United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2012 No. 6

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, January 20, 2012, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2012

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 18, 2012.

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

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 17, 2012, 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.

A GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY FOR A COLLECTIVE VISION IN REBUILDING AMERICA

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We begin the new year on the same sour note with which we concluded 2011—an appalling year, full of fabricated crises that didn't need to happen but which produced real-life consequences, the debt ceiling debacle being but one example. The Republican nomination of a Presidential candidate is showing the dark side of this new era of Super PACs and what happens when a party is captive to ideological extremists.

Even if you're not a Republican, it's a sad indictment. We need two constructive, effective, responsible political parties, or at least as close as we can come. It is past time to respond to things that Americans need and support.

It really doesn't need to be this hard.

I would suggest that one test going forward would be dealing with issues that could be supported by both the Tea Party and the Occupy Wall Street protesters—both movements responses to a shared concern that Americans are being shortchanged, that America is on a path that is not sustainable, and of a political process that is unable to respond to their needs. Both movements are understandable and have valid concerns, that the political process is too often stacked against people trying to make changes in how we do business.

The degree of overlap between the two narratives is very encouraging, and I think it is healthy that both have found political expression. The question is the extent to which people who identify with these movements can identify with each other and with practical, achievable responses.

I think they can.

This year, I hope that both sides of the aisle here in Congress will think about what those shared objectives might be.

Agricultural reform ought to be at the very top of the list. We have a system that the right and the left can agree shortchanges most farmers and ranchers and is far too expensive. It is tilted towards large agribusiness, not to smaller operations—the quintessential family farm. We know we can do better to help more people while we save taxpayer money, improve the environment, and enhance the health of our children in dealing with school nutrition.

Another major area of agreement deals with American leadership in helping the 2 billion poor people around the world who do not have access to safe drinking water or adequate sanitation or, tragically, to both. The United States has the potential to dramatically enhance the effectiveness of the work we are already doing and the money we are already spending. I am pleased we have bipartisan legislation with my friend TED POE from Texas as the lead Republican to enhance these international water and sanitation efforts.

For years, I've been working to enhance the capacity of our health care system to help people when they are most vulnerable. This has commonly been referred to as ''end of life,'' but it is not just that—it is much more. It is any time people are in difficult medical conditions, when they may lose control over what happens to them. We need to

Printed on recycled paper.

make sure that people understand their choices, are able to articulate what they and their families want, and that their health care wishes, whatever they may be, are respected.

This bipartisan concept got caught up in the madness of the 2009 political lie of the year—death panels—but it's now time to revisit it. It's overwhelmingly supported by the American people, including the Tea Party and Occupy Wall Street. It costs nothing, and will help enhance the well-being of our families.

There is a golden opportunity to come together around a collective vision of rebuilding and renewing America. This is happening at the State and local levels as people are uniting around their visions and putting up money to achieve it. This is the fastest way to revitalize the economy and protect our quality of life, and the Federal Government should be playing.

While I strongly support efforts to correct the distorting and, in some ways, corruption of the political process by avalanches of secret money that are now savaging Republican candidates for the Presidential nomination, there is another corrupting process that is taking place for which there are no constitutional barriers to remediate—the legislative redistricting process. In most States, it's a scandal where politicians pick the voters rather than voters being able to pick the politicians. We all ought to identify with reform efforts that are emerging in this area.

These are five simple steps that don't cost money and certainly, in the long run, will save money while they enhance the integrity of the system. They can strengthen the economy while revitalizing the political process and addressing the frustrations of both Occupy Wall Street and the Tea Party.

NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE IN TENNESSEE

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, it's great to be back down on the floor, back to being in Washington, DC, to continue with what I spent most of my time last year doing, which was addressing the high-level nuclear waste issues in this country.

Today, we go to the great State of Tennessee, and identify a location where there is presently high-level nuclear waste stored and compare that to the site that was picked and that is in Federal law right now, which is the high-level nuclear waste depository scheduled to occur in Yucca Mountain.

First of all, this is Sequoyah in Tennessee, where there are over 1,094 MTU of spent nuclear fuel onsite. At Yucca Mountain, which is in the desert in Nevada, there is currently no nuclear waste onsite. At Sequoyah, the waste is stored above the ground in pools and dry casks. If we were to put it in Yucca Mountain, where it is supposed to go, the waste would be stored 1,000 feet underground—underneath, in essence, a mountain. At Sequoyah, the waste is 25 feet from the groundwater table. At Yucca Mountain, it would be 1,000 feet above the water table, and Yucca Mountain is 100 miles from the Colorado River. Sequoyah is 14 miles from the city of Chattanooga and 14 miles from Chickamauga Lake.

So why do I highlight these issues? Because of what happened in Japan with Fukushima Daiichi and the high-level nuclear waste.

A lot of the nuclear exposure was because pools had dried up. The nuclear waste heated up, and then you had almost a worldwide catastrophe right next to the ocean. If we were doing what was public policy in Federal law in collecting our high-level nuclear waste and taking it to a desert underneath a mountain, that would be a much more secure location than around our major municipalities, our streams, and our groundwater locations. But, no, because of this administration and some political promises made in the last election cycle, they have defunded and pulled off the table Yucca Mountain from consideration.

In 1982, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act made the Federal Government responsible for checking waste. Since that time, $9 billion and 20 years was spent studying for a suitable location. That study ended in Yucca Mountain.

□ 1010

In 1987 Congress named Yucca Mountain the sole candidate site for a permanent repository, and then in '94 DOE published scientific results demonstrating Yucca as capable of protecting public health and safety; in '98, the statutory deadline for DOE to commence disposal of spent nuclear fuel.

So we pay these nuclear utilities money to hold their own waste that we should be collecting based upon Federal law.

In 2002 we voted here, and the President and Congress approved Yucca as the site repository. DOE issued a license application in 2008, and then in 2009 President Obama announced plans to terminate Yucca Mountain after $15 billion spent in studying this site.

And I'll close with this: Would you rather have nuclear waste 14 miles from a major metropolitan area next to a lake or would you rather have high-level nuclear waste hundreds of miles from the major, largest city, 100 miles from a river, underneath a mountain, in the desert?

Public policy, good public policy demands that we move forward on Yucca Mountain.

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA ON 2011 BCS CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the University of Alabama Crimson Tide for being the 2011 BCS champions. Roll Tide.

The State of Alabama is still number one in college football. For the past 3 consecutive years, a team from the State of Alabama has won the national championship trophy. The University of Alabama has been the national champs twice in the last 3 years.

The championship game between Alabama and LSU represents college football at its finest. Both schools have a proud and very rich tradition in football history, and the LSU Tigers should be commended for an outstanding season. While both teams deserve recognition, in the end, Alabama beat LSU with a final score of 21–0.

I want to congratulate the coaches, staff, team, and the entire university family and fans for an amazing season. It was your hard work, persistence, leadership, and commitment all season long that made this decisive victory become a reality.

The University of Alabama has had a long-standing tradition of excellence in collegiate football. This year's victory represented the 14th national championship title for the University of Alabama. Since being founded in 1892, the Crimson Tide football program has achieved 813 victories in the NCAA Division I and 26 conference championships. The Crimson Tide also sets an NCAA record with 58 post-season bowl appearances. The Tide leads the SEC West Division with seven division titles and seven appearances in the SEC Championship Game.

This entire team deserves recognition and honor. I want to especially acknowledge Trent Richardson, who was a Heisman Trophy finalist and winner of this year's Nation's Most Outstanding Running Back. I would also like to acknowledge Barrett Jones, who was the 2011 Outland Trophy winner for the Nation's best interior lineman in college football.

This championship team also includes six players who were selected for the 2011 Associated Press All-America Team: Mark Barron, Dont'a Hightower, Barrett Jones, Trent Richardson, Courtney Upshaw, and Dre Kirkpatrick. This year's team was truly a force to be reckoned with.

This win not only represents a victory for the University of Alabama football team, but it also is a unifying victory for the State of Alabama, who suffered so much during the devastation of the April tornados. This victory shows the resilient spirit of Alabamians and reflects our hope for a better future.

I speak on behalf of the constituents of the Seventh Congressional District, the great State of Alabama, and this Nation as I express how proud we are of the players, coaches, and athletic staff of the University of Alabama for making this victory possible and helping our communities heal.

I also want to thank Representative CASSIDY of Louisiana for being such a

good sport and looking so dapper today in his brand-new Crimson Tide tie and attire. What an addition to your wardrobe.

I urge my colleagues to please join me in celebrating the achievements of the University of Alabama Crimson Tide and its outstanding athletes on their 2011 BCS championship victory.

Roll Tide.

MAKE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT LIVE WITHIN ITS MEANS

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, when the 112th Congress was sworn in on January 5, 2011, I, along with many of my fellow Republicans, voted to change the status quo.

Instead of escalating spending, we have made and pushed for significant spending cuts. Instead of forcing a trillion dollar government takeover of health care on the American people, we voted to repeal it in the House. Instead of imposing costly and burdensome regulations on an already struggling business economy, we passed legislation to reverse overly burdensome regulations so businesses can get back to hiring again.

These are the vows we made to our constituents when we took office a year ago. And despite hitting numerous snags in the do-nothing Senate and with leadership lacking in the White House, we delivered on the promises.

In the past year, the House has passed 27 job-creating measures as part of our plan for American job creators. We have remained committed to removing the onerous taxes and regulations that are crippling small business and our families and are the cause for so much distrust of Washington. We have begun an honest conversation about which programs are in alignment with our constitutional principles and which programs are wasteful and inefficient.

We have the responsibility to make the Federal Government live within its means, just like hardworking families across the country. This means we have to cut spending, stop raising taxes, and eliminate wasteful spending from our outdated, overreaching government programs.

When we took office last January, we vowed to reduce discretionary spending to 2008 levels, and we delivered. The House passed a bill to reduce spending by $5.8 trillion over the next 10 years. We also voted to cut over 100 programs across government and save billions of dollars in the process. In May, the House also overwhelmingly voted against giving President Obama a blank check to increase the debt limit without spending reductions or reforms.

We have relentlessly fought for policies that will encourage job creation and free our families from the burdensome economic problems of government regulation. We acted to undo duplicative permitting requirements for farmers by passing the Reduced Regulatory Burdens Act. We pushed back against the President's attempts to implement a cap-and-trade policy—an energy reduction policy, really—through the regulatory process by passing the Energy Tax Prevention Act. And we confronted the EPA's costly and burdensome agenda by passing three regulatory reform bills that safeguard our environment while keeping Americans at work.

On November 16, we defeated the 3 percent withholding rule by passing H.R. 674. This misguided tax rule would have required government agencies at all levels to withhold 3 percent of their payments to businesses for goods and services. Any small business that contracts with the government would have their profit margins wiped out if such a rule were allowed to take effect.

We passed the REINS Act, to bring accountability to the executive branch by requiring that government bureaucrats receive permission from Congress, the elected representatives of the people, before the implementation of any major regulation.

Just 2 weeks after beginning our work in Congress, the House voted to repeal the overreaching, costly, and harmful government takeover of health care that President Obama forced upon the American people. H.R. 2 was one of my first votes after being sworn in. The bill cut new spending by $1.4 trillion over 10 years and repealed the President's health care takeover, and I was proud to vote to repeal this job-killing law which will do nothing to bring stability and certainty to American families.

Throughout the first session of the 112th Congress, House Republicans have remained committed to changing the way the government does business. We've delivered on our promises to pass legislation that reins in spending and encourages job creation. Going forward, I'm hopeful that our friends in the Senate and the leadership in the White House will finally be ready to join us in passing legislation that the American people want and not let dozens of job-producing bills sit idle in the Senate.

This year, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House as we look beyond the next election and focus on improving people's lives and creating a brighter economic future with the freedom God really intended for all of us.

□ 1020

STOP PIPA AND SOPA

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. PIPA, Protect Intellectual Property Act; SOPA, Stop Online Piracy Act. Now, who could be against bills like that, to prevent the theft of intellectual property or online piracy, to prevent online piracy. Clever names, great. Content, not so much.

Now, the worst, organized, government-sanctioned theft of intellectual property in the world goes on day in and day out in Communist China. And this government has done precious little to rein that in. We run a huge trade deficit with China. We're buying their goods. They are dependent upon our purchasing of their goods. And yet we allow them to get away with that. This bill does nothing to deal with the organized theft in Communist China, which is the greatest problem that confronts us in the theft of intellectual property.

Now, concealed behind these really benign names and embedded in the text is something that's kind of like what we call malware. Now, we all know what malware can do to our computers. We've seen it; the black screen of death. Well, this is a little bigger than malware that gets on your computer, steals your data, or crashes your computer. It could crash the entire Internet and the productivity of the Internet.

Now, eventually this legislation could threaten the existence of an entire domain because of one blog entry, one user link. A whole domain could be taken down. Wow. That's pretty incredible. Imagine how some of these user-content sites are going to have to try and police things.

Well, they can always err on the side of censorship because there are broad provisions in this bill to allow you in good faith to censor something because you thought maybe it was a problem. So they could start censoring rather dramatically. The legislation also includes very broad language for so-called anti-circumvention, that is any site that provides information that could—could, maybe, possibly—help users get around censorship would be a target. Well, that's kind of an interesting contradiction for the government of the United States because actually we promote through the State Department software that helps democratic activists in Communist China, which I already mentioned, and in Iran and other vicious dictatorships around the world to get around their government's online censorship. We're now going to enshrine principles that would allow this sort of censorship, sort of mimicking some of the actions of the Iranian and the Communist Chinese, I guess, in regards to the Internet here. Of course, we're going to allow private companies to impose this censorship instead of the government imposing this censorship; but they would have government enforcement behind their actions, the private right of actions that would be allowed in this bill.

This is pretty extraordinary legislation, very poorly drafted. If you didn't care about the Internet, if it didn't exist and you wanted to put in the toughest possible protections theoretically for piracy and intellectual property, maybe you'd write something like

this. But there's a better way to go than to kill the Internet at the same time as you're trying to get at these few bad actors that are out there, let alone the state bad actors, like China.

I'd love to see a bill drafted to take on the Chinese on their multi-billion-dollar annual theft of intellectual property from the United States. Everybody says we can't take on China; no, they're too big. So instead, we'll go after small, creative people who could tread across this line unknowingly who are participating in a much larger site. They have their blog as part of that site or they have their post as part of that site. The whole site could be taken down.

This legislation, I'm pleased to say, that it seems like the White House has woken up to the dangers here; the fact that we are essentially creating the PATRIOT Act national security letter provisions for private companies to censor the Internet. We cannot let that happen. We must stop this legislation. We also need to take on meaningfully piracy and the theft of intellectual property.

OUT OF AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

During the Christmas break, I wrote a letter to President Obama expressing outrage over the fact that Afghan President Karzai again snubbed our country and our men and women in uniform by signing an oil contract with China. How much more do the American people have to sacrifice with their young men and women? How many more young men and women have to walk the countryside of Afghanistan and have a leg or arm blown off, or killed, so Mr. Karzai can continue to say to Uncle Sam: We don't need you, but you've got to stay here so I can cut all these deals with these foreign countries.

In a December 8, 2010, Washington Post article, while meeting with General Petraeus and former Ambassador Eikenberry, President Karzai said: I have three main enemies—the Taliban, the United States, and the international community. Karzai further stated: If I had to choose sides today, I'd choose the Taliban.

Yes, young men and women in uniform, thank you for what you're doing; but it's time to bring you home.

In a November 14, 2010, interview with the Washington Post, Karzai said that he wanted American troops off the roads and out of Afghan homes and that the long-term presence of so many foreign soldiers would only worsen the war.

Very seldom do I say: Thank you, Mr. Karzai, you're exactly right.

March 12, 2011, New York Times: ''I request that NATO and American soldiers should stop these operations on our soil. This war is not on our soil. If this war is against terror, then this war is not here. Terror is not here.'' Mr. Karzai, president of Afghanistan.

In October of 2011 during a television interview, President Karzai stated: '' If ever there is a war between Pakistan and America, Afghanistan will side with the Pakistanis.''

Why are we still there spending $10 billion a month and saying to the American people: We're going to cut your school programs; we're going to cut your bridge programs; we're going to cut your road programs? American people, we don't have the money, but somehow, we have $10 billion a month to send to Mr. Karzai.

This little boy beside me is named Tyler Jordan. In 2003, his father, Gunny Sergeant Phillip Jordan, was killed in Iraq. I've spoken to his mom, Amanda. She lives in Connecticut. I've asked her about Tyler. I've had this picture since 2003. She says he still misses his daddy. He will always miss his father.

Bin Laden is dead. Al Qaeda has been dispersed all over the world. I hope the American people will call their Members of Congress in both parties and say: Get our troops out of Afghanistan. Do not wait until 2014, 2015. I don't know how many more will have to die for a corrupt leader named Karzai.

We have won. Bin Laden is dead. We have won. Declare victory and bring them home.

God, continue to bless our men and women in uniform. Bless the families who've given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. And God, please continue to bless America. We're in great need of Your guidance, dear God. God bless America.

□ 1030

POVERTY

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me just say to the prior gentleman who spoke, Mr. JONES, that I appreciate him continuing to call for the end of the war and occupation of Afghanistan and bringing our young men and women home because, of course, we know that this war has created undue hardship, so many deaths, and really has been the longest war in our lifetime. And so thank you, Mr. JONES, for your leadership.

I am the founder of the Congressional Out of Poverty Caucus, and I just have to rise today on behalf of the caucus to continue to talk about the tide of poverty that is sweeping our country.

As we begin now the second session of the 112th Congress, we must do more to help the millions of Americans living in poverty, looking hard for a job, and working hard every day to move up the ladder of opportunity and earn their share of the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, on January 4, The New York Times reported that economic mobility—the ability to work hard and make your fortune from humble beginnings, which is the fundamental cornerstone of the American Dream—is getting harder and harder to achieve in America. Americans have fallen behind and are increasingly cut off from their dreams of having a job and supporting their families.

How in the world did this happen? The failed policies of the past administration only helped the richest among us become richer and concentrated greater wealth into the hands of a wealthy few. And today, House Republican leadership has failed to address the needs of most Americans.

The only way that our economy can recover and reduce poverty is to create jobs and to expand access to the economic opportunities. We find that the lack of opportunity and economic mobility is worse at the bottom, and without a real commitment to change, it will only get worse.

The Republican-led Congress has been too beholden to their extremist Tea Party base to reach the necessary compromises to move our Nation forward and to begin the hard work of rebuilding and growing our economy for all Americans.

Now, President Obama did stop the economy from going off a cliff, and Congress must work with the President to put our Nation back on the road to recovery and growth.

We continue to have unacceptably high unemployment, and we all know that the rates of unemployment and the rates of poverty in our minority communities continue to be about twice the national average. But even these painful and these shameful statistics may not completely show just how much Wall Street has focused their efforts on stripping communities of color of the little wealth that they have managed to accumulate over the last few decades.

The Pew Research Center found that minority households were hit disproportionately hard by the housing and financial crisis. The Pew Center found that from 2005 to 2009, median wealth fell by 66 percent among Hispanic households and 53 percent among black households, compared with just 16 percent among white households. As a result of these declines, the typical African American household now has, mind you, just $5,677 in wealth; the typical Hispanic household has $6,300 in wealth; and the typical white household has $113,000 in net worth.

So the facts speak for themselves. Wall Street targeted minority homeowners and minority communities, and we must respond accordingly.

It is long past time that we as a Nation enact bold programs and policies that ensure that we are a Nation that truly does provide equal opportunity and access to the American Dream rather than allowing, for example, minorities to be targeted for policies and programs that undermine their ability to achieve the American Dream. We

must begin immediately to have an up-or-down vote on a clean bill that extends vital emergency unemployment benefits for the 99 weeks for the millions of job seekers who continue to struggle to find a job and are no longer eligible for unemployment compensation.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of Americans who are struggling to find a job now are already no longer getting unemployment benefits due to the 99-week wall. But people want to work. There are four people, however, looking for one job, and that is a fact.

So we need to pass H.R. 3638, the Restore the American Dream Act, for the 99 percent, a package of job-creation measures and policy reforms introduced by the Congressional Progressive Caucus. This bill would significantly boost employment and create jobs in the short term and improve the fiscal outlook in the long term. It's the right thing to do. Instead, this Tea Party-led Congress has wasted an entire year without any jobs bills, without extending any new help to the millions of Americans in need.

We can't wait and neither should Congress. Let's help to make sure that the poor and the unemployed Americans find good-paying jobs and make that our number one priority. We must remove these obstacles to reignite the American Dream.

ENERGY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, you know, when we look at what are some of the most important issues facing our country today, obviously economy comes very first. Next, we talk about energy, we talk about spending, and we talk about national security, all very important.

You know, one nexus between economy and national defense is energy and our lack of energy here at home. Yesterday, the President's own Jobs Council called for an ''all-in approach'' to energy policy that includes expanded oil and gas drilling as well as expediting energy projects like pipelines. The report stated:

''The Council recognizes the important safety and environmental concerns surrounding these types of projects, but now more than ever, the jobs and economic and energy security benefits of these energy projects require us to tackle the issues head-on and to expeditiously, though cautiously, move forward on projects that can support hundreds of thousands of jobs.''

The Keystone XL pipeline does just that. This pipeline would directly create 20,000 American jobs in manufacturing and construction and 118,000 total jobs. In addition, we would see 830,000 barrels of safe and secure oil each day from our friends to the north, which means we'll need less oil from countries we can no longer rely on and are not friendly to the interests of the United States.

Caterpillar, a leading manufacturer from my home State, supports securing stable and affordable energy from a North American ally through the Keystone XL pipeline and urges approval of this pipeline. Daniel Macholan, the Global Pipeline general manager for Caterpillar, said: ''Considering the economic and energy security benefits of these vital resources, we should continue to expand America's access to safe, affordable energy to help ensure improved domestic and global energy security and stable prices for consumers. Pipelines are a critical part of our energy infrastructure, and additional pipeline capacity will help consumers and businesses throughout the United States.''

There's a lot of talk of the need for bipartisanship today. There's a lot of talk for the need to unite different factions of people into one common goal for our country. And I agree that when you look at this project, the Keystone pipeline, it has bipartisan support. There were Democrats that supported this bill as well as Republicans and something that I believe we should move forward on as a country.

Manufacturers and union organizations are united alike in supporting this project. Last summer, the State Department announced that this extension had passed extensive environmental reviews, but President Obama has already stalled for more than 26 days to make a decision on the Keystone XL pipeline.

The fact is that somebody will benefit from oil out of Alberta, Canada. If it's not the United States, it will be China—unless we take immediate action to expand the Keystone XL pipeline—and it will be American businesses and consumers who will suffer the consequences from our inaction.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm an Air Force pilot. I've been overseas. I've fought in these wars. And I can tell you, as much as I think we're doing the right thing, one thing we can do is to reduce our reliance on foreign oil so that when Iran threatens to close the Strait of Hormuz, it means nothing to the energy security of this country and just simply leaves it to what that's going to mean for them.

I strongly urge President Obama to immediately support this job-creating, bipartisan project. The time to act is now.

INSENSITIVE COMMENTS BY PRESIDENT OF OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, my first reaction upon reading Dr. Gordon Gee's denigrating comments about the Polish Army was to see red—blood red.

As a Polish American, I fail to see the humor when the president of The Ohio State University described bureaucratic turf battles at his school with administrators ''shooting each other'' as ''kind of like the Polish Army.'' His comments revealed not only insensitivity to the suffering of the Polish people over the past two centuries, but a shocking lack of knowledge of history. Surely, the leader of a major institution of higher learning should know better.

□ 1040

Ohio State, after all, is home to the Center for Slavic and East European Studies.

Having spent my public career trying to overcome ethnic stereotyping, I thought about how to respond: Do I hold a press conference? Do I make an official statement? The Polish American Congress quickly demanded, received, and accepted an apology from President Gee.

But I kept thinking about my dear friend Colonel Marian Wojciechowski, a true hero of Poland and America, who died last year at age 97. I have known the Wojciechowski family for almost half a century. Marian's brilliant daughter Mary Ann was my friend in high school and the valedictorian of our class at St. Ursula Academy in Toledo.

Her father, Marian, had commanded a Polish Army cavalry platoon at the place where World War II started on land September 1, 1939. Against impossible odds, the Polish Army secured a tactical victory in the battle of Mokra. There was nothing disorganized or chaotic about Marian's home unit, the 21st Regiment Pulku Ulanow Nadwisclankich, which eventually was awarded the Virtuti Militari, Poland's highest military honor.

No, President Gee, the Polish soldiers at Mokra did not shoot at each other. In fact, they inflicted surprisingly heavy losses against the more heavily equipped Nazi invaders, who lost 800 men. Eventually, the Poles' situation deteriorated, as they ran low on ammunition and medicine. No Western country came to their aid. No Western country. The infantry commander considered surrendering, but the cavalry commander ordered a charge. Polish cavalry soldiers bravely drew their swords, positioned their artillery, and heroically charged German positions, even though they were hopelessly overmatched by mechanized blitzkrieg forces on the land, including two Panzer divisions, and Luftwaffe planes in the air.

A fellow soldier from Marian's hometown of Polaniec thought Marian had been killed and reported the sad news to Marian's family who held a funeral for him. But in fact, Marian had survived, had moved east with his remaining cavalry forces to fight the Red Army that attacked Poland 3 weeks later on the Russian front, on September 17. My friend Marian was grazed in the head by a Russian bullet.

He then joined the underground resistance for over 2 years in such dangerous work until he was arrested, brutally tortured, sent to Auschwitz in Death Block 11, and then transferred to Gross-Rosen and finally to Leitmeritz in 1945, from which he escaped. I must mention that the woman who had accidentally revealed his name was beheaded by Nazi forces.

Of course Poland, which had been partitioned by adjoining empires since the late 18th Century for daring to write its own democratic Constitution in 1791—2 years after our own and upon which it was modeled—was devastated by World War II. Poland lost a higher percentage of her population than any other nation, approximately one in five people. Cities such as Warsaw were razed because their people fought unrelentingly until they were subdued.

Fleeing to Germany and a U.S. Army-run refugee camp, Marian met his life-long love, Wladyslawa Poniencka, a Polish girl scout and also a member of the women's Underground resistance. She and her family had been arrested in Warsaw and sent to the notorious Pawiak Prison and then she to Ravensbruck where unspeakable experiments were performed on her while all of her closet relatives were killed. Marian and Wladyslawa married. They had their first child, my friend, and immigrated to America in 1950 under the Displaced Persons Act. They were sponsored by Marian's cousin in Toledo. They raised their family. And he published a Polish language newspaper Ameryka-Echo in Toledo, for more than 7 years. He also built a career in neighborhood community development, working until age 80.

Like Generals Kosciusko and Pulaski, Colonel Marian Wojciechowski dedicated his life to the cause of liberty and community building. He was an extraordinary man. In different times, I think he might have been president of Poland. He surely should have run for office here.

I am going to send a copy of the book ''Seven Paths to Freedom,'' edited by Miroslawa Zawadzka and Andrezj Zawadzki, to President Gee. I hope he reads it. It's over time for the President of Ohio State University to show reverence and respect for Poland's heroic struggle for liberty.

THE KOSCIUSZKO FOUNDATION,
New York, NY.

Subject: Ohio State President Gordon Gee Must Be Reprimanded For Polish Slur.

Chairman LESLIE H. WEXNER,
Board of Trustees, Ohio State University, Bricker Hall, Columbus, OH.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WEXNER AND TRUSTEES OF OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY: As a son of Polish war heroes, I ask that you publicly admonish University President Gordon Gee for his unacceptable comment that your staff, ''were shooting at each other . . . like the Polish Army.'' In addition, the Board of Trustees must truly serve the 465,000 Polish-Americans living in Ohio by funding classes on Polish history at the University. With a President who lacks erudition, how can you expect to educate your students about World history, or Poland?

I can assure Mr. Gee that my father, Corp. Dionizy Storozynski was shooting straight as a motorcycle scout for a Polish tank division during the allied invasion of Normandy. Afterwards, he was awarded the Polish Army Medal, and three medals from the British Army. And I can assure Mr. Gee that my grandfather, Sgt. Wladyslaw Krzyzanowski was shooting straight when his Polish regiment, the Anders' Army, helped drive the Germans from North Africa, and when he destroyed two German tanks in the Battle of Monte Cassino in Italy. For this he received three Polish medals and three British medals. And I can assure Mr. Gee that the Polish WWII pilots that set records in accuracy in destroying German Luftwaffe planes during the Battle for Britain were shooting straight.

It's Mr. Gee who is not a straight shooter. Gee has made a half-hearted apology. That is not enough. Gee has a history of putting his feet in his mouth and having to apologize. Yet the Ohio State Board of Trustees has made him the highest paid college president in the United States, paying him $1.6 million annually.

As Trustees, you are the governing body for a state university in a state that has nearly half a million Polish-American taxpayers and voters. Yet you offer few classes in Polish language and literature, and no classes in Polish history. With your university receiving $493 million in state appropriations and $426 million in other government funding in 2012, surely you can afford to rectify this situation. This should be put on the agenda for your next Board of Trustees meeting on Feb. 9.

After Mr. Gee made his unenlightened comment, he said, ''Who did I embarrass now?'' For starters, Mr. Gee embarrassed himself and Ohio State University. This is also an embarrassment to United States foreign policy.

With thousands of Polish soldiers who have served in Iraq and Afghanistan, Gee's comments have caused a stir in Poland. And the Polish soldiers supporting the American mission in Afghanistan will not be pleased with Mr. Gee's benighted opinion. Poland's Special Forces unit shut down oilrigs in the Persian Gulf during the invasion of Iraq, and the Polish Army played a major role in the war.

When I traveled to Iraq in 2006 to write an article for the New York Sun, U.S. Army lieutenant general, Peter Chiarelli, told me that the Polish troops ''are doing an absolutely outstanding job. They've been one of the most steadfast members of the coalition. And these are two of the most peaceful provinces in all of Iraq, Diwaniyah and Wasit. And that's largely attributable to the great leadership of successive Polish generals who have come down here and the Polish units who have served here.''

The Polish Army has made major contributions to European and American history. King Jan Sobieski turned back the Ottoman Empire during the Siege of Vienna in 1863 when the Turks invaded Europe and tried to turn it into a Muslim colony. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was the largest country in Europe at the time and Sobieski's Hussar Knights were the most feared soldiers in Europe.

The President of a major university should also know the military contributions of Poles to this country. The Father of the American Cavalry, Gen. Casimir Pulaski saved George Washington's life at the Battle of Brandywine. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko built the largest fortress in America, West Point and suggested putting a military academy there. That was before he devised the plans for the Battle of Saratoga, the turning point of the American Revolution. And Abraham Lincoln appointed Wlodzimierz Krzyzanowski Brigadier General in the Union Army during the Civil War. Would Abe Lincoln have picked a Polish general if he could not shoot straight?

Mr. Gee further exposed his ignorance about Poland when after his witless comments about the Polish Army he told the crowd at the Columbus Metropolitan Club, ''Oh, never mind, who did I embarrass now? I'll have to raise money for Poland now.''

If Mr. Gee read the Wall Street Journal he would know that despite Europe's financial woes, over the past several years, Poland has had one of the fastest growing economies in Europe. So no, Poland does not need Mr. Gee to help it raise money. But he can help himself by curing his foot-in-mouth disease and working to rehabilitate his image with the many Polish-Americans in your state.

