



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2012

No. 24

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 14, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANDY HARRIS 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 1:50 p.m.

THE GREAT RULER

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the country cannot afford this great ruler and his administration.

- He costs too much.
- He spends too much.
- He taxes too much.
- He regulates too much.
- He cuts defense too much.
- He grows the government too much.
- He divides the people too much.
- He blames others too much.
- He controls our lives too much.

He despises criticism too much.
He says no to domestic energy too much.

He obstructs drilling in the Gulf of Mexico too much.

He says yes to OPEC too much.
He subsidizes bankrupt green energy too much.

He ignores the border too much.
He sues States too much.

He infringes on religious freedom too much.

He tries to make Americans dependent on the government too much.

He likes giving away somebody else's money too much.

He campaigns too much.
He expands government too much.

He borrows too much.
He taxes people who die too much.

He taxes people who live too much.
He likes the word "trillion" too much.

He increases unemployment too much.

He likes the phrase "more deficit" too much.

He lets gasoline prices rise too much.
He makes health care cost too much.

He ignores the Constitution too much.

He panders to radical interest groups too much.

He berates capitalism too much.
He refuses to compromise too much.

And he really likes Big Government too much.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford this great ruler, and especially his current administration.

And that's just the way it is.

REJECT THE AMERICAN ENERGY AND INFRASTRUCTURE JOBS ACT OF 2012

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, for those watching on tele-

vision and here in the House, I assume my friend from Texas was talking about President George W. Bush. Certainly he was not talking about the current President, Barack Obama.

But I want to talk today about transportation. The residents of my northern Virginia district endure one of the worst commutes in the Nation. Each citizen spends an average of 74 hours stuck in traffic, costing the average commuter nearly \$1,500 a year in lost productivity and consumption. They're understandably fed up with congestion and traffic, and they want to see improvements being made. They want to be able to get to work without having to leave in the middle of the night to get there on time. They want to be able to attend their child's school activities or go to a doctor's appointment without having to take half the day off from work.

The unmet needs in northern Virginia alone top \$600 million a year. Across the Commonwealth of Virginia, they exceed \$100 billion over the next 25 years. My constituents and I are ready for a robust transportation bill that will repair our roads and bridges and expand commuting options, especially transit. Sadly, H.R. 7 is not that bill, and it is laughable for the House Republican majority to claim otherwise. Their plan will cut investment in transportation and in our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, and it will cut, not create, jobs.

In highway funding alone, Virginia will lose \$361 million under this proposal compared to current funding. H.R. 7 completely eliminates bus and bus facility funding for the Washington area metro system and the Nation's other metropolitan transit authorities. Just 5 States out of 50 will receive more highway dollars over the next 5 years. All the rest are losers. This bill eliminates all dedicated user funding for transit, prompting even the conservative Chamber of Commerce to

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

urge Congress to reject this proposal. Nationally, this bill will cut \$16 billion and result in the loss of more than half a million jobs, which will serve as an abrupt speed bump for our economic recovery. Mr. Speaker, that's unacceptable. We can and must do better.

Twenty-six business leaders in my community—including the Prince William and Fairfax Chambers of Commerce, realtors, builders, and contractors—recently signed a resolution in which they said: New transportation infrastructure is an investment, not a cost. Failure to invest will result in economic decline.

They are right. They have witnessed firsthand the consequence of not making significant, new, dedicated, and reliable investments in infrastructure. Due to this lack of investment at the State level, Federal revenues are now the single-largest source of transportation funding in my State. That's why \$500 million in State dollars are diverted annually from new construction to simple maintenance as more and more roadways deteriorate and along with them our competitiveness in attracting new employers and their families.

But it is not just roads. My community supports a multimodal transportation system that includes bus and van pools, commuter rail, and mass transit. We have the second-highest transit usership in the Nation; yet our success in getting people out of their cars and off the roads is now in jeopardy because of this bill eliminating dedicated funding for transit, breaking a 30-year commitment that we have to supporting multimodal options for commuters all across America. Under this proposal, money that has been dedicated to transit will now go to highways, and a one-time general fund transfer of \$40 billion is somehow supposed to make up for it.

To further salt the wounds of my constituents, House Republicans are proposing to pay for that one-time general fund transfer by gutting the retirement benefits of Federal employees. As a result of the 2-year pay freeze, Federal employees have already contributed \$60 billion over the next 10 years to deficit reduction, but that is not good enough. This new proposal would pile on by increasing out-of-pocket retirement costs by at least three times while reducing overall benefits by 40 percent. Once again, the House Republican majority is using the dedicated Federal workforce as a punching bag politically and discouraging today's young people from even considering a career in public service.

So let me get this straight. The Republican bill will actually reduce spending on transportation, end the reliable user-fee funding system that has been in place since 1956, shifting the burden onto the backs of Federal employees. That's not progress by any stretch of the imagination. In fact, it will just make congestion worse.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill and work together on a bipartisan alternative.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

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

As we meditate on all the blessing of life, we especially pray for the blessing of peace in our lives and in our world. Our fervent prayer, O God, is that people will learn to live together in reconciliation and respect, so that the terrors of war, and of dictatorial abuse, will be no more.

As You have created each person, we pray that You would guide our hearts and minds that every person of every place and background might focus on Your great gift of life, and so learn to live in unity.

May Your special blessings be upon the Members of this assembly, in the important, sometimes difficult work they do. Give them wisdom and charity, that they might work together for the common good.

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.

Ms. FOXX. 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET IS POLITICAL

(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, yesterday the President released his budget for 2013, which calls for a cut in defense spending, for the first time since 1998, by almost \$500 billion. It is clear the President is simply taking resources away from our military capabilities and using the funds to grow the size of government to promote more unsustainable domestic programs, putting senior citizens at risk of a devalued dollar and burdening young people and college students with crushing debt.

Instead of focusing on stopping defense cut sequestration, the President is putting our national security at risk and our allies in jeopardy during a time of international instability.

Cutting our defense budget with record-breaking tax increases destroying jobs will not reduce the national deficit, but only represents a diversion of funds. I urge the President to recognize the primary function of the national government is national defense, to provide peace through strength.

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

DEMOCRATS PROTECT MEDICARE

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 3 million seniors represented by the Alliance for Retired Americans, I rise with my Democratic colleagues to accept their valentine for our vote to improve Medicare under the health care reform law. Our seniors deserve love, care, and support every day. But today, on a day when people all across the country are celebrating with their loved ones, let us stand together and show our appreciation to the more than 47 million seniors who make up the fabric of our country.

In my State of Maryland, the Affordable Care Act is already working to provide more than 70,000 seniors with preventive care benefits and offers a 50 percent discount for prescription drugs to nearly 4,000 beneficiaries who enter the Medicare part D doughnut hole.

The Ryan budget, lauded by Republicans, would replace Medicare with an inefficient voucher plan and increase the out-of-pocket costs of Maryland seniors by more than \$6,800 in the first year alone. And while they charge the health reform bill cut Medicare, Republicans fail to admit that they adopted in their plan the same \$500 billion in “cuts”—actually cost savings—included in the health care reform law.

So I stand with my colleagues to assure seniors that we'll protect Medicare today and in the future. And to all of those seniors I visited this morning, Happy Valentine's Day.

SUGAR REFORM

(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, today, on Valentine's Day, millions of Americans will celebrate with a box of chocolates or candy. All told, consumers are expected to spend more than \$1.5 billion on candy this holiday.

What they don't know is that government sugar controls are making that heart-shaped box more expensive than it needs to be. What they don't know is that American companies are struggling to compete against foreign producers who pay half as much for sugar.

Because of government price supports, marketing allotments, and import quotas, U.S. consumers and businesses pay almost double the average world market price for sugar. By some estimates, this could be costing us more than 20,000 jobs. Many of us have watched good jobs lost because the government guarantees the profits of a relatively small group of growers and producers.

Reforming our sugar program isn't a partisan issue, which is why I've been proud to introduce H.R. 1385, the Free Market Sugar Act, with my friend from Chicago, DANNY DAVIS.

Maybe next Valentine's Day can be sweeter for American workers and consumers.

CONTINUED ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE FOR OUR SENIORS

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in 2010, the Affordable Care Act delivered a \$250 check to seniors in my district who were struggling to cover the gap between the cost of their prescription drugs and their Medicare coverage. In 2011, these same seniors benefited from an average savings of \$648 on their medications.

For my well-meaning Republican colleagues who say health reform is hurting Medicare beneficiaries, I ask them to imagine spending two and three times that amount on prescription drugs per month.

For most seniors, \$648 is a significant savings. And it is just the beginning.

The Affordable Care Act will provide more efficient care by bundling Medicare services, investing in our health care workforce, and focusing on quality.

Replacing Medicare with vouchers would erase the progress we have already made toward prescription drug coverage and lead to fewer choices for beneficiaries.

I encourage my colleagues to work with me on solutions that guarantee continued access to health care for our seniors.

CELEBRATING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE HOMECOMING OF CONGRESSMAN SAM JOHNSON

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to acknowledge a colleague, a fellow Texan, a veteran, and a true American hero. Congressman SAM JOHNSON served in the United States Air Force for 29 years. During service, he flew in 62 combat missions in the Korean war and 25 missions in the Vietnam war. While flying in his 25th Vietnam combat mission, Congressman JOHNSON was shot down and captured in North Vietnam.

On February 12, 1973, after 7 years of imprisonment, Congressman JOHNSON was returned to the United States and reunited with his wife and daughters. This week, we honor Congressman JOHNSON and we celebrate the 39th anniversary of his homecoming. Through the years of agony, he persevered, and he left Vietnam with the resolution to support every man and every woman fighting for the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, we are all called to office for different reasons. For Members of my class 10 years ago, it was the tragic events of September 11. For Congressman JOHNSON, it was his imprisonment that empowered him to run for office.

It is an honor to celebrate a man who has given not only part of his life to protect our freedoms, but a man who continues to represent the American people with dignity and respect. Thank you, Congressman JOHNSON, for your service to our Nation.

COMMENDING THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN TO HELP RESPONSIBLE HOMEOWNERS REFINANCE THEIR HOMES

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, the housing crisis plunged our economy into a recession that we are still struggling to overcome. Homeownership is at the heart of the American Dream, and yet over 10 million American families now owe more on their home than

what it's worth. President Obama recently announced a plan that would give homeowners the chance to save hundreds monthly and approximately \$3,000 yearly on their mortgages by refinancing at historically low interest rates.

Under President Obama's plan, the administration would also expand the eligibility for the Home Affordable Modification Program to borrowers with higher debt loans. It would also triple incentives paid to banks to reduce principal on loans and to help borrowers rebuild equity. In addition to these proposals, the administration is also extending HAMP to December 2013 to help responsible homeowners lower their costs and stay in their homes.

Mr. Speaker, I thank President Obama for his proposal that will provide much-needed relief for millions of American families. And I thank the President for his leadership and his commitment to helping American families move forward.

CAMERAS IN THE SUPREME COURT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court will soon take up the President's nationalized health care law. This case will go down in history as it affects every American. But unless every citizen has a seat inside the Supreme Court, they will not be able to watch the legal arguments or hear the questions by the Justices. The people will not be able to see justice in action. The American public should be able to view the proceedings on TV much like they do with C-SPAN when Congress is in session.

I know cameras can be placed in a courtroom without disruption because I was one of the first judges in Texas to allow an unobtrusive camera in the courtroom. I did so without any problem and proved the cynics wrong.

A lack of seating capacity is no reason to deny the American public access to the Supreme Court. The American people deserve an all-access pass to watch the High Court in action. The Supreme Court is the most important court in the world. Let the world know what takes place behind those closed doors. Let cameras and the people in.

And that's just the way it is.

MEDICARE ADVANTAGE

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

Ms. BUERKLE. Mr. Speaker, the President assured American seniors that under his health care package, their insurance plans would not be affected and that they would have the same health care choices as before the law.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, this is not the case. The President's health care law

makes drastic cuts to the popular Medicare Advantage program of more than \$136 billion. With these cuts, Mr. Speaker, Medicare Advantage plans will be forced to make significant adjustments, including reductions in what they cover. Those reductions will limit seniors' ability to choose the Medicare plan that best suits them.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that the cuts will hit low-income seniors and the disabled with disproportionate cuts. About 70 percent of the cuts will be imposed on those with incomes below \$32,400 per year.

The President's cuts will give the 120,000 seniors in my district who choose Medicare Advantage few choices and increased costs. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work with me to protect Medicare Advantage.

MEDICARE

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the question that is on the minds of every senior in America, and that question is, what is the future of Medicare? And what is this Congress doing to protect it?

The President's budget, which was released just yesterday, fails to address the inevitable bankruptcy this program faces. His budget includes a record budget deficit. His budget also includes over \$2 trillion in tax increases that will not only destroy jobs but do nothing to protect the future of Medicare. We know that ObamaCare cut \$500 billion out of Medicare. And now the President in his budget is asking for more than \$360 billion in additional cuts.

The President's health care bill is destroying a program that was designed to protect seniors. It's limiting access, increasing costs, and lowering quality care. According to the American Medical Association, one out of three doctors already limits the number of Medicare patients they see. Just try to find a doctor in eastern Washington who will take a new Medicare patient. This is unacceptable. We can do better, and we must do better.

MEDICARE ADVANTAGE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that our colleagues across the aisle are doing their best to hide the truth about the cuts to Medicare that came with ObamaCare and those that the President has recommended in his budget. However, the truth will out.

The President's health care takeover, like his latest budget, is bad for our Nation's seniors. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Demo-

crats' health care and tax increase law slashed funding for Medicare Advantage plans used by millions of seniors across the country.

According to an October Forbes article, the average beneficiary—considering both those who stay in the stripped-down Medicare Advantage program and those who transition out of it—will incur an average cut of more than \$3,700 in benefits per year by 2017.

That will directly affect the 40,000 seniors in my mostly rural North Carolina district who enjoy Medicare Advantage plans. So much for the President's promise that "if you like your plan, you can keep it."

That's just another reason why I voted against the health care law and intend to support its repeal.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 14, 2012.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 14, 2012 at 10:25 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1162.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 13, 2011.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on February 13, 2012, at 2:14 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits his Budget of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2013.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112-78)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message

from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

America was built on the idea that anyone who is willing to work hard and play by the rules, can make it if they try—no matter where they started out. By giving every American a fair shot, asking everyone to do their fair share, and ensuring that everyone played by the same rules, we built the great American middle class and made our country a model for the world.

Today, America is still home to the world's best universities, most productive workers, and most innovative companies. But for many Americans, the basic bargain at the heart of the American Dream has eroded.

Long before this recession hit, there was a widespread feeling that hard work had stopped paying off; that fewer and fewer of those who contributed to the success of our economy actually benefited from that success. Those at the very top grew wealthier while everyone else struggled with paychecks that did not keep up with the rising cost of everything from college tuition to groceries. And as a result, too many families found themselves taking on more and more debt just to keep up—often papered over by mounting credit card bills and home equity loans.

Then, in the middle of 2008, the house of cards collapsed. Too many mortgages had been sold to people who could not afford—or even understand—them. Banks had packaged too many risky loans into securities and then sold them to investors who were misled or misinformed about the risks involved. Huge bets had been made and huge bonuses had been paid out with other people's money. And the regulators who were supposed to prevent this crisis either looked the other way or did not have the authority to act.

In the end, this growing debt and irresponsibility helped trigger the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. Combined with new tax cuts and new mandatory programs that had never been paid for, it threw our country into a deep fiscal hole. And millions of hardworking Americans lost their jobs, their homes, and their basic economic security.

Today, we are seeing signs that our economy is on the mend. But we are not out of the woods yet. Instead, we are facing a make-or-break moment for the middle class, and for all those who are fighting to get there. What is at stake is whether or not this will be a country where working people can earn enough to raise a family, build modest savings, own a home, and secure their retirement. This is the defining issue of our time.

This Budget reflects my deep belief that we must rise to meet this moment—both for our economy and for the millions of Americans who have worked so hard to get ahead.

We built this Budget around the idea that our country has always done best when everyone gets a fair shot, everyone does their fair share, and everyone plays by the same rules. It rejects the “you’re on your own” economics that have led to a widening gap between the richest and poorest Americans that undermines both our belief in equal opportunity and the engine of our economic growth. When the middle class is shrinking, and families can no longer afford to buy the goods and services that businesses are selling, it drags down our entire economy. And countries with less inequality tend to have stronger and steadier economic growth over the long run.

The way to rebuild our economy and strengthen the middle class is to make sure that everyone in America gets a fair shot at success. Instead of lowering our standards and our sights, we need to win a race to the top for good jobs that pay well and offer security for the middle class. To succeed and thrive in the global, high-tech economy, we need America to be a place with the highest-skilled, highest-educated workers; the most advanced transportation and communication networks; and the strongest commitment to research and technology in the world. This Budget makes investments that can help America win this race, create good jobs, and lead in the world economy.

And it does so with the understanding that we need an economy that is no longer burdened by years of debt and in which everyone shoulders their fair share to put our fiscal house in order. When I took office 3 years ago, my Administration was left an annual deficit of \$1.3 trillion, or 9.2 percent of GDP, and a projected 10-year deficit of more than \$8 trillion. These deficits were the result of a previous 8 years of undertaking initiatives, but not paying for them—especially two large tax cuts and a new Medicare prescription drug benefit—as well as the financial crisis and recession that made the fiscal situation worse as revenue decreased and automatic Government outlays increased to counter the downturn.

