizable to the American people.

Of course even today, 1½ years after passage of ObamaCare, fully 60 percent of people across this country are opposed to it. They were opposed to it at its inception; and yet when President Obama was inaugurated and became our 44th President, just within weeks there was this push to have something that I would call national health insurance or government-controlled health insurance for this great country of ours.

Many times, Madam Speaker, the dialogue was, well, we have been wanting this government-controlled health insurance, national health insurance, Medicare-for-all government insurance from cradle to grave for years, way back in probably the days of Theodore Roosevelt. We have been wanting this and trying to get this passed, and now is our opportunity. Now finally we have the opportunity to bring this to the American people.

Well, who was it, Madam Speaker, that wanted it all these years? And why, if they wanted it so badly for 50, 60, 70 years, why was it never passed? Indeed, why was it not passed the last time before this passage in March of 2010? Why did it fail back in 1993–94, during the administration of President Clinton, when we referred to it as HillaryCare? Everybody remembers that very well. Well, it's because the American people don't want this. They didn't want it then, didn't want it in 1993–94, absolutely didn't want it in March of 2010. And yet this President and that majority—at the time, the Democrats controlled this House of Representatives. They controlled the Senate. They had the White House.

□ 1900

All their ducks were in a row. Everything was aligned. And they literally spent a year and a half, Madam Speaker, a year and a half forcing that legislation, literally, down the throats of the American people, even when folks of all ages, but especially seniors, were saying, you know, We don't really want this.

Part of that reason, especially in regard to our seniors, Madam Speaker, is the fact that they were worried, and still are worried, about their Medicare program. Medicare, of course, was an amendment to the Social Security Act that was passed back in 1965. I had just completed my freshman year of medical school, and I remember it very well. Medicare, of course, is a great program for our seniors. I would hate to think what our situations would be, those over 65 and those with disabilities, if it were not for the Medicare program.

But, Madam Speaker, the Medicare program is far from secure. I'm sad to say that tonight, but it's the truth, and I think the American people, and again, especially our seniors who are currently on Medicare, or those that are getting close to age 65, I think they know that our attention in this Congress and from this administration should be on preserving, strengthening the Medicare program for our seniors and not spending a year and a half, from January 2009, literally, until March of 2010, with almost nothing on the agenda but instituting, passing this new entitlement program called PPACA, Patient Protection Affordable Care Act, or, indeed, ObamaCare, that really has nothing to do with seniors, has very little to do with those who are poor in this country, through no fault of their own, and thank goodness, again, created in 1965, their health care system called Medicaid.

So, no, what we have done with ObamaCare, Madam Speaker and my colleagues, is just simply create a whole new entitlement program. I will make a little analogy and say that if, in the middle of a thunderstorm, you have a leaking roof on your house, you don't go out and add another room or a deck on the back of the house. You get up on that roof and you stop the leaking.

It's a matter of priorities, Madam Speaker. It's a situation that is beyond my comprehension that the Democratic majority and President Obama would spend all that time and effort trying to add a new room, put a deck on the back of the house when the roof was badly leaking. And the analogy is, of course, that roof is the Medicare program.

There's so many things that we need to do and we need to have the courage to do. I am very proud of my party, the current majority in this House of Representatives, when we passed our budget for fiscal year 2012, sometimes referred to as the Ryan budget. PAUL RYAN, Madam Speaker, as you know, is our colleague that is the chairman of the Budget Committee. But it is a Republican budget, and it has the courage of conviction, the commitment to our senior citizens to say to them, We are going to fix the Medicare program and we're going to guarantee that it will be there for your children and your grandchildren and your great-grandchildren, and that the benefit program that you currently have and, indeed, even people who are not yet eligible for Medicare but they're 55 years old, 10 years away, we would enact no changes whatsoever to their Medicare benefits.

Medicare as you know it will be preserved and protected for those 47 million people who are currently on the Medicare program; maybe 7 million of those are younger individuals who are permanently disabled. Forty-seven million people currently on Medicare. When you add those who, today, men and women in this country who are 55 years of age or older but not yet 65, in 10 years, Madam Speaker, that will be another 20 to 25 million people on the Medicare program with absolutely no changes. You're talking about 65 or 70 million people 10 years from now who will be on Medicare, traditional Medicare as we know it, for the rest of their natural lives, and I hope every one of them, including myself, lives to be 93 years old like my mom is today and enjoying the benefits and the security of Medicare.