Here's where he can start. Thaddeus Kosciuszko was given 500 acres on the Scioto River in Ohio by the Founding Fathers for his exemplary service in the American Revolution. That original tract of land borders the Ohio State University campus in Columbus. Today, part of that land is the Riverside Drive Park in Dublin, Ohio, and in May the city will rename it Thaddeus Kosciuszko Park. In addition to his military service, Kosciuszko put his money where his mouth was when it came to standing up for liberty. Kosciuszko donated his salary from the American Revolution, $17,000 and asked that it be used to purchase slaves, and to free and educate them.

Kosciuszko was a virtuous straight shooter who did the right thing. If Mr. Gee is as much of a straight shooter as Polish soldiers, and has any semblance of decency, he should pay to erect a statue of Kosciuszko in that park. With a salary of $1.6 million per year, Mr. Gee can clearly afford it.

ALEX STOROZYNSKI,
President & Executive Director,
The American Center for Polish Culture.

PIAST INSTITUTE,
Hamtramck, MI, January 17, 2012.

President E. GORDON GEE,
The Ohio State University, Bricker Hall, Columbus, OH.

DEAR PRESIDENT GEE: I like many others both inside and outside the Polish American community, was surprised and dismayed by your remarks that played off deeply offensive stereotypes of Poles and Polish Americans. I am glad that you have recognized the inappropriateness of your statements and have tendered an apology. Nevertheless, it is disheartening that such remarks should come from the President of one of America's major universities. It shows that our society still has a long way to go in dispelling prejudice.

I am sure that you and the university's trustees have also received quite a number of letters detailing at some length the story of Poland as source of a world-class culture, a distinguished democratic tradition, courageous soldiers who have fought consistently for freedom for themselves and others and an unparalleled contribution to the history of liberty and human dignity in our time, through the efforts of heroes such as John Paul II and Lech Walesa.

Many of those who have written have asked for redress in the form of greater attention to the history of Poland and Polish Americans in courses and programs at The Ohio State University. Such projects would indeed help the people of Ohio better appreciate the contribution of Poland to world civilization and to give students a valuable historical and cultural perspective on universal issues such as human dignity, the price of liberty, and the various dimensions of tolerance, pluralism and non-violence. The Piast Institute heartily supports such a program, which is at the heart of its mission.

Nevertheless, such a program no matter how far reaching, will be of limited success unless it also addresses deep-seated negative images of Poles and Poland that lie buried in our culture. It will be hard for most people to even hear, let alone incorporate more positive images of Poland and Poles until these are attacked and extirpated. As Malgorzata Warchol-Schlottmann pointed out in her study of stereotypes of Poles in German culture ''Positive personal experiences or empirical knowledge of Poland did not modify the stereotypical images''. On the basis of my experience, I believe that the same is true of American culture.

I do not think that you picked the image of incompetent Polish soldiers shooting at each other at random out of thin air. It would have left your listeners puzzled if you had chosen 'The Norwegian army'' as your example. You were drawing, certainly without deep reflection, perhaps ever reflexively on deeply embedded negative images of Poles and Poland in American culture.

These stereotypes took shape in Europe in the 18th century as part of propaganda by Prussia, Russia and Austria to justify their unprecedented partition of Poland and the destruction of the Polish constitution. They were later used to justify Nazi genocide against Poles. Those images were transmitted to America in the 19th century and became a distinct American bigotry in response to the large influx to Polish immigrants. Those stereotypes still exist and have power. This is clear from the fact that a President of a major American university could invoke them so unthinkingly and cavalierly.

I would hope that any program to provide redress would also include a mandate to examine the character and roots of anti-Polonism in courses and special programs designed to deal with racism, bigotry and prejudice in American Society. The Piast Institute, which is a national research and policy institute, would be pleased to assist in curriculum development and materials for such classes and programs.

We maintain close ties with the Polish community in Ohio and have worked with them on educational and cultural programs as well as providing demographic analysis of the Polish American population in Cleveland and Akron. The work of the Institute on such projects as our national survey of 1,400 Polish American leaders published as Polish Americans Today (2010) and our work in preparing curricula for the genocide curriculum in the California schools and for the National Catholic Holocaust Education Center at Seton Hill College has given us unparalleled recognition in Polish American communities and among their leaders. I also served for eight years as President of St. Mary's College founded by Polish immigrants and for many years a national center for Polish studies in the U.S.

I look forward to working with you and the university to turn this unfortunate event into a positive project to lessen prejudice and create a genuine pluralism at Ohio State as well as to build bridges to the half a million Polish Americans who live in Ohio and the 10 million Polish Americans in the United States.

Sincerely yours,

THADDEUS C. RADZILOWSKI, Ph.D.,
President.

FISCAL DISCIPLINE

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Obama asked Congress for $1.2 trillion in additional borrowing authority, and today Congress has the opportunity to respond to the President's request. Since the President took office, the national debt has increased $4.6 trillion. The current Federal debt now exceeds the U.S. gross domestic product, and our Federal Government is borrowing more than 30 cents of every dollar it spends. In recent years, that has been as high as 40 cents of every dollar it spends.

The President's most recent request for a $1.2 trillion increase will bring the debt limit to $16.394 trillion. Yet despite this fiscal outlook, Admiral Mullen, the recently retired Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has rightly called the national debt ''the single-biggest threat to our national security.'' President Obama and some in Congress still refuse to make the difficult, long-term spending choices necessary to begin restoring fiscal discipline to the Federal budget.

The President publicly opposed a balanced budget amendment, an idea about which Thomas Jefferson said, ''I would be willing to depend on that alone for the reduction of the administration of our government.''

The House of Representatives, in a majority fashion, passed a balanced budget amendment late last year. Unfortunately, it did not receive a two-thirds vote here, as the Constitution requires; and I hope we can revisit that issue.

President Obama has failed to put forth a credible budget plan that reins in runaway Federal entitlement spending. It is the single-biggest contributor toward our long-term fiscal problems.

When the President releases his budget proposal for fiscal year 2013 in a few weeks, he has another opportunity to propose real spending caps and entitlement program reforms. I hope he will seize the opportunity to do so.

I commend to the President's attention and to the administration's attention, for example, Chairman RYAN's budget proposals, and we would like to work in good faith with the administration and with the President to make sure that we move forward in a fiscally responsible way.

But today's debate, Mr. Speaker, is about leadership and making tough choices. The Governor of the State of New Jersey, my friend Chris Christie, said last year, ''Leadership, today in America, has to be about doing the big things.'' When given the opportunity to lead on issues concerning levels of spending, debt, and deficits, I urge President Obama to join with us in doing the big things to make sure that we can get our fiscal house in order, a glide path back toward fiscal responsibility for balancing our budget over time.

We need to restore that fiscal discipline in Washington instead of choosing the fiscally perilous path of more spending, larger annual deficits, and mounting debt. The next generation will have to pay back this debt. It is a tremendous burden on young people, and it will sap our strength in the continuing competition of the United States with the nations around the world, including, for example, China and India.

Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the President's request for an additional $1.2 trillion in spending. I hope that we can work together with the administration on this fundamental issue, the issue that confronts the Nation's fiscal responsibility. And may the United States be restored to fiscal responsibility so that future generations might succeed, as generations have succeeded generation in and generation out, the great promise of the American Nation.

MORE THAN LIP SERVICE: HELPING OUR VETERANS FIND JOBS

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is now in the 124th consecutive month of war. And while those of us privileged to serve in this body enjoyed time back home with our families for the holidays, there is no such holiday break for our servicemembers who are serving in harm's way.

□ 1050

Thousands of American families had a permanently empty seat around their table this holiday season because a son or daughter or mother or father was killed in one of these senseless wars that we've been fighting.

I would note as a bit of an aside, Mr. Speaker, how ironic it is that 2 days ago we celebrated a Federal holiday named for a man who was a proud and principled pacifist, who believed in the moral power of nonviolent resistance. Martin Luther King once said, ''A nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual doom.''

Mr. Speaker, it's time we paid more than lip service to his dream; it's time we started living it.

It's time also that we paid more than lip service to our veterans who are returning home from Iraq and Afghanistan. These men and women who have courageously sacrificed so much for us are coming home to an economy that seems to have no place for them.

Yes, we're in the grips of a devastating job crisis that's affecting just about every community and every group in the United States, but veterans of the Afghanistan and Iraq wars are feeling the squeeze disproportionately. Even as the job numbers have picked up some for the rest of economy, because it has rallied slightly, veterans are slipping further behind.

Overall, unemployment dropped to 8½ percent in December for our country. But for veterans who've served since September 2001, the jobless rate is a staggering 13.1 percent. Is this

what we call a hero's welcome? Is this how our Nation shows its gratitude? Closing this gap must be at the top of our 2012 calendar.

There has been some progress. For example, in November, Congress passed and the President signed the Vow to Hire Heroes Act, which provides tax credits to employers who hire veterans. But, Mr. Speaker, we need to do much, much more because unless we take bold action, this problem is going to get much worse before it gets any better as the war in Iraq and, hopefully, the war in Afghanistan winds down and even more returning troops flood the jobs market.

We know what to do. There's no question. We need more job training. We need more technical assistance so that these skilled young people can find the work they need. We need more career counseling and job fairs. We need to increase our investment in veterans' housing initiatives. How about helping veterans become entrepreneurs by starting their own businesses? And basically, we need more jobs in this country.

We must not pinch pennies on veterans. We must not pinch pennies on their health care, and we must make sure that wounded veterans aren't victimized by job discrimination.

So let's get creative here. Let's put our money where our mouth is. If we can spend billions of dollars every month on wars, then certainly we can spend a fraction of that to help the Americans who fought those wars. When they come home they should have a seamless transition back to civilian life.

These wars have already taken too much from all of us, from our country. We can't let them also destroy the job prospects and the successful futures of the people who served so bravely on the front lines. It's time to bring our troops home and, at the same time, provide them with the jobs they need to support their families.

WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED ABOUT THE CONSTITUTION FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, PART I

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the United States Constitution is the law of the land. It must be followed in the spirit and in the letter of the law.

Article II, in section 2, gives the Executive authority to appoint certain public ministers with advice and consent of the U.S. Senate. When the Senate is in recess, the Executive can make temporary appointments until the end of that legislative session.

See, the Constitution envisions cooperation by the Executive with the Senate over naming persons to offices that rule over the people of America. Both the Executive and the Senate must agree prior to an official appointment.

The Senate, within their legal prerogative, has been blocking three NLRB appointments and the appointment of the head of the new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

However, ignoring the Senate, the Executive appointed these people anyway. He declared the Senate was in recess when he made such appointments. But was it?

Well, constitutional experts disagree. The Senate was in a pro forma session. One reason they were in pro forma session was to prevent recess appointments by the executive branch. During pro forma sessions, the Senate can do business and meet another constitutional requirement to not be in recess without permission of the House of Representatives.

More from the Constitution. Article I, section 5 says no Chamber, the House or the Senate, can recess for more than 3 days without the approval of the other Chamber. The House did not and even could not agree to a recess of the Senate because the Senate was in session, not in a recess.

The Executive's claim that the Senate was in a recess is flawed because the House did not consent to any Senate recess. Thus, the Senate legally had to still be in session until the House agreed to a recess under our Constitution.

Furthermore, Congress determines when it's in recess, not the executive branch.

There is more evidence the Senate was in session. The Executive says the pro forma session was not a real session but a recess, so, thus, the recess appointments. However, during this pro forma session, the Senate passed legislation. The controversial payroll tax extension law became law signed by the Executive.

If the Senate was in recess, as the Executive claims, then it seems the payroll extension law is null and void. Why? Because Congress cannot pass legislation unless it's actually in session.

However, the opposite is true. Since the payroll tax law was passed during this pro forma session, and the appointments were made during this pro forma session, the appointments are null and void. They violate the letter and spirit of the Constitution. They were made without confirmation of the Senate. These were not recess appointments because the Senate was in session.

The Executive cannot have it both ways. The Executive cannot use linguistic gimmicks to redefine the words ''recess'' and ''session'' to his own liking, just so he can have it his way. The letter and spirit of the Constitution have been bruised and violated by his actions.

The Constitution must be followed, whether one agrees with what it says or not. Even if the Executive wins his argument, which is legally and logically flawed, he has ignored the framework of the Constitution, which is built on Executive cooperation with Congress.

The Executive went his own way. And that's just the way it is.

CELEBRATING THE 70TH BIRTHDAY OF MUHAMMAD ALI

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 17, Muhammad Ali became 70 years old, so I rise to salute the champ and to wish him a happy birthday.

Ali has taken a lot of hard licks during his lifetime, but has always gotten up and has always maintained his dignity. Ali lived in and spent a great deal of time in Chicago. He attended events, went to meetings, and was part of community life. Therefore, I got to know him quite well.

A few years ago, after he had become ill with Parkinson's Syndrome, I sat next to Ali at a community banquet, and he was having difficulty holding on to his food and eating. The person on the other side of him was trying to help. Ali was becoming more and more irritated and finally, in a polite but firm manner, said, Thanks, but please leave me alone, I can do this, and he did. And I think that's characteristic of his life.

Born Cassius Clay, Ali converted to Islam, became a Muslim, and changed his name. Ali took hits from individuals and fans who disagreed with this position.

□ 1100

Initially categorized as not qualified to serve in the military because of poor performance on a Selective Service exam, Ali is then reclassified. But in April of 1967, he refused induction into the Army. He is tagged a draft dodger and stripped of his championship and barred from boxing. He is ultimately permitted to return.

As he worked his way toward the title shot at Sonny Liston, there are rumors that the fight might be canceled because of his emerging relationship with Malcolm X and the Nation of Islam. However, the fight does take place. Cassius Clay wins, and a month later, the honorable Elijah Muhammad gives Clay a new name: Muhammad Ali.

Ernie Terrell, a friend of mine, who graduated from high school with my wife and was a heavyweight champion, refused to address Ali by his new name, and Ali whipped him soundly and taunted him by asking him continuously, ''What's my name? What's my name?''

Muhammad Ali is known as ''The Greatest'' to most people for his electrifying style in the boxing ring. But others might call him ''The Greatest'' for his continued humanitarian efforts outside the world of boxing. Since his retirement in 1981, he has gone on to do great things to help out the less fortunate and disenfranchised people throughout the world.

In 1991, he traveled to Iraq during the Gulf War and met with Saddam Hussein in an effort to negotiate the release of American hostages. On January 8, 2005, Muhammad Ali was presented with the Presidential Citizens Medal by President George W. Bush. He has received the Spirit of America Award calling him the most recognized American in the world. He has also been to Afghanistan as a U.N. Messenger of Peace.

One of his most recent accomplishments has been the creation of the $60 million nonprofit Muhammad Ali Center opened in downtown Louisville. This center was opened to reflect Mr. Ali's core values of peace, social responsibility, respect, and personal growth. These are the values that have made Muhammad Ali the great man he is today, and it's those values that should not be forgotten. Instead, they should be passed down to future generations.

So I say: Happy birthday, Mr. Champ, and thanks for what you have meant and continue to mean to millions of people throughout the world.

NO BUDGET

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

Mr. DENHAM. This month is the 35th consecutive month under this administration's economic policies where we're over 8 percent unemployment. If you look at an area like mine in California's central valley, we have been double that for that same time period.

Sixteen to 20 percent unemployment is unacceptable. We need to be pushing policies that will change this, not only for the central valley but across the entire Nation.

Now, I'm a small business owner, and I will tell you from my perspective, the trillion dollar stimulus package, the government takeover of health care, the Dodd-Frank bill, are all things that have created uncertainty in my business.

But in the central valley, I'm also a farmer. And as a farmer, regulations like the dust act that creates uncertainties where we're not allowed to have dust in a farming scenario, I can't shake the almonds off my almond trees. I can't even grow almonds in the central valley. I can't put a plow into the ground because tilling the dirt will create dust. The regulations of uncertainty keep jobs from being created in the central valley.

As well as water. Without water, we cannot grow the crops that we need to feed the rest of the Nation or the rest of the world. The water and the regulations that prohibit the water from getting to our farms create the uncertainty year in and year out.

But looking long term, we need to have the policies that allow us to have off-stream storage that will have greater water storage, greater certainty so that we know we're going to have a consistent flow of water throughout California's central valley year in and year out.

Once again, we would call on the President. It's fine to come to our great State and visit L.A. and San Francisco, even visit a coastline in San Diego, but California's central valley—the bread basket of the world—where we're creating greater agricultural commodities than many other regions not only in the United States but across the world, we would ask the President to come and understand the uniqueness of the central valley and some of the battles that we face.

This also comes at a time where next week we're going to see the 1,000th day since we've had a budget, the most fundamental responsibility of the Federal Government, of the President, of Congress, without a budget. This is going to be a President that fails to have a budget in his entire first term. A thousand days is coming quickly. And that same type of uncertainty, whether it's a business that is forced to have a budget every year or a family that is forced to have a budget, our Federal Government needs to have a budget as well.

I think that we need to look at the bottom line of getting both Houses of Congress to work together. Whether it's job creation or actually having a budget, it's incumbent on both Houses to work together and find solutions.

Now, I'm one Member that is providing a solution dealing with our Civilian Property Realignment Act, selling the things that we just don't need, utilizing properties like the post office right down the street here that costs us $6½ million every year to maintain yet sits vacant for well over a decade. We have many people who want to redevelop it; 150 jobs just in redeveloping that one site, another 150 jobs ongoing once that site is redeveloped. Now, isn't that a bipartisan solution that not only solves a problem with bringing in revenue but also getting rid of the cost of something that just is not needed, a cost that we don't need to bear the expense of?

At the same time, if you want new tax revenue, let's put it back on the tax rolls or find a bipartisan solution where we can come together, get Republicans and Democrats, the House and the Senate to agree on something that will create jobs, that will cut the cost of doing business and bring in new revenues.

It is time that the Senate works with the House. We have 27 bills sitting over there that deal with job creation, all aspects, whether it's the credit and financial markets or making sure that we're cutting regulations to end some of the challenges that we're facing in the central valley, but we have to get both Houses to work together.

We would call on the President. Visit California's central valley. Prepare a budget that can be passed by both Houses. This country is hurting right now, and we need real leadership that will bridge that gap.

CONGRATULATIONS, ALABAMA

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

Mr. CASSIDY. In the challenge that we have in creating jobs, every now and then we have a lighthearted moment. Congresswoman SEWELL, who represents Tuscaloosa, and I made a challenge to each other over the BCS championship game. I'm here to pay off my end of the challenge.

First, let me congratulate LSU. They had a tremendous season. They played nine ranked teams. Four of those games were against those that were in the top three in the polls. Coach Les Miles was Coach of the Year. There were four positions on the All-America Team held by LSU Tigers, two on the second team. It was a tremendous season for the fans as well.

That said, I also congratulate Alabama. They similarly had a great year. They are to be congratulated. They came back from their earlier defeat where LSU beat them at Bryant-Denny Stadium and stayed focused and got revenge on LSU in the BCS.

I would also say to Congresswoman SEWELL, she was incredibly gracious in paying off our arrangement then. I enjoyed those Tuscaloosa ribs. I also will thank Congressman PAUL BROUN, who, when LSU beat Georgia, was similarly gracious.

Now I hope to be as gracious as they and pay off my arrangement with Congresswoman SEWELL before we return to this serious business of Congress, and that is to say on the floor of the House of Representatives, Roll Tide.

□ 1110

REPEALING SECTION 1021 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a very simple piece of legislation: to repeal the infamous section 1021 of the National Defense Authorization Act, which was quietly signed into law by the President on New Year's Day. What a way to usher in the new year.

Section 1021 essentially codifies into law the very dubious claim of Presidential authority under the 2001 authorization for the use of military force to indefinitely detain American citizens without access to legal representation or due process of law. Section 1021 provides for the possibility of the U.S. military acting as a kind of police force on U.S. soil, apprehending terror suspects, including Americans, and whisking them off to an undisclosed location indefinitely.

No right to attorney.

No right to trial.

No day in court.

This is precisely the kind of egregious distortion of justice that Americans have always ridiculed in so many

dictatorships overseas. A great man named Solzhenitsyn became the hero of so many of us when he exposed the Soviet Union's extensive gulag system. Is this really the kind of a United States we want to create in the name of fighting terrorism?

Some have argued that nothing in section 1021 explicitly mandates holding Americans without trial, but it employs vague language, radically expanding the detention authority to include anyone who has ''substantially supported'' certain terrorist groups or ''associated forces.'' No one has defined what those terms mean. What is an ''associated force''?

Sadly, too many of my colleagues are too willing to undermine our Constitution to support such outrageous legislation. One Senator even said about American citizens being picked up under this section of the NDAA, ''When they say, 'I want my lawyer,' you tell them, 'Shut up. You don't get a lawyer.'" Is this acceptable in someone who has taken an oath to uphold the Constitution?

Mr. Speaker, of course I recognize how critical it is that we identify and apprehend those who are suspected of plotting attacks against Americans; but why do we have so little faith in our judicial system? Have we not tried in civilian court and won convictions of hundreds of individuals for terrorist or related activities? I fully support continuing to do so, but let us not abandon what is so unique and special about our system of government in the process.

I hope my colleagues will join my effort to overturn this shameful section, 1021, of the National Defense Authorization Act.

A NATION UNIFIED

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me join with my colleagues to wish some of our distinguished Americans a happy birthday in this month, but more importantly, let me acknowledge and salute both Muhammad Ali and First Lady Michelle Obama in celebrating their birthdays this month.

I've listened to my colleagues speak about the question of job creation, and they're absolutely right. As Democrats, we've come back to do nothing but to ensure the passage of the payroll tax decrease for working Americans and, as well, to be able to provide for jobs for this country and our communities. My constituents have spoken loudly and clearly, so I have several points, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to make today. Some of them wind back to the culture and how we work together.

First of all, I'm hoping that as a member of the Judiciary Committee here in the House we'll have an opportunity to look seriously at the SOPA legislation and find a compromise. I've worked on the issues of piracy from the time late-Chairman Henry Hyde served on that committee, and I am concerned about it. But in this new world of startups and technology that is beyond many times our comprehension, it is important to ensure that we do not falsely or inappropriately shut down sites or stop businesses from thriving. There must be a compromise. I am prepared to be at the table of discussion to save jobs.

The U.S. is losing high-tech jobs to Asia. In fact, the United States lost more than a quarter of its high-tech manufacturing jobs during the past decade as U.S.-based multinational companies placed a growing percentage of their R&D overseas. I am here to fight for that R&D to come back. I, frankly, believe those are the jobs of the 21st century and that it is time for us to fight for those jobs to come back.

Mr. Speaker, we can do many things together. That happens to be one, and I hope to encourage the high-tech industry and others to join me as we proceed with roundtable discussions to see how we can impact all of our communities, those communities that have unemployment at the highest levels. We know that there are jobs in the high-tech industry, not only in the famous Silicon Valley in California, but in places around the Nation. Houston, Texas, is looking with complete and great excitement at the potential of building our biotech and, of course, technology sectors more and more and more. Let's save those jobs.

I want to move to something that is quite contrary to what I've just mentioned, but the reason I started with something on which we could work together is because I'm concerned. In this element of political campaigns, this atmosphere, I have no challenge with the First Amendment and with those who are trying to encourage individuals to vote and to vote for them. But I rise today in the backdrop of the commemoration of Dr. King's birthday, which really speaks to all Americans' hearts.

No matter what your background, Dr. King spoke of peace, nonviolence, and harmony in this country. I love that. I am a product of that. I was educated by way of opportunities that had not been given to my parents. Yet we find candidates like Newt Gingrich who simply want to throw fuel on the fire of racial divide to develop sort of an explosiveness in this country that is unnecessary.

To suggest that President Obama is the ''food stamp President'' has underlying suggestions. To be able to say that the idea of substituting a New York janitor who makes $37,000 and put a bunch of kids to work—the New York school district is predominantly minority, Latino and African American—is by its very words divisive and destructive. And to insinuate that poor communities and minority children have never seen people get up, go to work and work hard—come to my district and see people getting up in the early morning hours, single parents working hard to create opportunities for their children.

Mr. Gingrich, I know you. You are better than that, and if not, America is better than that. I am incensed by your words.

Mr. PAUL, our colleague, another candidate who is running for President, has a series of newsletters that have already been appalling to those of us who cannot understand why racial divisiveness has to be at the core of Presidential politics. Now we understand that there is a comparison in these newsletters about 13-year-old African American boys: that they are wild and unmanageable. If you say that about our children, they will come to believe it.

I am literally appalled that our Presidential politics, Mr. Speaker, has to be grounded in racial divisiveness. Dr. King wants us as a Nation to be unified. I call upon the Presidential candidates to get out of the dungeon and to rise to your higher angels on behalf of the American people—speak of unity not divisiveness. Our troops fight for all of us, and for justice and equality for all.

JOBS FOR YOUNG AMERICANS

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, when I had the privilege of serving in this House for the first time in the 1980s, I joined with many of my colleagues in supporting the creation of the Martin Luther King, Junior holiday. I recall the time because we had twice before defeated the proposition based on fiscal concerns. I, in fact, had voted against it on one occasion and then had reflected further on it and thought that it perhaps was more important that we have a single holiday that celebrated the consensus that had been obtained on civil rights, the consensus in this country that we should take positive action to assure that all men and all women were recognized as being created equal and having opportunity in this society.

□ 1120

I thought this consensus on civil rights was embodied in the person of Dr. Martin Luther King and thought it was important for all Americans, young and old, to be able to reflect on that and to have a period of time for that reflection and that we could learn from the mistakes of the past and also the sacrifices of the past as we went forward.

Now, having said that, I must take exception to a characterization of the comments of one of our Presidential candidates, a former colleague and my friend, Newt Gingrich, when he was trying to make a very, very important point. Too often, those of us in government take credit for programs that

give things to people that is largesse from the government to individuals rather than understanding the genius of our system, which is the opportunity for people to rise to the best of their abilities to become as good as God created them to be, and that there is no greater social welfare program or social program than a job. That's a cliche at times but it is, in fact, an important statement.

The point that Newt Gingrich was making was that we should not revel in the fact that we have more people on food stamps than ever before, even though that has been promoted by some as evidence of our compassion. What Mr. Gingrich suggested is we ought not to be beating our breasts in pride about our compassion. We ought to be looking inward about our inability to create opportunity for our fellow men and women in this society. The point he made is that it is far better that we create an economic environment in which men and women, young and old, have an opportunity to experience the satisfaction of a job well done.

As Newt Gingrich said, his daughter's first job was as a janitor in their Baptist church in Georgia, and he said while that was not to which she aspired as a long-term goal, it was, in fact, the launching point of her job experience. Too often we have knocked out the lower rungs of the ladder of economic success in a manner which has created frustration, disappointment, and a lack of confidence in our young people today.

That was the point that former Speaker Gingrich made. It is a point well made. It is a point that we should contemplate. It is a point that we should recognize and place within our debate today. And to mischaracterize it as somehow having an underlying racial meaning demeans the level of debate on this floor, the level of debate in the Presidential campaigns, and frankly, the reality that confronts too many of our people today.

I represent a district that has higher unemployment than the national average, higher unemployment than the statewide average in California, which has for too long a period of time been, I think, the third worst unemployment rate in the country. We need to work harder on creating an economic environment in which the uncertainty imposed by the government is reduced so that those men and women of genius and hard work and inspiration and creativity can continue to make this the most vibrant, robust, economic engine in the history of the world.

That is the way that we help all in our society, men and women, black and white, Hispanic, people of every color, not by questioning motivations but by, in fact, facing the truth.

EVEN WITH WARNING SIGNS, BERNANKE FAILED TO SOUND THE ALARM

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, our economy today continues to suffer after shocks from the biggest financial meltdown since the Great Depression. Today we understand a series of mistakes were made in the past decade which led to our current financial crisis.

Now the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, FCIC, was given the task to investigate the causes of the meltdown of our financial institutions. Though the commission was unsuccessful in reaching a certain consensus of the exact cause, they did, however, conclude that the financial crisis was avoidable and was the result of the following factors, an explosion in risky subprime lending, an unsustainable rise in housing prices, widespread reports of egregious and predatory lending practices, dramatic increases in household mortgage debt, and exponential growth in financial firms' trading activities, unregulated derivatives, and short-term repo lending markets, just among a few of the red flags. Surely with all those factors Chairman Bernanke should have been more concerned.

In fact, the title of my speech this morning is, ''Even with Warning Signs, Bernanke Failed to Sound the Alarm.'' In fact, he was warned by members of the Federal Reserve Board often. The release of transcripts from the Federal Open Market Committee, FOMC, meetings in 2006 shed light on the critical failures of the Federal Reserve and Mr. Bernanke to act when the warning signs were clear and present. The first meeting, however, was spent praising Bernanke's predecessor, outgoing Federal Chairman Alan Greenspan. But the FCIC later concluded that 30 years of deregulation and reliance on self-regulation by financial institutions that was championed by Mr. Greenspan were the factors in devastating the stability of our Nation's market, stripping away safeguards that simply could have avoided this catastrophe.

Now in a later meeting on May 10, 2006, of the FOMC, then Fed Governor Susan Bies was one of the earliest to raise concern over the Nation's mortgage sector, which offered exotic loans that increased household debt over time instead of decreasing it. Now, specifically, her concerns stem from the absence of home equity growth, and the consumer's ability to absorb the uncertainties of the housing market. Listen to Mr. Bernanke's response when she made her declaration. ''So far we are seeing, at worst, an orderly decline in the housing market; but there is still, I think, a lot to be seen as to whether the housing market will decline slowly or more quickly.''

Yet again another colleague, then Fed Vice Chairwoman Janet Yellen, warns of the possibility of ''an unwelcome housing slump.'' But in the meeting of August 8, 2006, Chairman Bernanke remains hopeful in his prediction for a ''soft landing'' for our economy. Need I say the 2008 Great Recession was not a soft landing? In the September meeting, the Feds still remained oblivious to the detrimental effects in the housing market that will affect the rest of the economy.

In the last meeting, Mr. Speaker, of the FOMC, Fed Governor Bies again, in December 2006, stated once again her concern of the housing market, stating that mortgages securitized in the past few years warrants additional risk than the investors have been focusing on. Despite the concerns that reported increased difficulty getting mortgages in their region, as well as a noticeable cool down in housing activity, Mr. Bernanke fails to see the warning signs and, again, predicts a soft landing on December 12, 2006, once again. This was his second statement of a soft landing in the same year.

It was the failure of Mr. Bernanke to not pursue possible vulnerabilities and assuring us to the contrary that attributed to the economic crisis that we faced. On February 15, 2007, he stated ''Overall economic prospects for households remains good. The labor market is expected to stay healthy. And real incomes should continue to rise. The business sector remains in excellent financial condition.'' Again, on March 28, 2007, he stated, ''The impact on the broader economy and financial markets of the problems in the subprime markets seems likely to be contained.'' Even on May 17, 2007, despite concerns raised by Fed Governor Bies again, he said, ''We do not expect significant spillovers from the subprime market to the rest of the economy or to the financial system.'' How wrong he was. But all of the dire warning signs were there.

At Bernanke's confirmation hearing in the Senate Banking Committee, he conceded to the notion that the central bank ''should have done more.'' That's an understatement. The Fed had the authority and necessary power to prevent further abuses happening in the financial industry, but simply chose to ignore critical warning signs. Bernanke agrees he missed the warning signs, but thinks he can prevent a further crisis. Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that he, being Chairman, is going to prevent a further crisis and, frankly, I'm sure he failed to sound the alarm of the 2008 Great Recession.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Loving and Gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask today that You bless the Members of this assembly, to be the best and the most faithful servants of the people they serve. Purify their intentions, that they will say what they believe and act consistent with their words.

Help them, indeed help us all, to be honest with themselves, so that they will be concerned not only with how their words and deeds are weighed by others, but also with how their words and deeds affect the lives of those in need and those who look to them for support, help, strength, and leadership.