We have taken many steps to re-establish fiscal responsibility, from instituting a statutory pay-as-you-go rule for spending to going through the budget line by line looking for outdated, ineffective, or duplicative programs to cut or reform. Importantly, we enacted the Affordable Care Act, which will not only provide Americans with more affordable choices and freedom from insurance company abuses, but will also reduce our budget deficits by more than \$1 trillion over the next two decades.

As economic growth was beginning to take hold last year, I took further steps to put our Nation on a fiscally sustainable path that would strengthen the foundation of the economy for years to come. In April of 2011, I put forward my Framework for Shared Prosperity and Shared Fiscal Responsibility that built on the 2012 Budget to

identify \$4 trillion in deficit reduction. During negotiations over extending the debt ceiling in the summer, I presented to congressional Republicans another balanced plan to achieve \$4 trillion in deficit reduction. Finally, in September, I sent my Plan for Economic Growth and Deficit Reduction to the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, which detailed a way to achieve \$3 trillion in deficit reduction on top of the \$1 trillion already achieved in the Budget Control Act of 2011 that I signed into law the previous month.

I also made sure that this plan covered the cost of the American Jobs Act—a set of bipartisan, commonsense proposals designed to put more people back to work, put more money in the pockets of the middle class, and do so without adding a dime to the deficit at a time when it was clear that global events were slowing the economic recovery and our ability to create more jobs. Unfortunately, Republicans in Congress blocked both our deficit reduction measures and almost every part of the American Jobs Act for the simple reason that they were unwilling to ask the wealthiest Americans to pay their fair share.

In the year ahead, I will continue to pursue policies that will shore up our economy and our fiscal situation. Together with the deficit reduction I signed into law this past year, this Budget will cut the deficit by \$4 trillion over the next decade. This will put the country on a course to a level of deficits below 3 percent of GDP by the end of the decade, and will also allow us to stabilize the Federal debt relative to the size of the economy. To get there, this Budget contains a number of steps to put us on a fiscally sustainable path.

First, this Budget implements the tight discretionary spending caps that I signed into law in the Budget Control Act of 2011. These caps will generate approximately \$1 trillion in deficit reduction over the next decade. Building on reductions we already have made, this will result in a cut in discretionary spending of \$42 billion since 2010 when higher levels of Federal spending were essential to provide a jumpstart to the economy. Meeting the spending targets in this Budget meant some very difficult choices: reforming, consolidating, or freezing programs where we could; cutting programs that were not effective or essential and even some that were, but are now unaffordable; and precisely targeting our investments. Every department will feel the impact of these reductions as they cut programs or tighten their belts to free up more resources for areas critical to economic growth. And throughout the entire Government, we will continue our efforts to make programs and services work better and cost less: using competition and high standards to get the most from the grants we award; getting rid of excess Federal real estate; and saving billions

of dollars by cutting overhead and administrative costs.

Second, this Budget begins the process of implementing my new defense strategy that reconfigures our force to meet the challenges of the coming decade. Over the past 3 years, we have made historic investments in our troops and their capabilities, military families, and veterans. After a decade of war, we are at an inflection point: American troops have left Iraq; we are undergoing a transition in Afghanistan so Afghans can assume more responsibility; and we have debilitated al Qaeda’s leadership, putting that terrorist network on the path to defeat. At the same time, we have to renew our economic strength here at home, which is the foundation of our strength in the world, and that includes putting our fiscal house in order. To ensure that our defense budget is driven by a clear strategy that reflects our national interests, I directed the Secretary of Defense and military leadership to undertake a comprehensive strategic review.

I presented the results of the review, reflecting my guidance and the full support of our Nation’s military leadership, at the Pentagon on January 5. There are several key elements to this new strategy. To sustain a global reach, we will strengthen our presence in the Asia Pacific region and continue vigilance in the Middle East. We will invest in critical partnerships and alliances, including NATO, which has demonstrated time and again—most recently in Libya—that it is a force multiplier. Looking past Iraq and Afghanistan to future threats, the military no longer will be sized for large-scale, prolonged stability operations. The Department of Defense will focus modernization on emerging threats and sustaining efforts to get rid of outdated Cold War-era systems so that we can invest in the capabilities we need for the future, including intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities. My Administration will continue to enhance capabilities related to counterterrorism and countering weapons of mass destruction, and we will also maintain the ability to operate in environments where adversaries try to deny us access. And, we will keep faith with those who serve by giving priority to our wounded warriors, servicemembers’ mental health, and the well-being of military families.

Adapting our forces to this new strategy will entail investing in high-priority programs, such as unmanned surveillance aircraft and upgraded tactical vehicles. It will mean terminating unnecessary and lower-priority programs such as the C-27 airlift aircraft and a new weather satellite and maintaining programs such as the Joint Strike Fighter at a reduced level. All told, reductions in the growth of defense spending will save \$487 billion over the next 10 years. In addition, the end of our military activities in Iraq and the wind-down of operations in Afghanistan will mean that the country

will spend 24 percent less on overseas contingency operations (OCO) this year than it did last year, saving \$30 billion. I also am proposing a multi-year cap on OCO spending so that we fully realize the dividends of this change in policy.

Third, I believe that in our country, everyone must shoulder their fair share—especially those who have benefited the most from our economy. In the United States of America, a teacher, a nurse, or a construction worker who earns \$50,000 a year should not pay taxes at a higher rate than somebody making \$50 million. That is wrong. It is wrong for Warren Buffett's secretary to pay a higher tax rate than Warren Buffett. This is not about class warfare; this is about the Nation's welfare. This is about making fair choices that benefit not just the people who have done fantastically well over the last few decades, but that also benefit the middle class, those fighting to get into the middle class, and the economy as a whole.

In the Budget, I reiterate my opposition to permanently extending the Bush tax cuts for families making more than \$250,000 a year and my opposition to a more generous estate tax than we had in 2009 benefiting only the very largest estates. These policies were unfair and unaffordable when they were passed, and they remain so today. I will push for their expiration in the coming year. I also propose to eliminate special tax breaks for oil and gas companies; preferred treatment for the purchase of corporate jets; tax rules that give a larger percentage deduction to the wealthiest two percent than to middle-class families for itemized deductions; and a loophole that allows some of the wealthiest money managers in the country to pay only 15 percent tax on the millions of dollars they earn. And I support tax reform that observes the "Buffett Rule" that no household making more than \$1 million annually should pay a smaller share of its income taxes than middle-class families pay.

Fourth, to build on the work we have done to reduce health care costs through the Affordable Care Act, I am proposing more than \$360 billion in reforms to Medicare, Medicaid, and other health programs over 10 years. The goal of these reforms is to make these critical programs more effective and efficient, and help make sure our health care system rewards high-quality medicine. What it does not do—and what I will not support—are efforts to turn Medicare into a voucher or Medicaid into a block grant. Doing so would weaken both programs and break the promise that we have made to American seniors, people with disabilities, and low-income families—a promise I am committed to keeping.

Finally, to address other looming, long-term challenges to our fiscal health, I have put forward a wide range of mandatory savings. These include reductions in agricultural subsidies,

changes in Federal employee retirement and health benefits, reforms to the unemployment insurance system and the Postal Service, and new efforts to provide a better return to taxpayers from mineral development. Drawn from the plan I presented to the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, these mandatory proposals would save \$217 billion over the next decade.

Reining in our deficits is not an end in and of itself. It is a necessary step to rebuilding a strong foundation so our economy can grow and create good jobs. That is our ultimate goal. And as we tighten our belts by cutting, consolidating, and reforming programs, we also must invest in the areas that will be critical to giving every American a fair shot at success and creating an economy that is built to last.

That starts with taking action now to strengthen our economy and boost job creation. We need to finish the work we started last year by extending the payroll tax cut and unemployment benefits for the rest of this year. We also need to take additional measures to put more people back to work. That is why I introduced the American Jobs Act last year, and why I will continue to put forward many of the ideas it contained, as well as additional measures, to put people back to work by rebuilding our infrastructure, providing businesses tax incentives to invest and hire, and giving States aid to rehire teachers and first responders.

We also know that education and lifelong learning will be critical for anyone trying to compete for the jobs of the future. That is why I will continue to make education a national mission. What one learns will have a big impact on what he or she earns: the unemployment rate for Americans with a college degree or more is only about half the national average, and the incomes of college graduates are twice as high as those without a high school diploma.

When I took office, I set the goal for America to have the highest proportion of college graduates in the world by 2020. To reach that goal, we increased the maximum annual Pell Grant by more than \$900 to help nearly 10 million needy students afford a college education. The 2013 Budget continues that commitment and provides the necessary resources to sustain the maximum award of \$5,635. In this Budget, I also propose a series of new proposals to help families with the costs of college including making permanent the American Opportunity Tax Credit, a partially refundable tax credit worth up to \$10,000 per student over 4 years of college, and rewarding colleges and universities that act responsibly in setting tuition, providing the best value, and serving needy students well.

To help our students graduate with the skills they will need for the jobs of the future, we are continuing our effort to prepare 100,000 science and math teachers over the next decade. To improve our elementary and secondary

schools, we are continuing our commitment to the Race to the Top initiative that rewards the most innovative and effective ways to raise standards, recruit and retain good teachers, and raise student achievement. My Budget invests \$850 million in this effort, which already has been expanded to cover early learning and individual school districts.

And to prepare our workers for the jobs of tomorrow, we need to turn our unemployment system into a re-employment system. That includes giving more community colleges the resources they need to become community career centers—places that teach skills that businesses are looking for right now, from data management to high-tech manufacturing.

Once our students and workers gain the skills they need for the jobs of the future, we also need to make sure those jobs end up in America. In today's high-tech, global economy, that means the United States must be the best place in the world to take an idea from the drawing board to the factory floor to the store shelves. In this Budget, we are sustaining our level of investment in non-defense research and development (R&D) even as overall spending declines, thereby keeping us on track to double R&D funding in the key R&D agencies. We are supporting research at the National Institutes of Health that will accelerate the translation of new discoveries in biomedical science into new therapies and cures, along with initiatives at the Food and Drug Administration that will speed the approval of new medicines. We make important investments in the science and research needed to tackle the most important environmental challenges of our time, and we are investing in fields as varied as cyber-security, nano-technology, and advanced manufacturing. This Budget also puts an emphasis on the basic research that leads to the breakthroughs of tomorrow, which increasingly is no longer being conducted by the private sector, as well as helping inventors bring their innovations from laboratory to market.

This Budget reflects the importance of safeguarding our environment while strengthening our economy. We do not have to choose between having clean air and clean water and growing the economy. By conserving iconic American landscapes, restoring significant ecosystems from the Everglades to the Great Lakes, and achieving measurable improvements in water and air quality, we are working with communities to protect the natural resources that serve as the engines of their local economies.

Moreover, this Budget continues my Administration's commitment to developing America's diverse, clean sources of energy. The Budget eliminates unwarranted tax breaks for oil companies, while extending key tax incentives to spur investment in clean energy manufacturing and renewable

energy production. The Budget also invests in R&D to catalyze the next generation of clean energy technologies. These investments will help us achieve our goal of doubling the share of electricity from clean energy sources by 2035. By promoting American leadership in advanced vehicle manufacturing, including funding to encourage greater use of natural gas in the transportation sector, the Budget will help us reach our goal of reducing oil imports by one-third by 2025 and position the United States to become the first country to have one million electric vehicles on the road by 2015. We also are working to decrease the amount of energy used by commercial and industrial buildings by 20 percent to complement our ongoing efforts to improving the efficiency of the residential sector. And we will work with the private sector, utilities, and States to increase the energy productivity of American industries while investing in the innovative processes and materials that can dramatically reduce energy use.

It is also time for government to do its part to help make it easier for entrepreneurs, inventors, and workers to grow their businesses and thrive in the global economy. I am calling on Congress to immediately begin work on corporate tax reform that will close loopholes, lower the overall rate, encourage investment here at home, simplify taxes for America's small businesses, and not add a dime to the deficit. Moreover, to further assist these companies, we need a comprehensive reorganization of the parts of the Federal Government that help businesses grow and sell their products abroad. If given consolidation authority—which Presidents had for most of the 20th century—I will propose to consolidate six agencies into one Department, saving money, and making it easier for all companies—especially small businesses—get the help they need to thrive in the world economy.

Finally, this Budget advances the national security interests of the United States, including the security of the American people, the prosperity and trade that creates American jobs, and support for universal values around the world. It increases funding for the diplomatic efforts that strengthen the alliances and partnerships that improve international cooperation in meeting shared challenges, open new markets to American exports, and promote development. It invests in the intelligence and homeland security capabilities to detect, prevent, and defend against terrorist attacks against our country.

As we implement our new defense strategy, my Administration will invest in the systems and capabilities we need so that our Armed Forces are configured to meet the challenges of the coming decade. We will continue to invest in improving global health and food security so that we address the root causes of conflict and security

threats. And we will keep faith with our men and women in uniform, their families, and veterans who have served their Nation.

These proposals will take us a long way towards strengthening the middle class and giving families the sense of security they have been missing for too long. But in the end, building an economy that works for everyone will require all of us to take responsibility. Parents will need to take greater responsibility for their children's education. Homeowners will have to take more responsibility when it comes to buying a house or taking out a loan. Businesses will have to take responsibility for doing right by their workers and our country. And those of us in public service will need to keep finding ways to make government more efficient and more effective.

Understanding and honoring the obligations we have to ourselves and each other is what has made this country great. We look out for each other, pull together, and do our part. But Americans also deserve to know that their hard work will be rewarded.

This Budget is a step in the right direction. And I hope it will help serve as a roadmap for how we can grow the economy, create jobs, and give Americans everywhere the security they deserve.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 13, 2012.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:45 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1647

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

JOHN J. COOK POST OFFICE

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2079) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10 Main Street in East Rockaway, New York, as the "John J. Cook Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2079

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

SECTION 1. JOHN J. COOK POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10 Main Street in East Rockaway, New York, shall be known and designated as the "John J. Cook Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "John J. Cook Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2079, introduced by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10 Main Street in East Rockaway, New York, as the John J. Cook Post Office. The bill was introduced in June of this year and was favorably reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on November 3 of last year.

Mr. Speaker, John J. Cook served the community of East Rockaway, New York, for more than six decades, working as a letter carrier at the facility to be named after him. Serving his community for 60 years and 4 months, Mr. Cook went above and beyond to serve his neighbors and exemplified professionalism and courtesy each and every day on the job.

Mr. Cook delivered mail on the same route for nearly all of his 60 years on the job and, according to many in his community, he continually touched the lives of countless people spanning many generations.

According to one East Rockaway resident, he was quite simply "the best." He knew all of his customers very well and gave personalized service throughout his career. The resident went on to say that, you know what, "they just don't make people like him anymore."

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cook passed away in 2005 at the age of 78. He left behind his wife, Roberta, and many who will miss this true public servant and model postal employee.

I urge all Members to join me in naming the postal facility in East

Rockaway, New York, after John J. Cook, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 2079, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 10 Main Street in East Rockaway, New York, as the “John J. Cook Post Office.”

The measure before us was introduced by Representative CAROLYN MCCARTHY on June 1, 2011. In accordance with the committee requirements, H.R. 2079 is cosponsored by all members of the New York delegation. It was reported out of the committee by unanimous consent on November 3, 2011.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank, certainly, Mr. KELLY from Pennsylvania and Mr. CLAY from Missouri for helping me get this through the committee, and I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. John J. Cook, a World War II veteran, a model American postal worker, and an integral member of the East Rockaway community. I also want to thank senior Councilman Anthony Santino for bringing this to my attention.

Mr. Cook, a resident of my district, began working for the East Rockaway Post Office on January 8, 1944. For the next 60 years he served our East Rockaway community as a letter carrier who exemplified the American work ethic, displaying professionalism, courtesy and tireless dedication.

After serving in World War II in the Pacific theater, Mr. Cook began working for the local post office and quickly became an integral part of the East Rockaway community. Day in and day out, for more than 60 years, Mr. Cook took pride in his work, delivering the mail to the East Rockaway community in a timely and efficient manner.

He tailored his deliveries to the wishes of each individual customer. For example, he would make sure that important messages such as a wedding invitation or college acceptance letters were placed on the top of the day's mail for that customer.

Mr. Cook would go above and beyond his expected duties. At times, he even would cancel his family vacations because the post office needed him for a last-minute shift.

As public servants, we can recognize the importance of dedication, hard work, and service to one's community. It is only fitting and proper that the United States Government and Postal Service take the opportunity to honor a great man like Mr. Cook. He truly was a great American.

Mr. Cook exemplified these values on a daily basis and became an esteemed member of our East Rockaway commu-

nity. He watched the children of his customers grow up and marry and have their own children.

To rename the post office in Mr. Cook's honor will be a well-deserved tribute to a World War II veteran and a model public servant; and I hope my colleagues join me in supporting H.R. 2079 in honor of Mr. John J. Cook.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers at the moment, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker I have no further speakers and am ready to close, if that's okay with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Having no additional speakers, I, once again, urge adoption of H.R. 2079. I also ask that we keep the example of Mr. Cook's career in mind as we work together to craft what should be bipartisan legislation to ensure that the institution Mr. Cook loved so much, the United States Postal Service, can continue to serve our Nation so well.