Again, we diverted our attention away from a program that our seniors can't live without but that's in danger of becoming insolvent. And that's not Congressman PHIL GINGREY, Dr. GINGREY, the chairman of the GOP House Doctors Caucus speaking, although I do represent, Madam Speaker, that group here tonight as the designee for the Republican majority in this hour of time that is allotted to me. No, this is the trustees of Medicare and the Congressional Budget Office and the actuary of CMS, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, who every year they look at the sustainability of the program. And what they have told us, Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, in both bodies, we know very clearly that the best case scenario if we do nothing is that Medicare will be insolvent. We're talking now about the Hospital Trust Fund. It will be insolvent by the year 2024. Maybe it's worse than that, maybe by the year 2020.

For us to ignore that, just using the expression, Madam Speaker, whistling past the graveyard, pretending something doesn't exist that's as obvious as the nose on your face, kicking the can down the road thinking, well, gee, you know, all I really care about is getting reelected and let somebody else deal with the problems, unconscionable on our part.

And to suggest that this new program to cover those in the country, I don't know how many, 20 million people maybe, that are not poor enough for the Medicaid program and not old enough or disabled enough for the Medicare program, let's create yet another entitlement program. If money grew on trees, that might not be a bad philosophy, but it doesn't. It doesn't. If it did, we wouldn't be in debt $14.9 trillion, soon to be $15.5 trillion. We just can't do everything, and we have to set our priorities and focus on what is the right thing, what is the most important thing.

I say to my colleagues tonight, Madam Speaker, during this time, that that most important thing is to strengthen, to preserve, to save our Medicare program for our current seniors and for our children and our grandchildren.

□ 1910

There's so many things in ObamaCare, this new program, this new entitlement program, to make sure that everybody has health insurance whether they really want to or not.

There are so many things in this bill, which doesn't really fully go into effect until 2014, but yet the taxes that are burdening our citizens are already being applied, whether it's an addition to the payroll tax, taxing for the first time income that's not earned, income that's interest, income that's dividends, income that's rental income. If mom and pop happen to rent out a room in their basement, and they have income over a certain amount, the President says they're rich. Again, I used this word a few minutes ago, it's just unconscionable.

When ObamaCare was created, one of the largest pay-fors in that program, Madam Speaker, was cuts to Medicare, something like $550 billion taken out of the Medicare program—not to strengthen Medicare, not to pay for catastrophic coverage for our seniors, not to strengthen the prescription drug plan, part D, not to close the doughnut hole. No. That money was taken out of the program to pay for this new entitlement that most of us know as ObamaCare, or the Patient Protection and Unaffordable Care Act. In my opinion they should have called it that. That's what's hurting this country very badly right now.

There are many things in ObamaCare that a lot of folks are not really aware of. They don't fully appreciate what is there because as Speaker PELOSI said, you're not going to know until you read it. She suggested that once you read it, you might like it. That certainly has not turned out to be the truth.

Madam Speaker, I want to take an opportunity to go through a few slides. Here are some of the promises that were made as the ObamaCare law was developed.

''ObamaCare will reduce the deficit,'' Senator TOM HARKIN of Iowa says of the Affordable Care Act, ''This historic legislation will reduce the deficit by $143 billion over the next 10 years.''

The next bullet point, colleagues, I know you can't see the small writing so I will read it to you: ObamaCare will create jobs and improve the United States economy. The White House claims that ObamaCare, and this is also a quote from Tim Geithner, the Treasury Secretary, ''helps businesses and the overall economy by eliminating hidden costs that currently contribute to higher health care premiums charged to businesses and the government.'' Tim Geithner, Secretary of the

Treasury, said that in a White House blog on January 19 of this year.

Another quote from the President himself: The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act ''will save a typical family up to $2,500 on premiums yearly.'' President Obama said that, of course, back in 2009. He also said, ''If you like your health plan, you can keep your health plan.''

During the health reform debate, President Obama promised Americans that there is nothing in the new law that would force Americans to change plans or their doctor. Colleagues, do you remember that? Sure you do. Of course you do.

Then the last bullet point on this slide, Madam Speaker: ObamaCare will not ration health care.

Now, this is in reference to the provision that was added in the Senate creating something called the acronym IPAB, Independent Payment Advisory Board, kind of like MedPAC is an advisory board under current Medicare.