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

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HAHN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

KEYSTONE XL

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, before Congress left Washington in December, we asked the President a simple question: Will he stop blocking the Keystone XL pipeline?

Congress established laws to govern pipeline approval; the State Department published regulations; and typically, approval takes 18 to 24 months. However, Keystone has been sitting on the shelf for more than 40 months now. The President, ignoring standard procedures, ordered duplicative environmental reviews that would extend the approval process to more than 52 months.

Is this because Keystone is unprecedented? No. TransCanada has already built and operates a pipeline that crosses the U.S. border. Additionally, thousands of pipelines already crisscross the proposed route.

The difference is the political pressure brought by extreme environmental groups. Politics is blocking tens of thousands of new jobs. Politics is blocking a reliable new source of energy. It's time to stop letting politics stand in the way of a project that could help grow our economy.

STREAMLINING GOVERNMENT

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

Ms. HOCHUL. Mr. Speaker, over the last few weeks, I have traveled constantly throughout my 26th District of New York, meeting business owners and talking to them about the challenges that they are facing in this particular economic climate. Right now, they are frustrated with the various levels of government they have to go through to get an answer out of their Federal Government. It has become so burdensome that there are actually 80 different economic development agencies, four different departments, and in fact, there are 47 different job training programs. These businesses have enough on their minds and have enough challenges before them without having to solve this problem.

Fortunately, the President has come up with a plan. Last week, President Obama proposed consolidating six various entities into one, a one-stop shop for businesses, for trade so that they can get their questions answered without having complications. This is something I support, my local Chambers of Commerce support, and that's why I'm calling on this body: Let's take up this plan. Let's give the people in my district—a Republican district, I might add—what they're looking for. Streamline our government, reduce the cost of government, save taxpayer dollars, a one-stop shop for our businesses; and once and for all, let's demonstrate to the American people that we have the capability to work together.

NEW YEAR, NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR 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, in early 2009, the President assured the Nation that with the passage of his stimulus bill, which has failed, the borrowing and spending would reduce unemployment and that it would not exceed 8 percent. January marks the 35th straight month that the Nation's unemployment rate has remained above 8 percent.

Last year, House Republicans followed through with their commitment to the American people and passed 28 job-creating bills, most with bipartisan support. All of these pieces of legislation remain stalled in the liberal-controlled Senate, where bills are denied debate or a vote.

Because of the gridlock in the Senate and the President's failed policies, the American people are losing faith in government officials. As we begin a new year, I hope the Senate will take immediate action for the American people by passing legislation that promotes jobs.

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

CONGRESS AND THE ECONOMY

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

Ms. CHU. I came here today wanting to wish everybody a happy new year. But when I came, I found out that our Republican Congress wanted to give everybody an unhappy old year, continuing last year's agenda of no jobs for you. They ended last year not with a bang, but a whimper, as they walked out on a deal to stop a tax hike on the middle class right before the holidays. Even though Senate Republicans had agreed to a compromise, House Republicans were willing to abandon you, just as you were trying to figure out how to pay for gifts for your children.

They were serious about letting the payroll tax and unemployment benefits expire. Thank goodness you expressed your outrage and they were forced to change their position. They gave a 2-month extension. Now in just over a month, they'll be faced with the same choice: to raise taxes for the middle class or finally work together with Democrats to give real relief to Americans like you. Make sure they do the right thing.

GRATITUDE FOR THE WELL-WISHES

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, last month I was a sick pup. This month, I am a recovering pup. During my sick pup days, I became the beneficiary of cards and letters from well-wishers, personal visits, telephone calls, and emails. Many of these expressions originated here in the people's House. And the purpose of my 1-minute today is to convey my expression of appreciation to my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, for their generous support during that period.

LET'S INVEST IN AMERICA

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, it's 2012; and this is the year we need to create jobs and get our economy moving again. Without a growing economy, our budget deficit will only get worse. It's time that we boldly invest in America.

My friends on the Democratic side want to invest in education and infrastructure, creating jobs now and building our future. My Republican friends, on the other hand, want to cut spending on Social Security and Medicare. The Democrats want the wealthiest of Americans to pay their fair share, and my friends on the Republican side oppose even asking the wealthiest Americans to pay their fair share.

We need to make the right choices this year. Let's invest in America.

□ 1210

IN MEMORY OF SPECIALIST CHRISTOPHER PATTERSON

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of Specialist Christopher Patterson.

Christopher, a 2009 graduate of West Aurora High School in Illinois, came from a military family. He joined the National Guard while studying music education at Valparaiso University, but in his own words, he didn't join the Guard just for money for school. He joined to serve his country. His conviction to serve was so strong that he chose to join his Guard unit overseas when they were sent to Afghanistan, even though he could have stayed behind to continue his studies.

Just 3 weeks ago, Christopher and three other soldiers were working in the Kandahar province of Afghanistan to clear combat routes for convoys to pass through when an IED detonated and took his life.

Today we honor Christopher and the ultimate sacrifice he paid for our country and give our thoughts and prayers to his family and friends during this difficult time. We are, and will remain, eternally grateful for Christopher's service and sacrifice to our country.

HEALTHY SCHOOLS PROGRAM IN WEST NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the West New York, New Jersey, School District for their efforts to promote nutrition and physical education at school as part of the Healthy Schools Program.

Last week, President Clinton visited PS #2 in West New York to praise the Board of Education for its efforts in transforming the school system's nutritional program. This was part of the Alliance for a Healthy Schools Program to reduce childhood obesity. During his visit, President Clinton was able to see firsthand how the school has embraced nutrition and wellness.

West New York has a history of being recognized by the Alliance for nutritional achievement. PS #2 received a Bronx National Recognition Award in 2009 and a Silver National Recognition Award in 2010 for their efforts to provide students with a fresher, more nutritional meal plan.

In 2010, my high school alma mater, Memorial High School, received the first and only Gold National Recognition Award given by the Alliance. And last October, the Alliance awarded Sal Valenza, the food service director of West New York, the distinction of the Healthy Schools Program Champion.

I am honored to represent a school district that emphasizes healthy lifestyles, and I am pleased that West New York has been recognized for their efforts.

FEATHER CREEK FLOODING

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to light a problem that's facing my constituents in Clinton, Indiana. Feather Creek floods over 100 times per year, damaging the same homes year after year. In 2008, many of the homes filled completely with water, leaving only their roofs to be recognizable.

The Army Corps of Engineers has been working on the project for many years, including numerous environmental studies and surveys of the land, but the flooding does continue. The Army Corps, to their credit, held a town hall last week in Clinton, where they heard from over 300 residents about the damage this flooding has been causing them for decades. The estimated cost of the project is $900,000.

I do appreciate the willingness of the Army Corps of Engineers, specifically, Colonel Leonard, to meet with my staff and constituents, and I urge the Corps to remember what they heard in Clinton, Indiana, last week and complete the Feather Creek project as quickly as possible. My constituents deserve no less than a safe environment, free from the threats of yearly floods.

BUFFALO BILLS BLACKOUTS

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss an issue of great importance to western New York, the Buffalo Bills.

The Bills have one of the most dedicated fan bases of any football franchise in the entire country. Since 1960, Bills fans have embraced and supported the team, both emotionally and financially. Today, the Buffalo Bills franchise is an integral part of the New York State economy. But harsh blackout provisions threaten New Yorkers' ability to watch their team on television.

The blackout rule requires that a stadium be sold out 72 hours in advance in order to broadcast a football game locally. In Buffalo, this means that, in order to avoid a blackout, the Bills must sell more tickets than the league average in one of the league's smallest markets. Last year, almost half of the Bills' home games were blacked out. This is unacceptable.

This morning I sent a letter to the FCC Chairman asking that he eliminate this unfair rule, which does not provide for individual solutions to different local markets. The FCC has opened a public comment period on this matter, and I urge fans who feel similarly to do the same. In the meantime, I will continue this fight.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the White House announced that it was going to reject the Keystone XL pipeline. The White House did this among a backdrop with record high gas prices in January. A major factor in these high gas prices is the continued political upheaval in the Middle East and the impact that it's having on economic uncertainty around the world.

Keystone would bring nearly a million barrels of oil from our friendly neighbor, Canada, to the north and also up to 100,000 barrels of oil from the Bakken discoveries in Montana and North Dakota. It would also put more Americans to work while improving our energy security.

The Department of Energy has stated that ''gasoline prices in all markets served by the gulf coast and east coast refiners would decrease'' as a result of the pipeline's construction.

The White House would be well-advised to consider a poll that I took in

a recent tele-town hall of our constituents, where 87 percent of the constituents said that they strongly supported the Keystone XL pipeline.

We cannot wait for more jobs and for better economic certainty for all generations.

SUPPORT THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline. I ask that the President reconsider his reported rejection of this project. This project will increase employment while reducing our dependence on overseas oil.

Canada has already made its decision. The pipeline is going to be built. The question is whether it lands on the gulf coast of the United States or the west coast of Canada. And make no mistake: If it ends up on Canada's coast, that oil will only continue westward to China and their markets. The jobs and the economic benefit of the pipeline would then be lost here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this pipeline is a foregone conclusion; who will benefit is not. This is a chance to employ Americans and help protect them in a volatile oil market.

I ask the President to reconsider his reported rejection of this project.

IT'S A ''NO'' TO KEYSTONE?

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is disturbing news today regarding our national security and economic security. Politico reports that the administration will say ''no'' to the Keystone XL pipeline today. So ''no'' to thousands of union and nonunion jobs to build the pipeline, and ''no'' to refinery jobs in southeast Texas. ''No'' to obtaining oil from a reliable nation and ally like Canada.

But ''yes'' to more oil from dictators like Chavez from Venezuela; ''yes'' to being held hostage to Middle Eastern oil and dictators like Ahmadinejad, who now threatens to stop oil tankers from going through the Straits of Hormuz. And ''yes'' to insulting Canada.

The Prime Minister of Canada says that he will build a pipeline, but now it will go to his west coast, and that crude oil will be loaded on Chinese tankers—China, our national competitor regarding the economy. Isn't that lovely.

If the administration chooses to say ''no'' to Keystone XL, the administration chooses poorly.

And that's just the way it is.

ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE BUDGET AND NATIONAL PLAN

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

Mr. MARKEY. As we debate our national budget, we must address one of the largest costs threatening our economy and bankrupting our families—the Alzheimer's pandemic. 5.4 million Americans suffer from Alzheimer's today, and as all the baby boomers retire, 15 million Americans will have Alzheimer's.

We already spend $130 billion a year on Alzheimer's from Medicare and Medicaid. At this rate, in 2050, we will spend $800 billion every year from Medicare and Medicaid on this one disease alone. That is more than the entire defense budget today.

Thankfully, right now, the Advisory Council for the National Alzheimer's Project Act is developing the first-ever comprehensive national plan to fight this disease. We cannot cut funding for medical research for Alzheimer's today if we want to balance the budget tomorrow.

We made a vow to care for our citizens as they age. NIH is the National Institutes of Hope. We must not cut that budget or else all of these families with Alzheimer's will have no hope.

□ 1220

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, it's not too often that a President of the United States has the opportunity with one swipe of his pen to increase private sector jobs by thousands of employees, while at the same time increasing our energy independence and our energy security. But that's exactly what's going to happen with the Keystone XL pipeline.

Unfortunately, the President, earlier this year, punted on that decision and punted it past 2013, even though his own State Department said that there would not be a significant impact on the environment. But we gave him another chance.

Unfortunately, there are reports that he will reject the permit for the Keystone XL pipeline. The thing that's confusing, Mr. Speaker, is that he's been saying that we can't wait for job creation. But with this decision, he's saying that we can wait for thousands and thousands of private sector jobs here in the United States and that we can wait for energy security. Mr. Speaker, this is the wrong decision at the wrong time. We need better decisions from the administration.

EXTENSION OF PAYROLL TAX

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, if I asked the average American, what should be the first vote in the House? For sure, she would say extend payroll tax, unemployment insurance, and the doc fix. What is our first bill? Disapproval of raising the debt ceiling. For what? To remind Americans that Tea Party Republicans brought us the loss of our triple A rating for the first time in American history? A new year demands a new start.

The payroll tax is the best way to eat into Congress' 84 percent disapproval rating. Do the inevitable. No poison pills. Any add-ons will be understood as just that by every American who draws a salary or who is unemployed or who is a senior.

Do it to get it over with and get on with a year of working on jobs. Come over to the side of the street with the 99 percent. You may grow to like it.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, according to the Canadian Government, over 143,000 jobs in Colorado depend on our trade relationship with Canada. Further, crude petroleum is Colorado's top import from our neighbor to the north. And Colorado's not unique. Many of the jobs and energy around the country come as a result of our relationship with Canada.

It's been 3 years since the application was filed to build the Keystone XL pipeline, which would create a pipeline that extends from the oil sands in Alberta to the gulf coast, bringing significant oil supplies into the United States.

The United States as a whole, both economically and from a national security standpoint, will benefit immensely from the approval of this pipeline.

In my mind, it's a very simple question: Why import oil from countries that seek to do us harm when we can get it from our neighbor to the north? I'm continuously awed at how much energy potential we have in North America and how simple it would be to advance policies that would make us more energy independent. Isn't that what we're trying to accomplish?

But apparently there is an asterisk when it comes to job creation for this administration. Not these jobs, not these 100,000 jobs. Perhaps some others. This administration has done everything it can to stand in the way of a project that can help 100,000 Americans get back to work.

Mr. President, don't put a cork in our economy. Let's get this pipeline built.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to the President or other Members in the second person.

FRUSTRATION FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in frustration—frustrated with the lack of compassion for the middle class coming out of this body, frustrated with the lack of ideas and focus on job creation, and frustrated with the continued partisanship and division that have led to some of the lowest levels of confidence and trust for this body in its history.

America deserves better than this, Mr. Speaker. One hundred and sixty million middle class individuals deserve to have their payroll tax cut extended through the end of this year. Those who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own deserve to know that they will be able to continue to have a lifeline in the time of need. And seniors deserve to know that they can visit their doctor of choice without worrying whether or not Medicare will cover the visit. America and Americans don't deserve more wasted time.

Instead of a vote today on the debt ceiling, one that is partisan, divisive, and ultimately dead on arrival in the other Chamber, we should be focusing on jobs and creating jobs and protecting the middle class. Think of it: 61 percent of Americans always or usually live paycheck-to-paycheck, which has risen from 43 percent in 2007.

Mr. Speaker, I'm frustrated with the American people being also frustrated. It's time this body come together, put politics aside, and work on growing jobs.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, while the President campaigns on his ''we can't wait'' slogan, American workers are still asking, ''Where are the jobs?'' The President knows that 20,000 true shovel-ready American jobs can be created by approving construction of the Keystone XL pipeline.

Why is he rejecting 20,000 American jobs? Why is he not reducing our dependence upon Middle Eastern sources of oil? Why is he not increasing our energy security, which increases our national security? Why isn't he taking our debt crisis seriously by increasing revenue from taxpayers with American jobs? Why is he not listening to the American people?

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better from their President. He should focus on the 20,000 new jobs he could help create—not the one he wants to keep.

BE FAIR

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, as I was home, I was asked to explain the payroll tax extension, and as I did it, it was clear to me. The Republicans in the House are toying with the wellbeing of the working people, the seniors, and our most vulnerable.

Everyone will say we support a year's extension; the question is, how do we pay for it? The bipartisan Senate, only 10 voting ''no,'' gave us the 2-month extension to do that negotiation. It is time to pass a year's extension.

People are watching this House. They want to be sure that we don't limit unemployment insurance benefits to those who only have a high school diploma because unemployment is an earned benefit for those who are unemployed through no fault of their own, and it would just not be fair.

Mr. Speaker, be fair. Do not make our seniors, our most vulnerable, and the middle class pay for the extension because that just would not be fair.

CONGRATULATING WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, the West Virginia University Mountaineers football team faced the Clemson University Tigers in the prestigious Orange Bowl. Through an outstanding record-setting performance, the blue-collar work ethic of the West Virginia Mountaineers prevailed.

Eighty-four percent of the country had predicted that West Virginia would lose, but in case you missed it, the final score was 70–33. West Virginia's unheralded players proudly showed once again that as a team, they can dominate the best of schools on any given day, just like they've done defeating Georgia and Oklahoma in previous BCS bowl games.

Everyone in West Virginia should be proud of their State and their flagship university.

So let me end with this: For those Clemson supporters who still don't know where West Virginia is, look in your end zone.

□ 1230

COMBATING ONLINE PIRACY

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, today many Web sites across the Internet, from Reddit to Wikipedia, have blacked out their sites in protest of a bill before this body, the Stop Online Piracy Act, and its accompanying bill in the Senate, the PIPA Act. These bills threaten free discourse, free speech, and the very infrastructure of the Internet, itself.

The Internet has brought this country and the world so much, not only in terms of the millions of jobs and economic productivity of American citizens, but far-reaching changes in terms of the Arab Spring and the Voice of Freedom desires across the world. SOPA and PIPA directly threaten the very Internet that has brought humanity great prosperity and greater peace.

I call upon my colleagues to join in solidarity with Internet users across the world in making sure that we tackle online piracy in a way that doesn't throw out the baby with the bathwater.

THE AMERICAN ECONOMY: PUT AMERICANS FIRST

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

Mr. TIPTON. I appreciate following my colleague from Colorado, who recognizes the importance of jobs. Unfortunately, the President of the United States has turned a blind eye to the needs of the American people.

In my own district in the State of Colorado, according to the Colorado Department of Labor, we have 17 counties that have unemployment in excess of 20 percent. We have an opportunity to create jobs in this country. The Keystone pipeline will help provide energy certainty for this country in a responsible way, and will create American jobs on American soil to be able to put American people back to work.

Today, we hear the President is throwing his hands up and turning his back on the American people. The people deserve better. We must get this economy moving. We must create those opportunities for jobs for the American people. This is our time. This is our opportunity, and we call upon the President to join us in putting Americans first.

THE MUHAMMAD ALI LEGACY ACT

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, Muhammad Ali's contributions to the world continue to transcend his achievements in the boxing ring.

Although he won three heavyweight championships, Muhammad has never believed in resolving differences through conflict. He is a man of peace and justice, of patience and grace—a visionary who changed the boxing world so he could change the entire world. In 2005, he founded the Muhammad Ali Center in my hometown of Louisville, Kentucky. The center is a cultural attraction and an international education hub, whose work is based on the core values by which Muhammad lives—respect, confidence, conviction, dedication, giving, and spirituality.

Yesterday, Muhammad turned 70. Today, I'm introducing the Muhammad

Ali Legacy Act to honor his values and to build upon his humanitarian work. The legislation establishes a grant program to promote global respect, understanding, and communication. The program will prepare leaders to contribute to the global society through peacebuilding and violence prevention, and it will teach young people how to combat the pull of radicalism.

By cosponsoring the Muhammad Ali Legacy Act, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this work and the man who has dedicated his life to it.

OUR TROOPS WILL NOT BE FORGOTTEN

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this time to come and report back to this body and to the people of the Second District about my very quick but very informative weekend trip to Afghanistan where I was able to be cautiously encouraged by the progress that the Afghan National Army is making there. Mainly, my goal was to go and say ''thank you'' to the men and women of all the different branches and to let them know that they will not be forgotten by me, by my constituents or by the rest of us here in this body.

I especially want to say ''thank you'' to our international partners—the Brits, the Aussies, the Germans, the Dutch, the Romanians—who are there with us along with many others who are pushing this effort forward. I also want to say ''thank you'' to the Embassy staff for their fine work and to the men and women of the Air National Guard, who are there sacrificing, especially those men and women from the 82nd Airborne, who hosted us in Kandahar. I also thank the marines at Camp Leatherneck in Helmand province.

I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I now proudly carry this challenge coin given to me by a new friend, a sergeant major from Michigan. I carry this in my pocket every day, and I want them to know that they will not be forgotten.

TURKEY IS AMERICA'S ALLY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague in saying that our troops will not be forgotten. I continue to wear a yellow ribbon, as we're doing in our community in Houston, in welcoming home the troops from Iraq.

That's why I rise today—to challenge those who are in the midst of the Presidential campaign to be cautious about ill-conceived and ill-spoken words. When one of the candidates, the Governor of Texas, calls the leadership of Turkey ''Islamic terrorists'' and says that Turkey is run by Islamic terrorists, I can assure you that those words are ill-conceived and inappropriate and absolutely wrong.

Turkey is one of the United States' strongest allies. It's a member of NATO, and it is seeking at this time membership in the European Union. There is constant dialogue between our country and Turkey. We are encouraging, of course, Turkey's diplomatic efforts to engage with Israel; and frankly, our troops have benefited from some of the needs taken care of through efforts by Turkey.

So I would just encourage that we not pour fuel and fire together and that we recognize Turkey and others of our allies live in very difficult areas. Therefore, we need to be part of the solution and not part of the problem. Check your facts. I don't believe the democratic country of Turkey is run by Islamic terrorists. You're wrong and it is inappropriate.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3261

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3261.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 515, ADDRESSING A MOTION TO PROCEED UNDER SECTION 3101A OF TITLE 31, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 515 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 515

Resolved, That a motion to proceed with regard to a joint resolution of disapproval specified in subsection (a)(2) of section 3101A of title 31, United States Code—

(a) may be offered even if the joint resolution has not been reported to the House as contemplated by subsection (c)(3) of such section; and

(b) shall be in order only if offered by the Majority Leader or his designee.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. The Budget Control Act of 2011, which was enacted into law on August 2, 2011, authorized increases in the administration's borrowing authority subject to a joint resolution of disapproval. The law provides for consideration of a joint resolution of disapproval with 2 hours of debate. Amendments to the joint resolution are not permitted under the law. H. Res. 515 allows the House to consider the resolution of disapproval in the House today, rather than tomorrow, as currently contemplated in the law. Simply put, we are moving up its consideration by 1 day to better accommodate the House floor schedule.

I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying resolution. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you posing two very, very important questions. The first is an issue of scale.

Where I come from in North Charleston, South Carolina, we have a little trouble digesting exactly what $1.2 trillion really means. To help get my own head around the number $1.2 trillion, I did a little factfinding. A last-minute flight from Charleston, South Carolina, to Washington, D.C., is about $1,100. You could fly back and forth every single day for the next 3 million years in order to spend $1.2 trillion. I'm not sure about anyone else in the Chamber, but there aren't too many things I'm planning to do for the next 3 million years.

Now that we have a little perspective on what $1.2 trillion really means, the second question is a simple one: Why is it so hard to say we can't afford it? It's a simple question. Why is it so hard to say that we can't afford another $1.2 trillion of debt?

I asked the same question on my Facebook. Here are two responses to the question:

What's not to understand? Just cut the darned budget just like the rest of us have to do.

We the people, on an individual level, have got to demand less government. It's called courage, the courage to just say ''no.''

□ 1240

So, Mr. Speaker, it's bad enough that through the national health care bill, the Democrats raised taxes on the middle class by $500 billion and then they raised another half a trillion dollars for Medicare, but now they want to borrow $1.2 trillion. From whom—it's a good question—from whom? Unborn Americans, unborn Americans and foreign nations in order to continue borrowing 42 cents on every dollar to spend in 2012.

It's just not right, Mr. Speaker. The American people will not stand for the blank check culture of the past and I, for one, stand with the American people.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank my colleague for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I rise today in opposition to the rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, what exactly are we doing here? We could be talking about creating jobs for the middle class. We could be talking about a payroll tax cut extension. We could be talking about corporate tax reform, individual tax reform, and most importantly, we could be talking about solving the national deficit, about reducing government spending, about solving the deficit issue.

But, instead, we're here playing this game of Kabuki theater. Rather than pursuing an agenda that isn't a Democratic or Republican agenda, but an American agenda that both sides all can agree on, we're here playing a counterproductive and absurd game. In fact, not only playing a game, we're replaying a game.

We all remember the debt debacle last August that almost shut down Federal Government and led to a downgrade, potentially increasing interest rates and costing the government billions or hundreds of billions of dollars more in interest payments. For the first time in history, Standard & Poor's downgraded our country's credit rating, citing brinksmanship and political gridlock as motivating factors for their decision.

Look, this is all Monday night quarterbacking. It's after the fact. The money has been spent. The money has been spent, and 147 Republicans voted in December to spend $915 billion in the appropriations bill, the omnibus appropriations bill, 147 Republicans, $915 billion, all of which was deficit spending. One hundred forty-seven Republicans spent $915 billion in deficit spending December 17th. That's a Christmas shopping spree, and now the credit card bill has come in January, and here they are saying we don't want to pay that credit card bill.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is not to spend the money if you're not going to make good on your bill. Every American family knows that. Once the money's spent it's after-the-fact political finger pointing, not looking to a solution for a deficit problem.

And the Republicans have not put a solution on the table. Even the House Republican budget, the PAUL RYAN budget that ends Medicare, creates $5.1 trillion in deficit spending over the next 10 years, $5.1 trillion in deficit spending. How many times will the Republicans have to raise the debt limit to have a deficit of $5.1 trillion?

This Congress and the majority of this Congress on the Republican side are addicted to spending, Mr. Speaker, and until they are willing to entertain a real discussion—and the President of the United States, President Obama, has led the way by convening a commission, the Bowles-Simpson Commission, to try to take a bipartisan approach to actually solving the deficit situation. But rather than bringing any of those bills before the House, the Republicans passed the budget that not only ends Medicare but leads to $5.1 trillion in deficit spending and as recently as December 17th, spent $915 billion of deficit spending, the entire deficit for this year, essentially, around December 17th, because we had already spent the money that actually came in. And here they are in January, Mr. Speaker, saying they don't want to pay the bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I find it quite interesting to hear Mr. POLIS, who sounds like a good Republican over there, I must concede, sounds like a good Republican over there talking about excessive spending.

But here's the question, the Democratic-controlled Senate hadn't passed the budget, next Tuesday, in a thousand days, and it's laughable that someone on the left would talk about deficit spending since the three records on deficit spending have occurred in the last three cycles, FY 2009 a $1.4 trillion deficit and FY 2010, $1.294 trillion deficit. Under President Obama in 2011, a 1.299—let's just round it to $1.3 trillion in deficit spending.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. No, sir, but I yield 3 minutes to my good friend from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the leadership of Congressman TIM SCOTT on this very important issue.

As South Carolina votes in the Presidential primary on Saturday, our State is grateful for the leadership of Congressman TIM SCOTT, along with my other colleagues who are on the floor today, JEFF DUNCAN, TREY GOWDY, MICK MULVANEY.

We know that in November of last year, our Nation's annual debt reached $15 trillion and it recently exceeded the value of the entire American economy. Washington's out-of-control borrowing and spending must stop.

The President has ignored our Nation's spending problem and once again asked Congress to increase the debt ceiling by $1.2 trillion. This request is a chilling reminder of the out-of-control debt which threatens senior citizens' retirement security and saddles young people with a mountain of debt. The President in February of 2009 said the deficit is unsustainable, but then he proceeded to double the year's debt and has since.

Our Nation's unemployment rate has consistently remained above 8 percent for 35 months. This is tragic for American families.

Instead of offering solutions to reduce spending and decrease taxes to encourage economic growth, the President and the liberal controlled Senate continue to support legislation calling for massive tax increases and funding for programs that contribute to our growing national deficit, which destroys jobs and hurts American small businesses.

Americans have made it clear they expect their elected officials to make meaningful fiscal reforms today so as not to burden future generations with crushing deficits and debts tomorrow.

House Republicans have remained committed to our projects by fighting to create jobs and promote job growth in the private sector. Last year, House Republicans passed 35 job-creating bills, most with bipartisan support. Instead of acting on these bills to create jobs, the liberal controlled Senate refuses to consider most of these pieces of legislation.

By passing today's resolution that disapproves of the President's authority to increase the debt limit, Congress can help restore the American people's faith in our Nation's government by protecting future generations and limiting Washington's out-of-control borrowing and spending. Instead of giving the President more power to spend more money we do not have, Congress should work together to find ways to reduce spending and put America back on the path to fiscal responsibility just as Congressman SCOTT has pointed out families do.

I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina complained about the President's budget, he complained about a lack of budget in the Senate. What he failed to acknowledge is that the budget the Republicans adopted in this body without a single Democratic vote not only ends Medicare, but leads to $5.1 trillion in deficit spending over the next 10 years, several times the deficit over the last 10 years; $5.1 trillion, a larger deficit spending than this country has ever had in a 10-year period, was supported and voted on and enacted by the Republicans in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, as the Congress meets for the first time in 2012, the people of the country are burdened by a deficit of jobs, a deficit in our Federal budget, and a deficit of hope that things could get better.

□ 1250

It is our responsibility to work together to try to make them better. Now, to reduce the deficit of the country, yes, you should restrain spending. The parties came together in August and passed—with about half of each party voting for it—a deficit-reduction

plan that cut spending in our departments by about 5 percent each, made reasonable reductions in defense spending and some reasonable reductions in social problems. We should keep those reductions on the books.

We think that in reducing the deficit, that the very wealthiest and most successful in American society should have to pay a little bit more of their fair share. Not everyone agrees with that, but we think that is an important part of reducing the deficit. But by far the best way to reduce the deficit is to create jobs for the people of this country. You have a hard time creating jobs when there is a deficit, but you have an impossible time of reducing the deficit when there are no jobs.

132 days ago, the President of the United States came to this Chamber and put forward four good ideas to create jobs in this country. First, he said that we should cut taxes for middle class and working Americans. Well, we managed to eke out a 2-month agreement to do that. Let's get to work today in extending that middle class tax cut for at least the rest of the year.

The President then said that we should put people back to work, building science labs in our schools and fixing bridges and roads that need to be repaired. The Congress hasn't acted on that proposal at all in this House.

The President said that we should cut taxes for small business people who hire people, who create jobs. This House has not acted at all on that proposal since September 8. The President took due note that as private sector jobs have risen, police officers and teachers and firefighters have lost their jobs in the public sector. And he said to help our States and cities keep police officers on the beat, keep firefighters in the apparatus, keep teachers in the classroom, let's give some aid to those States and cities to keep those people working. The House has not acted at all on that proposal.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House and Mr. Speaker, rather than going through an exercise here where people can pontificate about how much they deeply care about the deficit, let's do something about it. Let's put on the floor of this House each of the President's proposals to create jobs and let's take a vote.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. And to those who say they have better ideas, let's put their ideas on the floor. The American people did not take the month of January off; neither should we. Let's put these job-creating proposals on the floor, put them to a vote and do our job to help put the American people back to work.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, one of the comments by my good friend, Mr. POLIS from Colorado, was that Republicans were trying to end Medicare. That's a laughable comment. As a matter of fact, it is so laughable that hot off the press, the PolitiFact, which finds out whether or not there is truth or not in words: The political lie of the year is that Republicans voted to end Medicare. PolitiFact just named the political lie of the year the comment that Republicans voted to end Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 98 denying this President the trillion-dollar draw on the Nation's line of credit. You know, just because you've got the credit limit that you've asked for doesn't mean you have to max out the credit card.

How dare this President come back for another increase in the Nation's debt after the failure of the supercommittee. How dare he. This President did everything he could and successfully stopped the committee from producing any kind of cut to the size and scope of government, and now he wants to kick the can further down the road yet again. Another year, another trillion dollars in debt, Mr. Speaker.

What has this administration done to stop the deficit spending that fuels the debt and brings about the need for an increase in the debt ceiling? Nothing. Mr. Speaker, this administration has done absolutely nothing to rein in this Federal Government.