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

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 2079, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2079.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

LANCE CORPORAL MATTHEW P. PATHENOS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3247) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 Town and Country Commons in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the “Lance Corporal Matthew P. Pathenos Post Office Building”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3247

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

SECTION 1. LANCE CORPORAL MATTHEW P. PATHENOS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 Town and Country Commons in Chesterfield, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the “Lance Corporal Matthew P. Pathenos Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Lance Corporal Matthew P. Pathenos Post Office Building”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3247, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 Town and Country Commons in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the “Lance Corporal Matthew P. Pathenos Post Office Building.”

The bill is cosponsored by the entire Missouri State delegation and was reported favorably by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on November 3 of last year.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that we name this post office in Chesterfield, Missouri, for Marine Corps Lance Corporal Pathenos, a true American hero who gave his life courageously defending freedom. More than a selfless marine, Mr. Speaker, Lance Corporal Pathenos was a loving son, brother, and friend.

As one of his fellow marines reflected after his tragic passing, the best thing about Matt was his ability to wake up every day with a smile and hold it all day long. Even while in the midst of war, Lance Corporal Pathenos strove to bring joy to his fellow marines and friends. That's just the kind of guy that he was; and for his service and sacrifice, Mr. Speaker, we are truly grateful.

I now yield as much time as he may consume to my distinguished friend and colleague from the State of Missouri and the sponsor of this legislation, Mr. AKIN.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3247, a bill I introduced on the life of Matthew P. Pathenos by designating the post office in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the Lance Corporal Matthew P. Pathenos Post Office Building.

A resident of Baldwin, Missouri, Lance Corporal Matthew Pathenos was part of the 3rd Battalion, 24th Marine Regiment, 4th Marine Division of the Marine Forces Reserve. On February 7, 2007, Lance Corporal Pathenos was killed during combat operations in the al Anbar province of Iraq.

Matthew was often described by family and friends as a friendly young man who always had a joke to tell and a smile on his face. Matthew decided to go join the military in order to follow his older brother into his country's

service with the hope of helping those who could not help themselves.

Matthew's then-girlfriend, Erin, calls Lance Corporal Pathenos her hero and wishes she might one day possess a fraction of his bravery and discipline.

As the father of three marines, one of whom has served in Iraq, it is a privilege to stand here today to honor one of our fallen marines. Matthew's commitment and dedication to his country is a shining example of how our military men and women are the finest our Nation has to offer.

□ 1700

His and his family's sacrifice should serve as a reminder to all that the freedom we enjoy in America is not free but the result of the tremendous bravery and selfless service of men and women willing to put themselves in harm's way for freedom's cause. Our Nation will be forever indebted to Lance Corporal Matthew Pathenos.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in honoring Lance Corporal Matthew Pathenos. Vote "yes" on H.R. 3247.

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

As a member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, I join my colleagues from my home State of Missouri in strong support of H.R. 3247, and I thank my colleague, Mr. AKIN, for introducing this legislation. The legislation will name the postal facility in Town and Country Commons in Chesterfield, Missouri, after Lance Corporal Matthew P. Pathenos.

H.R. 3247 was introduced by my colleague, Representative AKIN, and has the support of the entire Missouri delegation, including myself. The bill was introduced on October 24 of last year and was considered by and reported from the Oversight Committee by voice vote shortly thereafter, on November 3, 2011.

Tragically, on February 7, 2007, Lance Corporal Pathenos was killed while conducting combat operations in the al Anbar province, Iraq. Described as a disciplined, dedicated, and patriotic gentleman, Corporal Pathenos served his country proudly.

In recognition of his dedication to his country, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating the life of this brave marine by supporting the passage of H.R. 3247.

Mr. Speaker, having no additional speakers, I once again urge adoption of H.R. 3247 in honor of the life and service of Lance Corporal Matthew P. Pathenos.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am truly grateful for the brave and heroic service of Lance Corporal Pathenos and for all of those who serve and defend our Nation each and every day. I urge all Members to join me in strong support of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3247.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

LANCE CORPORAL DREW W. WEAVER POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3248) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 112 South 5th Street in Saint Charles, Missouri, as the "Lance Corporal Drew W. Weaver Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3248

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

SECTION 1. LANCE CORPORAL DREW W. WEAVER POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 112 South 5th Street in Saint Charles, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the "Lance Corporal Drew W. Weaver Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Lance Corporal Drew W. Weaver Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY. H.R. 3248, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN), would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 112 South 5th Street in Saint Charles, Missouri, as the Lance Corporal Drew W. Weaver Post Office Building. This bill is cosponsored by the entire Missouri State delegation and was reported favorably by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on November 3 of last year.

Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting and proper that we name this post of-

fice in Saint Charles for Marine Corps Lance Corporal Weaver, a selfless patriot who made the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq at just 20 years of age. Remembered by many for his tenacious spirit, the ability to find the positive in every situation, Mr. Speaker, for being a true hero, Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more.

Lance Corporal Weaver and all of our brave and courageous fighting men and women are true heroes, and I'm thankful to have this opportunity to stand before this Chamber and express my sincere gratitude for all that our servicemembers do and all that they sacrifice each and every day.

I will now yield as much time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague and friend from the State of Missouri, the sponsor of this legislation, Mr. AKIN.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3248, a bill I introduced to honor the life of Drew W. Weaver by designating the post office in Saint Charles, Missouri, as the "Lance Corporal Drew W. Weaver Post Office Building."

A resident of Saint Charles, Missouri, Lance Corporal Drew W. Weaver was part of the 3rd Light Armored Reconnaissance Battalion, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force. On February 21, 2007, Lance Corporal Weaver died while conducting combat operations in the al Anbar province of Iraq. As Captain Mark C. Brown noted, Drew was "known for his enthusiasm and his ability to motivate the people around him."

Drew's contribution to his country was honored by his community when hundreds of people showed up to his memorial service and procession. A graduate of Saint Charles West High School, friends and family of Drew remember him as an energetic young man who was eager to serve his country. Ryan Hanson, his best friend and a fellow serviceman, said, "Drew loved what he was doing and was proud of what he was doing in the Marine Corps."

As the father of three marines, one of whom has served in Iraq, it is a privilege to stand here today to honor one of our fallen marines.

Drew's commitment and dedication to his country is a shining example of how our military men and women are the finest the Nation has to offer. His and his family's sacrifice should serve as a reminder to all of us that the freedom we enjoy as Americans is not free but the result of tremendous bravery and selfless service of men and women willing to put themselves in harm's way for freedom's cause.

As Reverend James Benz noted during Drew's funeral, "I think we can learn from them that the freedom we enjoy in this country is precious, that it is special, and that it must be preserved sometimes at great personal cost."

Our Nation will be forever indebted to Lance Corporal Drew Weaver. Mr.

Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in honoring Lance Corporal Drew Weaver. Vote “yes” on H.R. 3248.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. As a member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, I’m pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 3248, which designates the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 112 South 5th Street in Saint Charles, Missouri, as the Lance Corporal Drew W. Weaver Post Office Building.

This legislation was introduced in October of 2011 by my colleague and friend, Representative TODD AKIN of Missouri, and considered and reported out of the committee by a voice vote on November 3, 2011. Additionally, along with all of my fellow members of the Missouri delegation, we are proud to be cosponsors of this bill.

□ 1710

As was mentioned, Weaver was a native of St. Charles, Missouri. He bravely served with the 3rd Light Armored Reconnaissance Battalion, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force out of 29 Palms, California. On February 21, 2008, the young marine was killed in action in al Anbar province, Iraq, while conducting combat operations in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Mr. Speaker, Lance Corporal Drew Weaver’s life and service stand as a testament to the strength and support of his devoted family. He is a fine example of the bravery and dedication of the young men and women who have joined him in serving this Nation and in making the ultimate sacrifice. His devotion to duty was in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service, and it reflects great credit upon himself, his unit, and the United States Marine Corps.

It is my hope that we can honor this outstanding marine through the passage of this legislation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the passage of H.R. 3248.

Mr. Speaker, having no additional speakers, once again, I urge the adoption of H.R. 3248 in honor of Lance Corporal Drew Weaver, who gave his life in service to our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am truly grateful for the brave and heroic service of Lance Corporal Weaver. Let us not forget the ultimate sacrifice that he and so many other young Americans have made in promoting freedom and in protecting our great Nation. I urge all Members of this House to join me in strong support of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3248.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o’clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PAULSEN) at 6 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 303, nays 89, answered “present” 1, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—303

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Calvert
Camp
Canseco

Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Ciocilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel

Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslie
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre

Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Heger
Higgins
Himes
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp

McKeon
McKinley
McMorriss
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Paulsen
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)

NAYS—89

Adams
Baldwin
Benishek
Bishop (NY)
Boren
Brady (PA)
Burgess
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crenshaw
Critz
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Hall
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Forbes
Fox
Garrett
Gibson

Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Hoyer
Johnson (OH)
Kind
Kucinich
Latham
Lee (CA)
LoBiondo
Lynch
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
Miller (FL)
Moore
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Olver
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce

Peters
Peterson
Poe (TX)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Renacci
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schilling
Schock
Sessions
Slaughter
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Townes
Vélazquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Waltermann
Wolf
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Amash
NOT VOTING—40

Austria
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Campbell
Cardoza
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Doggett
Duffy

Filner	Jordan	Scott (VA)
Gardner	LaTourette	Serrano
Gerlach	Meeks	Shuler
Gohmert	Noem	Sires
Gosar	Pascrell	Stivers
Grijalva	Paul	Tiberi
Guinta	Payne	Tsongas
Gutierrez	Rangel	Walsh (IL)
Heinrich	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)
Hirono	Rush	
Johnson (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta	

□ 1914

Mr. BISHOP of New York changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DENT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for votes in the House Chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 49.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 49, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I missed the one rollcall vote for the day.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 49, on Approving the Journal.

COMMEMORATING ARIZONA'S CENTENNIAL

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

Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a very happy occasion for every member of the Arizona delegation. I'm proud to have introduced H. Con. Res. 100, which invites the entire House of Representatives to join with the Arizona delegation in commemorating Arizona's centennial.

For the past 100 years, Arizona has stood as a beacon of opportunity for millions of individuals who came to the State to make a better life for themselves and their families. They came to Arizona and built the State we know today, a State with rich diversity, a soaring optimism, driven by an innovative spirit. They came because they know that Arizona embodies what's best in America.

I can't imagine a better place to live, and I'm proud to call Arizona home. I'm proud that it's the place that I've chosen to start my family, and representing this wonderful State is an honor beyond words.

Arizona has had 100 great years. We start the next 100 with the same spirit of optimism and determination that made our State great, and we still possess that same fierce independence needed to keep it great.

CELEBRATING ARIZONA'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, as many of you know, today is Arizona's 100th birthday. Think of this: 100 years ago there were only about 200,000 people in Arizona. Today there are about 6½ million.

One of the reasons I wanted to come behind the microphone today is, if you've been watching our Senators and some of my fellow members of our delegation, we've all gotten behind microphones and talked about the wonderful leaders, the Carl Haydens, the Morris Udalls, the Barry Goldwaters that have come from Arizona. But I actually want to say something special about the people of Arizona.

Think of this. In our hundred years, 6½ million have chosen to make it their home. And I believe it's both because of the wonderful lifestyle of Arizona, but also the people themselves. It's a unique population.

Think of this. You have a State full of people who have chosen to pick up their homes in California and the Midwest and back East and venture into a new life, and actually, that type of entrepreneurial spirit, that type of unique personality, I think, is actually what makes Arizona so special.

ADDRESSING THE ISSUES OF OUR DAY

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege and honor to be recognized by you to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and to take up some of the issues of our day.

First I'd like to address the situation that we are in with regard to the payroll tax extension and the unemployment extension and the components that are being deliberated now as a conference committee is trying to get to a final solution.

I'd take you back, Mr. Speaker, to the lame duck session a year ago last December when, within, oh, 30 to 45 days of the election of this 112th Congress, the legitimized now-112th Congress, the lame duck session negotiations took place, initiated by the minority leader of the United States Senate, MITCH MCCONNELL, and the President, President Obama, to deal with a way of extending the Bush tax brackets to avoid the automatic imposition of a 55 percent death tax at midnight on New Year's, beginning on the first minute of 2011. It was the payroll tax holiday, and it was also the refundable tax credits, unemployment benefits extended, and the list went on.

Mr. Speaker, I'd just make the point that we had 87 freshman Republicans waiting in the wings during that lame duck session. They were the legitimate representatives of the American people. And when the United States Congress makes a decision to move forward

on large pieces of legislation, any large piece of legislation, in a lame duck session, then it must be something that is urgent and mandatory that we take that kind of action. Our Founding Fathers did not imagine that we would—well, first of all, Thomas Jefferson said, large initiatives should not be advanced on slender majorities.

□ 1920

Large initiatives should not be advanced on slender majorities, but, Mr. Speaker, also large initiatives should not be advanced by lame duck sessions of the United States Congress. When that happens, you have a lot of people that are going home: 87 freshman Republicans, 9 freshman Democrats, they replaced all of them, people that were going home. So there's your math.

Ninety-six Members of this Congress today, and there have been several others that have been added, but 96 were waiting in the wings to be sworn into office here in the first week in January so they could do their just constitutional duty, and while that was going on, negotiations were taking place for a lame duck session, a large initiative lame duck session to address Bush tax bracket extensions, unemployment benefit extensions, and for the first time, the severance of the 50-50 relationship between employer and employee in the contributions to the Social Security trust fund.

Now, I've watched that Social Security trust fund since I came here to this Congress, and it was at about a plus of \$1.74 trillion. It's grown to \$2.34 trillion, one of the times I looked. It's moving quickly now because the higher the unemployment, the more damage it does to our Social Security trust fund because the contributions slow down.

As we're seeing baby boomers retire and qualify for Social Security and Medicare, there are more and more demands on the Social Security trust fund.

But the payroll tax holiday that was passed—and that's what it was called—but it actually created a \$130 billion hole in the Social Security trust fund. Now, you can charge it against the general fund, and when the time comes to pay the bill, it will have to come out of the general fund because the Social Security trust fund is borrowed from by the Federal Government anyway.

But the accounting created a \$130 billion hole. You can count that up proportionately and round \$10 billion, \$11 billion a month, each month that there is an extension of the suspension of the 2 percent contribution of the employee into the Social Security trust fund.

Now, that was one of the components from the lame duck session. We never should have, Mr. Speaker, severed the 50-50 bond between equal contribution to the Social Security trust fund out of the employer and the employee. As soon as that happens, it opens the door for class envy. It already had discriminated against the employer in benefit of the employee.

Now, if it had been a reduction of 1 percent from the employer and 1 percent from the employee, at least then the 50-50 bond would have been withheld. We have, in the past, adjusted the Social Security contribution rate so that we have a viable fund. But we have not in the past broken that 50-50 equal contribution, employer-employee. That happened in the lame duck session. It was one of those things that was agreed to in order to be able to extend the Bush tax brackets. Extending the Bush tax brackets at that time gets us just until December 31 of this year, and then all of the game changes again.

Now, it is a way to avoid having that be a debate while President Obama is up for reelection, just like the debt ceiling was timed so that the President can essentially direct a debt ceiling increase and avoid having a fight here on the floor of the House or the Senate to approve another debt ceiling increase. It looks as though we've negotiated some agreement to keep the President off the hook for holding him accountable coming into this Presidential election.

But to add into that agreement—the lame duck deal, I will call it, Mr. Speaker, when you add to that agreement the payroll tax situation that suspended 2 percent from the employee and didn't suspend any from the employer and broke that bond, we also had the extension of the Bush tax brackets, and we had an adjustment to the death tax, which was zero on the day that this was voted upon, but it jumped to 35 percent. It was automatically going to go to 55.

We also had an extension of unemployment benefits out to 99 weeks, Mr. Speaker. So 99 weeks of unemployment benefits are, as far as the charts that I have looked at and my memory, unprecedented in the history of this country. So the 99 weeks of unemployment, that and extension of refundable tax credits and a few other smaller programs, totaled \$212 billion in outlays just for the duration of that bill, that bill that was negotiated by people who were anxious to make a deal.

Why? I have a little trouble figuring out why the Republicans were anxious to make a deal, Mr. Speaker, because we had 87 new freshmen waiting in the wings. The legitimate voices of the American people, the shock troops that they sent here, they sent them here for fiscal responsibility. Every single one of them ran on the 100 percent repeal of ObamaCare. They ran on fiscal responsibility. They ran on a balanced budget. And \$212 billion went out the window with the lame duck deal without hardly any debate, \$212 billion, most of it to extend unemployment benefits for 99 weeks, but some of it for refundable tax credits. That did not include the \$130 billion created by the suspension of 2 percent of the contribution rate into the Social Security trust fund, that hole that was created.

All of this so the Bush tax brackets could be extended beyond the reelection

of the President of the United States.

That agreement, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, and it's a strong conviction, should never have been negotiated in a lame duck session. We should have allowed the new Members of this Congress, the 87 freshman Republicans, the nine freshman Democrats, to weigh in, to have a chance to debate, to configure a policy and to vote.

But meanwhile, they were waiting in the wings going through orientation while this vote was taking place. By the time they were actually seated here in this Congress, that horse was out of the barn. That plane had already left the runway.

The horse was out of the barn, the payroll tax was what it was, and it was set to expire at the first day of this year as we know. Now it's been extended for 2 months, and we're in the negotiations to see what to do with the rest of it.