But this creates this new board, and Secretary Sebelius said this on June 23, just a couple months ago, ''IPAB is expressly prohibited from making recommendations that ration care, raise premiums, reduce benefits, or change eligibility for Medicare.'' That's a quote from Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius.

Here, Madam Speaker, are the realities. Those were the promises. Here are the realities.

Colleagues, please pay attention to this next poster because this is so important.

ObamaCare will not reduce the deficit. According to a report by the House Budget Committee, there will be a $700 billion increase in the deficit in the first 10 years of ObamaCare.

The second bullet point: ObamaCare will not create jobs nor will it improve our economy. According to testimony by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, the American labor force will be reduced by 800,000 jobs due to ObamaCare provisions that will effectively increase marginal tax rates, which will also discourage work. That was the testimony of Doug Elmendorf, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office. He was put in that position by Speaker PELOSI. And that was at a House Budget Committee hearing in February of this year, some 6 months after the passage of ObamaCare.

The third bullet: ObamaCare will not lower health care costs for families by $2,500 a year. The President was wrong about that. Due to ObamaCare, families buying insurance on their own can expect a $2,100 increase in premiums. And that's from a letter from CBO to former Senator Evan Bayh, a Democrat from Indiana, and that was in November of 2009, some 5 months after passage of ObamaCare. I'm sorry. That was actually 6 months before. This is when the bill was being developed and debated in the Senate.

If you like your health plan, you cannot keep your health plan. According to the United States Census Bureau, the 2010 census shows that employer-provided insurance fell by 1.5 million to 55.3 percent from 56.1 percent in 2009. And it is continuing to fall. It would not surprise me if within the next 6 to 8 years, Madam Speaker, that a hundred million workers in this country will lose their employer-provided health insurance because the mandates of ObamaCare make it impossible to meet this requirement.

It's not just a matter of being forced to provide the health care for their employees; it is the type of health insurance coverage dictated by the Federal Government. That's why, my colleagues, 60 percent of this country remains totally opposed to this.

Finally on this poster, ObamaCare will ration health care. Don Berwick is the new director of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS. He had to be appointed by the President during a recess because he could not pass advise and consent and approval by the United States Senate.

□ 1920

They didn't have the votes. They didn't have all the Democratic votes, I feel quite confident.

So the President used a little trick of the trade and put him in this position during a congressional recess. This is a gentleman who was quoted and who wrote about and talked about other national health insurance programs. In regard to rationing, here is what the Director of Medicare said, ''The decision is not whether or not we will ration care. The decision is whether we will ration with our eyes open.'' Don Berwick in Biotechnology Health Care, June 2009.

Madam Speaker, as we talk about these two programs—Medicare on the one hand, ObamaCare on the other—I just think it's so important for us to understand what kind of costs we're talking about. This new entitlement program, it's not paid for. They tried to say that it was paid for, and raised $1 trillion by slashing and burning Medicare of $550 billion and by raising taxes for the other $500 billion, and said in the final analysis that this is paid for and that it saves money. Nothing could be further from the truth.

This program is not paid for. It does not save money, and it is probably costing we the taxpayers $2.7 trillion. How can we afford to do that, to add that new room or to build that new deck when there are obligations that we have made to our seniors and our obligations that we have made—our promises, our commitment—to those who, through no fault of their own, are unemployed, who have little income or maybe no income? That hand up, of course, is the Medicaid program. It is just patently unconscionable for we as Members of this great Congress to ignore that.

As our supercommittee now is debating what needs to be cut in our overall spending of $3.7 trillion every year—and 30 percent of that is borrowed—that's how you get to a debt of $15 trillion. If you borrow $1 trillion here and $1 trillion there for 3 or 4 years in a row and if you create a new entitlement program that costs another $2.7 trillion, you can get to $15 trillion worth of debt pretty darned quickly.

So, to this bipartisan commission which has been set up to recommend additional cuts so that the President can have his request granted to increase the debt ceiling another $1.5 trillion so that he gets through the next election and so that this issue doesn't have to be addressed again, and as this bipartisan, bicameral commission of 12 Members debates where to find the offsetting cuts of $1.5 trillion, Madam Speaker, I would say, Hey, men and women. You're all very bright. You were selected by your respective parties and your respective leadership because of the respect all the Members have for you and for your work and experience in regard to dealing with these things.

You've got the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, one of the more senior members of the Financial Services Committee—and I'm referring to the Republicans on the committee. You have the ranking member of the Budget Committee on the Democratic side, and you have one of the highest leadership Members from South Carolina. You have good Democrats and good Republicans in this body and in the other body.