This is the same President whose party controls the other body. And on Tuesday, the United States Senate will mark 1,000 days since they last passed a budget, the same day the President delivers his State of the Union address. What an embarrassment, to continuously ask for more debt without even pretending to know how you've budgeted. If this were a private business, it would be bankrupt.

This President and, sadly, this Congress continues to mortgage the futures of our children and grandchildren, drowning them in a sea of debt. After the failed policy of the President's stimulus package, we are swimming in deficit spending of this President's making.

Mr. Speaker, our country stands over $15 trillion in debt, and after this increase we'll be over $16 trillion in the red. Congratulations. We've now joined the club of nations whose national debt is larger than our annual national economic output. This is simply an unsustainable position, and the only way we will get our debt under control is to stop the insanity of trillion dollar a year deficit spending. This must stop, and we in this House must be the responsible adults in the room to stop it. Now is not the time to go get another increase in the limit. Now is the time for us to cut up the credit card and buckle down, like millions of American families are doing across this great land. In an economy this difficult, American families have had to tighten their belts, get back to basics, and cut things from their budget. Surely now is the time for the Federal Government to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the politics here. We'll thump our chests and we'll pass this resolution and we'll say we've done all we can to stop this increase. The other body, led by a party bent on destroying the American dream and taking us down the path of economic ruin to ever-greater government dependency, will table this. In the end, the President will get his increase. And we'll spend yet another trillion dollars that our children do not have. But the bill is coming due, Mr. Speaker, and sooner or later we're going to have to stop this debt train from derailing our country. God bless America.

Mr. POLIS. Before further yielding, I yield myself a minute.

Mr. Speaker, to hear the other side, they doth protest too much. Why does a party for whom 147 Members voted to spend $915 billion, causing the deficit, which is roughly a trillion dollars in size, essentially that $915 billion that they spent on their Christmas spending spree was the deficit, now they're complaining about it?

And since the gentleman from South Carolina wasn't kind enough to yield to me, I'd like to ask him on my own time, the gentleman referred to whether or not ending Medicare was true, and obviously there's been a vital discussion about that, but the other assertion that I made is a very factual one, and I just want to confirm with the gentleman that the Paul Ryan Republican budget that the Republicans passed did indeed contain $5.1 trillion of deficit spending. Is that your understanding as well? Is that true?

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina for an answer.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I do remember that the Paul Ryan budget came in at a number of $1.19 trillion in overall spending for the annual year. If you're talking about the 10-year impact of the Paul Ryan budget—

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

The 10-year figure for that deficit from the CBO itself, $5.1 trillion in deficit spending. And again, the same Republicans who spend $915 billion here in December are again saying now that the credit card bill has come due, they somehow don't want to pay it.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

I'd like to tell a fairy tale and the true story of the American people. The fairy tale, of course, is why we're here on the floor even today to actually tell a little story to the American people that we are doing something to impact the deficit.

The bill we passed in August, of course, responded to the need to raise

the debt ceiling to pay America's bills. But in order to cajole and drag our friends, the Republicans on the other side of the aisle, they did things like cut Pell Grants. They required the joint select committee that did not work to reduce the deficit. And, of course, they wanted us to have these shenanigans on the floor so that the American people could think they're doing their job.

But here's the real story of the American people. First of all, the debt that was increased that we are now dealing with, $1.9 trillion was raised under Ronald Reagan; $1.5 trillion was raised under George Bush; Bill Clinton, $1.4 trillion; and George W. Bush, $6.1 trillion.

What is the raising of the debt ceiling, which I think most Americans care about. It is responding to the debt that is now held by the public. It is doing our job. It is responding to the fact that the public should not burden America not paying her bills. What kind of bills? Debts that are owed to individuals, to our corporations that our friends say are of great friendship to them—banks and insurance companies; but most importantly, pensions, mutual funds. State and local governments will be left holding the bag because today we want to do a few shenanigans.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that the Kaiser Foundation has indicated in my own State that 5.6 million Texans are living in poverty—2.2 million of them children. And 17.4 percent of the households in the State struggle with food insecurity. Not raising the debt ceiling means that the burden falls on those who get up every morning to work. That's a true story of the American people.

What else will happen if we don't raise the debt ceiling? 642,500 jobs will be lost. The gross domestic product will decrease by 1 percent. Unemployment would go up. Every mortgage would increase by $19,175. Stocks would fall. The S&P dropping 6.3 percent. And every 401(k) holder would lose $8,816.

This is the real story of the American people. I want to stand on their side. I want to acknowledge that together as Republicans and Democrats, rather than writing the fairy tale story that you're seeing today, a resolution of disapproval, we can really work together as we have done in years past. 1997—the balanced budget amendment that created the Children's Health Insurance Program, helping children across America to be able to have health insurance. Or get rid of Medicare part D, passed by the past administration and the Republican Congress. Medicare part D, any senior will tell you, is one of the most devastating parts of their budget, causing them to pay three times more for their prescription drugs. We can get rid of that, as the Affordable Care Act did, and we would generate millions and millions of dollars.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Fairy tales are supposed to end with a wonderful ending, something such as never, never again or it ended happily thereafter. Well, let me tell you the true story of the American people. They don't want us on the floor today talking about not paying their bills to them. They want us on the floor right now to create jobs, to bring down the unemployment, to give them payroll tax relief, and to give extension for unemployment for those who are seeking jobs. And they don't want us to deny food stamps to young soldiers whose incomes don't allow them to provide for their families. They want us to get to work. Here I am. I'm ready to get to work.

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

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 98, a resolution that would prevent President Obama from raising the debt ceiling by $1.2 trillion.

This is a critical time for our Nation. Over 14 million Americans are unemployed, and our record-setting level of debt is more than $15 trillion. The fact is the Obama administration will not lead on this debt reduction issue. I believe it is critical we send a message that we will not return to the era of continuing to run up the American taxpayers' credit card and endless increases to our Nation's debt limit.

Let's look at President Obama's record. Since assuming office in 2009, President Obama has proposed consecutive budgets that offer more than $1 trillion in deficit spending, the most of any President in our Nation's history. And under the President's budget plans, in 2018 the United States will owe more interest on the debt than will be spent on all defense spending, meaning we will owe more money to our creditors than supporting our national defense. That is crazy.

Congress has a moral obligation to our children and grandchildren to stop the outrageous spending and restore fiscal sanity in Washington to ensure we don't leave them under a mountain of debt. Right now, every American faces $200,000 in financial obligations to pay for our debt, and this is unacceptable. This resolution of disapproval is a good place to start in getting our fiscal house in order, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds before further yielding.

Every Republican that has spoken on this issue voted for a budget that included $5.1 trillion in deficit spending over a decade, more deficit spending than any 10-year period in the history of our country. They also, as part of that budget, voted for raising the debt ceiling by $8.8 trillion. They voted to do it, Mr. Speaker. They voted to raise the debt ceiling from $14.3 trillion to $23.1 trillion by 2021. Yes, Mr. Speaker, every Republican in this body, except for four, and zero Democrats, voted to double the national debt over the next 10 years.

I'm proud to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my friend. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's winter in Washington, but apparently our Republican friends have returned thinking it's August at the beach, and they've packed their neon-colored flip-flops.

Last year, this Congress came together in a bipartisan fashion to avoid America's first-ever default. The business community, economists, financial analysts warned of the economic calamity that a default would cause. Passing this resolution today—in fact by two-thirds vote in this body and the Senate—would produce just such a catastrophic result.

The Budget Control Act we passed didn't appropriate one penny of new spending; it just provided for America to meet its previous obligations. Although the initial intransigence of some brought the Nation to the brink and the first downgrading by S&P in our history, ultimately 174 Republicans finally agreed to do the right thing.

Today's vote is a direct repudiation of that vote. The debt limit increase in this resolution is the exact same one they supported as part of the Budget Control Act only 5 months ago. Today's vote is simply an opportunity for Republicans to give themselves cover and to flip-flop and say they're against what they in fact already voted for.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker: Nothing Republicans have proposed this year would have forestalled an increase in the debt ceiling, not the Ryan budget, not the Republican Study Committee budget, not even the balanced budget amendment. Avoiding default was the difficult but responsible action last August, and it remains the responsible action today.

I urge my colleagues to leave their flip-flops at the beach and do the responsible thing. Put country ahead of politics today.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. TOM GRAVES.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'll try not to follow up too much on the flip-flop comments, but I do prefer Crocs if anybody cares.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to President Obama's latest request to raise the debt limit. Mr. Obama's spending spree in just 3 short years accounts for almost one-third of our national debt, the most rapid increase in the debt of any U.S. President and more debt than the first 41 Presidents combined.

And the Nation's debt level has recently reached a disturbing milestone. The U.S. debt is now as big as the entire U.S. economy. That's the value of

all goods and services produced here in the United States. It's another stark warning that America cannot continue spending at the current pace. And alarm bells should be going off all throughout the Halls of Congress because this problem is not going away. Yet, here we are again poised to go down and continue down this Road to Ruin.

The will to see the error of our ways and make significant spending cuts still doesn't exist here in Washington. Unless we start making the tough choices now, this Nation will reach a point where we have no choice at all.

Mr. POLIS. Again, the Republicans doth protest too much. If there is concern about the budget deficit, why did every Republican who has spoken here today—every Republican except for four—vote to double our national debt over the next 10 years? Why has every Republican here voted for a budget that included $5.1 trillion in deficit spending, more deficit spending than this country has ever had in a 10-year period?

I certainly hear complaints about President Obama and others. The President can't spend a penny—a penny—without congressional approval. So if the Republicans are concerned about the budget, why did they go on a Christmas spending spree where 147 Republicans voted to spend over $900 billion, every penny of it deficit spending? This makes no sense, Mr. Speaker.

Let's address this budget deficit, as President Obama has charged us to do with the Bowles-Simpson Commission. Let's undertake a bipartisan approach to solve the deficit. This Nation shouldn't have a $5.1 trillion deficit, as the Republicans have voted on and passed. This body should not spend enough money to double the national debt by the year 2021, which every Republican except for four has voted for.

Let's get to work, Mr. Speaker. This is all fun and games, but the country is burning while we continue to work to solve this issue and avoid the hard ones.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1310

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. RANDY HULTGREN.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of this important resolution of disapproval. I oppose raising the debt ceiling and will continue to oppose raising the debt ceiling without a real structural reform to how Washington works.

A balanced budget amendment is what we need. We find ourselves in this position today because the President has come to Congress telling us that he wants to raise the Nation's debt ceiling again. Our Nation's credit card is maxed out because of his administration's reckless spending.

My home State of Illinois is a perfect example of the truth that we cannot spend, borrow, and tax ourselves out of huge budget deficits; and now Illinois is the State in the worst financial shape of any other State.

Today's vote will not just show which of our colleagues support more spending, but it will also reflect our positions on the greater philosophical divide confronting us: Are we for bigger government or smaller, more accountable, more effective government?

Today's vote will clearly show the American people who in this Chamber wants to further grow the size of government, let it intrude further into the private sector, and give more power to Washington bureaucrats to meddle in the everyday lives of American citizens; and in contrast, it will show those of us who believe that a smaller government increases our constituents' liberties.

By supporting this resolution of disapproval, we are sending a message that we are standing for smaller government and greater individual freedom. We must not increase our debt ceiling without real structural change to how Washington works.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my friend from South Carolina if he has any remaining speakers.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Yes, sir. I suppose I have four or five.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. DAN BURTON.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You know, this whole process amuses me because, when we passed the Budget Control Act, we, in effect, gave the President the ability to raise the debt ceiling by an additional $500 billion without us having any control whatsoever. And with this $1.2 trillion we're talking about raising the debt ceiling today, we really don't have any control over that either.

Now, I voted against the Budget Control Act and I voted against raising the debt ceiling, or giving the President the authority to raise the debt ceiling by that first $500 billion, and I'm going to vote against the $1.2 trillion increase today.

But here's how it works, and I don't think the American people understand it. We disapprove today and let's say the Senate disapproves, and it goes to the President and he vetoes it. It comes back to us, and we have to have a two-thirds majority vote to override it. So this is not going to happen. We have, in effect, given the President of the United States the ability to raise the debt ceiling without us having any control whatsoever, and that's just wrong.

We should never have passed that Budget Control Act the way we did. This body should always have the ability to stop raising the debt ceiling. But when we passed the Budget Control Act the way we did, we gave the President carte blanche, and it's dead wrong.

This President now has control that no President has had in history. He is making appointments without advice and consent of the United States Senate. He is able to raise the debt ceiling without us being able to do a darn thing about it. It's just wrong, and this body made a big mistake when we put that provision in the Budget Control Act, and the American people need to know it.

Mr. POLIS. You know, Mr. Speaker, sometimes it seems like we're arguing about a different bill in this Chamber. Many of those who have spoken on the other side have risen to attack government spending; and yet they voted for a budget with a $5.1 trillion deficit over a 10-year period, a bigger deficit than this Nation has ever had. Many of them also voted to spend $915 billion December 17th on their Christmas shopping spree, all deficit spending. And now they're complaining about a deficit that their votes caused.

Let me assure you of something, Mr. Speaker. This Nation pays its bills. Families across America pay their bills. When families spend too much on Christmas gifts, the answer is not to not pay your credit card bill in January. The answer is to cut back on spending. That's what families across America know. That's what this Congress needs to know. That's common sense.

Every Republican in this body, except for four, voted for a budget that called for specifically raising the debt ceiling from $14.3 trillion to $23.1 trillion. The House Republican budget voted to double the national debt over the next 10 years.

We can and we must do better, Mr. Speaker. Let's get past these games and begin a real discussion about reining in the national deficit and starting to pay down our national debt.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from South Carolina has 13 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank my colleague, and thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to follow on to what my colleague said in his opening remarks about trying to get your hands around how big $1.2 trillion is. It's one of the things I struggle with. I know it's one of the things that my folks back home struggle with. So I look at it in a different fashion.

If you are a family that is making $46,000 a year, which is just under the average household in the United States, this is the equivalent of borrowing an additional $14,000, which might not sound that much until you stop to realize that if you were that little family making $46,000 a year, trying to borrow an additional $14,000—which is what we're doing today—you also owe $305,000 on the credit card bill. You

owe $305,000 on the credit card bill, and you are trying to borrow another $14,000.

It raises the question in my mind, Mr. Speaker, a fairly straightforward and honest question: Does the President really ever intend to pay it back? Seriously. I think that is a legitimate question to ask.

If someone came to me and said, ''Would you loan me an additional $14,000?'' and I knew that you already owed $305,000, I think asking that person a legitimate question would be to say, ''Do you ever really intend to pay it back?'' And if the answer is, ''Yes,'' which I assume it is, my question then would be, ''Well, when?'' Because you offered us a budget last year, Mr. President, that never balances, ever.

We've heard a lot of nasty things today about Mr. RYAN's budget, about the GOP budget. At least it balances eventually and goes to surplus and provides for a method with which to pay off the debt. The Republican Study Committee budget, which many of us voted for, balances it in 8 years and allows us to pay off the debt. Yet the President has never offered us a budget that ever balances or produces a surplus to generate the money with which to repay the debt that he's asking us to take on today.

The President's own words in 2006 have become somewhat famous. Back then when he was in the Senate, he said that the fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure.

America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the simple question: If the President would like to exercise some leadership, the opportunity exists for him to do so.

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

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

Mr. MULVANEY. And that would be to simply send us a budget that balances. In his lifetime would be great; in his children's lifetime would be okay; but send us a budget, Mr. President, that balances at some time. You are at the White House right now working on it to send to us next month. Send us a budget that balances sometime so at least maybe we can pretend that we will eventually pay off this money that he wants us to borrow today.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote from an article in The Hill. My friend and colleague Mr. MULVANEY from South Carolina said that this entire procedure ''is just a fig leaf for some Republicans to say they are against more debt, even though they essentially approved it.''

That's what we know this to be. This money has been spent. It's out the door. My colleague, Mr. MULVANEY from South Carolina, agrees and has put it into the RECORD. Even the budget from the Republican Study Committee, which the gentleman cited, calls for specifically raising the debt ceiling by $5.6 trillion, increasing the national debt by a third. That's not the answer.

The President has led the way through the creation of the Simpson-Bowles Commission and their hard, bipartisan work to come up with a way to reduce the national deficit. The Republican Study Committee budget, the Paul Ryan budget, all of the budgets that the Republicans brought before the House increase the deficit substantially, more so than any Congress has in the history of this entire country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. TREY GOWDY.

□ 1320

Mr. GOWDY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I want to thank my friend and colleague from the great State of South Carolina, Mr. TIM SCOTT, for his outstanding work on the Rules Committee.

So here we are again, Mr. Speaker, less than 6 months removed from last summer's so-called debt crisis, on the verge of committing another act of generational embezzlement. We are on the verge of assigning another trillion dollars of debt to our progeny because we can't muster the courage to make hard decisions.

We're on the verge of $16 trillion in debt, Mr. Speaker, because we can't bring ourselves to say ''no.'' We're on the verge of $16 trillion in debt, Mr. Speaker, because we refuse to have a serious conversation about the role of government juxtaposed with the role of the individual.

And at times like this, when leadership and moral courage, as my friend from South Carolina, MICK MULVANEY, so eloquently put it, when moral courage and leadership are needed we get slogans more befitting of a student body president race than a campaign to be the leader of the free world.

This administration says it wants a ''balanced approach'' but a ''balanced approach'' apparently doesn't include a balanced budget. This administration says it wants a grand bargain, a big, transformative deal, but the details of such a deal would fit nicely on the back side of a postage stamp.

And my personal favorite, Mr. Speaker, this administration wants the ''rich to pay their fair share.'' I've heard that phrase several times this morning. What I have not heard, Mr. Speaker, because they never seem to get around to defining who the rich are, and they never seem to get around to defining the word ''fair,'' which may be the most subjective word in the English language.

So I would ask, is it fair, is 34 percent not enough? You want a half? You want two-thirds?

When will your President define who the rich are and what's fair?

And if sloganeering and class warfare were not insidious enough, this administration criticizes those who do have the moral courage to offer a way out. Where is the President's entitlement reform plan? Where is his tax reform plan? Where is his regulatory reform plan? Where is his litigation reform plan?

Mr. Speaker, I have seen his reelection plan. Where is the plan to pay down the debt, balance the budget, and offer real opportunity to our fellow Americans who want it and need it?

We had a town hall in Greenville, South Carolina, Mr. Speaker, over the Christmas break, and one of the people I work for gave me some good advice. He said, drop the trillions and billions and talk where real people can understand. And he was right.

So, Mr. Speaker, assume a family makes $22,000 a year, but the family's expenses are $38,000 a year, and all the while they carry $142,000 in credit card debt. Do you think they really need an increase in their line of credit? Do you think another job or more hours will make ends meet?

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

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

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, you don't decide to go to the matinee instead of the 9 p.m. movie and order a cheaper appetizer when you're $142,000 in debt. You make real, dramatic, systemic transformative change.

Each one of us received an inheritance, Mr. Speaker, from our parents and grandparents. We received a better, stronger, more vibrant country than the one they inherited, and we have squandered that inheritance. We have become prodigal sons and daughters, except we have a credit card.

I hope the generations that come after us will have the courage the generations that came before us had, for we have been profiles in timidity and greed.

Mr. POLIS. Well, the gentleman from South Carolina didn't give me a chance to answer the question that he posed to me. He said, what's rich and what's fair?

What I and many others have proposed is that people making over $1 million a year in income is who we're talking about, not people with a net worth of 2 or 3 million or less, but people who have an income, make $1 million or more a year in income, and the tax rate would go from 35 to 39.6 percent, a 4½ percent increase. That's what we're talking about as part of a comprehensive package. That's in the bipartisan Bowles-Simpson package, that's in the bipartisan Gang of Six package. That's some of the revenue that, along with cuts and entitlement reform, are part of the solution to this issue.

Rather than bellyaching and complaining about having to do what Republicans themselves have said they

were going to do in the Ryan budget and the Republican Study Group budget that's doubled the deficit—Republicans committed to doubling the deficit. I didn't support that. I voted against those bills. But Republicans promised to double the deficit. I opposed that. But here they are, now that they're doing the spending that they did, their massive spending spree in December, their budget that doubles the size of the national deficit, and here they are bellyaching, after spending all that money, that they don't want to pay the bill.

Well, that's immature, Mr. Speaker. Let's rein in the spending, rather than not make good on the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman, and I thank the Speaker.

The reason why we're here today is because of the Balanced Budget Act of last year, which was a flawed bill, one which I voted against. Why? It set spending limits way too high. It guts defense by $1 trillion in a time when the world is becoming even more dangerous than ever. It cut funding to Medicare providers in a time when patients out there need access to their physicians and hospitals. And it finally creates a sham, this resolution that we're debating today, which is just that, a sham.

All the President has to do is veto our vote of disapproval and it automatically goes into effect. We just basically handed the President, in a time when we have crossed that threshold, $15 trillion of debt more than our GDP, our gross domestic product, which puts us up there with Greece. We have now handed the President a gift of another spending of $1.2 trillion, which now brings him increasing the national debt.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield the gentleman another 20 seconds.

Mr. FLEMING. This brings the President from a point which all Presidents, all the way through George Bush 43, bringing us to $10.6 trillion, increasing that national debt by 70 percent, just in one term under President Obama.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the disapproval.

Mr. POLIS. Well, finally, Mr. Speaker, we have some bipartisan agreement. My colleague from Louisiana called this vote a sham. My colleague from South Carolina called this a fig leaf to disguise excess Republican spending. I think we have agreement on those basic concepts. Whether you call this a sham or a fig leaf, this bill, this process that the Republicans have put before us doesn't do a thing to solve the deficit, doesn't do a thing to rein in the national debt. It only perpetuates this Congress' addiction to spending, Mr. Speaker.

By somehow pretending to say that we're doing something by making a fuss over whether we're going to make good on the full faith and credit of what we've already spent, rather than just not spend it in the first place, Mr. Speaker, we're misleading the American public into thinking that this Congress is tackling the national debt and the deficit, when all we're doing, as my friend from Louisiana said, is simply a sham.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to close.

Mr. POLIS. I am prepared to close as well. I ask the Speaker how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 8½ minutes. The gentleman from South Carolina has 5½ minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, Americans are urging both parties, Republicans and Democrats, to work together to solve the basic challenges that this country faces, joblessness, a tax code that rewards those with well-connected lobbyists rather than hardworking Americans, and yes, to solve the budget deficit and budget crisis and ensure that we don't leave a legacy of debt for our children.

And yet, we will deal with none of these issues today, none of these issues in the 2 days the Republican majority has scheduled us to work this week, amidst the biggest national recession since the Great Depression. And each time that President Obama and Democrats have sought consensus on these issues, the majority have bowed to radical elements within their party that insist on an agenda that is far outside the American mainstream and will lead to doubling the national debt over the next 10 years.

Time and time again, we've seen the Republicans choose gridlock over problem solving. We saw this most recently when the House Republicans refused to allow a vote on the bipartisan compromise to extend the payroll tax break.

You know, the American people are tired of political games. They want action rather than rhetoric; they want progress rather than partisanship. And with today's move, the Republicans are again playing the dangerous game of signaling to the world that America might not pay its debt, might not make good on the very money that the Republicans voted to spend in December.

□ 1330

At a time when Standard & Poor's has moved to downgrade nine European countries' ratings, the last thing our Nation can afford is a risk of default. If we are further downgraded, Mr. Speaker, it would likely lead to an increase in the rate that we have to pay to finance our national debt. This would, in fact, increase the national debt even more than the Republicans want to increase the national debt—by $5.1 trillion.

Yes, that very same Paul Ryan budget that ends Medicare as we know it and has $5.1 trillion of deficit spending could have $10 trillion or $20 trillion of deficit spending if the Republicans succeed in jeopardizing our credit rating by playing games with the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

Like millions of responsible Americans, our Nation knows that we must make good on our obligations. Every minute that we waste debating this—I'll use what the other side has called it—debating this sham, the gentleman from Louisiana, this fig leaf, the gentleman from South Carolina, every minute we waste debating this underlying rule and bill is a minute that could have been spent enacting practical, substantial legislation to end the budget deficit, to right the fiscal course of this Nation, and put our country back on the road to economic recovery.

I strongly urge a ''no'' vote on the rule and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Hypocrisy is nothing new in the House of Congress, unfortunately, and even in this House.

My good friend from Colorado talks about what we're doing on the right-hand side. There's no question, however, that Mr. POLIS himself voted for the Democratic Caucus budget proposed by Mr. VAN HOLLEN, which would have increased spending by $4.5 trillion more than the Ryan budget.

There is only one way to reduce the debt at that level of spending, and that's higher and higher taxes on the middle class. It's bad enough that, in one bill under the Democratic-controlled House, they increased taxes on the middle class by $500 billion and at the same time raided Social Security, men and women on a fixed income, by $500 billion—or a half a trillion dollars.

It's unfortunate that not only were they increasing taxes, but they specifically targeted the middle class, creating a new 3.8 percent surtax on investment income on folks who have a middle class income.

It is very unfortunate that the President went a step further than even the Democratic Caucus budget. He increased spending by $6.2 trillion more than the Ryan budget.

So everything we hear on the left right now about the spending and the debt, we need to frame it in the real conversation around what the left has already done under the Pelosi House $1.4 trillion annual deficit.

In addition to that, we need to think to ourselves and ask the question, do we need $49 trillion of spending over the next 10 years that's been proposed by some on the left? Can we afford taking our national debt from $16.3 trillion, $16.4 trillion with this credit card extension into the $27 billion range at

the end of this decade? The answer is obviously ''no.'' But the hypocrisy is just business as usual from the left.

Mr. Speaker, today's vote is very clear. You either stand for reducing spending here in Washington or you don't. It is as simple as that.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 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 H. Res. 515, if ordered; and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 176, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 2]

YEAS—238

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
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)
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
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
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—176

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
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
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
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)
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Landry

NOT VOTING—18

Berkley
Campbell
Cardoza
Carnahan
Farr
Filner
Giffords
Grimm
Heinrich
Hinchey
Inslee
Marino
Noem
Olson
Payne
Pelosi
Reyes
Speier

□ 1359

Ms. EDWARDS changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. MANZULLO and PALAZZO changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 2, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 292, noes 120, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

AYES—292

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)

Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—120

Adams
Andrews
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Burgess
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Dent
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duffy
Ellison
Fitzpatrick
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Keating
Kind
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lynch
Markey
McDermott
McGovern
Miller (NC)
Moore
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Poe (TX)
Polis
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Renacci
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Rothman (NJ)
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Shuler
Slaughter
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Towns
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (IL)
Woodall
Yoder

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—20

Bachus
Berkley
Campbell
Cardoza
Cassidy
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gohmert
Heinrich
Hinchey
Inslee
Johnson, E. B.
Marino
Noem
Payne
Reyes
Speier

□ 1407

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 3, I was unable to vote because I was a witness in a redistricting trial. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 3, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3622

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 3622.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 96

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 24, 2012, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION RELATING TO DEBT LIMIT INCREASE

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 515 and as the designee of the majority leader, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Reed moves that the House proceed to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 98) relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as submitted under section 3101A of title 31, United States Code, on January 12, 2012.

□ 1410

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3101A(c)(3) of title 31, United States Code, the motion is not debatable.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 98

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as exercised pursuant to the certification under section 3101A(a) of title 31, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3101A(c)(4) of title 31, United States Code, the joint resolution is considered as read, and the previous question is considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) as the proponent and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) as the opponent.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and 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 resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I rise today as the proud primary sponsor of the subject resolution that is before the desk.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to start my conversation with a few numbers: $15.2 trillion. That is the size of our national debt. We as a Nation are borrowing at the rate of $58,000 per second. That is approximately $45,000 for each man, woman, and child in America. This type of debt is not sustainable.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is offered today to send a message to the Nation and to the world that this Chamber is going to lead and not hide. We are going to deal with the issue of the national debt once and for all because it is time. The path that we are on is not sustainable. It is a path of bankruptcy, it is a path that will destroy the American Dream if we do not stand up to the plate and lead us out of this fiscal nightmare that we now find ourselves in.

Now, many people in this town and in this Chamber and in the Chamber on the other side of the Capitol probably would like this issue to go away until after the election. The problem is, is that the issue will not go away. And even though if we don't want to deal with it politically, we need to deal with it substantively. And my resolution that is before this Chamber will send a message that the constant borrowing on the backs of our children and our grandchildren must come to an end.

I quote the words of our own President when he was Senator in the U.S. Senate. The path that we are on is similar to the words he echoed and stated in the U.S. Senate Chamber when he said this constant borrowing, this national debt is a complete failure of leadership in the White House. We need to lead, and that is what we are going to do.

So I ask for support on this resolution from all of my colleagues, to stand with us, make the hard decisions, deal with this issue to stop this insanity that is truly a threat to our very Nation. And also, it is a threat to any economic recovery that our Nation hopes to enjoy in the short term, because if we do not get the debt under control, small business America, our entrepreneurs, the people that are going to put Americans back to work will not have the confidence or the certainty to invest in the American market that is going to lead to real jobs and to deal with the problem of our unemployment once and for all.

So with that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

You know, there's a very basic fact—I've listened to the rhetoric—if House Republicans prevailed on this bill, what would be the result? Chaos. Chaos.

The House Republicans have become the ''party of chaos.'' Six months ago, they took us to the brink of default. No one in this country liked what they saw—or maybe a very few—not the American public at large, surely not the markets, surely not the markets. But apparently House Republicans did, and you're at it again.

Here we are in the first full day in the House when we're in session this year debating a measure that would take us immediately back to the brink of default. House Republicans are once again relying on the votes of others to save them from themselves and to save this country from them.

This is posturing, not legislating. This is rhetoric, not reelection. And we've seen this movie before. 174 House Republicans voted for the Budget Control Act that set out the structure to keep the government functioning and address our long-term debt, but many decided to turn tail. And on September 14, 228 House Republicans voted in favor of the disapproval resolution to end the President's authority to pay our bills. That is what's fiscally responsible, paying bills.

Basically, they were for it before they were against it. It's a rerun of a bad movie when the American people clearly want us to move forward. And unfortunately, House Republicans have turned to Washington with the same confrontational tone they left when they nearly allowed the payroll tax and the unemployment insurance to expire. And I want to emphasize that, the same confrontation; instead of a spirit of seeking common ground, essentially confrontation. And I think the American people have said to you, enough is more than enough.

House Republicans act as if they don't already have a deadline looming, one with vast implications for millions of American families. That's what we should be talking about. In 6 weeks, the payroll tax cut expires for 160 million Americans, Federal unemployment insurance begins to end for more than 3 million people searching for work, and access to health care becomes endangered for 46 million seniors and the disabled.

□ 1420

Well, last month's jobs numbers were encouraging. The private sector created more than 200,000 jobs in December and nearly 3 million since the recovery began. But with 13 million Americans still looking for work, we need to do more. We should be doing everything possible, everything possible to ensure that our recovery doesn't falter. And you are here supporting something, if it prevailed, that would deeply impact our economy and economic growth.

So here we are in the third week of January. And now we have a conference committee on these issues, charged with the payroll tax cut and unemployment insurance. But that hasn't yet happened, not for a lack of wanting on our part. We've been ready and eager to begin. Businesses and families that are trying to plan and budget for the year should not have to wait until the 11th hour, once again, for certainty. For Republicans, brinkmanship has, I'm afraid, as demonstrated today, become the rule.

So I urge we should reject this cynical, this rigidly ideological attempt to take us back to the brink of default. If you prevail, it wouldn't take us back to the brink; it would throw us over.