But the problem is rooted back in a bad deal, the lame duck deal, and now this freshman class is being asked to address it, to solve the problem, and to not necessarily reach in their pockets and pay the price but to pay the political price to try to resolve this issue, which is going to go on and on and on until we put the pieces back together, Mr. Speaker.

We've got to put the pieces back together, and to get there politically, no one can paint that picture for me, no one can draw that map. And since I couldn't have drawn that map either, I wouldn't have gone there in the first place.

But we are where we are. It's \$212 billion in outlays to extend unemployment benefits from the lame duck session a year ago last December, and it's \$130 billion in the hole in the Social Security trust fund until you find it some other way, but that's what it is.

The result of extending unemployment benefits out to 99 weeks was that we had a lot of workers in America that were 63 years old that amazingly found themselves unemployed with unemployment benefits guaranteed with no obligation on their part except to sign up, out for the duration of their working career. So it amounted to an early retirement for 63-year-old employees or 64-year-old employees in America, unmeasured in its impact on our economy.

Meanwhile, the measure of what happens when you pay people not to work for 2 years is that their skills atrophy, they're out of the workforce, technology moves on. Not only are they not getting caught up with and staying caught up with technological changes and the modern shifts within our very nimble economy that we must have, but the skills that they had on that day are atrophying.

Now, that doesn't mean that we shouldn't have unemployment. We should have. The consistent duration of unemployment has been 26 weeks. That's a half a year. If you look at the

data, when unemployment runs out people are far more likely to go to work than they are the week before it runs out. It is a fact; it is not an opinion. It's a fact, Mr. Speaker.

But my point here is that we're in this discussion today with a pretty difficult decision that's being made by the conference committee, by the Speaker, the majority leader, and others, but this difficulty we have now is rooted in what I consider to be a mistake in the lame duck deal.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, how I wonder how much different it might have been if we had waited and seated the freshman class, consulted with them, asked them if they wanted to sever that 50-50 equal contribution rate between employers and employees. Ask them if they were willing to accept on their conscience a \$130 billion hole in the Social Security trust fund. Ask them if they were ready to face extending the payroll tax reduction, and doing so in perpetuity. As long as the other side is willing to play class envy, are we going to be willing to continue to dig a hole in the Social Security trust fund?

□ 1930

That is one question in front of us.

Another one that's in front of us—and one I'd like to ask the freshman class also—is:

Did you ever really think that 99 weeks of unemployment was the appropriate thing to do? How did you intend to fund that? Would you have found a pay-for if you'd thought 99 weeks were the appropriate way to deal with an unsettled employment situation in America? Do you have compassion for the employers who are looking to build their businesses with employees when it's difficult to hire them off of the unemployment rolls?

We had a hearing before the Small Business Committee, Mr. Speaker. Before that committee, we had four or five small business employers—there might have actually been six—but I asked them going down the line:

Have you had any kind of luck hiring from the unemployment? They invariably said: Once the unemployment expires, I can hire them just fine. One employer out of the list said that she had hired off of the unemployment rolls on one occasion.

That's fairly typical. I will tell you that I know of businesses in my neighborhood that look around the neighborhood, and they see that there are employees they'd like to hire. They know, when their unemployment benefits run out, they'll be knocking on their doors 1 week or 2 weeks before the unemployment benefits run out so that they're in line to hire them. We have employers who are lining up to hire the unemployed, but they know they can't get that done as long as unemployment is being paid.

Now, yes, there are people who are unfortunate; there are people who can't find jobs; there are especially people in parts of the country who have an economy that's far worse than that which I

represent in northwest Iowa, Mr. Speaker; but we need a logical unemployment plan, perhaps one that ratchets those benefits in an incremental way so that it slowly provides more of an incentive for people to go to work. It's not just that you as an unemployed can't find a job in the community you live in and in the profession that you happened to have been practicing before you were laid off. No, Mr. Speaker. There are many more aspects to this.

There is such a thing as travel: Go and get a job where you can get one. Relocate there if the job is good enough. Go check it out. Call for your family if that's good enough. That has happened throughout the history of this country. Yet our Federal Government is essentially saying to people, You're not going to be obligated to relocate. Some of the people over on this side of the aisle think that somehow we ought to take the jobs to where people live.

It puts me in mind of an article that was researched and written—I happened to have read it in the Des Moines Register some years ago, more than a decade ago, I'm certain, Mr. Speaker. They had gone into a neighborhood in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, into a residential neighborhood, and interviewed every household there—all the residences in a six-block-by-six-block area, 36 square blocks. As they interviewed the families and—I guess I can't say the word—analyzed the families and identified the characteristics of the families, they didn't find a single male employed head of household in all 36 square blocks of the residential area in Milwaukee.

The history of that area was that the people in that neighborhood had predominantly been descended from those who had moved up to Milwaukee, right after prohibition ended, in order to take on the brewery jobs, the good brewery jobs in Milwaukee. They brewed a lot of beer in Milwaukee, and they created good jobs there right at the end of the prohibition era, and people were willing to move from the Gulf States up into those neighborhoods to go to work in the breweries. So that would be the thirties, from the thirties to the nineties, a 60-year period of time so to speak. Thomas Jefferson would call that three generations. I'd say probably so. One generation arrived in Milwaukee at the dawn of the aftermath of prohibition. Another generation was born and raised, and the grandchildren were still living there, but they didn't have a single employed male head of household in 36 square blocks.

The story was about the lament, Mr. Speaker, in that we couldn't bring jobs to the people in that neighborhood; but, truthfully, their ancestors—their parents or grandparents—had moved to Milwaukee from the Gulf States for the jobs. Yet it didn't occur to the person writing the article that people could also move for jobs in the modern era. That is what you must do. If we're

going to have a flexible, mobile economy, we've got to go to where the work is.

But the disincentive is there from the Federal Government that discourages such things, and we don't ask very much the question about why is it that not a single male head of household is employed in this entire six-block-by-six-block area of Milwaukee. The biggest answer to that is that the 72 different means-tested welfare programs that we have are disincentives for people to find jobs. Now, that sounds shocking to the hyperventilating liberal left, Mr. Speaker, but it's just a fact. It's a fact of human nature. So the discouragement from finding a job has created neighborhoods of people who don't have a tradition of working anymore.

America was built on high productivity and on the efficiency we have, and the intuitive nature, the instinctive, innovative nature of Americans, has been what has made our economy so strong; and it's a very sad thing to think that here we sit with this discussion about whether or not unemployment should be 99 weeks or 79 weeks or 69 weeks. Mr. Speaker, 26 weeks have been long enough for almost all of the history of this country. We are not in an economic situation that matches that of the Great Depression's at this point, although the debt that has been accumulated does match that of the Great Depression's and then some.

I recall the President coming before our Republican Conference on February 10 of 2009, shortly after he'd been inaugurated as President, to make the case that we should advance his economic stimulus plan—his \$787.5 billion, grown into \$825 billion, shovel-ready, spend-now, pay-interest, and pay-principal-later plan. He said to us that FDR's New Deal actually did work. It worked, but FDR lost his nerve. He got worried about spending too much money, so he pulled back. When he pulled back in the second half of the thirties, it brought about a recession within a depression. These are President Obama's words. In this recession within a depression, unemployment went up, and then before the economy could recover, along came World War II, which was the greatest economic stimulus plan ever. That was the President's presentation to us.

President Obama convinced me and, I think, everybody who was listening that day that he will not lose the nerve that he believes FDR lost. President Obama is the lead Keynesian economist on steroids in the history of the country and, I believe, of the world in that he believes that borrowing money and spending money will stimulate the economy and that, as that economy rolls, the benefits of it will create jobs. He believes if you borrow money and hand it to people, not in exchange for a good or a service that has been produced but just get it in their hands one way or another—if they'll work for it, fine. Then give them something for

working. If they won't or if you can't give them something—because they can surely be busy spending as they've got more time to do that if they're not working after all, and spending money stimulates the economy; and, Mr. Speaker, Keynesian economists believe that: that spending money stimulates the economy.

I believe this, that we here in America have to produce goods and services that have a marketable value and that can be sold competitively here and abroad. We need to produce our way out of this economic doldrums that we're in, not spend our way out of it. They believe that if you spend billions of dollars—and in the President's case, I have to give him his due of trillions of dollars, of 4 or 5 or more trillions of extra dollars of debt that have been piled upon us—that that comes back to you severalfold.

In fact, the statement was made by our Secretary of Agriculture that, for every dollar in food stamps that gets spent, it stimulates \$1.84 in economic activity. Now, if that's the case, why don't we give out a lot more food stamps. That's because people have to produce the food and because they have to deliver it, stock it, shelve it, and those things. Well, if that's such a good economic stimulator, why don't we just do all of that, throw the food away, and then we can stimulate the economy, too. But who's going to pay the debt?

Here is what I do believe, Mr. Speaker. If we borrow money and if we hand it to people and say, Spend it, spend it, spend it—it's your patriotic duty—it may stimulate the economy for a short while. I call it a sugar high. It may be just for a little while that you can get that little bump—very, very temporary. The trade-off is that the trough that you might otherwise be falling into may not—not will not but may not—be as deep as it would be otherwise.

□ 1940

But the result will be, you have to recover, and you have to pay off the interest and the principal. So even though you might not fall as far, you have a much broader trough to recover from.

We have to pay the interest, and we have to pay the principal on all of this debt that's been accumulated over the last 3-plus years. And it doesn't mean that the Bush administration is somehow forgiven for the debt that's been driven up. But during the height of the Iraq war, the Bush administration came within \$160 billion of balancing the budget. Now \$160 billion sounds like loose change today compared to the President's budget that he rolled out, which is minus \$1.33 trillion. You run up a deficit of \$1.33 trillion, and you increase taxes by more than \$1.5 trillion in that process, you can see what happens, Mr. Speaker.

This budget that the President has offered should be the news of the day.

And maybe we ought to be looking at what's in it. But what we really hear instead is that it's dead on arrival, that his budget will not be brought up—certainly it will not be brought up here in the House. At least I don't think so here in the House, unless it's to illustrate its lack of support.

Last year, President Obama's budget was brought up on the floor of the Senate. And of all the talk about giving the President his due and working with the President on his budget, his budget was voted on in the Senate and voted down 97-0. Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I've had a piece of legislation come to the floor of this Congress that had that kind of unanimous—well, I guess I can't say "support"—unanimous rejection. That would be tough on my ego if I couldn't get anybody to agree with me after I had all that staff put that big budget together. But they didn't want to be held accountable for what the President's budget said.

The President now has a political document—not a fiscal management document—that he'll run around the country, talking about his budget. He will use it to beat up on Republicans that don't support his budget. And maybe he'll realize that it isn't just Republicans; that last time it was HARRY REID and all of the Democrats who voted on the budget over in the Senate. We didn't support it over on this side either.

We had a couple of budgets come to the floor here in the House of Representatives last year, Mr. Speaker. One of them was the RSC budget that balanced in 8 to 9 years. And the other one was what we call the Ryan budget, the Republican Conference budget. That's the one that actually passed here on the floor of the House. And even though that budget had a level of austerity to it, and even though it was ground-breaking in the boldness with which it addressed a path to prosperity, it wasn't strong enough, Mr. Speaker. It went in the right direction. And it was bold by historical standards, but not particularly bold by the standards that we need to envision the future.

Yesterday we had the chairman of the Budget Committee make the statement that we have 2 to 3 years, and we have the potential of becoming one huge Greece. I have been making a similar statement over the last year and a half or so. And what I believe is that—by the way, Greece is relatively easy to bail out, if you wanted to do that, because their economy is only 2 percent of the EU's GDP. And that's the EU's gross domestic product, just in case the acronyms are bothering people, Mr. Speaker. So 2 percent of the EU's GDP, not that hard to fix.

Here in the United States, we have a different kind of difficulty. The Ryan budget a year ago, though, didn't balance for 26 years and left us with a national debt at the end of 10 years of \$23 trillion. We walked into it with \$14.3 trillion in national debt and ended up

10 years down the road with \$23 trillion in national debt. But when the debt ceiling deal was made last August, it broke faith with the Ryan budget, which projected \$23 trillion in national debt, and became \$26 trillion in national debt. But in fairness, without applying the Ryan budget, we were looking at \$28 trillion in national debt 10 years from now. From \$14.3 trillion to \$28 trillion. The Ryan budget dialed the \$28 trillion down to \$23 trillion. The debt ceiling deal dialed it back up to \$26 trillion in national debt in 10 years.

It's hard to declare a victory over a \$1.2 trillion cut on a debt ceiling deal if you're reducing the projected national debt from \$28 trillion down to \$26 trillion. And if you are dealing with a budget that no longer is binding, having broken faith with at least the big numbers within that Republican Conference/Ryan budget, on a budget that didn't balance for 26 years—I have to go back and look at my three sons who are grown—they're in their thirties right now—and say to them, Sorry we didn't have a balanced budget in the previous decade. We haven't had an effective balanced budget, I don't believe, passed in this millennium. And in 26 years, if all goes well—and we've already said it's probably not going to—we might see a balanced budget. But you will, my sons, be eligible for that Social Security that will be paid for out of the trust fund that has, by then, hundreds of billions of dollars, if not trillions of dollars in holes created in it by paying for things now that make us feel good or we avoid the political confrontation of it.

And you'll never have worked and paid taxes in the United States of America for an entire career and known that a balanced budget is passed out of the United States Congress.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, those sons in their thirties that have been working for well over a decade going through an entire career, knocking on the door of Medicare eligibility, Social Security eligibility, having watched a hole created and expanded bigger and bigger in the Social Security trust fund every year while they're closer and closer to being able to finally qualify for Social Security and Medicare, and we can't fix this problem now? And the Federal Government is running a deficit for all of those years: 26, 28, 38, add 10, 12,—40 years, 40 years of deficits are what are staring us in the face now, before we can get to the point of paying off the first dollar on our national debt. And that's if we would stick with Ryan's budget of last year. And I'm hopeful we'll do better this year.

But the President, who spoke in his State of the Union address in front of where you are seated right now, Mr. Speaker, when he came for this much anticipated State of the Union address a couple of weeks ago, he made no mention whatsoever of a balanced budget. He didn't make mention of fiscal responsibility, let alone austerity. He laid out his agenda of spending. And I

guess I know now why he didn't address the promise that he made 3 years ago in which he said he was going to cut the deficit in half by the end of his term. Well, no, that hasn't happened. That would require a deficit proposal by his budget of roughly a half-trillion dollars, somewhere in that neighborhood. He has got red ink in his own budget of \$1.33 trillion. And he says, This is not the time for us to tighten our belts. This isn't the time for austerity. The economy can't stand it now. Well, the creditors are not going to be able to take this much longer either.

As I sat asking a series of questions over in the German finance minister's office not that long ago, we went through the national debt of the countries that are in trouble, those who have had their bond ratings just lowered by the news that I saw today. And if you add up the national debt of those countries—and I will name them: Greece, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Ireland, Belgium, those countries. If you take the national debt of those countries, not including France, for example, but just the countries that have been, for months now, hanging in the balance of facing the fear of default, their total cumulative national debt, if they paid off everything that they owed as a country, the sovereign debt of those countries that I have mentioned totals \$4.5 trillion.

Now the President already met that. Running up the debt within the first 3 years of his office, he had already arrived at a little over \$4 trillion. So we're in the same neighborhood. The red ink spent under this administration was enough red ink to pay off the sovereign debt of the nations in the EU that are having trouble. I'm not suggesting that we should have done that. But look at the austerity that Greece is having to accept and the fires in the streets, when the streets of Athens go aflame when they find out that about 15,000 government jobs have been cut in order to meet the budgetary guidelines that they must meet if they're going to be able to borrow money from—who are the players in the European Union? It really comes down to Germany now today.

□ 1950

Fifteen thousand government jobs cut in Greece alone, a little old country that is 2 percent of the GDP of the EU. And we're here, and we cannot tighten our belt. We have a President that puts a budget out that will not even speak of moving toward balance. He will not speak about tightening our belt. But he will demagogue people who will propose such things, and that includes PAUL RYAN.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting that we call upon the Presidential candidates who are seeking the Oval Office and ask them, renew your efforts. Declare and ask for the support of the American people; that if you are elected to the highest elected office in this

land as President of the United States, call for a mandate from the American people for this Congress to pass a balanced budget out of the House and out of the Senate and message it to the States to begin the ordeal of the ratification of a balanced budget amendment in the 38 States that are necessary in order to implement an amendment to our United States Constitution.

And the balanced budget amendment must have a GDP cap. I'll stand on 18 percent. That's the historic take-out of the GDP for the Federal Government, 18 percent. And it must require a supermajority in order to raise taxes.

Mr. Speaker, this country will not survive in the long run with less. The will to balance the budget does not exist in this Congress today. It doesn't exist in the House. It surely doesn't exist in the Senate. The push from the President for deficit spending is one of the factors. But if you remove the President of the United States and put a new individual in there who is fiscally responsible, we still have the problem of the tendency to overspend and the unwillingness to tighten the belt and the unwillingness to listen to the American people that insist that we balance this budget.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I want to see the Presidential candidates call for a balanced budget amendment. I want that to be actually the second plank in their platform. The first plank needs to be the full, 100 percent repeal of ObamaCare. That's an essential component for us to get our liberty back, and it is an essential component to balance the budget.

We can't afford ObamaCare. It takes away our liberty. It takes away our freedom. It takes away our choices. And we're dealing now with the national debate over right to conscience.