I know they're struggling. I know they're struggling. I know the President just sent them a document, a 29-page document, asking for another $2 trillion worth of cuts. Hey, repeal ObamaCare, and you'll get $2.7 trillion of reduction in the debt. It is so simple, and it's what the American people want. It's what the American people want.

Majority Leader REID, pass the House-passed budget for fiscal year 2012. I know the Senate hasn't passed a budget in 900 days—I understand that—but just don't keep down that path. It's like trying to tax your way out of debt. The President seems to think that that's the way to create jobs. You just tax the so-called ''rich,'' who actually are people who have an adjusted gross income of $200,000 a year. These are the job creators. These are the small business men and women who, by the way, pay their taxes as individuals.

Colleagues, you know that, and you know that this is a lot about politics and that it's a lot about the next election; but we just need to take a deep breath and think about what the people back home are telling us. Think about the struggles that they're going through, those 15 million without jobs—and 45 percent of them have been without jobs for more than 6 months. When you add the underemployed or the people who have just given up, you're probably talking about not 14, 15 million; you're probably talking about 25 million people.

I see it. I see it, colleagues, in town hall meetings, and I know you do, too—both Republicans and Democrats. People ask questions. They shake their fingers at you. They're just not going to take some little smoke and mirrors answer to these tough questions. They're fed up with that, and I don't blame them. That's why our approval rating is so poor in the Congress. We as individuals like to think ''they love me in my district.'' You'd better hope so, but maybe not. Maybe not. Maybe every one of us is at risk of joining the ranks of the unemployed.

If we don't do the right thing, Madam Speaker, we deserve it. We deserve to be fired.

I stand here tonight, hopefully not in a partisan way. I think my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle would agree that my rhetoric is not over the top—maybe occasionally. Let's try to be honest with each other and work together and get things done and realize, when you've crammed a law like PPACA, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, down the throats of the American people when 60 percent or more say they don't want it, your first priority should be to create jobs and that your second priority and your third priority should be to create jobs and put America back to work and not spend a year and a half trying to pass something just because Democrats for 75 years have wanted this program of government control over health care. I think it was so wrong-headed. It's even worse than the previous year when we spent the whole year trying to please Al Gore and pass this scheme of cap-and-tax—or cap-and-trade—in regard to carbon dioxide. In the process, it would literally have cost every family in this country $1,500 a year in increased utility bills.

□ 1930

That's what the Democratic majority did when they took over in January of 2007. For a year and a half, I can remember distinctly, Madam Speaker, I was on the Science Committee and the very first hearing we had, we had one witness. That was the new Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, promoting cap-and-trade or cap-and-tax.

And the next hearing we had, we had one witness. That was Al Gore, former Vice President, again, pushing for something that was a job killer, maybe not a job killer for him, maybe not a job killer for certain sectors, special interests in this country, but for John Q. Public, Joe the Plumber, an absolute killer to jobs and has done nothing but increase unemployment despite spending $850 billion on a stimulus bill that, if it created any jobs, they were government jobs.

Then, in the default position, the Democratic majority says, oh, well, you know, if it hadn't been for this bill that we've passed, all this spending, a lot of jobs would have been lost. Well, that's easy to say, but how do you count that? How do you verify that? Trust but verify.

Again, Madam Speaker, I am not going to take all of the designated hour this evening, but I am proud to have had the opportunity tonight to talk about these issues, yes, on behalf of the GOP House Doctors Caucus, as a member, health care providers, nurses, doctors, dentists, psychologists, people that have been there, that walk the walk in regard to what's best for our country and best for our citizens and, yes, best for our patients, not just seniors. I talked a lot about Medicare tonight and this PPACA, ObamaCare, but we need to let the marketplace work.

Mr. President, we don't want, we didn't want, we never will want a U.K.-type system. We don't want national health insurance. We don't want bureaucrats coming between our health care providers and their patients.

If we don't repeal ObamaCare, we are going to destroy medicine as we know it, not just Medicare and Medicaid as we know it, but health care as we know it. Colleagues, that's one-sixth of our economy today, and it will be growing each and every year.

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

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 7 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1958

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) at 7 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–214) on the resolution (H. Res. 409) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. SUTTON (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 2 p.m. on account of attending a funeral in district.