The resolution, fortunately, is going nowhere. Its only impact will serve to divide and distract from addressing the real needs of the American people. So I assume—it's happened once before—a majority, and maybe a vast majority, of the House Republicans will come down here and essentially contradict what they helped to pass. That contradiction isn't even good politics, and it's terrible policy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, what I would like to say is that time has passed since we passed the Balanced Budget Control Act. There has been no action on the debt. We have seen nothing out of the White House as to a plan to deal with this national crisis. And my colleague on the other side, I will remind, that I am a conferee on that conference committee to deal with the payroll tax rates, to deal with unemployment, and to deal with the doc fix.

We were here at the end of December. I was here over the New Year's break, Thursday, Friday, working on it. We are ready to do the work. And I'm glad to hear my colleague on the other side of the aisle say that now the House Democrats are here to do the work. We do need the Senate to join into that conversation, and my hope is that they will join into that conversation very soon.

But we are capable men and women in this Chamber, Madam Speaker. I am confident that we can walk and chew gum at the same time. We will deal with the issue of the payroll tax rate. We will deal with the issue of the unemployment. We will deal with the issue of the doc fix. But we will not take our eye off of what is becoming one of the fundamental issues of our generation, and that is our national debt. And that's what this resolution speaks to and will constantly remind all of us that we need to be diligent on this issue to get it taken care of once and for all.

And with that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for the time and for his work on this vital issue.

I am opposed to raising the debt ceiling limit. How in the world can we raise the debt limit when the Senate refuses to work with the House to even pass a budget? The Senate hasn't passed one in 3 years. No one would walk into a bank and ask for a loan without a plan on how they would spend that money and pay it back. So why is it okay for the Federal Government to operate that way?

It's not.

The latest increase to the debt ceiling limit allows President Obama to borrow an additional $1.2 trillion, which brings our national debt to $16.4 trillion, and he will likely be back at the end of the year asking for another increase. To put that into perspective, after the Revolutionary War, when we became a country in 1776, and after that, many wondered if the young democracy could withstand what many at the time considered a crushing debt. The Nation had borrowed heavily to pay for the Revolutionary War. The debt, when the war was over, was about $34 per American which, in today's inflation-adjusted dollars, would be about $653. Today's debt, by contrast, is nearly 68 times that size, or $45,000 per American. It's bad enough to borrow money like there is no tomorrow, but to do so without even a budget in place is simply wrong.

Today I have introduced a bill to stop this madness. The Budget Before Borrowing Act, H.R. 3778, is a straightforward, no-gimmicks approach to spending money. It very simply says that the Nation cannot raise the debt ceiling limit unless the House and the Senate have agreed on a budget resolution. This can only be waived with a vote of two-thirds of the Members of both houses.

To conclude, I am opposed to raising the debt ceiling limit, and I urge my colleagues to support this disapproval resolution. With our current debt load and lack of a budget, the President has no business asking to raise our Nation's debt at this time.

Mr. LEVIN. It's now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in firm opposition to this resolution, a political stunt that prevents the increase in the debt limit that this Congress has already approved.

This is a dangerous distraction from our efforts to move the country forward, support continued economic growth, and promote job creation, and it flies in the face of the Budget Control Act, which 174 House Republicans voted for last summer.

In 2011, my colleagues across the aisle caused multiple self-inflicted economic crises with the specter of defaulting on our Nation's debt each time they played with fire regarding the debt limit. The Republican majority simply has not learned that these kinds of empty, partisan measures can cause immediate harm to our economy and hurt working families everywhere.

This resolution is nothing but a deeply harmful and dangerous charade: dangerous for Americans still struggling to find work, dangerous for our economy that is depending on a robust and focused recovery, and dangerous for our responsibility as a legislature, tasked not with these grand charades of brinkmanship but of safeguarding the well-being of our Nation.

We have already seen America's credit downgraded and have watched as other nations have faced the worst of default. It is time to stop holding our economy hostage to an ideological agenda. I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution and protect the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, we are here today to try to prevent the national debt from going up another $1.2 trillion, but in a way, it's a formality because most everybody knows the national debt is going up $1.2 trillion. This is sad because this process is a very mixed effort to try to curtail spending. And this power of the President to ask for a debt increase, and then we have to get two-thirds of the Congress to prevent this from going up, this is a creature of Congress. It's also a creature of a mental status here in the Congress of overspending on just everything.

It would be nice if we could blame everything on the current administration or even the previous administration. But the crisis that we're in has been building over a long period of time, and it's very bipartisan. There's been way too much cooperation in this Congress because those who like spending cooperate, and they keep spending. And for a long time, we were able to get away with this because we were a very wealthy country. Now we're nonproductive. The good jobs are overseas, and yet the spending is escalating exponentially.

We're really not facing up to the reality that the problem is spending. Yes, we have to deal with the debt. But the debt is a consequence of too much spending. Where do we spend too much money? In two places: overseas and domestically. And we need to stop the spending.

Really, in my mind, it started about 40 years ago when there was a guarantee that you don't have to worry about debt because we always had somebody there to buy the debt. If we would have had a market rate of interest where you didn't have the Federal Reserve buying the debt, interest rates would go up and would force us to live within our means. As long as you have a Federal Reserve there with no linkage to anything of soundness—since 1971, the Congress has been reckless, and the deficits have continued to grow, and the crisis that we're facing today is an inevitable consequence.

□ 1430

I believe we're in denial here in the Congress. If we had the vaguest idea of how serious this crisis is financially, not only for us, but for the world, we'd cut spending because you can't solve the problem of debt by accumulating more debt. It's just impossible to do this.

And one other thing that I think we fail to do on both sides of the aisle is really cut spending overseas. It is considered that if you spend more money overseas you have more defense, and there's no truth to that. Just spending over $1 trillion a year overseas doesn't necessarily give you more defense. And yet nobody's willing to cut. Some of these automatic cuts that are just supposed to be in line that come out of the supercommittee, everybody's squirming already. How are we going to prevent these cuts?

And this pretense that we might cut $1 trillion over the next 10 years is total pretense. We're in total denial that it's cutting something. There's a proposed increased baseline budgeting of $10 trillion. We're going to cut $1 trillion over 10 years? That's $100 billion a year.

Our national debt is going up $100 billion a month. So it's really a charade. But the American people know it's a charade. They're tired of it, and they've heard about this for so long, and we need to make up our minds. Are we going to live within the confines of the Constitution? Cut the spending and balance the budget and get out of this mess.

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

Mr. REED. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. PAUL. But the crisis that we face, as I said, is not just domestic because it is a worldwide crisis. And if we don't do something, we will be forced, under very dire circumstances, because we cannot bail out the world. We are prepared now through our Federal Reserve to bail out all of Europe. We've been downgraded, France is downgraded, Greece is downgraded, and we believe that all we have to do is spend more money and inflate the currency. Believe me, we ought to face up to reality and live within our limits.

Mr. LEVIN. It's now my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished senior member of our committee, Mr. CHARLES RANGEL of New York.

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

Mr. RANGEL. I was awed in listening to my friend, Congressman PAUL. He usually comes up with some farfetched ideas that I have no idea what he's talking about. But the truth of the matter is that he is right. America is walking down a very serious economic path that could not only jeopardize what's left of our fiscal system, but, good or bad, the whole world depends on our system.

And I cannot believe that a group of Americans, especially Members of the Congress, would say that the President of the United States is not authorized to pay off the debts that we already had. We certainly can find a lot of agreement as to how we got there, whether it's President Obama or Bush's tax cuts, or going to wars that the Congress never declared, hey, all you need is a mathematician to add it up. But we got it there and we owe the money.

Who is so less patriotic, who cares so little about our country that you would have, in addition to the falsehoods they tell about us, saying and we don't pay our debts either?

It's a question that you want to talk about what we do in the future as relates to spending, but I know the debate has to deal with people who don't pay taxes. I know the debate has to say that people are taking unfair advantage of a Tax Code with so many loopholes in it that the most conservative Republican has to agree it's time for a reform.

There's a broad area that we can talk about in what we're going to do about

wild, reckless spending. But you just don't to it by saying that I am so angry with the President, I'm so politically involved in opposing him that I would deny him the opportunity to do what every President has always done, and that is to be able to tell the world that can you count on us to pay the money that we have borrowed.

Now, being a politician myself, I know there's extreme things that we go through, but love of our country has to be something that we believe in. And I don't know what Republicans feel such a strong commitment to the Tea Party, or whatever other people having parties on the other side, that they would say that they will stop America from paying its debts.

I don't believe it. You don't believe it. You know this is not going to pass. But my God, I don't think we should be dictated in connection with what foreigners think about us. There should be some dignity and pride in saying if we make mistakes, they are our mistakes. Not European mistakes, not foreign mistakes. And if we borrow money and we don't like how much we borrow, that is our domestic problem.

For God's sake, don't let us fall in such partisan positions that we are going to say that the United States of America, the leader of the free world, we know how to borrow but we won't allow us to pay it back.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY. Our national debt now stands at more than $15.2 trillion. That amount exceeds the entire U.S. economy. Washington's reckless spending now burdens every child born in the U.S. with a $50,000 share of the national debt. If we don't do something about it now, we will be the first generation in American history to leave our children a nation worse than we inherited.

Our skyrocketing debt doesn't just affect our children and their future. It damages our economy and our unemployment rate today. It is a drag on the economy that fuels uncertainty. It hurts our credit rating. It slows economic growth and it prevents job creation.

When President Obama took office, he pledged to cut the deficit in half by 2012. After 3 years in office, has he yet to introduce a credible plan to get our deficits under control? No. Instead, under his watch the country has hit three of the highest deficits on record. That is unacceptable. The national debt has grown by more than 4.6 trillion in his 3 years in office.

We can't solve our debt problems until we address the root cause of this issue, and that is overspending here in Washington, D.C.

In the House, we passed a budget that would put our country on the path to a balanced budget. The Senate didn't pass a budget, they didn't take up our budget. They did nothing.

We passed nearly 1 trillion in spending cuts and we are planning to do more this year. The Senate, as I said, has not written a budget in nearly 1,000 days.

If your family was trying to get out of the red, you would sit down at the table, figure out how much you're making, how much you're spending and where you should cut back. The Senate refuses to do that. Think about that for a second. How on earth are we supposed to get our fiscal house in order if the Senate won't even write a budget?

Why won't the Senate do their job? One word: Politics. It is no wonder we have a 12 percent approval rating.

It is time to cut up the credit cards here in Washington and stop spending money we don't have. The longer we wait, the harder it will be to fix the mess that we are in. Putting our country on a responsible fiscal path is the only way to restart the economy and ensure our children a prosperous future.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from the State of New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Listening to this debate, you're not hearing the same thing you heard 7 months ago I'm told. But when you look away, then you say: Gee, didn't I hear this before. Maybe that is true on both sides.

Bruce Bartlett, who was a former adviser to President Reagan and a Treasury official in George Bush's administration, wrote about the five myths of not paying the debt or not increasing the debt. One of them I think bears witness today of what I have heard, the myth that it is worth risking default on the debt to prevent a tax increase given the weak economy. This is a Republican saying this. I'm just repeating the words.

He says while Republicans' concerns about higher taxes are not unreasonable—and they are not—most economists believe that any fiscal contraction at this time would be dangerous. In fact, they note that a large cut in spending in 1937 brought in another sharp recession.

□ 1440

It's very easy to say that the President is the reason why we had the plague and the tremendous deficit, but if the private sector wasn't spending money, then we would have had 5 million more people out of work.

The government has a responsibility when folks can't do for themselves what we expect. That undermines the recovery of the country, and that's what happened in the Great Depression. Republicans respond that tax increases are especially harmful to growth; however, they made the same argument in 1982 when President Reagan requested the largest peacetime tax increase in American history, and again in 1993 when President Bill Clinton asked for a large tax boost for deficit reduction. In both cases, conservative economists' predictions of economic disaster were completely wrong and strong economic growth followed.

I wasn't here in '93. Many of you were here in '93. You remember what the dire consequences of the Clinton plan were and what happened. We had the greatest boom in 50 years. Just like the economists who told us we were heading toward nirvana since 2001; and I don't want any part of nirvana if that's it, and none of us do.

We're not talking here about helping the middle class; that's for sure. We've got bailouts for them, for the other side. We know what the results are. All of us know that. It's not a partisan issue, really.

So you're trying to say that you want to protect people's taxes, and we want to say we've got to pay our debts. Well, we're really not 180 degrees apart. I think we need to do both. And if we don't sit down together, we're not going to do both.

Mr. REED. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, any vote to raise the debt ceiling should be tied to restraints on spending.

This is the voting card, America's most expensive credit card. During my time in Congress, I voted nine times against raising the debt limit because it was not tied to spending controls. This is another time to say ''no.''

Last August we were hopeful that we could have gone beyond the $4 trillion mandate in the Budget Control Act, but it did not happen. Unfortunately, the supercommittee could not come to a consensus, and we've been drifting ever since. We are now projected to add $2.1 trillion to the national debt since August, with the President's most recent request.

I've voted over 700 times against 2.6 trillion in spending over the past 5 years. That's a good place to start to find the savings that we need to get serious on debt reduction.

We need to vote ''yes'' to disapprove raising the debt limit yet again so we can get to work to cut the spending.

Mr. LEVIN. You know, I was looking over the vote from the 1st of August, and it's interesting to see and hear people coming forth who voted ''aye'' on August 1 and now essentially want to repudiate that.

I now yield 3 minutes to another very distinguished active member of our committee, JAMES MCDERMOTT, Dr. MCDERMOTT, from the snowy State of Washington.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, it's been more than a year since the Tea Party took over the House, 375 days, and in all of that time, the Republicans have not brought one bill to the floor to help the economy—not a single bill.

Today, after a long vacation and on the only day of legislative business in

the month of January, the Republicans are yet again wasting the American people's time putting out press releases. We aren't voting to help Americans get jobs or make education better or investing in roads or bridges, no. Instead, the Republicans have us voting on their top priority: to default on our country's debts. Ain't that some priority?

Today's vote is exactly why the public is disgusted with the Congress. The hypocrisy of this vote boggles your mind. Republicans wage unnecessary wars on our credit cards, they cut taxes on the very rich and blow up the deficit, and now they don't want to pay for the spending binge.

Yesterday, I got the Republican Study Committee's email outlining their agenda for next year. I admit I subscribe. I always want to know what folks on the other side of the aisle have come up with.

We have 14 million people unemployed. We have huge competitive challenges with other countries. There's lots of investing that we need to do at home. But what's the Republican program as they put it out over the email? Nothing. They didn't have one new idea in that agenda. All the Republicans want is more war, more deregulation on Wall Street, and more dirty air—and no help of any kind whatsoever for the middle class.

Madam Speaker, the Republicans are wasting the Americans' time. We need investment, not a Republican default. They're spending their time in South Carolina now selecting their next leader to lead into this same Congress of ''no.'' This is the Congress of ''no'' we're watching. They don't pay their debts. They don't have any ideas. They don't provide any jobs. It is simply the ''no'' Congress.

Mr. REED. I'd just like to remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that last time we took a vote on this issue back on the Budget Control Act in August was a much different time than today. Since August, we've been waiting for a plan from the other side to deal with our national debt. We've been waiting for a plan from the White House to deal with our national debt. Nothing has occurred.

So, Madam Speaker, there is no repudiation of our vote from August. This is consistent with what the American people are telling us, that we have to get our act together in Washington.

I join my colleagues on the other side. My hand is open to work hand in hand to deal with these problems once and for all. I'm willing to sacrifice my political life to do what needs to be done for the American people. I just hope my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join in that same sentiment.

Let's put politics aside. Let's deal with the substance of the day. Let's deal with this underlying national crisis that is represented in our national debt. You have many friends over here that are looking to reach out hand to hand, join arm in arm to deal with this problem and deal with the economy of our Nation once and for all. I just ask you to jump and join us rather than fight us.

With that, I'm happy to yield to my colleague from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) for 2 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. This vote has been called a charade. That is true; it is. Let's face it. The President will veto this. The Senate will sustain the veto.

Having said that, for years and years we raised the debt limit without a discussion, let alone a vote sometimes. It would just happen procedurally. That's wrong. At least this time we've had a discussion back in August. I didn't favor the budget agreement that we had there. I did not vote for it because I think, if we're going to raise the debt ceiling, then boy, we ought to have a plan to pay down the debt or actually deal with the deficit.

But I think we have to admit that even if the Senate had passed the House-passed budget, the so-called Ryan budget, we would still have to raise the debt ceiling. I don't think anybody really disputes that. We're going to have to raise the debt ceiling again and again. But at least let's put together a plan to deal with our deficit, and we haven't done that.

Now, in our candid moments over here on the Republican side of the aisle, we have to admit that we were headed toward this fiscal cliff long before the current President took the wheel. He stepped on the accelerator a bit, and we're going to get there a lot faster.

Having said that, this Congress seems to only take action when we're right at that cliff, right staring off into the abyss. We can't do that anymore. We don't know where that next cliff is. It could happen when we have a treasury auction and have no buyers for our debt. That could happen sooner than we might want to realize. So it behooves us now to actually put together a plan to deal with our debt and deficit. That plan does not exist today.

□ 1450

So I think, for that reason, we ought to vote for this resolution and then actually put a plan in place to deal with it rather than just letting future generations inherit this debt.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. FLAKE, the problem is, if you prevailed, you'd create an abyss.

Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Georgia, another active member of our committee, Mr. LEWIS.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Here we go again, Madam Speaker. Instead of working on legislation to help create jobs, House Republicans have gathered us here for political games. This bill is not constructive. Madam Speaker, it is destructive. It is disruptive to the most important task we face—helping struggling Americans get back to work and getting our economy moving again.

We've been down this road before. We fought this so-called ''battle'' last year. The debt limit is America's credit card bill, and just because we don't like the balance doesn't mean we don't have to pay it. It's just that simple. When you get a balance on your credit card, you pay it. We all do it. This exercise is a waste of time and taxpayer dollars.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill. Let's come together and work for the good of this Nation and not partisan dissent. The time is always right to do right.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I would just like to remind my colleague on the other side of the aisle that when you get a credit card bill that you can no longer afford, you do pay it, but you cut it up, and you stop the spending so you don't exacerbate the problem.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I stand in strong support of this resolution of disapproval of increasing the debt ceiling another $1.2 trillion.

You've heard colleagues on both sides of the aisle, members of the Ways and Means Committee, the distinguished former chairman, Mr. RANGEL, and others speak about why we have to raise the debt ceiling and that it's something that has been done over the years. Certainly, that's true. In the 9 years that I've been a Member—this being my 10th year—I've seen it happen many times. A lot of times it has passed, as Mr. FLAKE said, procedurally, and the public doesn't even know it.

Now, I rarely disagree with my friend from Arizona, but I take a little bit of exception to what he said. He said the President has just stepped on the accelerator a bit. I would say $4.5 trillion in 3½ years is not stepping on the accelerator just a bit, Madam Speaker; that's putting the pedal to the metal. This has gotten so totally out of hand that it has got to stop.

So, on our side, this is not a waste of time as the gentleman from Washington said. We're not just pandering to the Tea Party. Listen, we're paying attention to the conservatives in this country, who first got my attention in 1964, and to the conscience of a conservative: to just quit all this spending and get our fiscal house in order. We need to do that with the cooperation on both sides of the aisle.

This resolution of disapproval, yes, it's going to fail—we understand that—but the American people need to know that there are Members of this Congress who are going to stand with them. Whether you call them Tea Party or whatever and try to denigrate them, we're going to stand with them and do the right thing. That's why I'm proud to take the time today. Yes, it is important. It may be the most important thing we do to finally say that

we're not going to overspend; and then we say we're going to cut over the next 10 years but we'll borrow over the next year $1.2 trillion. It has got to end.

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

Mr. REED. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. My colleague has yielded to me a little bit of additional time, but I'm pretty much ready to wrap up, Madam Speaker.

Honestly, this is what we need to do. This is what the American public wants us to do. It's time for us to get together in a bipartisan way to solve this, to solve Medicare, to solve Social Security.

As former Speaker Newt Gingrich said on the campaign trail just yesterday: It's time to take Social Security off budget and have it stand alone, not let the Congress raid the trust fund. We now owe it $2.5 trillion. Then for the Secretary of the Treasury to say if we don't increase the debt ceiling that seniors are not going to get their Social Security checks, that's baloney.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my privilege to yield 3 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me call attention to some of the statements that have been offered here.

Mr. REED, the reason you were invited to the floor to manage this time as a freshman Member of Congress is very simple. You weren't here for the reckless ride that the Republican Party took during the 8 years of the Bush administration. That's why you're here and the other freshmen who have come to the floor. You weren't here for this tirade of spending.

You said you'd cut up the credit card. So we're going to cut up the credit card for the VA hospitals after 35,000 men and women have been wounded serving us honorably in Iraq and Afghanistan?

Now, look. I voted against the war in Iraq, and I voted against the Bush tax cuts in 2001 and 2003. Now a fact, not opinion: Bill Clinton says goodbye, and there is a $5.7 trillion surplus. He balanced budgets four times in 5 years. It has only happened five times since the end of World War II.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is one of the few Republicans who will come to the House with a straight face and say, Let me tell you how we got here. He knows how we got here. Mr. GINGREY is a friend, and he knows how we got here. You can't cut taxes by $2.3 trillion and fight two wars and honor the commitment we have to those men and women who have served us honorably in Iraq and Afghanistan. While I was against the tax cuts and while I was against the war in Iraq, I'm going to vote for those appropriations to take care of those veterans' hospitals. You don't cut up the credit card when they come back. You use good judgment before you send them off.

What happened here during those 8 years with the prescription drug benefit? What happened during those 8 years with weapons of mass destruction? What happened with tax cuts? By the way, the corresponding argument on those tax cuts is: Tax cuts pay for themselves? Well, guess what. We're staring at a $15 trillion deficit and debt because of those reckless fiscal practices that took place.

For the Republican Party to make these arguments today about this issue—which, by the way, Mr. FLAKE is correct about again—is but a charade. You meet your obligations. You pay your bills. That's what the credit card is about and not to pontificate in front of this Chamber today about reckless spending when, for 8 years, nobody had the courage on that side to stand up and say enough is enough.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Every time I go back home to Tennessee and as I hold town hall meetings, I do hear from my constituents: Enough is enough. Stop the madness. Let's get the Nation's fiscal house in order.

That is what the American people are demanding that we do. Just so we all realize what the debt is, you're talking $15.2 trillion. Nearly $5 trillion, or one-third, of that debt has come onto the books in the past 3½ years. That is the rate of acceleration by which this administration is pushing this Nation to the brink, and that is why our constituents are saying, ''Stop it.'' It's the reason for this vote today: to pass a resolution of disapproval and to send our message to the President that, look, time has long passed for you to bring forward a plan to deal with this debt. It is your responsibility to do so for this country, and it is your responsibility to do so for future generations in order to make certain that our children and our grandchildren, like my two grandchildren, don't have an increasing share of this.

□ 1500

This past year, a family's share of our national debt grew by $30,000. It is time for us to realize that we have to stop the out-of-control spending, we have to freeze this spending, and then we have to begin to cut and remove and eliminate items that are unnecessary to the budget. Let's reiterate our commitment to getting back on the right track, getting our fiscal house in order, and let's reiterate this commitment to the American people that we have hit the high-water mark in spending, and we are going to join together in a bipartisan fashion to make certain that we get the Federal Government's fiscal house in order.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from the great State of Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this measure. What we are dealing with today is a smokescreen to obscure the self-inflicted crisis of confidence that has been unfolding with our friends on the other side of the aisle over the course of this last year.

Everybody knew that we would honor our debts that had already been incurred, but they fogged the issue, created doubt, pushed to the brink. And this charade today is a result of what was required to help them get off the ledge onto which they had climbed, that risk, damaging the credibility and creditworthiness of the United States.

The issue should be how we spend money. We need to change how we do business, and I think, with all due respect, there are things that we could be working on now to make some progress.

There is an opportunity to reform our tax system that is complex and unfair. We're just finding out that Mr. Romney, worth hundreds of millions of dollars, pays less in tax than probably the undocumented workers who worked in his yard.

There are opportunities to deal with carried interest, with unnecessary tax breaks that are permanent for oil and gas while important emerging technologies like wind are in a state of limbo. And the public agrees that the most fortunate among us should be paying a little more. It's only fair, they can do it, it makes a difference.

We could be working together on agricultural reform to spend less money, but target on farmers and ranchers, rather than large agribusiness.

We should accelerate the health care reforms that started out bipartisan and relatively noncontroversial that actually would help us no longer spend twice as much as other developed countries for results that aren't as good.

Instead of getting down to brass tacks, my Republican friends are playing games like this measure. Luckily the game that they are playing today won't crash the global economy, but it will further erode confidence in Congress, and it delays the day that we work together on the elements that I just described where we could get bipartisan support, change how we do business, reduce the deficit, and give the taxpayers more value for their dollars.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Let's look at President Obama's record after his first 3 years. President Obama has left us a record of debt, despair, and downgrades, and here we are today debating whether or not President Obama is able to go grab another $1.2 trillion that he adds to the debt of our Nation that our children and grandchildren are going to have to pay.

The reason we were downgraded is because President Obama himself has still refused to put a plan forward to balance the Federal budget, his budget that he purported and pushed forth doubles the national debt in his first 5 years. And then, of course, he becomes the first President in the history of our Nation to have our debt rating, the debt rating of the United States, downgraded.

You know, you look at the despair as Americans are trying to get jobs. We're getting reports today that President Obama is going to reject the Keystone pipeline, turning his back on 20,000 American families who were looking for those good jobs here in America, making us more dependent on Middle Eastern countries who don't like us.

You know, the Canadians, who are a good friend of ours, wanted to send oil down to America. That's oil we don't have to be buying from Middle Eastern countries. Instead, the President is going to, as we're hearing reports of today, is going to turn his back on those 20,000 jobs. And he's going to send that oil and those jobs to China.

Now how preposterous is that? As the President is trying to rack up more debt on the Nation's credit card, which we're debating here today, at the same time he's turning his back and running 20,000 more jobs out of this country. That's the record of this administration. That's what President Obama has given us, and you wonder why we've had over 8 percent unemployment for almost every single month he's been President.

We can't afford the Obama economy. It's time for a change. We need to reject this increase in the debt ceiling. Stop spending money that we don't have.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to a former active member of our committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my good friend.

Madam Speaker, I understand the Republican majority will vote today against the President's request to raise the debt limit. To borrow a phrase from the former Speaker of the House, can we please drop the pious baloney?

Less than 6 months ago, 174 Republicans voted for precisely what they are voting against today. This Republican leadership created a national crisis and walked us to the brink of default. Then they voted for a bill to end the crisis, but slipped in a provision allowing them to attack the President for the decision that they now don't have the guts to stand by.

This is not leadership, and it certainly is not governing. It's an ideological game that has ventured well beyond the absurd.

Now, Mr. FLAKE, I think in a very important moment of candor, talked about the fact that the very budget that the Republicans passed this last year would, in fact, raise the national debt by more than $6 trillion over the next 10 years. You cannot square logically an opposition to raising the debt ceiling when you have then voted for a budget that does exactly that. It raises the national debt.

And with all due respect to the gentleman from New York, when he says nothing's changed in the last 7 months—nothing has changed in the last 7 months. We agreed on something, we knew what the debt was going to be, the deficit. We agreed to accommodate it in this way.

The only thing that has changed in the last 7 months is that the Republicans are now trying to renege on the agreement that they made 7 months ago. That's the only thing that's changed.

The American people have been loud and clear on what they need from this Congress: responsible investments and infrastructure; education; and job creation. And they want everyone to share in the sacrifice for our economic recovery, including billionaires and big oil companies.

Madam Speaker, it's time to do the work the American people have asked us to do. They don't have time for more pious baloney.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I would just remind the gentleman that what we have done on our side of the aisle is at least we have put a plan in writing by adopting and approving the budget. We're just looking. In the last 7 months we've been waiting for a plan in black and white from the White House on how we are going to get out of this national debt crisis. Not political speeches, but in black and white so that we can take it back to the American people and have an open and honest debate with them as to where we're going to prioritize our spending and how we're going to get out of this hole.

That's what we're looking for, and that's what my colleague from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is talking about. We are at the point on this side of the aisle, ladies and gentlemen, of saying we don't care who's at fault. I'm at the point—Democrat, Republican, we're at $15.2 trillion, whoever is responsible for it, I could care less.

□ 1510

What I care about are my kids—and my grandkids, who aren't even born, who aren't even on the face of this Earth—and getting our act together in Washington and getting a national plan put together so we can join arm in arm and stand with each other to deal with this issue.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to raising the debt limit again and again and again.

Last week, I traveled across the First Congressional District of Kansas to host seven town hall meetings. Kansans reiterated the same thing I heard in 70 town halls last year—overspending, over-regulation, and yes, overtaxing must end now.

Kansans are not concerned about the next election, like most in Washington seem to be. They are worried about the next generation.

Between the first day this President took office and today, debt has grown by $4.6 trillion. As a comparison, it took from George Washington to Bill Clinton to build up that much debt. And now the President wants another $1.2 trillion. But unfortunately, the real battle to prohibit this $1.2 trillion mortgage on our children's future was lost 5 months ago when the House passed the Budget Control Act. Since the Budget Control Act passed, the Congress has failed to produce any cuts from the supercommittee. We have failed to pass a balanced budget amendment. And Senator REID not only refuses to pass but even to consider a budget.

However, those recent failures don't paint the picture. The culture of overspending in Washington for the past half century has led us to where we are today. Every President has refused to balance the budget. Every Member of Congress who advocated for their pet projects, every bureaucrat who practiced a use-it-or-lose-it mentality, every special interest who came to us, everyone, they are all to blame for where we stand today.

Our national debt is equal to our GDP. When this debt limit is reached, every man, woman, and child in America will have their own debt to pay to Washington of $50,000, and this doesn't take into account the mountains of debt we face for future runaway entitlement programs.

I look around this body, this is not about us. This is about our children and grandchildren who will have to pay this back. Unless and until Washington can get its grip on reckless spending and borrowing, the future of our country will remain on the line.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman from New York that he has 34 minutes remaining on his side. The gentleman from Michigan has 35½ minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, it is now my privilege to yield 5 minutes to our distinguished whip, Mr. HOYER from the great State of Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, according to a new poll by The Washington Post and ABC News, 84 percent of Americans disapprove of the way Congress is doing its job. I don't know that the other 16 percent are paying attention, because we're not doing our job well. And this certainly is not doing our job well. The reason it is not doing our job well is because it is a pretense, a sham. This legislation is to pay bills that we've already incurred. Whether, as the gentleman said, it was incurred with your votes or whether it was incurred with our votes, we have incurred those expenses. This is about whether America is going to pay its bills. Nothing more, nothing less.

Now, the previous gentleman said nobody had done anything about the debt. In point of fact, we did do something about the debt. We put revenue at levels commensurate with our spending. As a result, in 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000 and 2001—in 1997 we brought the deficit down to $25 billion, and for the next 4 years, we had a surplus. Now a couple of those years were not real surpluses because we counted on Social Security revenue. But two of those years were real surpluses.

This is about whether we pay our bills that we have incurred. Not doing this would be irresponsible, and would lead, I think, to further disrespect by the public, and properly so. One of the reasons for this feeling by the public is that Americans are tired of political games. This is a political game. This is a game that will say, see, I voted against debt.

Now, let me tell you how you can vote against debt. When you cut taxes in 2001 and 2003—and I agree with my friend, it's not about blame. It is about learning, however. When we cut taxes in 2001 and 2003 under George Bush, we didn't pay for them. We pretended they would pay for themselves. They didn't. Alan Greenspan says they won't. We ought to learn from that.