Never in the history of this country have we seen a President that had the level of audacity to believe that he could sit in the Oval Office and dictate the terms of health insurance policies to every American. And the President did so. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker. It wasn't Kathleen Sebelius sitting in her office with some of her trusted advisers over at HHS that decided they were going to compel, especially the Catholic but the faith-based institutions who were providing health care services, to provide also for their employees health insurance policies that 100 percent of them would cover birth control pills, other contraceptives, that 100 percent of them would cover sterilizations, tubal ligations—vasectomies in particular.

That 100 percent of the health insurance policies would cover the morning-after pill or the Plan B pill that comes in after the morning-after pill, the ella pill; the ella pill that is prescribed to bring about an abortion up to 5 days but is effective up to 22 days. That would be 4 days after the baby's heart starts beating, I might add, Mr. Speaker.

To compel any religious institution, any person of faith, let alone the Catholic Church, which is the largest single institution standing for life and marriage in the United States of America, the White House understands that if they can plow through the Catholic Church on life and marriage and matters of conscience, then there is no institution left that can stand up to the President of the United States and his radical, social, transformative agenda would have no serious impediment from that point forward.

Thankfully, Mr. Speaker, the American bishops understood what was taking place when Kathleen Sebelius made the announcement, which was actually the order of the President of the United States to compel religious institutions, in particular Catholic institutions, to fund, provide and pay for birth control pills, sterilization, and abortifacients.

That was a violation of the right to privacy. It was a violation of the religious right to conscience, a right to conscience which is guaranteed in the First Amendment of the United States Constitution, freedom of religion.

But for the Federal Government, and I should probably not use that term quite so benignly because this is, for the President of the United States to issue such an order, tells us how radical and aggressive his agenda is, maybe how out of touch he is with the faith community in America.

But I compliment the American bishops for taking such a bold stand, Mr. Speaker. And the stand needed to be taken. When you think about the martyrs of history, it's not a hard stand to take here in the United States of America. You're not going to be crucified. You're not going to lose your head. You're not going to be stoned to death for taking a stand like this. You might be ridiculed, but when you stand on principle, how can that hurt. It doesn't. If you believe in the principle, it doesn't.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the American Catholic bishops took this position. They said it was a violation of a right to conscience. And they wrote: We cannot, we will not, obey this unjust law. The strongest language that I have heard read from the pulpit in my years as a faithful Catholic. We cannot, we will not obey this unjust law.

A bold position, a bright line, uncompromising. And I know the question was posed that the delay of 12 months in implementing the rule was to give the religious institutions an opportunity to make accommodations and adjust to the imposition of the Federal Government in requiring them to violate their conscience.

Mr. Speaker, I'd submit that one does not violate their conscience. If it is a conscience clause that protects you, that's one thing, but it is your conscience that prohibits you from crossing the line.

The lives of babies are ended by morning-after pills, by the ella pill; and it is a direct violation of the teach-

ings of the Church and no government can compel a church to violate its conscience. Nor can a government compel individuals to violate their conscience. This rule that was imposed was designed to do that, and I believe the President calculated that he could fracture the Catholic Church in doing so. And if he were successful in doing that, then there would be not an impediment in the way with the other components of the radical social agenda.

But, Mr. Speaker, that didn't happen. It's not going to happen. The bishops listened to the President's "accommodation" and bought a little bit of time and said we're going to study this and deliberate and we'll give you an answer. And they did. They studied it, deliberated, and they came back with an answer in a short period of time. It was less than 48 hours, as I recall, and rejected the President's accommodation because it still violates conscience, and it violates the conscience of many faithful Americans and Americans of all religious denominations. Particularly, it runs directly against the principles of the Catholic Church.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we now have a bright line drawn along the line of conscience protection, and we're having a good American debate on conscience protection, and I'm hopeful that we'll be able to get that established. But I would caution this body, Mr. Speaker, if I were addressing them instead of yourself, that we should not accept the idea that we can go into ObamaCare. All this power and authority is rooted in ObamaCare. ObamaCare grants this authority to the executive branch. The President assumes the authority because he makes the appointments within the Department, such as Kathleen Sebelius.

But to make changes in ObamaCare that essentially lower the pressure, the 1099 squeal forms component, well, this House passed a bill to repeal it. And you've got other components of ObamaCare that have been egregious and efforts made to repeal a little piece here, a little piece there. The medical equipment tax would be one of those. And now we have the violation of conscience that imposes that everybody in America pay for everybody else's contraceptives and their sterilizations and their abortifacients. My conscience won't let me do that, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2000

But yet the President of the United States believes he has the power built into ObamaCare; and every time we come to this floor and pass a piece of legislation, it takes some of the pressure off from a legislation that would amend out the most egregious aspects of ObamaCare. I remember some of the language back when ObamaCare was passed, and some of the leaders within this Congress—and I count you all as leaders here, as I address you, Mr. Speaker—have said, We will repeal the most egregious aspects of ObamaCare.

The most egregious aspect? Mr. Speaker, every aspect of ObamaCare is egregious. It is because it's a violation of our American liberty. And if we repeal one egregious aspect after another after another after another, each time we do that, we take the lid off the pressure cooker, and we lose that opportunity for the heat to come up where we can solve the whole mess.

So I have argued since the beginning, we need to hold the lid on, keep the pressure on and let the heat increase until such time as we are all ready to pass a repeal of ObamaCare and send it to the next President. This President, we have an idea what he would do with it, but the next President will sign the repeal.

And so I've worked on that relentlessly over the last couple of years and worked with each of the Presidential candidates on this, and every Republican candidate has taken a pledge or an oath multiple times for a 100 percent full repeal of ObamaCare. Almost all but one of them have pledged to rip it out by the roots, to repeal 100 percent of ObamaCare and not leave one particle of it left behind.

It's what we must do if we're going to keep faith with our Founding Fathers. It's what we must do if we're going to protect, preserve, and refurbish the liberty that is God given to us as Americans. It's what we must do if we hope to have an economic future in this country with an unsustainable ObamaCare staring at us. It's what we must do if we're going to have research and development in the health care industry and if we're going to continue to lead the world in providing health care. It's what we must do if we're going to preserve and protect the Constitution of the United States, which we've all taken an oath to uphold.

All of these are reasons for the full 100 percent repeal of ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker. It needs to happen. It needs to happen in the first weeks of the next Congress, and the repeal needs to be set upon the podium on the west portico of the Capitol, prepared there for the next President of the United States so, when he takes the oath of office, his first act of office can be to sign the repeal of ObamaCare right there at the podium, the west portico of the Capitol. I hope to have a good seat for that glorious occasion, Mr. Speaker, and I'll intend to do my share of the work to continue this argument to position us so that this Congress is prepared to pass that repeal.

I believe that we should just go through a warm-up drill here fairly soon. Now, this is St. Valentine's Day, February 14. Sometime in the next 30 to 60 days would be appropriate, Mr. Speaker, for the House of Representatives to renew and refresh our vote to repeal ObamaCare again. Perhaps the people over in the Senate have understood how important it is and have changed their mind, but I believe that this Congress should remind the American people that we are still—100 per-

cent of the Republicans—in a bipartisan way in favor of the full 100 percent repeal of ObamaCare. That's an important message to send.

Mr. Speaker, I'd also submit that the repeal of Dodd-Frank is an essential component, too. We've got to do a lot of undoing of this administration before we can get turned around to doing what we need to do to start the reform process over again. We will have lost 2 or 3 or more years before President Obama, and being locked up in a Congress that's led by NANCY PELOSI then and HARRY REID on the floor of the Senate, and we'll have lost 4 years of the Obama Presidency. We've got to make some progress. We've got to make some progress, and that can't come as long as ObamaCare sits in the way. It can't come as long as Dodd-Frank sits in the way.

The decisions that were made by BARNEY FRANK and Chris Dodd to presumably reform the financial world, the solutions came from some of the people that contributed to the problem. And I would suggest that we do this as a financial package, Mr. Speaker, and that would be in the early days of the 113th Congress to pass the repeal of Dodd-Frank, to pass the repeal of the Community Reinvestment Act, and to move Fannie and Freddie even more boldly towards privatization. And some of those, I understand, are in the agreements that are being negotiated right now. But it won't be bold enough or strong enough, I'm convinced of that.

And, by the way, let's repeal Sarbanes-Oxley while we are at it. If we do that—running the table is what I would say—repeal Dodd-Frank, Sarbanes-Oxley, the Community Reinvestment Act, and move Fannie and Freddie toward privatization, all of these things will lay a foundation where we can write some reasonable regulations in on our financial institutions and open this country back up to do business again, Mr. Speaker.

I think it would be appropriate of this Congress to move the repeal of Dodd-Frank that MICHELE BACHMANN has introduced. She has carried that legislation with her around on the Presidential campaign trail. She is the lead on repeal of Dodd-Frank. And I think a great way to welcome her back to the conference after a brilliant run for the Presidency would be to bring her repeal bill forward here on the floor, the repeal Dodd-Frank. And it sends a message, Mr. Speaker. The message that it sends is the House is for repeal of Dodd-Frank. The Presidential candidates are for repeal of Dodd-Frank. Send it over there to the Senate and see what they want to do about it. But getting that marker down helps encourage the Presidential candidates that this Congress is in and will be in lockstep with the Republican nominee.

Those principles that are universal among all Republican candidates at this point should be moved by the Republican majority in the House of Rep-

resentatives. For example, passing official English. Eighty-seven percent of the people in this country support English as the official language. It sits there as a dormant issue because it seems as though the only agenda that this Congress has is jobs, jobs, jobs. Well, people earn better pay and better benefits in their jobs when they have English skills.

We burn billions of dollars—and that means “consume” or “waste.” That was a hyperbole, so to speak. We waste billions of dollars in multilingualism, when the strongest and most powerful unifying force known to humanity throughout all of history is having a common language. It's more powerful than a common religion, a common background, a common race or ethnicity. It's more powerful than a common sex. It is the most powerful unifying source in the world.

When God looked down at the Tower of Babel and He said, Behold, they are one people, they speak all one language, and they are building the tower to the Heavens with the arrogance that we remember. He said, Behold, they are one people, they speak all one language and nothing they propose to do will now be impossible for them because of having a common language to bind them together. So God scrambled their language, and that's where the Tower of Babel came from, and they began to babble. They couldn't understand each other, and they split up to the four winds. And that's the Old Testament story about how we ended up with so many different nations.

We also know historically what has happened. People move into enclaves and live in those enclaves. They communicate with each other. If they do that and don't have a language, they'll create their own. But even if they go there with a language, the language morphs into something else if it doesn't interrelate with the other communications in the region, in the neighborhood, and in the world.

So we have encouragement going on in this culture of encouraging language enclaves instead of the success of assimilation. And I think we should move the H.R. 997, the English Language Unity Act, here right away. It's an 87 percent issue. I know nothing more popular than that. If I've got an agenda here, Mr. Speaker, that is as popular as 87 percent among the American people and I can't get a vote, meanwhile, the President can offer his budget and 97 Senators reject it and he gets a vote, there's something really wrong with that. There's a lot of disparity between the two.

So I think that's another thing that needs to happen. Let's move English, and let's move the repeal of Dodd-Frank. Let's move the repeal of ObamaCare. Those pieces would be good messages to send to the American people. They're good pieces of policy to be established to lay on the desk of HARRY REID that can join the cordwood of the jobs creation legislation that

this House has sent over to the Senate and help set the stage for the next President of the United States who needs to come in with a strong mandate from the American people, from the United States Congress, with a clear vision that Americans support our new President to take us where we need to go as a people.

□ 2010

But the components of the agenda of the next President need to include a balanced budget—a balanced budget amendment, a commitment to that balanced budget amendment, and a mandate from the American people to get that balanced budget amendment passed. It's the only way that I can see that we get that accomplished, Mr. Speaker. We need to call for the Presidential candidates to call for a balanced budget amendment.

So I will go through these issues again: pass a balanced budget amendment, one that has an 18 percent cap on spending of GDP, one that requires a supermajority to raise taxes, that has legitimate exemptions for a declared war or a case of a serious national emergency. Balanced budget amendment, repeal ObamaCare, repeal Dodd-Frank and the other financial components that I said, and let's move forward with a country that's based upon freedom, upon liberty, upon free enterprise. If we do all that, Mr. Speaker, the American people will take care of the rest.

We still have interest that we've got to pay and principal that's got to be paid down before we can get rid of the interest bill. This is a huge credit card that has been run up. The debt of the countries in trouble in the EU is \$4.5 trillion. And now President Obama's \$1.33 trillion added on to his \$4-plus trillion threaten to take his term of the Presidency well over \$5 trillion, knocking on the door of \$6 trillion in accumulated debt in his time in office.

Whatever we do that's good, we still have to pay the interest and have to pay the principal on that debt. So the recovery time, the depth which we might have otherwise fallen a little bit further, it takes a lot longer to recover when you borrow the money to do so. That's the nature of the free enterprise system. That's the nature of capital and investment and risk. That's the nature of Keynesian economics that the President has embraced.

I am a supply-sider. I don't believe that borrowing money, handing it to people, telling them it's their patriotic duty to go out and spend that money is how we're going to recover from this economy. We're going to recover from this downward economy by producing those goods and services that have a marketable value here and abroad. We do that, we'll sell, we'll compete, we'll rebalance our trade deficit, we'll make American industry strong again, and we will again be the powerhouse of the world. When that happens, we are strong culturally, politically, we are

strong militarily, we are strong economically, and we will continue to be looked up at by the rest of the world.

If we fail economically, if we become one huge Greece—as Chairman RYAN is concerned, and as I am and many others—if we become one huge Greece, there is no one to bail us out. There's no one there. We can hold our tin cup out, but no economy will be big enough to put enough in the tin cup that we can get a meal. We would be in a situation of default. It would be a sad, sad day in America. It would take generations to build our credit back again. It would take generations to recover. In fact, the trajectory of this country would be so altered that we could never recover.

Power abhors a vacuum; it fills it. If America has an economic crisis, as I'm suggesting looms in our future, that power, that global vacuum will be filled by our competitors. Much of that power that is projected around the world has been paid for in treasure and blood, Mr. Speaker. We must maintain that for the future destiny of our country. We must maintain it out of honor for those who have sacrificed so much to protect freedom and liberty around the world.

We are a great country. We're the unchallenged greatest Nation in the world. We derive our strength from Judeo-Christianity, western civilization, and free enterprise capitalism. We need to understand those underpinnings of American exceptionalism, those pillars of American exceptionalism. We need to celebrate them. We need to teach them. We need every child to understand the pillars of American exceptionalism and be able to recite them in the same fashion that the seven sacraments are recited in the very Catholic Church that's standing up for our constitutional rights today, along with the other faith-based organizations.

It's a big picture we have going on in this country, Mr. Speaker. It's a great country that we are. It's a great country filled with great people, people with individual spirits, individual sense of self-sacrifice, willing to tighten their belt, willing to carry their share of the load.

And what do they want out of it? An opportunity to work, prosper, raise their family, live free without an oppressive government reaching in and regulating every aspect of their very lives. They want to be able to utilize the God-given liberty that was articulated by our Founding Fathers, and promote that kind of liberty to all humanity throughout the world, wherever they may be.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your attention to the discussion that I've had with you this evening, and I would yield back the balance of my time.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA:
MANUFACTURING MATTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALAZZO). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

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

I'm joined tonight by two of my colleagues, Mr. TONKO from New York and Mr. ALTMIRE from Pennsylvania. We're going to be talking about the President's budget and about one of the issues that we think really will propel America back to the leading edge of the world's economies.

We've had some tough times, but we've seen some progress. If we can once again make it in America, we're going to see this economy grow, we're going to see the middle class come back to life. We're going to see an expansion of wealth and the opportunity for families to make it in America when we make things in America.

Let me just start off this discussion with the progress that's been made. Some of our colleagues here would like to say that nothing good has happened over the last 3 years when, in fact, this chart, which is from the Department of Labor Statistics office, points out very, very clearly where we have come from since the Great Recession began.

If you take a look at this, the gold columns over on the far left—or far right, depending on your perspective—you can see the great decline that took place from 2007 until January and February of 2009, when President Obama came into office. Since that time, we've seen a steady improvement in the number of jobs in America. So even though we were seeing here in this particular 2009 period a continued decline, each week that went by we saw improvements, less of a falloff, and we began to emerge from the depths of the Great Recession.

So beginning here in about 2010, we began to turn around and we began to see positive job growth. Every month since that time we have seen positive job growth in America—not enough, not enough to satisfy any of us on the Democratic side and not enough, I'm sure, on the Republican side, and certainly, as President Obama said when he appeared here at the State of the Union, not enough to satisfy the President.

So we're now looking at the President's budget going forward, proposed, came to the Congress yesterday. That budget lays out how he would like America to move forward, and how we in the House of Representatives and the Senate can put into place the laws, the programs, and the money to pay for the advancement of the American economy.

□ 2020

So we're going to spend tonight building off the President's budget and the things that are in there.

Over the last year, my colleagues and I have been talking about the key ladders to success, those things that create opportunity in America. And certainly, they're education, it's the research, it's the manufacturing, the infrastructure, and the opportunities that come with them.

Tonight we'd like to start by focusing on one part of the President's budget, which was the R&D, the research and development portion of the President's budget. Now, in any economy, if you're going to grow that economy, you have to stay in the forefront of technologies. America has been the best in the world at this. And in doing so, we have created extraordinary growth in the economy and opportunities for new businesses.