Mr. BACA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 22, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3166. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Make Inoperative Exemptions; Vehicle Modifications To Accommodate People With Disabilities, Head Restraints [Docket No.: NHTSA-2011-0108] (RIN: 2127-AK22) received August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3167. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Car Assessment Program (NCAP); Safety Labeling [Docket No.: NHTSA-2010-0025] (RIN: 2127-AK51) received August 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3168. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Electric-Powered Vehicles; Electrolyte Spillage and Electrical Shock Protection [Docket No.: NHTSA-2011-0107] (RIN: 2127-AK80) received August 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3169. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Air Brake Systems [Docket No.: NHTSA-2009-0175] (RIN: 2127-AK84) received August 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3170. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Courtesy Notice of Liquidation [USCBP-2010-0008] (RIN: 1515-AD67) (formerly RIN: 1505-AC21) received August 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3171. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — United States Income Tax Treaties That Meet the Requirements of Section 1(h)(11)(C)(i)(II) [Notice 2011-64] received August 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3172. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 2011 Marginal Production Rates [Notice 2011-58] received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3173. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 2011 Section 43 Inflation Adjustment [Notice 2011-57] received August 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3174. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2011-67] received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3175. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Creditability of UK Remittance Basis Charge (Rev. Rul. 2011-19) received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3176. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Definition of Solid Waste Disposal Facilities for Tax-Exempt Bond Purposes [TD 9546] (RIN: 1545-BD04) received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3177. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — State and Local Bonds: Volume Cap and Timing of Issuing Bonds [Notice 2011-63] received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3178. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of correct liability (Rev. Proc. 2011-41) received August 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3179. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — September 2011 (Rev. Rul. 2011-20) received August 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3180. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Elections Regarding Start-up Expenditures, Corporation Organizational Expenditures, and Partnership Organizational Expenses [TD 9542] (RIN: 1545-BE77) received August 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3181. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Annuity and Life Insurance Contracts with a Long-Term Care Insurance Feature [Notice 2011-68] received August 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3182. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Branded Prescription Drug Fee [TD 9544] (RIN: 1545-BK34) received August 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3183. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revenue procedure under section 263(a) regarding the capitalization or deduction of electric utility transmission and distribution costs (Rev. Proc. 2011-43) received August 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3184. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Group Health Plans and Health Insurance Issuers Relating to Coverage of Preventive Services under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act [TD 9541] (RIN: 1545-BJ60) received August 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3185. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Method for Making Election to Apply Carryover Basis Treatment under Section 1022 to the Estates of Decedents who Died in 2010 and Rules Applicable to Inter Vivos and Testamentary Generation-Skipping Transfers in 2010 [Notice 2011-66] received August 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3186. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Use of Actuarial Tables in Valuing Annuities, Interests for Life or Terms of Years, and Remainder or Reversionary Interests [TD 9540] (RIN: 1545-BH67) received August 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 409. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 112–214). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (by request):

H.R. 12. A bill to provide tax relief for American workers and businesses, to put workers back on the job while rebuilding and modernizing America, and to provide pathways back to work for Americans looking for jobs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, Transportation and Infrastructure, Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, House Administration, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, Rules, and Science, Space, and Technology, 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. STARK (for himself, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 2981. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the 1-year deadline for application for asylum in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. LONG, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WOLF, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 2982. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include human trafficking as a part 1 violent crime for purposes of the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 2983. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct offshore oil and gas leasing, to deposit use revenues from such activity into the Inland Waterways Trust Fund and the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. MICHAUD (for himself and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H.R. 2984. A bill to designate certain Federal lands within the Cross Island National Wildlife Refuge and the Petit Manan National Wildlife Refuge, part of the Maine Coastal Islands National Wildlife Refuge Complex, in Lincoln County, Hancock County, and Washington County, Maine, as wilderness; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AKIN (for himself and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 2985. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 2986. A bill to expand the Officer Next Door and Teacher Next Door initiatives of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to include fire fighters and rescue personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself and Mr. MANZULLO):