Learning from that, we ought to say yes, we'll pay our debts. The President doesn't want this money. It's not for the President; it's for bills that we incurred in fighting two wars, in giving tax cuts primarily to the wealthiest in America, to passing a prescription drug program that frankly all of us now support, but we didn't pay for it. And as a result, we got deeply into debt. And we have to get out of that debt, and we have to show courage, wisdom, and hopefully intellectual honesty in getting to that.

The American public is tired of seeing Republicans spending time on votes simply because of electoral positioning. And, frankly, they'd be tired of us doing the same thing. But that's all this is. It's so we can say: Look what we voted for. This is not our debt, we voted against it. But that's not responsible, and it's not honest. And I think most of you know that.

The resolution before us today is simply another waste of time. More than that, it undermines confidence here and around the world. Some of that debt, of course, we owe to people around the world. It is the essence of political gamesmanship, and does nothing to reduce the debt or create jobs. And we spend a whole day on it. As a matter of fact, this is the only full day we are going to spend in January debating any issue.

Americans know that we ought to pay our bills. They know we reached a deal in August that said both parties will work together to address our deficits in a way that will provide certainty to our businesses, markets, and families around the dinner table.

Agreeing to this resolution would only provide more uncertainty at a time when our people need to see us working together on a big, balanced deal to meet our fiscal challenges. My friend and I are both for that effort. I am very much for that effort. But I don't pretend that not paying the bills that we have incurred is going to solve that problem. The only thing that's going to solve that problem is we're going to ask everybody to contribute their fair share. Yes, we're going to have to make some cuts. And we're going to have to make some cuts that neither side will like, and we're going to have to raise revenues that neither side will like.

But I will tell my friend who is waiting for his grandchildren, I have three grandchildren now, and I have two great grandchildren, and he's right; they are the ones who are going to have to pay this bill.

And I saw my young friend, a new Member from South Carolina, and I can't recall his name right this second.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I saw my young friend passionate about not passing these bills along to his children. I thought to myself, I could give that speech. But, very frankly, I voted against cutting taxes without paying for them. I voted against the AMT without paying for it. We paid for it when we set the AMT. I think it needs to be fixed, and we paid for it.

I will vote ''no'' on this resolution, which comes as no surprise after you've heard me talk, and I strongly encourage my colleagues to do the same. Why? America is disheartened because they do not believe we are honest in dealing with them. They believe we play political games. They believe that we are not addressing the issues they know are of importance and they know do not have easy, simplistic answers.

I hope Democrats who vote ''no'' are joined by a large number of Republicans, not because you like debt, not because any of us like debt. And, very frankly, I voted for the Clinton revenue increases in 1993, and the prediction on your side of the aisle was that it would destroy the economy, unemployment would spike, and the deficit would explode. None of that happened. You were wrong. All of us are wrong from time to time. Dead wrong.

□ 1520

As a matter of fact, we enjoyed the best economy I have seen in my adult life in the 1990s. And we have seen the worst recession in my life after pursuing the Bush policies for 8 years. Yes, we were in charge for the last 2, but we couldn't change policies because the President had the veto and a majority of the votes to sustain that veto on this floor.

So ladies and gentlemen, let's be honest with the American people. We've all incurred a debt. We all spent the money. We drove on the roads, we were defended abroad, we invested in health care, research. We all incurred these debts. We know we need to solve it. We know that medicine will be tough. But honesty will make it easier, honesty between ourselves, honesty with the American people, and honesty, integrity and courage.

I hear around this country talk about Greece has a real problem. They are 128 percent, I think, in debt; we're only at about 100 percent. If you count our internal debt, it's less than that. But the problem that Greece has is they don't have the resources to solve their problem. America, the good news for us is we have the resources to solve our problems if we have the courage and political will to do so. This vote is a small token of showing that we have the courage, the wisdom and the political will to do so.

We need to pay our bills. Vote ''no'' on this resolution. Show the American people that we have courage, that we have wisdom, and we can have the political will to make America the continuing strongest country on the face of the Earth.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I would like to say to Mr. HOYER that I have a tremendous amount of respect for him as a Member of this body. And I have joined him to support the ''Go Big'' effort.

And what I would say is, by this resolution, look at what we have done on our side of the aisle. We have brought this conversation out of the back rooms. We have brought the ideas and proposals that we've heard from Mr. BLUMENAUER from Oregon, I believe, who talked about comprehensive tax reform, agriculture reform on the floor of this House, in front of the American people, in an open and honest manner. And what we have done on our side of the aisle is to stress that these conversations will no longer happen behind closed doors, but they will happen on the floor of this Chamber. And I'm confident, I am confident that when we come together like we are, like the foundation that we are setting in our conversations, that we are going to solve this problem. But until that solution is enacted, I will get up every day as a Member of this House to champion the cause of getting the fiscal house of Washington, DC in order, to get our reckless spending under control, and get this economy going.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. And I want to thank him for his participation in addressing this issue. And frankly, in my opinion, he was one of the 100 signatories that we had saying let's get a big deal, we have to get a handle on this debt. I want to thank him. But I want to assure him as well, I've been here just a little longer than he has, this debate

has been going on for some period of time. This is not a new debate. With all due respect, it's been on this floor—I've been raising this issue for some 20 years, very frankly, others have as well on both sides of the aisle. The debate has been going on, but as I said, we need to summon the courage and political will to not just debate it, but to address it and address it effectively. And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO).

Mr. PALAZZO. I thank the gentleman for my time.

It's a new year, and we have a new chance to tackle some real problems in this session of the 112th Congress, but real problems need real solutions. We saw what was possible when the House came together last year to pass conservative, job-creating bills and a plan to cut $6.2 trillion in government spending and reduce deficits by $4.2 trillion over the next decade. We also saw how little got done when Democrats in the Senate and the Obama administration consistently ignored the wishes of the American people.

This administration has said it will continue to wage its 2012 campaign against this Congress. So instead of working with us and encouraging the Senate to consider the numerous jobs bills we have passed in the House, the President has chosen once again to try to divide us and the American people.

Make no mistake, the issue of spending will be as important in this second session of Congress as it was in the first. It remains so because our economy has not stabilized. Government is still too large and too many people are still looking for work. Yes, the President inherited a bad economy, but his destructive policies have made it much worse.

I support this resolution of disapproval of the President's debt limit increase because shouldering future generations with trillions of dollars in debt is not leading, it is following. So I say to the President and leaders in the Senate, if you're ready to work together on some very real solutions to real problems in 2012, so are we. We've been ready.

America deserves and demands better than the short-term, drive-the-car-off-the-cliff mentality and policies our President has given us over this past year. And we in the House will continue to bring forth real leadership and real solutions to the real problems facing us for this generation and for those to come.

Before I yield, one of our colleagues mentioned something about the Path to Prosperity, the Republican budget. He said, yes, it does include running deficits and increasing the debt. But what he failed to mention was it would also repeal job-killing regulations, simplify the Tax Code, repeal the government takeover of health care, and address the number one driver of our deficit, and that's Medicare. We call that plan the Path to Prosperity. The President and Democrats' only alternative has been a path to despair.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. REED, Mr. HOYER mentioned this. You know, on Ways and Means for years, once the Republicans gained the majority, we protested they weren't paying for anything. So this isn't a new issue. It isn't a new issue.

I now yield 5 minutes to the ranking member of the Budget Committee and a distinguished former member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague, Mr. LEVIN.

You know, day after day, month after month, we hear Members of Congress—Republicans and Democrats alike—come to the floor of this House and say we've got to do more on jobs, we've got to make sure that we get this fragile economy moving again. Unfortunately, while we say those things in this body, we haven't yet taken up the President's jobs initiative that he presented to this Congress last September. We've taken little bits and pieces here and there. We've had 2 months now in the payroll tax cut—that's good news, I hope we can get the rest of it—but the rest of it has been absolutely ignored. But at least people said they wanted to focus on job creation and getting the economy moving again.

And what's incredible about today is we have our Republican colleagues advocating a course of action which, if we took them seriously, would wreak absolute havoc on the economy. It would destroy jobs throughout the economy. That's not just me saying it, that's Republican economists, independent economists, Democratic economists. If the United States, for the first time in its history, refused to pay its debts, if the United States, for the first time in its history, refused to make good on the full faith and credit of the United States, the economy would fall to pieces, millions of people would lose their jobs.

You know, if we want to be taken seriously we have to be serious about the consequences of our actions. And if we take the course of action being presented, we'd have a fiasco on our hands.

Look, the American people I think understand full well what's going on here, but I do think it's important to make clear what the debt ceiling does. You raise the debt ceiling in order to cover obligations already made. If we don't lift the debt ceiling, it's as if we woke up one morning and said, you know, we're not going to pay our mortgage, or if you went out and purchased goods and services with a credit card and said, hey, you know what, we're not going to pay our credit card today. Well, you know what happens? You lose your house if you do that. The credit card company comes after you for that. If the United States of America was to renege on the full faith and credit of its obligations, it would be a disaster in the international economy, and yet that is apparently the course of action being advocated by our Republican colleagues today.

□ 1530

Now, what makes this really political theater is everybody knows that more responsible Members of Congress and certainly the President of the United States are not going to let that happen. They are not going to allow that reckless outcome to happen. And that's why, in so many ways, this is unfortunately just political theater; and it's one of the things, frankly, that contributes to the American people's low view of the Congress, this kind of political game playing.

Another thing that contributes to that is Members of Congress' refusal to take responsibility for their own actions. Last year, we had the Republican budget on the floor of the House. There are major differences in the priorities between the Republican budgets and the Democratic budgets. But the reality is the Republican budget that was overwhelmingly voted for by our Republican colleagues would require us to lift the debt ceiling of the United States, the very debt ceiling that our Republican colleagues are now telling us they don't want to increase. It would require us. It would have added $7 trillion to the debt over the next 10 years.

How is it that people can come down and vote for a budget that says we're going to ask the United States to take on these additional obligations and then vote for a motion, a resolution, that refuses to take responsibility for those very actions? And I think that's why the American people are understandably losing much of the confidence certainly in this House of Representatives.

Obviously, we have big challenges with respect to the deficit. Let's get together and solve them. But as my colleague from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) said, in order to do that, we have to come to the table in the spirit of compromise.

And we have before the country a number of approaches. We've had a number of bipartisan commissions. We have Simpson-Bowles, Rivlin-Domenici. They have established a framework for resolving the deficit issue. All of their frameworks say, yes, we have to make some tough decisions on making cuts, but we also have to deal with the revenue side of the equation. And the major obstacle—let's just be clear—to dealing with the revenue side of the equation is we have a lot of folks who have taken the position that you can't close one corporate tax loophole for the purpose of deficit reduction.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague from Michigan.

We have our colleagues on the Republican side taking the position of the so-called Grover Norquist pledge, a pledge to Grover Norquist's organization as opposed to the pledge we all take to do our best to uphold the Constitution of the United States. And under that pledge, if you close a corporate tax loophole for the purpose of deficit reduction, you have violated your pledge. If you say, ''You know what? Gas prices are doing really well. Oil companies are doing just great. We don't think they need a taxpayer subsidy. We are going to get rid of it,'' you can't get rid of that if you are going to use some of that money for deficit reduction. It's a violation of the pledge.

So, yes, let's get serious about deficit reduction. Let's take a balanced approach. We have a bipartisan model—at least a framework—in Simpson-Bowles. Let's be serious about that. But the reason this process on the floor of the House today is not serious is because everybody recognizes the United States can't afford to default on its full faith and credit—everybody, that is, except for the folks who are apparently going to vote to say we can't raise the debt ceiling, that we are not going to take responsibility for paying for obligations already due and owing, budgets already passed. What kind of message is that to our children?

You've got to pay for your debts. But you know what? You don't really have to; wink, wink, nod, nod. Go ahead and buy those things on your credit card and then decide the next day you are not going to pay for them. What a terrible message that is.

So let's take responsibility, I will say to our colleagues, for our actions. Let's not play political games. And most of all, let's not follow the advice that our Republican colleagues today are recommending which would undoubtedly, if taken seriously, result in economic chaos and a huge loss of jobs.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I'm happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. BUERKLE).

Ms. BUERKLE. I thank my colleague from New York.

You know, we prepare our remarks to come down here and speak, but as I listen to my colleagues across the aisle, I just have to comment on a couple of things here today. First and foremost, this is not a Democratic or a Republican issue. The debt that this Nation faces is not partisan. It's an American issue. We need to join together and figure out a path forward. And to hear my colleagues across the aisle demagogue our Republican budget—well, I challenge the Senate to put forth a budget, and let's put a spending plan in place.

This debate about the debt ceiling is critical to this country because we can't get the Senate to the table to debate a budget, so we've got to somehow get their comments out and get to the American people how very important it is to stop the spending.

The United States of America doesn't have a taxing problem; we have a spending problem. And until and unless we get our spending under control, we cannot move forward as a Nation. It isn't about taxing the American people anymore. They are taxed enough. We need a fairer and a flatter income tax. We need to revise our Tax Code. But, most importantly, we need to stop the spending.

This past week, our President came out, Madam Speaker, and he talked to us about consolidating Departments within the Federal Government, about decreasing government, making it more efficient, and yet he comes to us and he asks us to increase the debt ceiling. That's talking out of both sides of your mouth, Madam Speaker. This President, I believe, thinks that government has the answers, and he wants to give the bureaucrats a blank check to move forward and to spend this country into oblivion.

I came here as the mother of six children and a grandmother of 12 because I believe the best thing we can do for this country is to get our spending under control, stop spending money that we don't have so that the country that we give to our kids and our grandchildren is a better place with more opportunity to achieve the American Dream.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 3 minutes to the very active gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, the course of action that is being proposed by the Republican majority is two things: One, it's reckless and irresponsible; and, two, it's cynical and very political.

First of all, why is it reckless and irresponsible? It is because this country has never seriously considered defaulting on its obligations, saying ''no'' to paying its bills. What great country would ever seriously suggest to its citizens that it will stiff its creditors, with all of the economic chaos that would ensue?

Also, the reason that we have to raise the debt ceiling is not so we have permission to spend more money. It's to meet obligations that have been incurred. Many of those obligations, incidentally, are for expenditures that I opposed but you supported: the war in Iraq; the extension of the Bush tax cuts; the Medicare prescription drug part D that was never paid for; the extension of the Bush tax cuts a year ago December when it was going to add $800 billion to the 10-year deficit, but even then, in order to accommodate that, you wouldn't raise the debt ceiling. So that's the irresponsible part of this proposal.

Obligations incurred are obligations that must be paid. I was against the Iraq war. I didn't want to spend that money. Had I been here, I would have voted against the Bush tax cuts because I thought it was bad policy. But, as a Member of Congress, those were congressional obligations, I believe, that we and I have an obligation to stand behind.

But secondly, the reason I believe this is cynical and political is two things: First, these budget requirements are ones that were incurred, in many cases, at the advocacy of our Republican majority. Secondly, this process that we're now doing is one that was designed to allow people who wanted to stand up and vote ''no'' against extending the debt ceiling the opportunity to do so so that they could claim they were against it, even though it was designed as well to guarantee that the debt ceiling would be raised, just putting the full burden of making that happen on the President of the United States.

□ 1540

I'm glad that he's willing to bear that responsibility. But I question whether the American people are fooled by a congressional maneuver whereby the majority is saying that we want to say no, that we're against raising the debt ceiling, even though we've guaranteed a process by which it will happen.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DESJARLAIS).

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Madam Speaker, our Nation is over $15 trillion in debt. But what does 15 trillion in debt really mean?

Well, it means that every American's share of the debt is roughly $48,000. It means that our debt is more than our Nation's yearly Gross Domestic Product. It means we must borrow 40 cents on every dollar we spend. And it means that China can purchase a new F–35 Joint Strike Fighter every 2 days with the interest we pay them.

While these facts alone should cause concern, the truly frightening part is that there is no plan in place to prevent our debt from continuing to grow. Increasing the debt limit by another $1.2 trillion will mean by the end of 2012 our national debt will be in excess of $16 trillion. But worse than that, raising the debt limit sends the message to job creators that we are still not serious about making the necessary spending cuts and reforms to pay down this unsustainable debt.

My constituents have given me a clear message: Make the Federal Government live within its means. That will require us to prioritize our spending and make tough spending decisions. But there's no other choice. It is simply impossible to continue to run yearly trillion dollar deficits, yet that is exactly what some in Washington want to continue to do.

There is absolutely no doubt that if we don't change this course, this reckless spending binge will ruin our economy and bankrupt our Nation. That is not fair to our future generations.

We have an opportunity here today to say, enough is enough. We can be the Congress that acts to put this great Nation back on the right track.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this disapproval resolution.

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

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS of Florida. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today I rise against the debt ceiling, and I rise in favor of reality.

Madam Speaker, my freshman colleagues and I arrived in Washington, D.C. from various backgrounds. Many, like me, owned their own businesses. Others include auto dealers, funeral home directors, a dentist, doctors, soldiers, a pilot, law enforcement officers, a football player, a roofing contractor and others. The point is, Madam Speaker, people who lived and worked in the real world came in as freshman as my colleagues.

Many of that same group have been told, ''We just don't understand how Washington works.'' The fact is, Washington doesn't work. Only in Washington is slowing the rate of growth in spending called a cut. Only in Washington are job creators called a myth, but bailouts are called a stimulus.

Madam Speaker, the sad reality is that Washington doesn't work. But what is more saddening is that it can. Our founders, in their enduring wisdom, crafted a system of government with checks and balances.

Just because we have a President that is willing to spend our way into further debt does not mean that this branch of government has to go along with it. We have the ability, right here, right now, to stop repeating the fiscal insanity that has led us to trillions in debts and deficits.

The fact that we're even talking about raising the debt limit without any realistic credible plan to pay off our debts shows just how ingrained in our thinking this irresponsible spending has become. The fact that this President wants to spend 23 to 25 percent of GDP, when over the last 80 years this government has never come close to matching that in revenues, regardless of tax rates, is a travesty to the American people, our children and our grandchildren.

The fact that our friends across the Capitol can't pass a budget for more than 1,000 days is unacceptable. The fact that we are printing money to buy our own debt makes sense only if you got your economics degree by passing go and collecting $200.

Madam Speaker, the entire government has a choice. We can make a government work for the betterment of the American people.

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

Mr. REED. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROSS of Florida. We can make Washington work for the betterment of the American people. Will we live in the real world, prioritize spending and yes, go without, or will we continue to play in Congressional Candyland, the place where some say the sky is blue while others say the sky is red, and at the last minute, a deal is declared saying it's purple, and it's called progress.

Madam Speaker, the sky is blue, and at this time, I ask Congress and the President to join the rest of America in the real world.

Mr. LEVIN. How many more speakers do you have, Mr. REED?

Mr. REED. We believe we have about three or four.

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

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, could I inquire as to the amount of time we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 23½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 17¼.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to state the obvious, that the Federal Government still spends too much and it borrows too much.

President Obama has asked the Congress to raise the debt limit by $1.2 trillion. Let's put this number into perspective. There are 83 million families in the United States. So what the President is really asking is for every hardworking American family to mortgage an additional $14,450. While middle-class Americans are struggling, the President has requested to pile more and more debt on top of hardworking taxpayers.

Americans are tired of hoping that their lawmakers will come together and find commonsense solutions to a very serious problem facing our Nation. Our national debt stands at over $15 trillion. Our outstanding debt totals 100 percent of our Gross Domestic Product. Our credit rating has been downgraded. Medicare will be bankrupt in 9 years, and Social Security faces insolvency.

The time for hope is past. We must act. America simply cannot wait. We got into this mess because of a decade of budget tricks, accounting gimmicks and empty promises. We did not get into this situation overnight, and we certainly cannot get out of it overnight.

But the fact is, we need a commonsense budget and a Federal Government that is efficient and effective, not one that wastes money of hardworking taxpayers.

If we do nothing, American prosperity will drown in debt, as we are currently on an unsustainable path of trillion per year deficits. But if we make the hard decisions today, we can avoid the unacceptable consequences that we will surely face.

We're all in this together, and we must find a solution together. America never backs down from a challenge. We can and we will make the right decisions today so that we can restore the American dream and give our children and our grandchildren a future full of opportunity.

Therefore, I support the resolution, and call on the President to work with the House and the Senate to put in place a budget that guarantees a more stable and secure future for America.

Mr. LEVIN. Let me reserve so I don't have to do this each time until, Mr. REED, you finish, and then I'll close and then you'll close.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER. Madam Speaker, you know, I'm a military pilot, and I've been overseas and executed this Nation's wars. And I'll tell you, one of the things I've seen firsthand is that the biggest threat to our national security is our national debt.

This debt ceiling increase is a symptom of overspending that has consumed Washington for far too long. President Obama's request for a $1.2 trillion increase in the debt limit points to the serious fiscal challenges we have found ourselves in due to decades of irresponsible and reckless spending.

For decades, Members of Congress who continue to serve, voted to simply raise the debt ceiling without ever offering a plan to stop the bleeding. It wasn't until the new House majority arrived with my freshman class when we turned the focus of conversation from how much more to spend to how much we can cut, and we turned the conversation to how to cut spending in Washington, D.C. We demanded that Washington stop doing business as usual and include spending cuts greater than the amounts raised.

□ 1550

In June, I told President Obama head on in the weekly address that under no circumstances will Republicans support irresponsible legislation which increases the Federal Government's credit limit without any spending cuts or budgetary reforms.

It's high time that we cut up the government's credit cards and draw a hard line to stop the government from overspending, which is hampering our economy's ability to grow and thrive.

Currently, every man, woman, and child has a share of the public debt that exceeds $46,000 a piece. Unemployment rates are through the roof, and the irresponsible spending habits of prior Congresses and administrations have racked up trillions in national debt.

The culture of Washington must be reformed from the ground up. The future of our Nation depends on it.

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

Mr. REED. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI).

Mr. AMODEI. I want to thank my colleague from the Empire State.

Recently a leader in the other House said, ''I hope this Congress has had a very good learning experience, especially those newer to this body.'' Essentially saying that you new people need to learn how we do things here in Washington.

Well, as the newest Member of ''how we do things here in Washington'' for about 122 days, I can assure you that the people who gave me this job know how we do things here, and they're tired of it.

They understand that Washington has a fatal spending problem. They understand that the answer to every question is not more Federal spending. That is the problem—more Federal spending. I find it interesting to hear my colleagues from both sides of the aisle talk about, we need to pay our bills. We need to talk about what we incur as bills before we take more money from others.

This is not a problem that we got here by ourselves in a partisan manner. It was in fact a bipartisan problem. But to treat the solution as one that requires only a one-sided solution or another gets us to this point that I find it incredible that people would talk about wreaking havoc on the economy and also about sending the wrong message for confidence.

For the first time in the history of this Nation, we've had our credit rating downgraded because of what we're doing here. This is not about whether we will pay our bills in the near future or not. This is about having the courage to start talking about how the problem is spending. Yes, there are loopholes, and yes there are others who may be able to pay more. But why on Earth would you ask them to pay more into this system of spending that we have created which is in no way accountable to any of those folks who are paying?

So I can tell you this for those folks that are new and perhaps need to understand how things are done here in Washington: the people who gave me this job understand very well how things are done here in Washington, and they're tired of it. And you know what? They're right.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

It will take me just I think 30 seconds, maybe a minute.

You know, in a few words what the Republicans in the House are doing, they're playing with fire. And that's reckless. They know that others will put out the fire. And we'll vote, many of us, to do that today. And if we don't succeed, the Senate will do so.

This, I think, is worse than a charade because it really assumes that the agenda of this Congress should essentially be a kind of a plaything.

A number of the people who came to speak for this resolution voted in August for the resolution that brings us here today, including, I think, Mr. REED.

So I think what's changed is not our responsibility, but the ability of some to kind of have it both ways, to vote ''yes'' on the resolution knowing that as it goes to the Senate, this potential damage to the economy will be saved.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I thank my colleague on the other side of the aisle, Mr. LEVIN, for engaging in this debate today that is so important, in my opinion, to the future of this Nation, to the future of the world, in the sense that we need to get this issue under control once and for all.

The national debt is a serious threat to our very existence as a nation. You don't have to take my word for it. You can take the word of the former joint chief of staff, Admiral Mullen, who, when he was asked by the President what is the biggest threat to our national security, responded: Not a military threat, but the national debt. A fiscal threat is what jeopardizes us most in regards to our national security.

When I hear that type of opinion and advice coming out of our military leaders, I am very concerned. It should send a message across the nation that this debt needs to be addressed. It doesn't necessarily just need to be addressed for the purposes of the threat it represents to our national security, but also the threat that it represents to the economic recovery that we are trying to kindle in this city across America.

The national debt represents a threat to that American recovery when it comes to putting our men and women back to work because it is the cancer that is causing concern across all of small-business America and all across the private sector when they express that they don't have the confidence or certainty that Washington will take care of the problems that threaten us most. So it is time that we come up with a hard plan.

My colleagues during this debate referenced the House budget as the plan that was adopted here, that somehow by voting for this resolution we contradict ourselves because we voted for that House budget because it called for an increase in the debt ceiling. I would remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that budget only passed this House. The Senate has yet to enact a budget.

It will soon be 1,000 days that the Senate of the United States of America has not passed a budget. If we don't have a U.S. House and a U.S. Senate committed budget that we can rely upon to solve this issue, how can we only rely on the House budget to see us through?

This resolution today sends a message to the Senate and to the Nation that the House of Representatives will remain committed to finding a solution on this issue.

The second threat that it represents to our American recovery and putting men and women back to work is if our interest rates in the private sector, which are keyed upon the national debt and the interest rates that are charged for our borrowing costs as a governmental entity, if those interest rates in the private sector increase, you're not going to have the capital to invest in small-business America or in the private sector that is going to lead us out of this economic turmoil that we find ourselves in, because they won't be able to afford that capital that will build the next plant, that will build the next assembly line or build the next retail operation that will put people back to work.

The bottom line is this debt touches everything across America. What we are doing with this resolution is saying we are going to deal with it, and we are going to continue to deal with it until we get a plan in place from the White House, from the U.S. Senate, and from the U.S. House that deals with it once and for all and brings certainty and competence back to the American market.

Madam Speaker, it is time to lead this Nation, not hide. It is time to put our ideas in writing, debate them with the American people in an open and honest fashion, and once and for all even be willing to sacrifice our political lives to do what is right for the American people. I am committed to doing that if it means that we will save my children's generation and the generations yet to come. That's what needs to be done.

□ 1600

That's what needs to be done, and I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that. We know it on our side of the aisle, and our hand is open to work in a bipartisan fashion. So I am glad that I heard many comments today on the other side of the aisle showing they are committed to that also. I am confident that when we join hands, when we come together, we will solve this issue and that we will solve the economic problems we face as a Nation, because together the history of our Nation has shown that we can overcome any obstacle in America, any threat to our existence once we unite, not divide, and put forth a commonsense solution to our problems.

With that, Madam Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 98, a resolution disapproving of President Obama's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit. We have been through this song and dance several times before, and we have reached the same conclusion every time. Failing to raise the debt ceiling would do irreparable damage to our economy, our financial markets and our credit rating. We know we must raise the debt ceiling to prevent a default on our nation's obligations, avert an international economic crisis, and prevent further harm from being visited upon middle class families. Why are some around here so hopelessly slow—or is it malevolent?

With the coming of the new year, most of us hoped that Congress would reconvene with a

real dedication to getting our economy on track and putting Americans back to work. Yet here we are, rehashing the same tired debate for the third time and continuing to play the same sorry old political blame games. It is no surprise that the approval ratings of this institution are at record lows when the American people see us engaged in political posturing instead of trying to deal with the problems average Americans face every day. People across this country are hurting and are sick of the inaction in Washington.

Instead of passing a full-year extension of the payroll tax cut, reauthorizing our Nation's surface transportation programs or federal aviation programs, we are faced with another symbolic vote which has no chance of being signed into law. Why would leadership even schedule this vote? Is it to pander to their base and score cheap political points? Congress has plenty of items to consider which could provide a real benefit to the American people and our country. It is time to stop playing games and get to work, and we might just do something good for America.

Mr. MACK. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to stop the President from increasing Washington's borrowing authority once again. How many times do we have to say ''Enough is enough'' before President Obama and his liberal allies in Congress get the message?

Do we have to be in a debt crisis like Europe's before we make the necessary spending cuts? Does our country's credit rating have to be downgraded further? Do we have to be pushed into a corner with no other option but to eliminate programs altogether before we do what's right for America's economic well-being? The answer is clearly ''no.'' We can act now to avoid more painful decisions down the road. America's freedom, security, and prosperity depend on our courage and what we do now to restore fiscal discipline.

America can't afford to let this President continue to borrow and spend on our nation's credit card to advance his failed liberal policies. We need to adopt this resolution. And we need to enact the Penny Plan—legislation I introduced to cut spending by just one penny out of every federal dollar spent and to balance our nation's budget.

Madam Speaker, if families and businesses throughout the United States have to make the tough decisions and cut their budgets so their families and businesses won't be buried in debt, why can't the government do the same for the American people? After all, tax dollars don't belong to the government—they belong to the people who work hard to pay their bills and make their payrolls. We, as elected officials, must be responsible stewards of the people's money. We have been entrusted by those who have put us here.

If we allow Washington to continue its reckless spending habits, we will continue to lose the people's trust—and justifiably so. This is the ''People's House.'' If we don't stand for the American people, who do we stand for? Deficit spending must stop. Enough is enough. Let's restore the America we know and love by getting—and keeping—our fiscal house in order.

Madam Speaker, I am encouraged by every effort to restrain federal spending, and I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, from the beginning of this debt debate last summer, I rejected the notion that America's creditworthiness should be used as a bargaining chip. Americans from all walks of life are wondering why Congress can't do the job that they sent us here to do: putting Americans back to work and revitalizing our economy. Now, here we are again, only two days into the new session of Congress, and the Republican majority is still playing political games and still trying to have us default on our debts. This resolution may have no chance of becoming law, but those who vote for it are nonetheless voting for default.

I urge my colleagues to make the responsible choice: pay our bills, and pay them on time. Instead of engaging in partisanship and manufacturing crises, we should be coming together to fashion effective and bipartisan solutions to the jobs crisis.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 98, ''Relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as submitted under section 3101A of title 31, United States Code.'' This Joint Resolution is designed to prevent President Obama from raising the debt ceiling by $1.2 trillion. Under the agreement reached last summer, which Republicans supported, the President was given the authority to raise the debt ceiling. Republicans are now putting forth a resolution that is a direct contradiction to the agreement which we all felt was the right decision for our country.

Today we are here pursuant to the Budget Control Act of 2011 that this body passed last summer. In the course of our efforts numerous concessions were made to placate Republicans just to do the business of the American people; to pay our bills and ensure that essential services were taken care of for the infirm, the elderly, our children—in short: the most vulnerable in our society. This Republican led resolution is nothing more than an attempt to obstruct the government; the measure is expected to fail in the Senate. In the end, this measure will be a tremendous waste of both Congressional resources and time.

The words to the resolution read as follows:

''Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as exercised pursuant to the certification.''

These words, less than forty by my count, are an unabashed attempt to throw cold water on the mere prospect of an economic recovery. It is notable that some jobs have been created; however, our economy continues to gradually recover. You would think that Congress would be acting in a bipartisan manner, and not acting as poseurs in the legislative picture.

I am disappointed to see that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are more interested in playing political games than improving the economy. Congressional Republicans are attempting to constrain the ability of Congress to deal effectively with America's economic, fiscal, and job creation troubles instead of working towards a bipartisan job creation bill.