Unfortunately, in the last 20 years, we've seen those businesses go offshore. But the genesis of that growth is often in the research and development, usually funded by the Federal Government. And that research and development comes in several different parts of the Federal budgets. Certainly, we see it in health care, the National Institutes of Health. We see it in the national science, in the Energy Department, and in the military. Each of those organizations has a research budget, and from that budget comes new innovation, new products.

For example, the defense research agency, known around here as DARPA, really did the grunt work, the initial development and research to create the Internet. And we've certainly seen what that has meant to America.

Now, with that introduction, \$148 billion in the President's budget for all the research and development that the Federal Government supports gives us the opportunity to create the new solutions to today's health problems, today's economic problems, energy issues and defense issues.

Fortunately, my two colleagues today are well-steeped and very, very knowledgeable about the research budget. My colleague from New York ran a research program in New York. Share with us, and then if you'll reflect on the President's budget.

Mr. TONKO. Sure. Absolutely.

Representative GARAMENDI, thank you for bringing us together for an hour of thoughtful discussion, dialogue that needs to be exchanged here on the House floor so as to promote what I believe is a very progressive agenda.

And in my heart, I believe that the President has promoted a budget here that allows us to move forward in a progressive style to be able to talk about sustainable outcomes, to be able to talk about meaningful employment, cutting-edge ideas that will now take us, as a sophisticated society, embracing our intellectual capacity, to move forward with the soundness of job creation in the realm of high tech.

Now, we have been talking on the floor, a number of us for several weeks now, months perhaps, about the vision of reigniting the American Dream, re-

igniting that American Dream through the underpinnings of small business as the pulse of American enterprise and, certainly, entrepreneurs who are those dreamers and movers and shakers and builders that provide the soulfulness of the vision of how we can move ideas forward that translates into jobs and translates into product development.

Then finally, a thriving middle class, making certain that in any democracy the measurement of a resounding future comes through the measurement of how well that democracy's middle class is performing. And so we know that, through reforms out there, we can go forward with this budget and address small business, entrepreneur development, and thriving middle class dynamics in a way that will build the sustainable outcome.

We cannot, in my opinion, I totally believe that we cannot cut our way to prosperity, cut our way to opportunity, cut our way to an economic recovery. We do it through investment, investment of the soundest order.

Now, to your point, I had served, before entering Congress, as president and CEO of NYSEDA, the New York State Energy and Research Development Authority. And it was there that I got to see programs that we've devised and funded through the State legislature, where I served for nearly 25 years, my last 15 of which were as energy chair. It was quite an eye-opener to see the program development that was providing job opportunities of a new variety, of a cutting-edge opportunity.

And there, not all the research scenarios were, perhaps, a success story; but without that investment, without government joining forces with academia and the private sector, we do not strike that sort of visionary outcome, and what you saw were tremendous investments made that enabled us to pave the way for investments in the Internet, or GPS, or working through the DARPA vision of how we strengthened our military, and then sharing a lot of that information and that intellectual property with the growth of jobs here in this country.

That is the sort of opportunity that is envisioned here by the President in his budget presentation to Congress. And it's that sort of investment that believes in the American worker, believes in a thriving middle class, believes in the strengthening that small business brings to any community, and believes in entrepreneurs, that "rags to riches" scenario that has been, you know, very much a part of our American story. The American history is replete with success stories, "rags to riches" scenarios where America was seen as the promised land.

Well, we have not abandoned manufacturing. We have endorsed this idea of investing in manufacturing, investing in research; and I am really pleased to see that we're moving forward with soundness, with this budget presentation in a way that translates into

jobs, no other higher priority, and we do it by reigniting the American Dream.

So, Representative GARAMENDI, seeing those success stories through the lens of NYSEDA, the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, where we were able to speak to water efficiencies, where you're saving mountains of electrons, we got to see it in electric vehicles that were being developed, we got to see it in energy retrofits for business.

These are the sorts of ideas that a sophisticated society embraces. We don't abandon these goals. We get into it full steam and go forward.

And by the way, it's because we are competing with other nations in what is a global race on clean energy and innovation. If we don't take that in, if we don't acknowledge that we're in the midst of that race, we will watch nations pass us by, and we will let down generations of American workers, and that would be unforgivable.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you so very much, and thank you for your extraordinary experience in dealing with research and then translating that research into real things that Americans could make.

Now, the great manufacturing center of America is represented here by my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE). Thank you for joining us, and share with us your thoughts as we look at the President's budget and on making it in America.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman from California and my friend from New York (Mr. TONKO). We have a discussion going now about manufacturing in America. And our colleagues understand the relationship that exists between manufacturing and R&D, research and development. And it's critical that we look at those together, because of the discussion that we're having in this country about why, over the past several decades, we've lost so much in manufacturing, we've lost our core manufacturing businesses.

I come from western Pennsylvania. We have seen the steel industry over the past several years. Although there is a resurgence today, it's been many, many years since we lost a lot of that steel industry that we had in western Pennsylvania, and it was the core base of employment for generations in the Pittsburgh area.

Across the country, we've seen our manufacturing industry decimated by foreign competition; and the reason R&D relates to this, as the gentleman certainly knows, is it's a continuum. And at first, when America lost its manufacturing lead to other countries, we still kept the innovation; we still kept the R&D. But the continuum that exists between someone in America coming up with an idea, an invention, turning that, through R&D, into a real product, a real innovation, we have always been the leaders in that in America. Americans have led the way with innovation, with creation, with technology, and then turning that into the

manufacturing sector, turning that towards product development, manufacturing, exportation to other countries, creating a base of people who are going to use that product.

The whole continuum is something that we have seen over the last several years through foreign competition. We've lost our lead in a lot of those things. And because of our failure to invest in research and development, because of our failure to keep up with the foreign competition, we've lost even more than just the manufacturing sector. We've lost our competitive edge on the innovation side as well.

That's why it's so critical, even in the times that we face now, severe fiscal restraint, a recession that we are finally recovering from. We have to continue to make that investment in R&D because, as the gentleman from New York said, if we don't do it, other countries will—and they are. And if we expect to compete in a global economy, if we expect to get back our lead in manufacturing, which we are starting to do, it has to begin at that first stage of innovation, of research and development, creating new products, leading to new ways of manufacturing, more cost-efficient ways of manufacturing.

We're going to be able to do it, and we're starting to see the resurgence in America specifically because we understand that continuum that exists. It would be a tragedy for workers in this country to begin moving in the other direction.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

□ 2030

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. ALTMIRE, and thank you for the work that you've done for us in western Pennsylvania. Indeed, at one time, I know, when I was growing up, it was the center of the American steel industry and manufacturing there, and to the immediate west in Ohio and Indiana and on.

I want to put up this chart because it really demonstrates the challenge that we face and the opportunity that we have.

This chart speaks of the 12 years with 6 million American manufacturing jobs lost. Let's go back about 20, 25 years ago. There were just under 20 million manufacturing jobs in America. Over the years, it was up and down, with a slight decrease. Then beginning around the year 2000, we began to see a precipitous decline, basically the outsourcing of American jobs. The great manufacturing heart and heartbeat of America just began to slow down to a rhythm where now we are down to just over 11 million manufacturing jobs. This is our work. This right here. This decline is the challenge that this House faces.

When you start with what the President has suggested, you start with R&D, because that's the genesis. That's where the new ideas and the new products are developed. Then you have to couple that with manufacturing.

I want to give just two examples from my own district, one that I learned last weekend when I was back home in the Sacramento Valley just west of Sacramento.

A university town, the University of California, Davis, about 10 years ago, some graduate students at the engineering campus or the engineering school there at the University of California, Davis figured out a new program, a new way to do advanced manufacturing. They were into machine tools, and they figured out a way to take machine tools and make them far more productive and innovative and capable of doing some really different things. They took that idea—these were the entrepreneurs that you talked about, Mr. TONKO. They took that idea and they started a small business. In the intervening years, they began to grow. They now employ 75 people in the Sacramento region for the development of these advanced machine tools.

A company in Japan took a look at this and said, Oh, we want to do that. They were in this business. So they bought the company, and they thought about taking the company back to Japan. No. Didn't happen. Instead, they decided to build that manufacturing facility in Davis, California. That factory is now being constructed, and it will soon employ a hundred people.

So here we have an example of where research out of the University of California, Davis engineering school led to the creation of a new business in the machine tool industry and the continuation of research and development and advancement and, now, manufacturing taking place in California.

There are a couple of other pieces of public policy that fit into this continuum of development of economic growth, and they were policies that were put forth by the House of Representatives when the Democrats controlled the House. It was this: For any company that wanted to make a capital investment, they could immediately write off that total investment in the first year. Rather than depreciating that investment over 7, 10, 15 years, they were able to take advantage of it. A very, very powerful incentive to make it in America, to build your manufacturing facility in America.

So this company, DTL, is now growing in California as a result of the research at the university, coming out, entrepreneurs taking the ideas, building a business, and now investments, in this case by a foreign company, into the United States. We call that insourcing.

I'll come up to the other example a little later.

Mr. TONKO, take it from there.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, thank you for that lead-in. Certainly Representative ALTMIRE talked about the need for us to invest in manufacturing, when you look at that precipitous drop, losing the many millions of manufacturing jobs, per-

haps the largest loss of manufacturing jobs in world history. It's up there. It ranks very high. Why? Well, policy, tax policy that encouraged taking jobs offshore and investing in other nations. We were rewarding that behavior.

What we're talking about now is turning that around, doing this U-turn, putting the brakes on a process, on an incentive that really was destroying hope for American workers. So now what we see is a new vision of providing incentives for those who will build opportunity in this Nation.

Also, I think when we look at some of the focus that existed or didn't exist over the past decade and a half, you look at where we were going as a Nation, and the focus wasn't on agriculture, it was not on manufacturing, but it was on the service sector, and primarily on the financial service sector.

Now, we know that scenario. We won't go down that road. Suffice it to say, we turned our back and said, Here's the keys; play as you wish. No watchdog in the equation, and people created vehicles by which to circumvent regulation. So we put at risk the Nation's economy. Every family that invested into their future was put at risk.

So we ignored manufacturing.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, may I interrupt you for a moment?

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You mentioned something that we actually talked about last week. I want to hand you this chart. If you would hold that one up there and let me go back to the microphone.

You mentioned the effort that we made in the 2002 change from a manufacturing economy to what this chart calls a FIRE economy—finance, insurance, and real estate—a FIRE economy, one that collapsed because it was about manipulating money instead of creating mechanical engineers and chemical engineers and nuclear engineers. We created financial engineers. The result? Not good. The Great Recession.

Please excuse me for interrupting.

Mr. TONKO. It's a valid point. Where was that linear, where was that outreach, that extension into all of America with the good products we developed that would serve this Nation well? So what we're talking about now is bringing back some programs.

What was ignored was the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, MEP. MEP is a program I hear about all the time from my manufacturers who are still clinging on, who are working trying to be productive, offering hope to the worker. They're saying, Where is the MEP program? Well, it was brought back last year, and it's reinstated into the budget this year. The request to Congress is to support the Manufacturing Extension Partnership.

What does that do? It's an MEP program. Okay. It's alphabet soup. But

what does it do? It allows for manufacturers, small and medium-size businesses, small and medium-size manufacturing firms, to develop additional markets.

The President has said let's get into exporting; let's build it in America and export to the world. That's a vibrant economy. Also, it enables us to define, to explore new opportunities and to adopt those technologies and retrofit our manufacturing base with that know-how, with that productivity margin growing. That means greater opportunity for us to compete in the global market, to create jobs, and to provide hope again for the worker.

So it is good to see that MEP, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, is back in this budget. It's a statement that we care about manufacturing, we care about small and medium-sized businesses, and that we are going to see that as the springboard, the economic springboard to the economic recovery that we so much deserve.

It's about priorities. That's what a budget is. It's like, Where are you putting your investment? How are you developing that formula? What is the hope that you anticipate that is translating to America's working families?

This is the moment for us to move forward by reigniting the American Dream, doing it through small and medium-sized business, the pulse of the American enterprise, investing in those dreamers, those movers, those builders, those entrepreneurs, and then resulting in a thriving middle class. Again, where there's a thriving middle class, you have a strong democracy.

So reignite the American Dream, and gentlemen, we have work to do.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Indeed we do. We have much work to do.

Mr. ALTMIRE, you've been working long and hard here in the U.S. Congress on these issues. Carry on this discussion.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I wanted to transition into talking about the trade deficit that we're facing in this country. But before I did that, I wanted to close the loop with what Mr. TONKO and Mr. GARAMENDI have been talking about for my colleagues.

□ 2040

I hear a lot back home. You'll have town hall meetings, and you'll have discussions with people about federally funded research. It seems as though there's always an example somewhere of a research project that seems on the surface to be unjustifiable, and in some cases, people will argue it's ridiculous that we're funding certain things. I just wanted, for my colleagues, to give a couple of examples of federally funded research that has paid huge dividends for everyday life.

There was in the late 1970s and early 1980s a big national story about federally funded research that studied the eyesight of eagles. At the time, it was considered to be a mockery—it was of no use to society, and it was a waste of

money. Well, lo and behold, what did we get out of that research? We got night vision goggles for our troops who were serving overseas on the military battlefield. We got soft contact lenses. We got so many innovations from that type of research. The touch screen on our everyday iPad was federally funded research out of the University of Delaware, of course many years after what I'm speaking of. The GPS system, which so many of us rely on, was from federally funded research. The Internet was created, as we all know, through the Pentagon and federally funded research.

So I would say to my colleagues, for those who may be skeptical that certain projects—and you know, I'm sure there are some that you can point to that haven't paid dividends, but there are some that maybe on the surface didn't sound like good ideas in the beginning that have paid huge dividends. I would go back to that example of studying the eyesight of eagles. LASIK eye surgery was the byproduct of that type of research. So investment is what we're talking about. Research and development just pays back so much more than what we're paying into it.

The R&D tax credit has to be made permanent. That is a key part of this. The manufacturing extension partnership that the gentleman was talking about is a key part of our future in this country, bringing back a resurgent manufacturing base. What happens if you don't do that? What happens if you aren't competitive in the global economy?

It's what this chart shows.

Now, this will come as no surprise to our colleagues. This is the U.S. trade deficit from 1976 through 2008. You don't even need to look at the numbers, and you can see it's heading in the wrong direction and that it has been heading in the wrong direction for a very, very long time, and there are a lot of reasons why this is.

Some of it has to do with our foreign competitors and their getting their act together and joining the world competition in a way that they hadn't before. But a lot of it has to do with our own policies and the fact that we have not invested, that we have not had a strategic manufacturing strategy in this country and that we were a little bit slow to react to what was happening overseas.

The role that we have in this House is to change that, and we have a decision to make in this country: Are we going to continue to allow this to happen and just sit back and wait while other countries continue to improve, to modernize, to become more cost-efficient, to become more competitive, and to continue to make this trend worse for the American worker? Or are we going to take action? Are we going to invest in our future? Are we going to change the way that we do our manufacturing strategy in order to incentivize making products in America?

We talked a couple of weeks ago, the gentleman from California and I, on this very floor about a provision of our Tax Code which may very well be, in my opinion, the most egregious and unjustifiable provision in the entire Federal Tax Code, which is, if you have physical assets, if you have a plant in this country, a manufacturing plant, and if you want to move that plant overseas, if you're going to close your operations, if you're going to get rid of your American workers, if you're going to move your physical assets, literally move those assets overseas, in some cases, you can get a tax deduction for the cost of your moving expenses. The American taxpayer, believe it or not, will cover the cost to move that plant overseas.

That's ludicrous. There is no reason that provision should exist, and that's one of the reasons you see the chart going in the wrong direction—because we have been slow to react. Yet we're at a turning point in this country. We have a tremendous opportunity in front of us to do the right thing, to change the policies that have led to our trade deficit and to begin turning the corner and heading in the right direction.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much for pointing out the eye of the eagle. We have to keep our eye on this particular prize, and that's rebuilding the American manufacturing sector.

I handed this chart to Mr. TONKO a while ago. It really needs a further explanation.

What we did beginning in 2000, actually before that, was to develop a FIRE economy—finance, insurance, real estate—not manufacturing. So manufacturing was allowed to decline, and of course real estate, finance, and insurance grew and became the essential economy in the year 2000 to 2010. And, of course, the great collapse in 2007 and 2008 as a result of, as Mr. TONKO said, regulatory oversight disappearing and anything goes. We're reversing that.

Mr. ALTMIRE, you talked about the egregious tax policy of giving the tax breaks when companies offshore jobs. It was actually in 2009, just before the new Congress came into effect, that we enacted legislation that eliminated much of those tax breaks.

Now, there is more to be done. In the President's budget, he calls for the full elimination of tax breaks to companies that offshore jobs and, as he said here in the State of the Union address, turns that around and gives a tax break to companies that bring jobs back to America. In his budget and in his proposals are specific actions on tax law that we must take to carry out that commitment to American and foreign countries that want to bring jobs back to America.

We can do this. Public policy plays into this—the budget and the research and development piece of it. That's the genesis. That's the start of the idea of a new business or of a new technology and then the manufacturing support

that goes with it. There is the tax policy, and we've talked about the vast manufacturing systems. All of those are the feedstock to get these companies up and going so that the entrepreneur, in using the research and creating a small business, will ultimately create a bigger middle class, reigniting the American Dream in doing that.