H.R. 2987. A bill to amend the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 to further enhance the promotion of exports of United States goods and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 2988. A bill to amend the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 to enhance awareness of export promotion activities with respect to clean energy and environmental products and services of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. TIBERI, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 2989. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2990. A bill to create a full employment economy as a matter of national economic defense; to provide for public investment in capital infrastructure; to provide for reducing the cost of public investment; to retire public debt; to stabilize the Social Security retirement system; to restore the authority of Congress to create and regulate money, modernize and provide stability for the monetary system of the United States; and for other public purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2991. A bill to disapprove of a certain sentencing guideline amendment submitted by the United States Sentencing Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. FORBES, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 2992. A bill to provide Taiwan with critically needed United States-built multirole fighter aircraft to strengthen its

self-defense capability against the increasing military threat from China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 2993. A bill to direct the Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers to revise certain authorized purposes described in the Missouri River Mainstem Reservoir System Master Water Control Manual; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 2994. A bill to promote marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. KEATING:

H.R. 2995. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for hiring post 9-11 veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KISSELL (for himself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2996. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the period of time in which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs presumes the service-connection of certain disabilities of veterans who served in the Persian Gulf War, Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, or Operation New Dawn, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2997. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Responsive Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (''Superfund'') to provide that manure is not considered a hazardous substance or pollutant or contaminant under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 2998. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to prohibit the delegation by the United States of inspection, certification, and related services to a foreign classification society that provides comparable services to Iran, North Korea, North Sudan, or Syria and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 2999. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Duwamish Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. FLEMING):

H.R. 3000. A bill to provide for incentives to encourage health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Rules, House Administration, Appropriations, Oversight and Government Reform, and 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. MEEKS (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. HAYWORTH, and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 3001. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Raoul Wallenberg, in recognition of his achievements and heroic actions during the Holocaust; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3002. A bill to make local funds of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2012 available for use by the District at the beginning of the fiscal year at the rate of operations provided under the local budget act for such fiscal year if the regular District of Columbia appropriation bill for such fiscal year does not become law prior to the beginning of such fiscal year; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BACA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. STARK, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. PITTS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. YODER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DOLD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SCHOCK, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 3003. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. Balazs ''Ernie'' Bodai in recognition of his many outstanding contributions to the Nation, including a tireless commitment to breast cancer research; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 3004. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 260 California Drive in Yountville, California, as the ''Private First Class Alejandro R. Ruiz Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 3005. A bill to make supplemental appropriations for disaster relief for fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. WELCH (for himself and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 3006. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to prevent excessive speculation in commodity markets and excessive speculative position limits on energy contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 3007. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish and carry out a direct lending program for small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

140. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 28 questioning the assumptions made and the accuracy of the analysis used in making the decision to relocate the F-15C/D mission out of Great Falls to Fresno, California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

141. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 10 urging the Congress to enact legislation that assists the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund in establishing a voluntary system for full insurance for public funds accounts; to the Committee on Financial Services.

142. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 13 supporting the filling of the overwhelming need for reinvestment in the profession of social work in the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

143. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 12 urging the Congress and the President to call a White House Conference on Children and Youth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

144. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 10 requesting Congress to consider adopting legislation prohibiting the EPA from utilizing existing federal laws to regulate greenhouse gas emissions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

145. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 12 urging the Department of the Interior to consider the negative impact that oil and gas leasing and permitting policies that may have on Montana's economy; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

146. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 urging the Congress and the President to focus adequate federal resources on funding to complete environmental review processes for federal land use decisions with improved timelines; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

147. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 1 supporting the transfer of management of the grey wolf to the state of Montana; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

148. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 4 opposing the presidential designation of any new national monument in Montana; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

149. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 1 urging the Congress to pass legislation to ease the visa application process for Chinese visitors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

150. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 11 memorializing the Congress to restore funding for the Regional Counterdrug Training Academy located in Meridian, Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

151. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 6 urging the Congress to require the Veterans Health Administration to pay the transportation costs when a veteran who sought emergency care at a facility not operated by the VHA is transported to a VHA facility; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

152. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 170

memorializing the Congress to take such actions as are necessary to ensure that no reductions are made to benefits for Social Security recipients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

153. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 25 urging the Congress to pass legislation that will reauthorize and extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources.

154. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 10 supporting school-based health center program; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and the Workforce.

155. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 20 urging the Congress to enact legislation that requires the Federal Aviation Administration to develop an expedited approval process for application for aerial testing in rural counties; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Science, Space, and Technology.

156. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 12 requesting that the Congress and the President enact the federal Strengthening Medicare and Repaying Taxpayers Act of 2011; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 12.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce clause and provisions to provide for the general welfare.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 2981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4, Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 2982.

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 Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 2983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Spending Clause: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

Interstate Commerce Clause: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

Power Respecting Property Belonging to the United States: Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2984.