My Republican colleagues have put forth a measure that will impact the President's ability to raise the debt limit. This is a dangerous stunt and amounts to political theatrics that could result in our nation defaulting on its obligations. We are a nation that pays our bills. We are a nation that will provide for those among us who are unable to provide for themselves.

To address our ever-growing and complex needs, the first debt ceiling was established in 1917, allowing the federal government to borrow money to meet its obligations without prior Congressional approval, so long as in the aggregate, the amount borrowed did not eclipse a specified limit.

Since the debt limit was first put in place, Congress has increased it over 100 times; in fact, it was raised 10 times within the past decade, under both Democrat and Republican presidents; and last year, we were able to negotiate another compromise, and keep the country from default. I urge my colleagues not to undermine the agreement that was reached by attempting to block the President's ability to raise the debt ceiling.

This Republican Congress has asked for a balanced budget amendment. It has codified the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, which is possibly unconstitutional, and has had no impact on jobs and the unemployment problem. This illustrates what happens when Congress does not work together in a bipartisan manner, laboring for the American people. We must work together and compromise.

At a time when our citizens need legislation that will fuel the economy and drive the engine of job growth, before us is a measure that will take us on the road to nowhere.

Our country cannot afford to take the issue of raising our nation's debt limit lightly. It is reckless for Republicans to send confusing signals to international markets that could jeopardize our own fragile economic recovery.

This country has made tremendous progress, even in the face of a cavalier attitude towards job creation and unemployment eradication on the part of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Housing starts are improving; the economy is adding jobs at a gradual, steadied, yet consistent pace. Retail sales were up during the recent holiday season. The American people are out there living their lives, going about their business, and hoping that we get our act together here in Congress.

REPUBLICAN ACCORD: BUDGET CONTROL ACT

This Joint Resolution is nothing more than a gimmick that has been implemented by Republican leadership to divert serious discussions about our debt limit and instead inspire partisan vitriol.

BUDGET CONTROL ACT LANGUAGE

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) $900 billion.—

''(A) certification.—If, not later than December 31, 2011, the President submits a written certification to Congress that the President has determined that the debt subject to limit is within $100,000,000,000 of the limit in section 3101(b) and that further borrowing is required to meet existing commitments, the Secretary of the Treasury may exercise authority to borrow an additional $900,000,000,000, subject to the enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval enacted pursuant to this section. Upon submission of such certification, the limit on debt provided in section 3101(b) (referred to in this section as the 'debt limit') is increased by $400,000,000,000.

''(B) RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Congress may consider a joint resolution of disapproval of the authority under subparagraph

(A) as provided in subsections (b) through (f). The joint resolution of disapproval considered under this section shall contain only the language provided in subsection (b)(2). If the time for disapproval has lapsed without enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval under this section, the debt limit is increased by an additional $500,000,000,000.

''(b) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except for the $400,000,000,000 increase in the debt limit provided by subsection (a)(1)(A), the debt limit may not be raised under this section if, within 50 calendar days after the date on which Congress receives a certification described in subsection (a)(1) or within 15 calendar days after Congress receives the certification described in subsection (a)(2) (regardless of whether Congress is in session), there is enacted into law a joint resolution disapproving the President's exercise of authority with respect to such additional amount.

AMENDMENT NOT IN ORDER

''(e) AMENDMENT NOT IN ORDER.—A joint resolution of disapproval considered pursuant to this section shall not be subject to amendment in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

PAYROLL TAX CUT FACTS

For more than 360 days, the GOP House majority has failed to offer a clear jobs agenda. Congress left Washington for the holidays without extending the payroll tax cut and unemployment benefits, for the entire year, an act that could have put money into the economy and promote jobs, by providing certainty to the American people and American businesses.

The GOP is risking tax relief for 1.60 million Americans while protecting massive tax cuts for 300,000 people making more than a million dollars per year.

Extending and expanding payroll tax cuts until the end of the year would put $1,500 into the pockets of the typical middle class family, and relieve them of the uncertainty.

At least 400,000 jobs would be lost if Republicans block the payroll tax cut from being extended until the end of the year.

In November, Senate Democrats proposed reducing it to 3.1 percent for 2012, and cutting employers' taxes on the first $5 million in taxable payroll to the same level, which helps small businesses. To pay for the cut, the bill called for a 3.25 percent tax on gross income over $1 million for single filers and married couples filing jointly, the so-called ''Millionaire's Tax.'' This was a reasonable compromise, then, and now.

There are other ideas floating around this Chamber that touch on tax, such as repatriation. Lowering taxes for the American people and American businesses is always a good idea, but piecemeal, scattershot approaches to tax reform can lead to undesirable outcomes.

TARGETED TAX RELIEF FOR AMERICAN WORKERS

The 2% payroll tax cut in effect for 2011 provided $110 billion of tax relief to 159 million American workers.

If the payroll tax cut is not extended until the end of the year, a family struggling through the economic recovery making $50,000 will see its taxes go up by approximately $800.

Expanding the 2% payroll tax holiday to 3.1% will cut Social Security taxes in half for 160 million American workers next year.

Republicans targeted the unemployed by slashing 40 weeks of unemployment insurance. Such an action would have negatively impacted the lives of millions of families.

These are the very families who are still struggling under the weight of the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression. The Senate rejected this assault on families and the elderly. When we come back to the table in the coming weeks, let's focus on what matters: the American people.

It was clear that our failure to act to support the Senate amendment to H.R. 3630 late last year would have resulted in twenty-two jurisdictions with the highest unemployment rates being the hardest hit these states are: My home state of Texas, Alabama, California, Connecticut, DC, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee and Washington.

According to report released by the Department of Labor just weeks ago, 3.3 million Americans would lose unemployment benefits as a result of H.R. 3630 compared to a continuation of current law. In my home state of Texas alone, 227,381 people were in danger of losing their sole source of income by the end of January.

There is nothing normal about this recession. Republicans seem to want to blame the unemployed for their unemployment. Until it was clear that the American people would not stand behind Republican efforts, House Republicans continued to put in jeopardy tax cuts for the middle class and aid for the unemployed. In this economy the unemployed are not to blame; it is the failure of Republican leadership to bring forth any job creating measures before this house. Currently, there are over four unemployed workers for every available job, and there are nearly 1 million fewer jobs in the economy today compared to when the recession started in December 2007. In our nation's history there has never been so many unemployed Americans without work for such a long period of time. But the other side wants to send messages to their base by requiring drug testing of unemployed applicants? Really? Republicans are clearly out of touch.

I stand with my fellow Congressional Democrats and remain committed to responsible deficit reduction. We must protect our citizens. By threatening to prevent an increase in the debt ceiling threatens our ability to pay for Medicare. Protecting Medicare represents the basic values of fairness and respect for our seniors that all Americans cherish, including the 2.9 million Texans who received Medicare in 2010. I am committed to addressing the budget deficit by putting America's working families first. We should not be cutting programs that protect the everyday lives of Americans.

Repeated attacks against Medicaid by Republicans, this Congress, are additional examples of wrong priorities that are poor choices for seniors and middle class families.

FACTS ABOUT MEDICARE

Medicare covers a population with diverse needs and circumstances. Most people with Medicare live on modest incomes.

Today, 43% of all Medicare beneficiaries are between 65 and 74 years old and 12% are 85 or older. Those who are 85 or older are the fastest-growing age group among elderly Medicare beneficiaries.

With the aging and growth of the population, the number of Medicare beneficiaries more than doubled between 1966 and 2000 and is projected to grow from 45 million today to 79 million in 2030.

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

POVERTY

Madam Speaker not only will allowing America to default on its debt wreak havoc and chaos on financial markets around the world, but it will also be damaging to the most vulnerable members of our society. In essence it takes a hatchet to the programs Americans truly care about.

In my district in Houston, Texas, there are 190,035 people living under the poverty line as well as 82,272 seniors and over 58,500 seniors. In addition, children represent a disproportionate amount of the United States poor population. In 2008, there were 15.45 million impoverished children in the nation, 20.7% of America's youth.

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.

If House Republicans' self destructive economic policies are allowed to play out it will threaten the viability of the programs that our Nation's seniors, children, and poor depend on for health and well being.

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

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

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

According to a well respected moderate think tank, released a report outlining the consequences of not paying America's bills:

642,500 jobs lost

GDP would decrease by 1%

Every mortgage would increase by $19,175

Stocks would fall, the S&P dropping 6.3%

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

The House Republican majority needs to stop threatening the American people and get to work to increase the debt ceiling so that our country can pay its bills.

We must begin to focus on the real plights faced by our nation. We must find ways to raise revenues while also reducing spending. They must complement each other. Congressional Republicans must be prepared to allow everything to be on the table, including ending

the tax cuts to the top 2% of the wealthiest people in our country.

We need a serious measure that will discuss reasonably and responsible ways to increase the debt ceiling. A measure that will allow us to have a deliberative discussion on how to cut spending without cutting Medicare and Medicaid.

If not, the failure to extend our Nation's debt limit would have harmful effects on job creation and the programs necessary to ensure the health and safety of our constituents.

Perhaps my friends on the other side of the aisle are content to conclude that life simply is not fair, equality is not accessible to everyone, and the less advantaged among us are condemned to remain as they are, but I do not accept that. That kind of complacency is not fitting for America.

Prior to the existence of the debt ceiling, Congress had to approve borrowing each time the federal government wished to borrow money in order to carry out its functions. With the onset of World War I, more flexibility was needed to expand the government's capability to borrow money expeditiously in order to meet the rapidly changing requirements of funding a major war in the modern era.

To address this need, the first debt ceiling was established in 1917, allowing the federal government to borrow money to meet its obligations without prior Congressional approval, so long as in the aggregate, the amount borrowed did not eclipse a specified limit.

Since the debt limit was first put in place, Congress has increased it over 100 times; in fact, it was raised 10 times within the past decade, and last year, we were able to negotiate another compromise, and keep the country from default. I urge my colleagues not to undermine the agreement that was reached by attempting to block the President's ability to raise the debt ceiling.

Once again, the American economy hangs in the balance as the act of the President raising the debt ceiling becomes an irrelevant spending debate that is as unnecessary as it is perilous, as increasing the debt ceiling does not obligate the undertaking of any new spending by the federal government. Rather, raising the debt limit simply allows the government to pay existing legal obligations promised to debt holders that were already agreed to by Presidents and Congresses, both past and present.

This resolution is a petulant attempt to undermine President Obama. The bill itself says it is a joint resolution "relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit." Exercise of authority. It does not say unlawful exercise of authority, or unconstitutional exercise of authority. The language of the bill itself makes it clear the President has the authority to raise the debt ceiling as indicated in the agreement reached on August 2.

PAYROLL TAX AND STOCK OPTION AMENDMENTS

I attempted to offer in the Rules Committee meeting last night an amendment extending the payroll tax credit until the end of 2012, and to help reduce the budget deficit by closing a tax loophole that bridges the gap between book and tax accounting when stock options are awarded.

The amendment closes a loophole that allows corporations to take a deduction for the fair market value of an exercised corporate stock option, over-and-above the value of the deduction that they receive when the option is issued. It does two significant things: raises money and shuts down an egregious loophole.

But we were unfortunately subject to a closed rule, which is undemocratic.

STUDENT LOANS

I would note that in completing this bill, which was, perhaps a Hobson's choice for some Members, it should be stated that we took aim at education funding via Pell Grants, Direct, and Stafford Loans, which are a lifeline to many of our most disadvantaged citizens.

How will we compete for the new factories when we are offshoring education. I take some consolation in the fact that we did it to save the country.

ADOPTION TAX CREDIT FACTS

Last night in the Rules Committee, I also attempted to offer an amendment yesterday evening to encourage and promote adoption, and if you take a look at the statistics on adoption and foster care, it really speaks for itself. Yet, we dither in this body while children out there need us, and we are failing them.

The most recent data on all types of adoption, collected by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) based right down the road in Charlottesville, indicate that an estimated 127,000 children were adopted in 2001. According to NCSC data, of adoptions in 2001, an estimated 46% were private (including tribal and kinship, such as stepparent), 39% were intercountry, and 15% were public agency adoptions.

Today, in the United States there are an estimated 500,000 children in the foster care system and of those children, there are 130,000 waiting for families to adopt them. The number of youth who "age out" of the foster care system by reaching adulthood without being placed in a permanent home has increased by more than 58 percent since 1998, as nearly 28,000 foster youth "aged out" of foster care during 2007 which is appalling and unacceptable.

In addition, 3 in 10 people in the United States have considered adoption; a majority of them have misconceptions about the process of adopting children from foster care. Approximately 45% believe that children enter the foster care system because of juvenile delinquency.

And, I offer up forlornly the tale of the little baby who was found on the stairs of a house blocks away in South East Washington, DC. just this past weekend. A sad and heart-breaking story that serves to remind us how critical something like the Adoption Tax Credit can be. It is also a reminder that time is of the essence.

Passing this resolution will not decrease spending; it will merely compromise our ability to pay for spending already authorized. This bill does nothing to reduce the deficit, or address the budget, it only risks our economic standing and ability to pay our nation's bills, while simultaneously hurtling the nation toward another debt ceiling crisis.

Instead of spending time on Resolutions designed to cast the President in a negative light, it is time for this Congress to come together, and pass meaningful legislation that will benefit the American people. In his address to a joint session of Congress last September, President Obama gave this body a great opportunity to achieve bipartisan, job creating legislation that will invest in small business, help families that have been struggling with chronic unemployment, assist veterans in finding jobs, and invest in our infrastructure.

It is time for a new sense of bipartisanship. It is time for Congress to work together to aggressively take on job creation. It is time to end these divisive tactics and compromise to encourage the rapid job growth the American people deserve. I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to stand up and vote no on this partisan resolution; we can, and we must take this opportunity to declare our intent to do what is right, face what is hard, and achieve what is great.

Instead of attempting to embarrass the President, I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to come together, and focus on passing legislation that will help the American people by improving the economy and creating jobs. Now is not the time for partisan malice, now is not the time for H.J. Res. 98; now is the time for this Congress to do all it can to usher in a new age of American ingenuity and prosperity. H.J. Res. 98 is simply a way to engage in past battles, and I am voting against it in order to focus on the future.

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

Pursuant to the statute, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 176, answered "present" 2, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—239

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

NAYS—176

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
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
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
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)
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Landry
Walsh (IL)

NOT VOTING—16

Bartlett
Berkley
Brown (FL)
Campbell
Cardoza
Farr
Filner
Giffords
Heinrich
Hinchey
Inslee
Marino
Noem
Reyes
Simpson
Speier

□ 1626

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

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

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. NOEM. Madam Speaker, because I was attending the funeral service of Governor Bill Anklow today, I was unable to be present for the vote on H.J. Res. 98. If present, I would have voted "yea" in favor of the resolution.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 4, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 2012

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, January 23, 2012, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3261

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of the Stop Online Piracy Act, H.R. 3261.

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

There was no objection.

PERMANENT STRUCTURAL REFORMS NEEDED

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, permanent structural reforms are needed in Washington. The Nation's debt is now greater than the value of the entire U.S. economy. Nonpartisan economists have noted that a debt to GDP ratio above 90 percent results in a reduction of economic growth. That means that the Obama administration's own economic model could be preventing the creation of nearly 1 million jobs.

Over the last 2 weeks, I have talked to many of my constituents in Arkansas' First District, and nearly every person I spoke with told me that we must get our Nation's debt under control.

The Federal Government has a spending addiction that is paralyzing our economy. We cannot keep spending money that we simply don't have. We must start living within our means, and we must stop growing our Nation's debt.

Fundamental change must come to Washington to force this and future Congresses to live within our means. Both Republicans and Democrats are to blame for the poor fiscal health we find ourselves in, and whether the change is a balanced budget amendment or some other permanent binding measure, both parties must take the steps to prove that this Congress understands that our government cannot continue on its current path.

NATIONAL DEBT THREATENS NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in regards to our most pressing threat to our national security—our staggering and ever-increasing national debt.

The message from my constituents in Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District is loud and clear: We cannot continue to saddle the soaring debt onto the backs of our children and our grandchildren. This is irresponsible, and quite frankly unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, this epidemic is the reason that I jumped into this fight. Our national debt will increase to over $23 trillion in the next 10 years. Currently, our debt is now over $15.2 trillion; 47 percent of that debt is foreign owned; 30 percent is owned by China.

It is past time to alter course, Mr. Speaker, or this generation will be the first generation of this great Nation to leave our children less well off.

□ 1630

NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Less debt and more jobs, Mr. Speaker. This remains our priority as we begin

the second session of the 112th Congress.

Our national debt recently surpassed economic output, meaning the national debt is now greater than the value of the entire U.S. economy. Despite almost $1 trillion of stimulus spending, there's been 35 straight months of national unemployment averages greater than 8 percent. These are the facts, Mr. Speaker, yet some are calling for more deficit spending and tax increases, and that's just plain wrong.

The best way to reduce our debt and deficit is to get America back to work. Over the last 12 months, this has been the focus of this Chamber. The House has passed more than 30 jobs bills, most of which the Senate has refused to consider. Next week will mark 1,000 days since the Senate has passed a budget.

Today, the House again has taken the steps to disapprove of further raising the debt ceiling. Failure to address even a budget will only serve to speed up our downward spiral. Mr. Speaker, there is no way around it: Without dealing with the debt, this country's long-term economic outlook will remain unclear.

REMEMBERING REV. BERNARD REISER

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Rev. Bernard Reiser, who passed away late last year at the age of 87.

Ordained in the Catholic Church in 1949, Father Reiser spent most of his adult life in the community of Coon Rapids, Minnesota, where he established Epiphany Catholic Church back in 1964. He helped grow Epiphany from a small 125-family parish to one of the largest parishes in the State, with over 5,000 member families.

And though he was well known within the community of Coon Rapids, Father Reiser's work extended far beyond its borders. Since 1996, he had traveled to Haiti, where he helped improve the lives of the less fortunate. And last year, he was honored for his international aid work by a local Twin Cities television station in our community.

Though he will be missed, his memory does live on in the community and the lives that he touched at Epiphany and in Haiti.

CREATING JOBS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, there are three things we need to do to create jobs in America:

Number one, we need to roll back job-killing regulations. You don't have to work for worker safety at the expense of the job. There is a balance. Government agencies need to work with the entrepreneur and the employer and the job creator, not against him or her. We can find a balance.

Number two, you need to drill your own oil. For us to suggest and believe that the people in the Middle East are more environmentally friendly or more sensitive than we are is ridiculous. We have got to get our head out of the Middle East sand and our drills and bring it back home to America. If gas fell $1 a gallon, it would be a huge economic boom to our country.

And, number three, we need tax simplification. Ask any audience, ''How many of you fill out your own tax return?'' and then ask, ''How many of you pay to fill out your own taxes?'' and inevitably you'll find an 80/20 split. It is ridiculous when 80 percent of the people in America have to pay an accountant or a lawyer to fill out their taxes. We need tax simplification.

LOCAL KERNERSVILLE BUSINESSES SHOW HOW PRIVATE SECTOR CAN HELP PEOPLE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the headlines regularly remind us about the country's trying economic times, but back in the Fifth District of North Carolina there are stories of people coming together to help one another through difficult situations—without the help of government. In Kernersville, North Carolina, for example, two local businesses have played a crucial role in ensuring that the community's less fortunate are fed.

Over the holidays, the interior design company Designer's Attic and the construction firm Friddle and Company, Inc. paired up to bring thousands of meals to the needy. Designer's Attic decorated Friddle and Company's ''Holiday House,'' which was open to the public for tours. Instead of a tour fee, the businesses requested that visitors pay in canned goods. Out of the shared endeavor, the businesses were able to donate enough food to the Second Harvest Food Bank for 17,000 meals.

In a time of difficult economic news and consistent government overreach, it's a thrill to highlight this kind of success story.

Congratulations to the good people at Designer's Attic and Friddle and Company, Inc. for giving back to the community in such a creative and effective manner.

GETTING BACK ON ROAD TO PROSPERITY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege to be speaking on the floor here this evening.

Here we've been talking for some time about the huge deficit spending that's going on. In fact, Republicans have promised to make massive cuts. And the old story that used to be told about the fellow Texan, Sam Rayburn, about a young freshman Democrat coming up and talking about how difficult things were here in the House and that: Gee, as a Democrat, it's obvious the Republicans are our enemy. They're trying to stop us from doing what we need to, and, boy, the media's not helping. And Speaker Rayburn stopped him, reportedly, and said: Son, the Republicans are not your enemy. The media is not your enemy. At the other end of the hall, the Senate, now they're your enemy.

Well, I thought that was a strange story when I heard that about Speaker Rayburn, but the longer I've been here, the more we see so many great bills that have come out of the House in the last year have gone down the hall and are languishing for lack of action. And so when I read that a friend down the hall, Leader REID, was lambasting Republicans for a do-nothing status, it was remarkable to me that they could have so many House bills sitting down there waiting to do something and yet doing nothing with them.

Now, we have been trying to get bills passed into law that would make substantial cuts. It's still, as our friend from east Texas, Bo Pilgrim, used to say, a mind-boggling thing to have seen this President come in in 2009, with Speaker PELOSI in charge of the House and Leader REID in charge of the Senate, and to know that we had been just vilified as majority Republicans in the House in 2006 for exceeding the amount of income coming in by $160 billion, vilified, and yet when President Obama became the President and Leader REID and Speaker PELOSI were in charge, we ran a deficit of 10 times that much in 1 year. Incredible.

□ 1640

Now one thing that should not have ever happened is to have our national security out on the table as a bargaining chip in the debt ceiling negotiation. But it was. And we were told that, Gee, neither side is going to allow those kinds of cuts to occur to our national security.

And lo and behold, being in Afghanistan, seeing the new year come in with our military men and women in some remote operating areas—I went with Senator JIM INHOFE from Oklahoma and JOE BARTON from Texas—and being in remote areas, it was amazing to hear some folks say, We're already being told amounts that we're going to be cut because of the sequestration coming. Talking with some of our Texas National Guard folks, I've been told over the last couple of weeks, We're already being told about moneys that are being cut. These are people that are

trying to protect and defend our country.

I went to the deployment ceremony of a unit leaving from Lufkin, Texas, being deployed as guard. And they're hearing, as they're being deployed, about cuts to the amount of money they will have to protect them while they're protecting us. Absolutely outrageous.

As we talk about doing what's best for America and as we hear from people around the world that think of the United States as ''the great Satan,'' one would think—especially if they studied history—that the last thing we would want to do is to hurt our national security, yet that is where we're going.

It seems also clear that those negotiating from the Republican side during the debt ceiling bill made an assumption that turned out to be false, that the Democrats in the Senate would never allow the sequestration of $100, $200, $300 billion from Medicare. That was a bad assumption because the same Democratic leadership in the Senate passed ObamaCare, which brought about $500 billion in cuts to Medicare. So of course they were going to be willing to allow sequestration because this time they would be able to blame Republicans for also being part of what caused the cuts. Cuts to Medicare and cuts to our national security, not a good idea. Not a good idea.

National Review Online had an article out in the last couple of days with some great information; and we have taken that information and put it in short form from the article and double checked; and apparently, these are accurate numbers. These numbers, if anybody cares to contest them, actually come from President Obama's own Office of Management and Budget.

It turns out that as this President and his administration have complained about not having money, not having the ability to make cuts, having to make draconian cuts to Medicare and to our national defense, his administration has been sitting on money, hundreds of billions of dollars of money that they haven't spent from 2010 and 2011. They're complaining about not being able to even cut $5 billion or $10 billion when it turns out they're sitting on hundreds of billions of dollars that have not been obligated, have not been spent from 2010 and 2011.

So let's take a look at the money that this administration has not been willing to cut, even though it's unobligated, it's unspent, it's been appropriated, they have the ability to spend it or save it or spend it for something else. And yet this administration just can't seem to want to cut loose from this money to reduce the deficit, to cut down on the money we borrow from China, to cut down on the deficit spending or the reduction in spending for the military, reduction in spending for Medicare. How about that? It turns out they're sitting on all this money.

The Department of the Treasury, under the direction of Secretary Tim Geithner—hopefully he will be okay getting his tax return in this year. He is sitting on $226 billion that was appropriated; and yet it is sitting there unobligated, unspent. Yet Timothy Geithner has told us, you know, there's just no money to do what he feels needs to be done. He was out there this summer saying, We've got to raise taxes because this poor gentleman was not going to be able to cut loose, as we find out, of the $226 billion he's got sitting in change. And that is not even including the $125 billion that he still has in TARP assets or money, and it's estimated by some to be maybe about $50 billion in additional assets. So around $170, $175 billion remaining from TARP, $226 billion sitting there appropriated. I guess that means we've already borrowed 42 cents of every dollar from the Chinese. So we're sitting on it.

Then the Department of Defense. Since we've got $78 billion that the Defense Department has unobligated—it has been appropriated but unspent—why couldn't we use some of that $78 billion to help eliminate some of the cuts that are being suggested—in fact, being demanded of Defense?

You've got the Department of Transportation with $45 billion in unobligated, unspent money from 2010 to 2011. You've got $40 billion from the Department of Health and Human Services sitting there unobligated, unspent from 2010 and 2011. Department of Housing and Urban Development, $23.8 billion sitting there. Department of Education, $19 billion.

And the thought comes, What if we did away with the Department of Education and all that money that comes pouring into Washington every year—some of it borrowed—and it gets held here in Washington and gets funded to administrators and bureaucrats that have nothing to do with actually teaching anything, how about if we just turn that right around and send it right back to those States and say, We're taking our grimy fingers off of that money; we're not going to keep any of it because we think it is that important that it go for education? And how about if we, by doing that, therefore, encourage every State—as I believe it was Newt Gingrich who suggested to then let go so many of the administrators in each State capital that are not involved in any kind of teaching, just involved in dictation to local school boards? And of course for every bureaucrat that we have to have right now in Washington, they have to have at least one in every State capital because they've got to carry out the assignments from Washington. And then for every one in the State capital, you've got to have bureaucrats at each local school district to carry out those assignments.

I was shocked to go online and see that one of the best school districts in east Texas was saying that they were proud to note that half of all their school district employees were actually teachers.

□ 1650

So when I went to look at that a little further, you go back to before President Jimmy Carter created the Department of Education. That number was closer to 75 percent in Texas. Now it's around 50 percent in Texas. But before there was a Federal Department of Education, about 70, 75 percent of all Texas education employees were just wonderful school teachers, like my mother, like my sister, like my wife was. Now, that's getting teachers, that's getting people in the education system where they can do some good.

So you have the Department of Education sitting on $19 billion. You go online and look up how many school districts there are in America, and divide them into $19 billion, you'd have school districts that were not having to fire teachers right now. That would do a world of good.

But we've got bureaucrats here in Washington that think it is more important that they sit there with a slush fund, $19 billion unobligated, unspent funds from 2010/2011.

You've got the Department of Labor. They've got $18 billion sitting there from 2010 and 2011. And we acknowledge it is important for them to sit on a slush fund because they have so many things they have to do, like they have to run to States like South Carolina and tell them, you can't have a new Boeing plant in your State because we're trying to help unions in Washington. Even though not one single union worker in Washington was going to lose their job or be adversely affected, we're going to rush in and be, not a referee, we're going to be a player/referee, and we're going to dictate, like used to be done by caesars, kings, czars, emperors, pharaohs.

They thought they had the authority to come into South Carolina and play Pharaoh and say, nope, you're not going to have these jobs. Well, once the unions finally got satisfied, then isn't it amazing that the NLRB backed off some. I think we've seen the NLRB is something we could do away with, and one of our colleagues in our party here in the House has a bill that will do just that. I think it's time to do that.

Department of Agriculture, $14 billion sitting unspent, unobligated from 2010/2011.

The Department of State, they don't have quite as much money sitting there as some of these other departments, but they still have $8.7 billion sitting unobligated, unspent from the last 2 years.

Department of Homeland Security, $7.2 billion. Now, they may want to use some of that to go buy some more of these machines from our friend, Secretary Chertoff. What a waste of money those were.

Then you've got the Department of the Interior at $6.7 billion sitting unspent, unobligated in their coffers.

Department of Energy. The Department of Energy that was set up by President Carter, with the purpose of

getting us off of dependence on foreign oil, and every year the Department of Energy has existed one thing has been consistent. And we've got to give them credit for this. One thing has been very consistent from the Department of Energy. Every year they've existed we've become more dependent on foreign oil.

So if you're in the private sector, and you went all these years, 32 years, working on 33 years or so, with a department in your business that got further and further from its original goal, you'd probably cancel that department, get rid of it, disband it. Not here in government. Not only are they not doing what would help America by getting us off dependence on foreign oil, they are actually working in conjunction with the Department of the Interior to make us more dependent on foreign oil, and to limit the amount of production here in the United States.

Just today, the President of the United States has had the incredible nerve to step up and say, there are thousands and thousands and thousands of Americans who I am going to deprive of the opportunity to have a good union job. And there are thousands and thousands and thousands of more Americans who would be suppliers for those people who would be working on the Keystone pipeline, everything from private suppliers to people that work in steel plants that would be providing the pipe, to be providing the materials that would be used, that would be building the heavy equipment that would be used, all of those thousands and thousands and thousands of ripple jobs that would be coming, this President today is saying, I am not going to allow you to have that kind of job.

We're going to keep pushing, the President might as well have said, to make sure you can get unemployment for 99 weeks, and we can keep you from reaching your God-given potential of actually producing, because there is a great deal of satisfaction for doing something productive, seeing the products of your hands. That's why, as my wife would tell you, I actually enjoy getting out in the backyard on weekends, kind of tough during the winter, but actually getting out there and doing things, so that when I finish I can see I've done something productive, because we come up here and we pass some good legislation in the House, it never becomes law.

We pass things and encourage the President to get the Senate to help us pass off on things so people could become productive, and they could get their own jobs and become productive and they wouldn't need to become so dependent on the Federal Government. It gets pretty frustrating.

But you've got a Department of Energy sitting there, $5.6 billion unobligated, unspent from the last 2 years.

Department of Veterans Affairs. You would think that with all of the veterans who need assistance, who need help, who have problems, both psychologically, physically, that some of that $5.2 billion that's been sitting there for the last couple of years, it could have been used to help our veterans, you would think. Our veterans need help.

President Bush, right before he left office, had asked a retired military, retired Army General to do an assessment of the VA and make recommendations. He had some good recommendations. Unfortunately, they've not been carried out by this administration.

But one of the things he told me personally, privately, he said, the problem with the Veterans Administration is they're supposed to be an assistance organization, and, instead, they think they're an adversarial organization. They should be assisting our veterans. And yet, so often, every time a veteran comes through the door needing help, they look at them as if they're a thief coming in to steal something. Our veterans deserve better than that.

There are some VA clinics, VA places, you know, in Lufkin, I keep asking our veterans—even though I did 4 years in the Army I'm not entitled to this care, but I want to make sure that our veterans get what they think is best for them. People around Lufkin that go to that clinic, they say, hey, I would far rather go to this VA clinic than any other medical facility.

□ 1700

Other places I hear from veterans that go to other clinics that say, I'd just as soon you give us a card and let us go to any doctor or any clinic we want. But at the same time all of this is going on, and we were told there now is a need to increase the contribution for veterans for TRICARE, we find out there's $5.2 billion that has been sitting there unspent, unobligated for the last couple of years.

Department of Justice, $1.9 billion here that we have them coming in before our committee whining and moaning about all of the millions and millions of dollars they need. Turns out they've got $1,900 million that they could use instead of coming begging here for more money from Congress.