Mr. TONKO, I'm not sure where we want to go with this. I think we ought to spend a few moments talking about transportation if that's okay with you gentlemen.

Mr. TONKO. I think before we leave this talk of manufacturing growth, both of you gentlemen held up tremendous charts that tell the story.

What I think is interesting is, when you overlay those two charts with the deficit—the trade deficit and the loss of manufacturing jobs—they mimic each other. They absolutely trace the same curve. And so as you drop those manufacturing jobs, as the commitment was the tax policy and the investment in manufacturing declined, the trade deficit impact from Representative ALTMIRE's chart—they're mimicking each other. You can see the precipitous drop here is almost at the same rate as the impact of the trade deficit.

So we can step back and deal with facts or we can be in denial. We can be bitter about success and come on to the floor and try to hold back success. But instead of a tug of war on this House floor, let's tug together. Let's tug forward to make certain that we're investing where we ought to. Let's cut where we can but invest where we must. One of those investments has got to be in the human infrastructure. We're talking about capital investment, and we're talking about physical infrastructure, but we need to talk about the human infrastructure with this manufacturing comeback.

When I see advanced manufacturing embraced in my district, where we as a hub in the 21st Congressional District of New York, in the Capital Region of New York, have seen tremendous growth in clean energy and innovation, those jobs are coming about because of an investment in nanotechnology, semiconductor research so as to transmit more electrons over an exact same-sized cable. From what we do today, we talk about the investment in chips and in growing those chips to a smaller, smaller dimension so that they can have an impact—a partnership with agriculture, communications, energy generation, health care—you name it. Any industry can be impacted by that nanotechnology investment. So there is all this investment, but you're going to need the workers who are now being part of an advanced manufacturing stage in our society, where we're having more and more investment and keen intellect. You need to train those workers.

The President has said, Look, we've got a vehicle that is very sound out there. They're called community col-

leges. In my district, we not only have Hudson Valley Community College, Fulton-Montgomery Community College, Schenectady County Community College, but we also have an ag and tech campus in the SUNY system, the State University of New York system, in Cobleskill.

□ 2050

All of these are having cutting-edge involvement in research that spills over to the worker. Cleanroom science, retrofitting homes to solar, making certain that you have a trained workforce for nanotechnology, all of this is happening in our community colleges. And the President said, Let's go forward and invest. There is, I believe, an \$8 billion investment in our community colleges to train the worker. So let's not pull back on success. We see what's working. We know what has to happen. We have the formula based on history that ought to speak to us. And let's get it done. The worker can't wait until the next election.

The decisionmaking on this floor should be about hope and opportunity, not about the next election, but about the next jobs we can bring into the congressional districts of this great country that, in a cumulative format, will spark a reigniting of the American Dream.

My district is the donor area to the Erie Canal; and we saw a necklace of communities emerge from that investment which, by the way, came at a tough time for this Nation. Governor DeWitt Clinton said, Look, here's a solution: We have a tough economy. Let's provide opportunities for shipping our cargo, building. And what happened? A number of immigrant patterns traveled to these shores in hope of that rags-to-riches scenario, and they invested. They were the brains behind the industrial revolution, immigrants who came here and developed—along with the industrial giants—an agenda for jobs.

We can do that again. This is the American pioneer spirit. The DNA within my district is a pioneer spirit where these mill towns became the epicenters of invention and innovation. And the same story can be lived today if we're willing to reignite the American Dream through investments in small business, entrepreneurs, and a thriving middle class.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you. And you really hit one of those issues directly, particularly the education issue. And we ought not jump to transportation before we deal with the investment in the human capital, that is, in the American worker.

And the President did, in his budget, lay out \$8 billion for community colleges to work directly with companies to educate their workforce. I can give a specific example. Again, in Davis, California, there is a biopesticide firm that actually goes out and finds microbes, or various kinds of naturally occurring materials, and uses that and makes that into a biopesticide, not a chemical

but a biopesticide. They need technicians in their laboratories and in their manufacturing. They go to the community college to bring up the necessary skills and bring those workers in.

So there are jobs out there, but they have to have the education behind them. So much of what the President is proposing—not only with community colleges, but with the Pell Grants and proposing \$30 billion going into our K-12 schools so that those schools can be upgraded, and an additional \$30 billion to bring the teachers back into the classroom.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, if you will just yield on one point, what I believe is also important with the community college investment is the stated purpose of creating partnerships with the private sector.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Exactly.

Mr. TONKO. So it's not like one person or one institutional network working in a vacuum but, rather, a partnership that is fostered by this budget process, by the thinking here of the administration working with Congress. Let's develop those partnerships with academia, community colleges training people and retraining.

Many people are starting second careers. They lost a job through no fault of their own. This was a brutal time on America's manufacturing base. Let's bring that base back, and let's give them the tools they need to be successful so that it grows more and more opportunity so that we can have as sharp a competitive edge as possible as we enter into the global sweepstakes on jobs.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. TONKO.

Mr. ALTMIRE, I see you are kind of ready to go here.

Mr. ALTMIRE. The gentleman has given me so much to work with here on community colleges, and then I will transition into transportation, as the gentleman would like to do.

I visited, just yesterday, the Community College of Allegheny County, outside of Pittsburgh; and they have an amazing fundraising campaign going on, because western Pennsylvanians, private industry, and the foundation community believe in the future of our country, and they believe in the future of community colleges. They have a \$40 million fundraising campaign. They've already exceeded \$30 million. And the discussion was about all of the wonderful things that are happening as a result of the innovations that are taking place at the community colleges, not just in western Pennsylvania but across the country.

We have energy resources in western Pennsylvania that are unique. And all the time we hear about employers saying that they have jobs available, but they can't find people who are trained to fill those spots. So being right on the cutting edge, the Community College of Allegheny County has almost two dozen new programs, new curricula

that they have established to train workers and retrain, in some cases, to fill the new spots—geologists, managers, people out there on the work-sites, all types of ways, through the natural gas industry, the nuclear industry, energy, research and development, what we were talking about earlier.

Our community colleges really do play a unique role in this because of their ability to partner with local businesses, to identify the needs, to retrain workers who have lost their jobs through downsizing or changes in the workforce. It's an amazing resource for this country, and the President is right to put a focus on community colleges as part of our resurgence in this country.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. ALTMIRE, if you could wait just a moment. Now you've got me engaged in this, and you talked about your community college. We are going to be going to our community college in Fairfield, the Solano Community College, and we're going to take the work that was done by this Congress in 2010 when it brought the Pell Grants down into the community colleges.

Previously, the Pell Grants were only available at the 4-year college level, but now the community college students can also vie for the Pell Grants and the loan programs that had been significantly improved back in 2010, before we lost the majority here. We took back from the big Wall Street banks the student loan programs, reducing the interest rates, reducing the hassle for students, and making loans far cheaper and more available.

Just this year, the President took one additional step under his authority and stretched out the payment mechanisms so that no graduated student who had taken out a loan needs to pay more than 10 percent of their annual income to repay that loan. All of this is part of investing in the human capital, investing in the workers.

I suspect the three of us could go on for a long time about education.

Mr. TONKO. Let me just mention this. Last night, I spoke before the ERC, the research center at RPI, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. They are well regarded for their development of scientists and technology experts and the engineers of the future. Their funding is primarily from the NSF, the National Science Foundation.

There is a 5 percent increase in NSF in this budget, and rightfully so. What they're doing in this think tank is stretching the creative genius and the imagination of folks with regard to lighting designs, lighting designs that will be used in ways that are unbelievably creative and constructive. It's about creating the incubators of the future, the entrepreneurs of the future. It's about developing the professors that will train students into the future. It is an infrastructure unbelievably sound, and it is NSF-funded.

You know, for people to say, Well, our best days are behind us—what I'm

hearing tonight is that there's optimism. There's great optimism. There's a reason to be hopeful. There is a charge for us to be optimistic by investing in opportunity. There are the tools that America's base needs. They need these tools. And how dare we not provide them. Earlier statements on the floor were denouncing workers instead of providing hope, training, and retraining people in areas that will be geared toward their specific strengths.

We all have certain skill sets or have that potential for those skill sets. There's a passion that everyone has for certain types of work. Let's not denounce the worker. Let's insert hope in the equation and, again, provide for the infrastructure, human infrastructure required for this manufacturing base.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. ALTMIRE, I was about to respond that, while the lighting at Rensselaer is obviously good, it's California where the light-emitting diode—the LED—is actually being manufactured by a new startup company called Bridgelux, which has taken that technology and, with a little bit of assistance, is going to be able to manufacture in America.

However, controlling this for the next 20 minutes, we're going to move to transportation. Mr. ALTMIRE, why don't you get us going on transportation.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Earlier, our colleague, Mr. TONKO, was talking about the Erie Canal and the foresight and the commitment that went in and just the unbelievable feat that it was to accomplish that. And I was thinking, as the gentleman was speaking, about the debate that we're having in this country about transportation and infrastructure.

□ 2100

We are going to debate tomorrow and vote probably Thursday in this House on a very underfunded transportation bill that does not contain the same foresight that the gentleman was discussing occurred in New York. And I think about the debate that must have occurred in New York when the Erie Canal was proposed, and the cost and the expense and the manpower and just the time commitment that was necessary, a seemingly impossible task.

You think about the intercontinental railroad in the 1800s and what the country's debate, the political debate had been at that time. What must have been the debate in the 1940s and 1950s when President Eisenhower finally got off the ground the interstate highway system and began connecting our roads in a way that we'd never done before.

That's what we're facing right now. We have a system of transportation in this country to move goods from point A to point B, manufacturing and make it in America, what we were talking about. Well, if you make it in America, you have to have a way to move goods across the country. We can do that in all kinds of ways. We can do that on our waterways, through shipping, cargo

ships; and we also have barges in my neck of the woods. In Pittsburgh, I have a system of locks and dams in the district that I represent, six different locks and dams that average 85 years old. They were built to last 50. Two of them have been rated by the Army Corps of Engineers as in imminent threat of failure. That is a crisis of infrastructure, and that's happening in similar ways all across the country.

You look at our aviation system. If you want to move goods by air, we have an air traffic control system in this country that is still based in technology from the 1950s. And this NextGen technology that is possible through satellite technology, it is expensive but it's long overdue, and it's a commitment that we need to make in this country, as they've made in other countries. Our competitors don't have the same bottlenecks that we do at their airports because they have more modern air traffic technology.

And then you get to our rail system. We all understand the bottlenecks outside of Chicago and other places in this country and our lack of modern investment in our rail system. But what we're going to be talking about this week in the House is our roads and bridges and a highway system. I spoke earlier about President Eisenhower's vision with the interstate highway system and the way that this bill lacks that same vision because it underfunds that investment and it doesn't require or doesn't even incentivize products to be made in America.

There are literally trillions of dollars of need in our transportation infrastructure. Certainly we don't have the ability to afford it all, but I can't think of a better way to put American workers back to work, to put American jobs back in play in the manufacturing sector, to have a resurgence, a regeneration of our manufacturing sector than through our transportation infrastructure.

I'm very disappointed at the lost opportunity that the bill we're debating presents because there are so many ways American workers can win, American manufacturers can win, and, most importantly, America can win. And we're missing that opportunity. But through the discussion that we are having today, maybe we can move this country in a different direction.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. ALTMIRE, for getting us started. And I've got to compliment you on the really neat segue that you used, the Erie Canal to move to modern transportation. That was very nicely done.

We do have a real challenge. This week, we're going to be taking up a transportation bill that the Secretary of Transportation, who has now been in office nearly 3½ years and who was a Member of the House of Representatives for I think over 20 years and a Republican, says that this is the worst transportation bill he has ever seen. Ever seen.

This transportation bill that we are going to be taking up is underfunded.

It totally eliminates from the funding stream the public transportation sector. So we're talking about Amtrak, buses, light rail, the metro systems here in Washington, New York, San Francisco, Chicago, Atlanta and other places that are going to be cut out of the funding stream.

There's a whole lot of other things that are within this piece of legislation that are nonsense and nonstarters and ultimately detract from the goal that you so well stated, Mr. ALTMIRE, of building that infrastructure that we need for a modern, thriving, growing economy that's based upon manufacturing.

Now, if all you're doing is sending buy-and-sell signals over the Internet, I guess you don't need a highway. But if you're sending cars and rail systems and you're sending equipment back and forth across America, you better have all of that transportation infrastructure in place. So as we rebuild the American manufacturing sector, we will need this in place.

Now, Mr. TONKO, you took the train from New York today.

Mr. TONKO. I did.

Mr. GARAMENDI. What happened that you were talking about earlier?

Mr. TONKO. Yes. Well, there was concern expressed on that train that the transportation bill advanced in this House falls grossly short of what's needed.

And, you know, when you look at the many sectors of the infrastructure community, it's not just our traditional roads and bridges which require assistance. It's mass transit. It's rail. It's also telecommunications and it's energy. And it's water. So all of this infrastructure requires an investment. And how do we make up ground where we have underinvested in this area?

Well, the President proposes a \$10 billion infrastructure bank bill that will leverage government moneys and private sector moneys that will enable us to provide for the sorts of investments that are required. Now, investing in our transportation infrastructure has great merit. Many of us can cite those weaknesses out there.

My district, in Montgomery County, lost 10 people when a bridge collapsed along the New York State Thruway. There are bridges around the country that need immediate attention. There are those situations where many believe we're going into a water economy in the next 10–20 years. If that's so, how are we treating that resource of water? Are we being the most efficient?

And energy, if we're going to move into a creative, innovative arena for energy supplies and diversify our mix, we need to retrofit the grid system in order to make it all work, in order to incorporate these ideas. Or we can stay beholden to a fossil-based infrastructure for energy supplies, which means that we'll be beholden to nations that are oftentimes unfriendly to the United States and use those energy consumer dollars, American consumer dollars, to

pour into their treasury and develop their troops to fight against the American forces. So it's an issue of national security.

So there are many dynamics here that need to be addressed in a full-picture view, not just dealing in some sort of snapshot of denial. That does not produce an infrastructure bill that is worthy of the needs of Americans out there from coast to coast.

You know, sometimes, Representative GARAMENDI, you're looking for that Sputnik moment. That's what inspired our win in the global race on space—U.S. versus USSR. We gave it our all because we had that Sputnik moment. We got knocked on the seat of our pants, stood up, dusted off the backside and said: never again. And we won that global race on space.

What is our Sputnik moment today?

Is it bridges collapsing with people dying? Is it paying God-awful prices for energy supplies and not creating our new energy supplies? Is it ignoring a water economy that is to come and will be a strength for this Nation and a wisdom to invest in our water resources?

All of these moments could be referred to as Sputnik moments, and we need to take those experiences and that recent history and have it influence our thinking and have us go forward with a sound investment in infrastructure.

So I see great potential here in this budget. I see great opportunity. And I see investing our way to opportunity and investing our way to an economic recovery, investing our way to the re-igniting of the American Dream, which is our principal foundation by the Democratic Caucus in this House. Let's reignite that American Dream. Let's do it through small business and through investment in entrepreneurs and a thriving middle class. Infrastructure is prime amongst those areas of investment.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, you are so very correct about reigniting the American Dream. One of the dreams I have is to drive down Interstate 5 in California and not have my car knocked to pieces on the unimproved and the falling-apart highways. In America today, we have 150,000 miles of roads that are in desperate need of repair—150,000 miles. That's about 50 times back and forth across America.

□ 2110

Now, if we did that and repaired those highways, what could happen? What could happen if we actually built a real robust transportation network in America? Well, back to the jobs issue, back to making it in America: What if our tax dollars were to be used to buy American-made equipment? This piece of legislation, H.R. 613, is now working its way into the transportation bill. The bill that our Republican colleagues put out has a very, very weak Buy America.

This particular bill, H.R. 613—I happen to be the author, and I'm kind of

proud of the piece of legislation—would require that our tax dollars, which will be used to fund the transportation program, the airports, the NextGen system and the roads and bridges that both Mr. TONKO and Mr. ALTMIRE talked about, that those be made in America, that we make it in America. We would use our tax dollars to actually make these things in America. So if we're going to build a high-speed rail, let's make it in America.

In fact, that's happened. In the stimulus bill, the American Recovery Act, there was a provision for some \$12 billion for high-speed rail in various parts of the United States, and an additional sentence was added to that law that said all of this money must be spent on trains and equipment made in America. Guess what happened? Foreign companies that built high-speed systems decided, oh, \$12 billion, we want a piece of that. And so they came to America, and they built manufacturing facilities. One was built in Sacramento. Secretary LaHood was just there a couple of days ago visiting that factory. The German company, Siemens, built a large manufacturing plant in Sacramento, California, to make light rail and to make locomotives for Amtrak, to make and to be prepared to build the high-speed rail systems that are coming.

Why did they do it? Because it was the law of the land that said your tax money, American taxpayer money, must be spent on American-made equipment. But what this bill does is it extends that idea as we go forward so that when we build bridges, the steel is American steel, and it's put together by American welders and by American ironworkers, and that the cement is American cement and that the computer systems that are being used to develop these things are American made. We can rebuild the American manufacturing sector when we decide it is the public policy that we use American taxpayer dollars to make it in America once again.