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 1 of the United States Constitution (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. AKIN:

H.R. 2985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 2986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 2987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 2988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2989.

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. KUCINICH:

H.R. 2990.

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, which enumerates the power of Congress to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures. The bill will re-assert the sole grant of constitutional authority to Congress to create money.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 2992.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 2993.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, Congress shall have the power to Regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Graves 050 seeks to remove an impediment to commerce, among other things.

By Mr. INSLEE:

H.R. 2994.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 2995.

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 make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KISSELL:

H.R. 2996.

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. LONG:

H.R. 2997.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section I

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 2998.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is authorized by the United States Constitution under Article I, Section 8, Congress shall have the power To . . . provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States and To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2999.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 (To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes)

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 3000.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the original understanding of the commerce clause, the authority to enact this legislation is found in Clause 3 of Section 8, Article I of the Constitution.

The bill repeals the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which exceeds the authority vested in Congress by the Constitution.

Finally, the bill removes government intrusion into the doctor-patient relationship, which is protected by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 3001.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3002.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 3003.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 clause l (relating to the general welfare of the United States) and clause 5 (relating to the coinage of money).

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 3004.

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 1, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 3005.

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. WELCH:

H.R. 3006.

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. YARMUTH:

H.R. 3007.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. PAUL and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 25: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 49: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 104: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 157: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 303: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 306: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 396: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 420: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 482: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 593: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 615: Mr. SCHILLING.
H.R. 632: Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 650: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 674: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 702: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 719: Mr. COBLE and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 750: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CANSECO, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 795: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 812: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BOREN, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 831: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 886: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 923: Mr. RIVERA and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 997: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 998: Ms. HOCHUL.
H.R. 1063: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1164: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1167: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 1172: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1182: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 1259: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 1267: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1340: Mr. KLINE and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 1366: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1381: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1418: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CHU, and Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 1509: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 1550: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1558: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1585: Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 1639: Mr. ROKITA, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1653: Mr. LANCE and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1681: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1697: Mr. CANSECO and Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 1738: Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1754: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1755: Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 1821: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1826: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1834: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1847: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1848: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1862: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1876: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1881: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1905: Mr. GUINTA, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TERRY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BERG, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1909: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1912: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1951: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1965: Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1980: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1983: Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2000: Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 2032: Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2059: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 2088: Mr. KIND and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 2097: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 2106: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2140: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 2233: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2247: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 2250: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2299: Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 2306: Mr. FARR and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2337: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 2369: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. CHU, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DOLD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RIVERA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 2381: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 2425: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2429: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 2433: Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 2447: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 2457: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2459: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 2471: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2502: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2508: Mr. COHEN, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FARR, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2513: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2514: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 2530: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2541: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 2559: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2671: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2674: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 2681: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 2689: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2695: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2696: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2731: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2750: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2752: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2757: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2763: Mr. STARK, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2766: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2772: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 2786: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2815: Mr. ROSKAM and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2823: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2827: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2829: Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. TURNER of New York, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 2830: Mr. CARTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2833: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 2848: Mr. JONES and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2855: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2859: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 2864: Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. JONES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BOREN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2897: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HURT, and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 2898: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KELLY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GUINTA, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 2926: Mr. FLORES, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 2938: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2941: Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 2966: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2973: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.J. Res. 47: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.J. Res. 73: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.J. Res. 78: Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. OLVER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. ROSS of Florida.
H. Res. 60: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H. Res. 111: Mr. MICHAUD.
H. Res. 295: Mrs. LOWEY.
H. Res. 306: Mr. GARRETT.

H. Res. 333: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BACA, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H. Res. 336: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. REYES, and Mr. KING of New York.

H. Res. 367: Mr. MARINO.

H. Res. 394: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H. Res. 407: Mr. KING of New York.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

21. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Liberty County Development Authority, Georgia, relative to Resolution supporting the relocation of the 3rd Heavy Brigade Combat Team/3rd Infantry Division from Fort Benning, Georgia to Fort Stewart, Georgia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

22. Also, a petition of Wayne County Commission, Michigan, relative to Resolution No. 2011-350 opposing altering the direction of Michigan into becoming a right-to-work state; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

23. Also, a petition of the Niagara County Legislature, New York, relative to Resolution IL-043-11 opposing the Cross-State Pollution Rule; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

24. Also, a petition of Wayne County Commission, Michigan, relative to Resolution No. 2011-376 supporting an integrated network of high-speed trains and expanded Amtrak service as a key to economic development; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.