You've got other independent agencies and miscellaneous: $82 billion unobligated, unspent; Office of Personnel Management $55 billion. I know that the administration spends more money than any other administration in history, far and away a lot more, but you would think that they wouldn't have to come demanding more and more money and put pressure on HARRY REID down in the Senate to get more and more out of the House because they just can't live on the $55 billion slush fund they have from the last couple of years unspent.

International assistance programs, $45 billion. I've said it over and over, but it is absolutely true. I've seen it firsthand going around. You could even see it in some areas of Afghanistan. You don't have to pay people to hate you. They'll do it for free. It would save a lot of money.

I still have a U.N. voting accountability bill. I filed it my fourth time in this fourth Congress I've been in. It says unless you vote with the United States over half the time in the U.N. that you shouldn't get any foreign assistance from the United States. Again, these people in foreign countries that hate us, it is absolutely their right to do so. But we don't have to pay people to hate us. They'll do it for free.

Environmental Protection Agency, one of those things that was created when Congress made the mistake of giving the Nixon administration the power to consolidate and reorganize government and make it more efficient. The Nixon administration created the Environmental Protection Agency. And right now, the EPA is in the process of costing thousands and thousands and thousands of people jobs all over America, and this administration is doing nothing to rein them in.

Some people have said, well, can the Congress do something about that? Sure we can. We can get rid of the EPA. I've been told by some Federal authorities: But you don't understand. Even though Texas has an environmental commission, the TCEQ, there are a handful of States that don't have environmental commissions for their States, so we need one for the whole country. What happened to the Ninth and 10th amendment? If it is just inside the State, doesn't involve interstate commerce, then why shouldn't we let the States take care of those issues? Instead, the EPA is spending some of their slush fund money to sue States like Texas and others, shutting down power plants.

And I would have thought today that when the President released his statement about why he was going to deprive tens of thousands of Americans jobs immediately where they could earn their own way and own their own things without the government handouts, that he would at least be able to say, ''Because I have a better plan of getting us off foreign oil.'' That's not what he said.

Apparently, it's the President's position he wants to get us off oil—not off foreign oil, just off oil. He wants to put more people out of work, increase the cost of gasoline and diesel, which means increasing the cost of everything you buy in America because transportation costs have to be figured in.

The one good thing about the President killing the Keystone pipeline that you have to acknowledge with money like the EPA has, $4 billion, and Transportation, $45 billion sitting there in their slush fund unobligated, unspent from the last 2 years, different other Agencies, Departments, Department of the Interior, by cancelling the Keystone pipeline, they won't have to spend money checking it out, regulating, making sure things are done appropriately. They can spend these hundreds of billions of dollars, if they care to do so, on more Solyndras. Isn't that a great thing?

We will be able to fund more crony capitalism. Somebody wants to come in and claim they're going to create some kind of solar product, then this administration will take a good look at it; and there's a good chance if you're a Republican you can forget it, but if you're not, you may very well be the next Solyndra to get money appropriated for you. And heck, we may even have one of the administrations step in when the United States, as a creditor, wants to stand in line and get repaid for loans that are made and downgrade those loans and put other unsecured creditors in front, just as the administration did in the bailout of the auto manufacturers, turn the Constitution upside down, deprive people with property of due process. There's a lot of good money to do those good projects that the President has been doing for the last 3 years.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the days ahead, as people hear more and more complaining and whining from the administration about there not being any money, gee, we're going to have to raise taxes, I hope that there will be people in America that will look at these figures and say: Enough whining. Let us tell you about a shortage of money. You keep taking our money in taxes and sitting on it in your Departments. Enough is enough. It's time to be accountable. It's time to let money be in the hands where it is earned so we can get this economy going again.

One thing is for sure. Even though we've spent more money than any nation in history no matter how you want to look at it, whether it's in dollars or whether it's in percentage of GDP, this administration has been on a course for ruin; and I just hope that as this administration continues to follow the lead of countries like Greece, Italy, Spain, others in economic trouble, that hopefully, before we go over the cliff with them, there will be enough of us that can stop the wagon train and get us back on the right road to prosperity.

Quick recap: $687 billion that has been appropriated or unobligated, unspent from 2010 and 2011, so we shouldn't hear any more bellyaching about there being a shortage of money by this administration. It's time to help the American people, not the bloated government.

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

□ 1710

SUNSHINE AND APPLE PIE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the time. I appreciate your giving me a moment to set up my charts, because I've got some pretty ones down here, and I'm sorry you can't see them, Mr. Speaker.

I've got here the White House. The White House isn't the President's house. It's our house. Every time I drive by, Mr. Speaker, every time I go past, I think, you know what? I own that. I may live in a little old apartment of my own, but when I drive by the White House, I think, I own a piece of that. That house belongs to me. I do hope every American believes that same thing. It is our house. So, if you have not gone to your Member of Congress to try to get a tour of the White House, I encourage you to do it. I encourage you to do it because it belongs to you, and Presidents, Republican and Democrat alike, open up those doors so that we can see our White House in America, Mr. Speaker. It's a symbol of freedom around the world.

I printed this one up in full color. I spent a little extra. I'm pretty thrifty in my budget. If you know anything about me, not only do we cut our budget here in the United States House of Representatives, but I cut mine another 10 percent. Beyond that, we're going to give back about $300,000 to the American taxpayer, but we spent the extra money to put down the blue sky of optimism because this is the President's election night victory speech in 2008. Do you remember it? Do you remember it, Mr. Speaker?—because I remember it. I remember the promise of a better day, and here it is as he's talking about bipartisanship, because it gets a lot of lip service in this body, Mr. Speaker, but it takes hard work. It takes hard work. Here we go. He is talking about bipartisanship and about partisanship in particular. He says:

I will resist the temptation to fall back on the same partisanship and pettiness and immaturity that has poisoned our politics for far too long.

He hadn't been sworn in yet. The inauguration hadn't happened yet. His victory speech 2008:

I will resist the temptation to fall back on the same partisanship and pettiness and immaturity that has poisoned our politics for far too long.

That inspires me, Mr. Speaker. Would that it be true.

Let's move past full color to the stark black and white, which is the world we're living in today. Here is the President from last month, giving up on that commitment of bipartisanship. When questioned about the partisan angle that he took throughout the Social Security debate, throughout the doc fix debate, throughout the unemployment debate, he concluded:

It was gonna take more than a year. It was gonna take more than 2 years. It was gonna take more than one term. Probably takes more than one President.

Mr. Speaker, you know as well as I know we've only been in this institution just over 1 year now. It does not take time. It takes courage to make things happen in this body. It does not take hours. It takes ''I do's.'' It takes somebody standing up and saying, ''I will be responsible for that,'' which the President did. He said:

I will be responsible for ushering a new era into Washington, D.C.

As a freshman legislator, I took him at his word. Four years later, here we are. Can't do it in a year. Can't do it in 2 years. He couldn't do it in 3 years, and now he says it probably takes more than one President. It might take a different President, but he says it's going to take more than one.

Let me take you back to sunshine and apple pie, Mr. Speaker, because that's what we're about here in America. We thrive on challenges. We thrive on opportunities to do better. We want one generation to do better than the previous generation, and we want the next generation to do better than our generation. Here is what President Obama says in August 2008 in talking about his Vice Presidential pick:

After decades of steady work across the aisle, I know he'll—in talking about Senator BIDEN, now Vice President BIDEN—be able to help me turn the page on the ugly partisanship in Washington so we can bring Democrats and Republicans together to pass an agenda that works for the American people.

Who doesn't believe in that, Mr. Speaker? Who doesn't believe in that? Who doesn't believe it's not necessarily compromise and that it can be consensus? Who doesn't believe on coming together to pass an agenda that works for the American people?

You do, Mr. Speaker. I do.

I'll take you back to the stark black and white of where we've come, of President Obama in November 2010, a year ago. When talking about why it is his administration has taken on such a partisan tone, he says this:

I neglected some of the things that matter a lot to people, and rightly so that they matter: maintaining a bipartisan tone in Washington. I'm going to redouble my efforts to go back to some of those first principles.

Mr. Speaker, you and I came here for the same reason. We came here to get stuff done for our constituents back home. We came here to uphold the Constitution and the freedoms that it preserves for our constituents back home. We've been stuck in an environment in Washington, D.C., where the Senate refuses to act on any of the legislation that we put forward and where it refuses to act on any of its own legislation. Then we have a President who says this about his leadership in this town:

I neglected some of the things that matter a lot to people, and rightly so that they matter: maintaining a bipartisan tone in Washington. I'm going to redouble my efforts to go back to some of those first principles.

Mr. Speaker, that's the funny thing about principles. You're not supposed to have to go back to them. You're supposed to stick with them day in, day out, in good times, in bad times. It's easy to have principles in the good times. Whoo, it's easy. It's when times get tough that principles really matter. This was a year ago, Mr. Speaker.

The President is going to redouble his efforts to go back to some of those first principles of his, which is ending the partisan tone in Washington, D.C., in November 2010.

Now, folks know what happened in November of 2011. We began the discussion of what to do to solve health care issues for our seniors because Medicare reimbursement rates were on their way down, and seniors might not have had access to care, and we wanted to protect our seniors to make sure that that access to care existed. We had unemployment benefits that were getting ready to expire, and we had folks who were depending on those benefits and who were trying to sort out how it was that we would continue those and reform that program so it wouldn't just provide a check but provide a way back to employment.

We had Social Security, the payroll tax break that the President instituted in December of 2011, which was right after he made this comment that reduces the Social Security contributions of every working American by a third but does nothing to change the benefits that those working Americans get back when they retire, thus accelerating the bankruptcy of the Social Security Trust Fund, not to mention breaking that link that has been omnipresent in this country. With Social Security, it is not an entitlement in the welfare sense of the word. It is an entitlement in that you paid into it, and so you have earned it. You deserve it. We're changing that linkage for the very first time.

Following that debate, I wake up in the morning down in the Seventh District of Georgia, in the northern suburbs there of Atlanta. I was in Gwinnett County. I wake up to find out the President has made recess appointments. Ah, I've got to tell you I went through the roof, but you might not have gone through the roof, Mr. Speaker. I don't know where everybody was, all 300 million Americans, where they were when they woke up to that news that morning or where they were with regard to their Constitution. I carry mine. I know you carry yours, Mr. Speaker, and I would encourage anybody who doesn't have one to contact another Member of Congress. We can absolutely get you the United States Constitution, the rule book by which everything we do here should be judged—should be judged. It's why recess appointments matter, Mr. Speaker.

What I have here is article II, section 2 of the United States Constitution. It's clause 3. I'll back up just a little bit and make it clear for folks who haven't studied their Constitution recently that article I delegates the legislative powers to the United States Congress.

□ 1720

Article I, the very first order of business of our Founding Fathers in framing our Republic was to protect the people's powers here in the people's House and in the United States Senate, article I.

Article II vests power in the Executive. Article II, section 2, clause 3: ''The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.''

It seems pretty straightforward, but it is not. That is what it so wonderful about our Constitution. Our Founding Fathers had the wisdom to say enough without saying too much.

Shortly after the ratification of the Constitution, Alexander Hamilton was writing on this topic. When he read this very same clause, he read this: ''The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate.'' What Alexander Hamilton saw is that the only vacancies that can be filled are those vacancies that occur during a recess of the Senate; not vacancies that are getting filled then, but vacancies that actually occurred then.

This is important language. It is important language because I live 640 miles away from the United States Capitol. I happen to travel with my friends at Delta, and they get me here in an hour and a half; but if I had to get on my horse and ride, it would take a little while.

There is good reason there was recess appointments going on in the founding of this Republic, Mr. Speaker. I hope we can get back to having more recesses here. Why in the world we have let this Congress evolve into a full-time job that takes place year round, I do not know. The general assembly in Georgia meets for 40 days out of the year. I tell folks back home I will have achieved success when it is we in Washington, D.C., who only meet for 40 days out of a year because we have sent that power that has been gradually stolen from the people, stolen from the community, stolen from the States, and return that power to those communities.

But it was a real issue in the early days of our Republic that if there was a recess, we wanted to give the President the power to continue the Republic even when you couldn't get a hold of the United States Senate for confirmation. Well, in the age of iPads and BlackBerrys and fax machines, it is not that hard to get in touch with folks. It is easy to reconvene the Senate. But still on the books today, ''The President shall have the power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate.''

You may be asking, ROB, why do you even care about this? You are in the House. This doesn't concern you. Let me tell you, this concerns me and it concerns every American because it concerns the rule book by which our Republic is governed. If we decide that the rule book doesn't matter, it will be something small today and it is going to be something medium-sized tomorrow, and it is going to be something huge a year from now, and the freedoms that our Constitution has so ably protected for over 200 years will soon be gone.

This isn't a partisan fight. This is an American fight. I will tell you that when we had a Republican President in the White House and Republican Members controlling this U.S. House and Republican Members controlling the U.S. Senate, power left this House and went down to the executive branch. Republicans allowed legislative power to leave this House and get transferred to the executive branch.

We have got to be on duty all the time. It is not Republican/Democrat; it is Executive/U.S. House. Why? Because when our framers were framing the Constitution, they knew tyranny of the Executive was what was to be feared. King of England. Tyranny of the Executive was what was to be feared, and so they invested most of the power in the Congress, in the House, in the Senate. This is where our framers trusted that power to reside, but they gave the President the power to make appointments in recess of the Senate.

Why is this important at all? Article II, section 2, clause 2, which is known as the advice and consent clause: The President ''shall have the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for.

Hear this: The President absolutely, positively has the power to appoint whomever he wants, by and with the advice and consent of the United States Senate. If the Senate is not in session, clause 3 takes over during those times. The President shall have the power to fill those vacancies, and it shall not extend past that one session.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what happened over Christmas, as the rights and privileges of the American people were stolen out from under us here in the United States House and Senate and transferred to the executive branch, is that the President said—and you will remember the quote. He said: If I can't do it with Congress, I will go around Congress.

Do you remember that?

If I can't pass my agenda with Congress, I will go around Congress.

Tyranny of the Executive, the most fundamental fear our framers had. The most fundamental fear was that an Executive would decide that he or she could do whatever they wanted without the consent of the government.

We have to stand up as Republicans and Democrats and say there is a right way and a wrong way to run this town, that there is a rule book by which this town is governed, that there is 200

years of precedent that tells us how appointments must occur, how that advice must occur when those appointments can be made.

If you followed any of this—and we'll talk about this more in the weeks to come because it goes to the bedrock of our Republic. Again, if you let your reverence for the Constitution slide when it is convenient for you, you're going to find it pulled out from under you when you need it most.

Mr. Speaker, I know that when you swore your oath to the people of this country, you swore your oath not to protect the Constitution from Democratic Presidents, not to protect the Constitution from Republican Presidents, but to protect the Constitution from all enemies foreign and domestic. Your oath, whether there is a Republican in the White House or a Democrat in the White House, is to make sure that the people's power remains here with the people. We legislate and the President executes.

This isn't a mystery. This isn't something I came up with in the Seventh District of Georgia. This is something President Bush and Senator HARRY REID struggled with during the Bush administration. This is something all Congresses and Presidents struggle with. The struggle is not new. The complete abdication of constitutional responsibility, that is new. The deciding that if you can't do it with the Constitution, you will go around the Constitution, that is new.

Let me tell you what HARRY REID said, Mr. Speaker. I hold in my hand here a copy of that page from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As you can see, we record absolutely every word that goes on here. We don't want folks to be misquoted. We don't want the debate to go on and folks not to be able to remember what was said. We want to hold folks accountable to the people back home.

Let me tell you what HARRY REID said as it was recorded right here by the reporters, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

□ 1730

He said on November 16, 2007: Mr. President, the Senate will be coming in for pro forma sessions during the Thanksgiving holiday to prevent recess appointments.

Now, I understand there's a lot of legalese that goes on here in Washington, D.C. We have the Constitution right here. Article II, section 2, clause 2; Article II, section 2, clause 3, this is the important part. This is the important part. With the advice and consent of the Senate, the President shall appoint, and the President has the power to appoint without the Senate during recess.

But now we are in what's called pro forma sessions because the Constitution also says that no body of Congress, neither the House nor the Senate, can adjourn for more than 3 days without the consent of the other body. We've seen that in some State legislatures across the country, haven't we, where folks just take their toys and go home, Mr. Speaker. They decide they don't like the way things are going, so they just leave.

The Founding Fathers 200 years ago sensed that challenge and wrote it into the fabric of our founding document that no body of Congress, neither the House nor the Senate, shall adjourn for more than 3 days without the consent of the other. And what that leaves you then with is these bodies in what they call pro forma session. We're in. We're open. Every 72 hours, the Speaker comes up here to the microphone and gavels us in. The House is open for business. When business is done, they gavel us out. Is it a full day? No, it's not. Are we in session? Yes, we are. And this is a process that has gone on for decades, in fact, dozens of decades. And in November of 2007 when Senator HARRY REID was trying to prevent President George Bush from making recess appointments, he said this: We're not going to go into recess. Hah. Hah. I've got responsibilities to the people back home, HARRY REID said, to advise and consent on all of your appointments. I think you're going to try to pull one past us when we're gone for Thanksgiving. In fact, I think you're going to try to pull one past us while we're gone for Christmas. So what am I going to do, the Senate will be coming in for pro forma sessions during the holiday to prevent recess appointments.

Mr. Speaker, this was 2007, when it was well known that the law of the land is that while the Senate is in for pro forma sessions, no President—not President Bush and not President Obama—can make appointments without the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate. November of 2007; well known. HARRY REID, presiding over the U.S. Senate, issuing those words: We will remain in pro forma session to prevent recess appointments.

And this President, whose Justice Department put together literally dozens of pages to defend this departure from constitutional tradition, to defend this rejection of 200 years of congressional precedent, to defend this going around Congress, said no, we think you can do it. The majority leader of the United States Senate knew you couldn't do it. The Framers of the Constitution knew you couldn't do it. And this President, as if it was nothing, that's what troubles me the most, Mr. Speaker, as if it was nothing, pulled together a press conference and said, I'm doing it any way—Richard Cordray, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. This is a confirmation that didn't occur during a recess, didn't occur during a recess. The President made his nomination while the Senate was absolutely in session. The Senate voted, Mr. Speaker, and did not confirm. Could not get the 60 votes necessary to move forward on the confirmation, took the vote, couldn't move forward. The vote occurred. It occurred in the negative.

And while the U.S. House and the U.S. Senate remained in pro forma sessions, working out those issues I talked about earlier, the doc fix for our friends on Medicare to make sure that the resources were still available for unemployment, to make sure the program was reformed and funded for Social Security taxes, to make sure that the trust fund was funded and that workers were satisfied, while all of those things were happening in this body during session, the President decided, no, in fact, we were not in session, and he would make appointments. And he started with one that had already been rejected by the United States Senate. Then went on to name three more members to the National Labor Relations Board. That was a smaller press conference for that one, Mr. Speaker, because that one was much more controversial. No press conference at all, in fact, just a press release. And then the President said: Look out, I may do more. I may do more. You know what, I kind of like this thing where I get to do whatever I want to do. I kind of like this thing where it doesn't matter what the Senate says, it doesn't matter what the Representatives of the States say, it doesn't matter what the representatives of the people say; I've got an agenda, and Congress is standing in my way. And if you'll not work with me, Congress, I will go around you.

Article II delegates authority to the Executive. Article I delegates authority to this House. Article I delegates authority to the people's House. You cannot go around the people in America. I can't do it. The President can't do it. The military can't do it. That's not what we do. Are there countries around the globe that do that? Yes, there are. Our forefathers fled those countries to come here where the only power vested in government is that which we the people give it. Hear that, Mr. Speaker. You know it to be true. The only power held in this city in the capital of the free world, the center of free speech and freedom of religion, the beacon of hope and prosperity all across the world, every bit of power that is here is here because the American people elected to share it.

There's no inherent authority in being the President of the United States; it comes from the people. There's absolutely no authority in being a Congressman of the United States; it comes from the people.

The President has the power to execute the laws passed by this body. But he does not have the power to make new laws on his own. We've heard that from executive branch agencies across the board. The President has the power to choose who he would like to be in those positions of power in those agencies, and he can make those selections with the advice and consent of the United States Senate.

This isn't about me, Mr. Speaker. It's not even about this body. When the

President tramples on the Constitution like this, he's trampling on the Senate's powers. But when he tramples on the Constitution, he tramples on my freedom, and he tramples on your freedom. And he tramples on all of our freedoms, and we cannot let it stand.

What are we going to do? Well, candidly, what makes this so troubling is the Constitution didn't actually imagine that we would ever elect an Executive that would simply go his own way. There is no slap on the wrist. We can't send the U.S. House Sergeant of Arms down there to prosecute this kind of offense. What happens is it plays itself out in the courts, and we're going to see it. Everyone who's regulated by this Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, they're going to sue. Folks who are regulated by the NLRB, they're going to sue. It's going to go across the street to the United States Supreme Court to try to decide about this division of powers. And if it gets there, folks are going to decide in favor of the very plainly written words of the United States Constitution.

But, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't have to be like this. The President said I'm going to change the tone in Washington. The President said we can work together to implement an agenda for the American people. Mr. Speaker, you stand here ready to work. I stand here ready to work. And the President said: I can't work with you, I'm going around you.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know who the President thinks we are, but I'm a mouthpiece for a million Americans back home in the Seventh District of Georgia. I come here with their hopes and dreams. You're the voice of a million constituents in your home State, Mr. Speaker, and you come here to do their bidding. The President isn't fighting with this House, the President is fighting with the American people. And I say to you, Mr. President, if you get on the wrong side—Mr. Speaker, I encourage you to share with the President—if he gets on the wrong side of the American people, he's on the wrong side.

□ 1740

We can work together, and we do work together.

And I encourage folks to watch 2012. I had great hopes, Mr. Speaker, for what would happen in 2012. And the President's very first act was not to work with Congress, but to go around Congress. The license plate of the vehicle that ran over the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, it reads Illinois. And we have to stand up and reverse.

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

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the Speaker for the time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. BERKLEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for January 17 and today on account of a family illness.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 19, 2012, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4597. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Extension of Temporary Registration of Municipal Advisors [Release No.: 34-66020; File No. S7-19-10] (RIN: 3235-AK69) received December 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4598. A letter from the Associate Chief, WTB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — National Environmental Policy Act Compliance for Proposed Town Registrations, Effects of Communications Towers On Migratory Birds [WT Docket No.: 08-61, WT Docket No. 03-187) received December 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4599. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amending the Definition of Interconnected VoIP Service in Section 9.3 of the Commission's Rules, Wireless E911 Location Accuracy Requirements, E911 Requirements for IP-Enabled Service Providers [GN Docket No.: 11-117] [PS Docket No.: 07-114] [WC Docket No.: 05-196] received December 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4600. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List; and Implementation of Entity List Annual Review Changes [Docket No.: 111202715-1724-01] (RIN: 0694-AF46) received December 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4601. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-146, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4602. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-136, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4603. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-124, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4604. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Registration and Licensing of Brokers, Brokering Activities, and Related Provisions (RIN: 1400-AC37) received December 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4605. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Revision of U.S. Munitions List Category VII (RIN: 1400-AC77) received December 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4606. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a notification pursuant to the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4607. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Correction of Administrative Errors; Court Orders and Legal Processes Affecting Thrift Savings Plan Accounts received December 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4608. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Amendment 11 [Docket No.: 0808041037-1649-02] (RIN: 0648-AX05) received December 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4609. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Revisions to Pacific Cod Fishing in the Parallel Fishery in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 110207103-1113-01] (RIN: 0648-AY65) received December 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4610. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Driggs, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0837; Airspace Docket No. 11-ANM-17] received December 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4611. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0971; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-030-AD; Amendment 39-16862; AD 2011-23-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4612. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedule for Rating Disabilities; Evaluation of Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (RIN: 2900-AN60) received December 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

4613. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Loan Guaranty Revised Loan Modification Procedures (RIN: 2900-AN78) received December 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

4614. A letter from the TTB Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Fort Ross-Seaview Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2011-0004; T.D. TTB-98; Re: Notice Nos. 34, 42, and 117] (RIN: 1513- AA64) received December 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4615. A letter from the TTB Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Coombsville Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2011-0006; T.D. TTB-100; Ref: Notice No. 119] (RIN: 1513-AB81) received December 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4616. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 482: Methods to Determine Taxable Income in Connection With a Cost Sharing Arrangement [TD 9568] (RIN: 1545-BI47) received December 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4617. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Use of Differential Income Stream as a Consideration in Assessing the Best Method [TD 9569] (RIN: 1545-BK72) received December 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 200. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of water resources in the Rialto-Colton Basin in the State of California, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2070. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the nation on June 6, 1944, the morning of D–Day; with an amendment (Rept. 112–368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2087. A bill to remove restrictions from a parcel of land situated in the Atlantic District, Accomack County, Virginia; with an amendment (Rept. 112–369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2336. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the York River and associated tributaries for study for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; with an amendment (Rept. 112–370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2752. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct onshore oil and gas lease sales through Internet-based live lease sales, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112–371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2236. A bill to provide for the issuance of a Wildlife Refuge System Conservation Semipostal Stamp (Rept. 112–372, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

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. LAMBORN:

H.R. 3778. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to establish a point of order to prohibit the extension of the public debt limit unless a concurrent resolution on the budget has been agreed to and is in effect; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 3779. A bill to hold accountable Federal departments and agencies that fail to meet goals relating to the participation of small business concerns in procurement contracts, to authorize Federal departments and agencies to give preference to small business concerns when procuring goods or services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 3780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an ordinary and necessary business expense deduction for contributions to regional infrastructure improvement zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 3781. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a criminal penalty for torture committed by law enforcement officers and others acting under color of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. STARK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 3782. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to address unfair trade practices relating to infringement of copyrights and trademarks by certain Internet sites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 3783. A bill to provide for a comprehensive strategy to counter Iran's growing presence and hostile activity in the Western Hemisphere, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 3784. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a windfall profit tax on oil and natural gas (and products thereof) and to allow an income tax credit for purchases of fuel-efficient passenger vehicles, and to allow grants for mass transit; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. PAUL:

H.R. 3785. A bill to repeal section 1021 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3786. A bill to ensure clarity of regulations to improve the effectiveness of Federal regulatory programs while decreasing burdens on the regulated public; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 3787. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require a jobs score for each spending bill considered in Congress; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3788. A bill to ensure that State and local E911 fees, taxes, and surcharges are imposed in a fair and equitable manner with respect to prepaid mobile services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3789. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish clear regulatory standards for mortgage servicers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 3790. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide comprehensive cancer patient treatment education under the Medicare Program and to provide for research to improve cancer symptom management; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be

subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 3791. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require annual disclosures relating to the compensation brackets in which an issuer's minority and women employees reside; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 3792. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to evaluate the significance of the Mill Springs Battlefield located in Pulaski and Wayne Counties, Kentucky, and the feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SHULER:

H.R. 3793. A bill to establish State infrastructure banks for education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 3794. A bill to repeal the National and Community Service Act of 1990 and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 3795. A bill to establish a grant program to preserve the legacy and ideals of Muhammad Ali and promote global respect, understanding, and communication, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KUCINICH:

H.J. Res. 100. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the use of public funds to pay for campaigns for election to Federal office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED:

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. NUGENT (for himself, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LATTA, Mr. COLE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. DENHAM, Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. ADAMS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. WEST, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H. Res. 516. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the passage of a fiscal year 2013 Federal budget is of national importance; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. CHANDLER):

H. Res. 517. A resolution to commemorate the 150th Anniversary of the Battle of Mill Springs and the significance of this battle during the Civil War; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SEWELL (for herself, Mr. BONNER, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. BACHUS):

H. Res. 518. A resolution congratulating the University of Alabama Crimson Tide football team for winning the 2011 Bowl Championship Series National Championship; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WATERS:

H. Res. 519. A resolution honoring Apostle Frederick K.C. Price on his 80th birthday; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. WATERS:

H. Res. 520. A resolution recognizing the significance of the 45th anniversary of Kwanzaa Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. LAMBORN:

H.R. 3778.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 3779.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: Appropriations and Accounting of Public Money.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 3780.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3781.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3782.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3783.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''This bill follows the Constitutional prerogatives of Congress under Article I, Section 8, pertaining to the clauses to 'provide for the common Defense' and 'make Rules for the Government.' ''

By Mr. KUCINICH:

H.R. 3784.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 3785.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3786.

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 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3787.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3788.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 5 of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution and Congress' plenary power under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution (commonly known as the ''commerce clause''), in order to ensure that States and political subdivisions thereof do not discriminate against providers and consumers of mobile services by imposing new selective and excessive taxes and other burdens on such providers and consumers.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3789.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3790.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States. Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 3791.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 3792.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. SHULER:

H.R. 3793.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 gives Congress the authority to ''provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3 gives Congress the authority to ''regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among several states.''

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 3794.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States, which states ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .'' and clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have the Power ''to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 3795.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. KUCINICH:

H.J. Res. 100.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. FARR, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. FLEMING.
H.R. 83: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 104: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 139: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.
H.R. 190: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 303: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 350: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 374: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 402: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 431: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 459: Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BERG, and Mr. LEWIS of California.
H.R. 507: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 511: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 544: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 555: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 572: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 607: Mr. CRITZ and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 733: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 856: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 883: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 890: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 954: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 974: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1124: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1154: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 1167: Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 1195: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 1265: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1288: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 1332: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1417: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1418: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 1558: Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 1614: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1639: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois and Mr. GOWDY.
H.R. 1697: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 1704: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1738: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. TURNER of Ohio.
H.R. 1775: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1792: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1903: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1916: Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 1960: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2014: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 2026: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2162: Mr. ROSS of Florida.
H.R. 2179: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 2238: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 2247: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2288: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2305: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2335: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2357: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2377: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 2397: Mr. ROSS of Florida.
H.R. 2414: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2418: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. KIND, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 2453: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 2459: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2536: Ms. CHU, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 2542: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 2595: Mr. MORAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2604: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2634: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2649: Mr. BOREN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 2652: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. ROSS of Florida.
H.R. 2679: Ms. MOORE, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2682: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2705: Mr. WELCH and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 2733: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2741: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 2746: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2810: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2902: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2948: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2954: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2982: Mr. WEST.
H.R. 3001: Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. DOLD, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BERG, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HANNA, Mr. PENCE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. RENACCI, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HECK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 3053: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 3087: Mrs. ADAMS.
H.R. 3096: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3187: Mr. GIBSON and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 3203: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 3208: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 3209: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 3210: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3211: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 3215: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 3216: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 3259: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 3265: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 3300: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 3324: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 3340: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3399: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 3409: Mr. BERG.
H.R. 3437: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 3474: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3483: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3501: Mr. PENCE, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3506: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 3523: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 3525: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 3527: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 3553: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 3554: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 3555: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.
H.R. 3573: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3578: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. BERG.
H.R. 3581: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
H.R. 3582: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 3583: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 3600: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.R. 3606: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 3608: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 3609: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 3612: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 3634: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 3643: Mr. PETRI and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 3646: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 3662: Mr. HECK, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. FOXX, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. COLE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 3676: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, and Mr. HECK.
H.R. 3687: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3695: Ms. BORDALLO and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 3713: Mr. COBLE and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 3750: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3760: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 3762: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 3767: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 3770: Mr. LATTA, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. COLE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.J. Res. 72: Mr. FARR.
H.J. Res. 86: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.J. Res. 97: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Ms. LEE of California.
H.J. Res. 98: Mr. FLORES, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. ROONEY.
H. Res. 111: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. HUNTER.
H. Res. 220: Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 225: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H. Res. 484: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H. Res. 509: Mr. HALL, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. RIBBLE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3261: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 3622: Mr. TIBERI.