There's another piece of legislation that does the same thing for energy products. You've heard of solar systems, the photovoltaic systems, the big wind turbines that we're beginning to see across America. All of those energy products are essential elements in the future. Once again, our taxpayer money is used to support that. And my legislation says if you're going to get American taxpayer money to support your solar system or your wind farm, then you're going to buy American-made solar panels, solar equipment and wind turbines. We can make it in America.

So all of these things fit together—a transportation program that is going to give America what it needs to travel and an education program so that our workers are prepared and an R&D, research and development, program that allows us to innovate for tomorrow's economy.

Mr. TONKO, I think we have about 2 minutes left. Could you wrap it up for us?

Mr. TONKO. Sure. Absolutely. I think beyond the innovation and the ideas that translate into jobs, research equaling jobs, there are these benefits of connecting us as a Nation. We are a large Nation geographically, and the interconnecting that can be done through the investment in infrastructure is important.

Now, we know beyond the roads and bridges and the rail and the grid system for our energy supplies there's a telecommunications network; and that effort to create a national wireless initiative is very important. It will range from first responders with interoperable communications devices for first responders to a high-speed Internet system so that we're wiring in to remote areas and enabling this country to truly prosper.

So, tonight, we have heard such great comments about what we can do and what we must do about cutting where we can, by addressing inefficiency, waste, fraud and outmoded programs, but maintaining the vigilance about investing where we must. If we do not invest, we deny the American Dream. If we invest, we reignite that American Dream. We reignite the dream through the investment in a historic display of what America is at her greatest: when she invests in ideas, she invests in her workers, invests in infrastructure, in small business, entrepreneurs—those dreamers, shakers, movers and builders—and invests in a thriving middle class. It can be done, and it will be done if we put our minds to it. Mr. GARAMENDI, we have work to do.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We have work to do indeed.

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

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENISHEK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, happy Valentine's Day to you. Thank you for this time.

There is so much going on. We have had in recent days the testimony of the director of CBO, Congressional Budget Office, making projections. We've had the White House dictating what religious beliefs people could observe and practice and which they could not, and then what was said to be a compromise so that individuals—actually institutions—could practice religious beliefs, the insurance companies that they utilize will have to provide the coverage that the President dictates even though it is against the religious beliefs, and then naturally the way things work, the insurance companies will spread out the costs, and they will pay for them anyway, which will be, once again, in breach of their religious beliefs.

It's quite interesting. I've been trying to take this all in, Mr. Speaker, as we have seen ObamaCare basically rammed down the throats of Americans with the vast majority not wanting that bill passed, with the vast majority in Congress not having read the bill, and with Speaker PELOSI at the time saying, we'll have to pass it so we can find out what's in it. Well, as people are finding out what's in it, they're not terribly happy.

And when you realize, as some of us did before it passed, as some of us were arguing here on the House floor before it passed, that if the President's health care bill passed, it would be such an intrusion into the rights of Americans that as I said here on the floor, it would be about the GRE, the government running everything, that means every aspect of people's lives. That includes setting aside people's religious beliefs when that came into conflict with the President's health care bill. We knew that it would run up tremendous debt. We knew that it would cut Medicare by \$500 billion—something our friends across the aisle don't like to talk about a whole lot.

Before the supercommittee fiasco ever occurred, the Democratic majority in the House and the Senate passed a bill a majority of Americans didn't want passed that would wrest control away from Americans in so many different areas and would take control and give it to the Federal Government in a way that was never anticipated in the Constitution.

□ 2120

So as we have seen this White House dictate to the Catholic Church, to Catholic hospitals, what they would be allowed to practice in the way of their religious beliefs, it's been quite interesting. We've heard many Catholic leaders who have said, you know, gee, we supported President Obama when he was Senator running for President. We thought he would do all these wonderful things. From conversations, as President Jenkins at Notre Dame had with President Obama, he just never anticipated that there would be this type of usurpation of religious practices and the ability to practice one's religious beliefs.

This isn't about contraception. Anybody in America that wants contraception can get it. That's not an issue. In fact, it's been interesting to hear people say people have a right to have contraception provided. When I look at the Second Amendment of the Constitution, there is a right to bear arms, but I don't remember anybody who was pushing for the government to basically provide whatever people want in the way of health care, paid for by somebody else. I don't remember them saying, well, the Constitution mentions the right to bear arms, so the Federal Government must provide everybody guns. There's all kinds of things that are ensured under the Constitution and under the Bill of Rights,

but it doesn't mean the government's supposed to buy them for everybody.

But in view of the White House's position, President Obama's position on what religious practices he would allow the Catholic Church to observe, Mr. Speaker, I figure we really need to make an addition to the Constitution. Since the President has already taken these actions, then I think maybe we need to just observe some language that we insert into the shadow of a penumbra. So where it says in amendment one to the Constitution of the United States, "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," I think in order to make the President's actions and the White House actions consistent, as those reflected by Secretary Sebelius, we need to insert there a line that comes up and says, But only if you are a religious institution and your beliefs agree with the President of the United States. Because if your religious beliefs come into conflict with Secretary Sebelius or the White House, unless the White House is willing to make some insurance company deal with your practice, then you're just going to have to set aside your religious beliefs.

So apparently the parenthetical has been inserted into the Constitution. I'm hopeful that on this issue the Supreme Court will strike down ObamaCare, say there are so many aspects of this bill that are unconstitutional—the mandate to buy a product for the first time in American history is only one of them. But that mandate, of course, is central to the bill itself.

But then the way it supercedes the religious institution's beliefs, why we would say "religious institutions" is because the President and Secretary Sebelius in their so-called "compromise" had not been willing to recognize an individual's beliefs, which I've always understood the Constitution was talking about.

No, they say it is confined to the religious beliefs and practices of a religious institution. Because under this White House's interpretation of the Constitution, if you're an individual and you are Baptist, Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, whatever it is—although the FBI has apparently been meeting with named coconspirators for funding terrorism and trying to eliminate any kind of language that might in any way offend people that have supported terrorism, we don't want to offend those who want to kill us, of course.

But other than that, this White House sees it that if you're an individual and not a religious institution, then you have no right under the First Amendment to practice your religious beliefs if they're in conflict with what President Obama or Kathleen Sebelius want to do. You'll have to set them aside. It's only under their interpretation of the Constitution—and of course we know the President was an instructor—not a professor, but an instructor—at a law school at one time, so I'm

sure he understands the Constitution—but under their beliefs, you've just got to set them aside. If you're not a religious institution, you have no right to demand to put your practices into use. So apparently the First Amendment, according to them, only applies to religious institutions.

I never learned that in law school, because we were taught that if you read the Declaration of Independence and how that ended up by the end of the Revolution opening the door—of course first for the Articles of Confederation, then 4 years later for the Constitution—that all this worked together. There was a belief at that time in the rights of an individual—not of a religious institution—the rights of an individual. That's why one of the statues here in the Capitol, one of the two from Pennsylvania, is for a Reverend named Muhlenberg. The statue is of him taking off his ministerial robe because he believed, as the Declaration of Independence said, that we were endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights, and there comes a time when people have to stand up for those rights.

So Reverend Muhlenberg was preaching from Ecclesiastes and he was talking—I believe it's chapter 3—that there is a time for every purpose under heaven. When he got to the verse—I believe it's verse 8—“there is a time for war and a time for peace,” he took off his ministerial robe, and there he was in an officer's uniform and in essence said, ladies and gentlemen, now is the time for war. He recruited people from his church to join him in the fight in the Revolution, they recruited people from the town, and by the end of the war, Muhlenberg was a general.

His brother was also a reverend. There's a story told that his brother did not agree with him recruiting from the pulpit; but after his church was burned down, he got active and ended up being quite a participant in the Revolution and actually ended up being the first Speaker of the House of Representatives. Those who know where the term “separation of church and state” came from know that it came—not in the Constitution, it's nowhere in here, not at all. Nowhere before the end of the Constitution do you find the words “separation of church and state,” nor do you find the words “wall of separation.” Those are both contained in a letter that Jefferson wrote to the Danbury Baptists.

So in the Constitution, you don't see any prohibition against them dating the Constitution itself with these words: “Done in convention by the unanimous consent of the states present the seventeenth day of September in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven.”

□ 2130

They apparently did not think it offended the Constitution to date it as being done in the year 1787, that being

in the year of our Lord, 1787. So imagine the Founders' surprise to learn that the Bill of Rights that they put together, when it said the government would never prohibit the free exercise of religion, would somehow base beliefs on something unwritten in the Constitution as giving the President of the United States and his appointed representative, Kathleen Sebelius at Health and Human Services, the power to order people to disregard the religious beliefs, set them aside and do what the President ordered. For people, as Dennis Miller said, that were willing to go to war over a tax on their breakfast drink, they would probably have been even more riled up if King George had taken this kind of action.

So, we're told that everyone in America must pay their fair share; yet we're told by the President he does not mean to divide America. And yet I would hope that by the end of this year, before the election, he would put the law where his mouth is and say, You know what? I've been saying for so long now that everybody should pay their fair share. I am finally going to go along with the Republicans who say we ought to have a flat tax. It doesn't matter who you are, Warren Buffett or whom-ever, we're going to have a flat tax.

Steve Forbes said it could be done with a 17 percent flat tax, even allowing for a mortgage interest deduction, even allowing for charitable deduction. And that way, if you've got a flat tax, then Warren Buffett would not have to sue, or his company would not have to sue, as it is now, to avoid paying the millions or billions in taxes that are alleged to be owed. He wouldn't have to fight the IRS so hard at the same time he's saying he doesn't mind paying more. There wouldn't be any question.

It's a flat tax. Just take your income, multiply it by the flat tax—no matter who you are, how much you make—and that will be your tax. Because with 53 percent of Americans being the only ones that are paying more in income tax than they get back, we'd better act in a hurry; because once we cross that line where people who are voting get more from the government than they pay in, we're not coming back, absent a miracle of God.

So I'm hopeful that the President's going to realize that all the speeches he's been giving about paying fair share really lead you to one, unavoidable conclusion. It's time to quit saying some don't have to pay any tax. It's time to say, look, everybody pay their fair share. Everybody has a percent of their income.

Now, of course, Steve Forbes proposed, under his flat tax, that in order to shield the poor, and of course we could debate on what poor is, but in the United States, his proposal was that if you're a family of four, I believe it was \$46,000 and less, you wouldn't pay any tax. How could anybody argue with that? A flat tax could do that.

In the meantime, we have a proposal from the President for a budget for this

year, and it's quite interesting. There's a Wall Street Journal article, and I'll quote from this. It's entitled, “The Amazing Obama Budget,” and it's dated today, Valentine's Day 2012. It says:

Federal budgets are by definition political documents, but even by that standard, yesterday's White House proposal for fiscal year 2013 is a brilliant bit of misdirection. With the abracadabra of a tax increase on the wealthy and defense spending cuts that will never materialize, the White House asserts that in President Obama's second term, revenues will soar, outlays will fall, and \$1.3 trillion in annual deficits will be cut in half like the lady in the box on stage.

All voters need to do is suspend disbelief for another 9 months. And ignore this first 3 years.

It says “4,” but it's the first 3 years of his administration.

The real news in Mr. Obama's budget proposal is the story of those years. What a tale they'll tell.

It says down further:

All of this has added an astonishing \$5 trillion in debt in a single Presidential term. National debt held by the public, the kind you have to pay back, will hit 74.2 percent this year and keep rising to 77.4 percent next year.

Economists believe that when debt to GDP reaches 90 percent or so, the economic damage begins to rise, and this doesn't include the debt that future taxpayers owe current and future retirees through the IOUs and the Social Security “trust fund.”

Anyway, it goes on to say:

Mr. Obama's chief economic adviser, Gene Sperling, reported that the President wants a new “global minimum tax.”

Talking about a new tax that's a global minimum tax. Wouldn't it be easier just to say, You know what? We're just going to have a flat tax. Everybody needs to pay their fair share.

I don't have this in a blowup, but the debt boom, according to the Office of Management and Budget of this White House shows that for 2012 and 2013 we go from a Federal debt held by the public as a share of GDP, around 35 percent, just spiking up, as The Wall Street Journal points out, to between 75 and 80 percent. Pretty dramatic.

There's an article from Jeffrey Anderson today that said:

According to the White House's own figures, the actual or projected deficit tallies for the 4 years in which Obama has submitted budgets are as follows: \$1.293 trillion in 2010, \$1.3 trillion in 2011, \$1.327 trillion in 2012, and \$900 billion in 2013.

That's because that's the year that hadn't happened yet.

Further down it says:

To help put that colossal sum of money into perspective, if you take our deficit spending under Obama and divide it evenly among the roughly 300 million American citizens, that works out to just over \$17,000 per person—or about \$70,000 for a family of four.

That's just the debt that has accrued with President Obama at the helm.

I think it's also important to note that, under the bill that I was against but it got passed anyway, the debt ceiling extension back last summer to give

the President all the debt ceiling authority he would want, that should carry him clear through the election, it's already appearing that that wasn't near enough.

And of course we had the supercommittee that was going to protect us and take care of us and make the cuts that were necessary. And now that those haven't happened, we're gutting our own defense, gutting our own defense.

Anybody that studies history knows you never put your national security on the table for negotiation, and we've done that.

Now, this chart is pretty telling, and it's based on the testimony of the CBO Director before the Senate Budget Committee. It makes it pretty basic. The Director of CBO in the projections for this year has projected the U.S. tax revenue will be \$2.523 trillion.

□ 2150

The head of CBO in his February 2, 2012, testimony projects the Federal budget this year will be \$3.61 trillion, approximately. That is a deficit for 1 year of \$1.079 trillion. Our national debt currently appears to be \$15.348 trillion. According to the director of CBO, our budget cuts from 2010, when coupled with the ones projected for 2011, actually amounted to around \$41 billion.

So that's kind of hard for some of us to understand when you're talking about numbers with so many zeroes. So it may be far more effective—and my staff has done a great job of putting this together for me—by removing eight zeroes from all of those trillion dollar numbers. It makes it more easily discernible if you say, All right, let's look at it as a family budget.

A family budget. They're bringing in \$25,230 for 1 year, but they're going to spend \$36,010 in that same year. That's going to increase their debt that they're going to owe by \$10,780. So \$10,780 on the new credit card.

Well, we already have a credit card balance of \$153,480. That should put it in perspective.

As a country, it's basically like being a family making \$25,000, spending \$36,000, not once, but 4 years in a row under this President. And we already had \$153,000 in debt, and we're only bringing in \$25,000. This is like credit card debt. It's not secured by a home—except for America.

We have put our future, America's future, our children, grandchildren's future all in hock for this much, and we can proudly say—those that don't understand, I get sarcastic from time to time—we can proudly say that since 2010, 2011, if you take away the eight zeroes, we have cut \$410 of our spending.

We've got a lot of work to do. We owe the American public better than we've done. It's time to take a stand.

We've been told, of course, whether you're a Republican or Democrat, that when you're elected as a freshman,

your odds of being defeated in the first election you stand for as an incumbent, are 10 to 20 percent. That means there were some fantastic freshman Republicans that were elected in this last election. Ten to 20 percent of them may get defeated in the next election. What will they have to show unless we stand up and say enough is enough?

Mr. President, Senator REID, we're standing on our principles so that we can leave the next generation as good or better a country than we inherited. But we're going to have start moving and we're going to have to start standing on principle very quickly. Easy to do.

Some say, Oh, it will be so hard making all of these cuts. No, it won't. We can go back to the 2008 budget that the most liberal Congress in history had passed. Didn't hear a lot of complaints about not enough spending that year. Go to that budget. That knocks out a trillion right there.

Enough of the games. It's time to stand up for America, stand up for a responsible budget, cut the wasteful spending, stop the crony capitalism for groups like Solyndra, and let's get this economy going back again—strong, stronger, strongest ever.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2317

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) at 11 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3408, PROTECTING INVESTMENT IN OIL SHALE THE NEXT GENERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL, ENERGY, AND RESOURCE SECURITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3813, SECURING ANNUITIES FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ACT OF 2012; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, AMERICAN ENERGY AND INFRASTRUCTURE JOBS ACT OF 2012

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-398) on the resolution (H. Res. 547) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3408) to set clear rules for the development of United States oil shale resources, to promote shale technology research and development, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3813) to

amend title 5, United States Code, to secure the annuities of Federal civilian employees, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highway, public transportation, and highway and motor carrier safety programs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. HEINRICH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. CAMPBELL (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and February 15 on account of illness.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness in the family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WEBSTER, Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 15, 2012, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4985. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cyazofamid; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0697; FRL-9332-5] received January 24, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4986. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Etoxazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0968; FRL-9334-9] received January 24, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4987. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Rimsulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-1017; FRL-9332-1] received January 24, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4988. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Equipment Delivery Report for fiscal years 2009, 2010, and 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4989. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Captain Christopher W. Grady, United States Navy, to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4990. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report on the operations of the Exchange Stabilization Fund (ESF) for fiscal

year 2011, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 5302(c)(2); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4991. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-B-1237] received January 23, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4992. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received January 23, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4993. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Report to Congress on the Final Head Start Program Designation Renewal System"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4994. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's Alternative Fuel Vehicle program report for FY 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4995. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Oklahoma; Infrastructure Requirements for 1997 8-Hour Ozone and the 1997 and 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS [EPA-R06-OAR-2008-0637; FRL-9622-5] received January 24, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4996. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Consumer and Commercial Products [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0730; FRL-9620-9] received January 24, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4997. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina: Approval of Section 110(a)(1) Maintenance Plan for the Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point 1-Hour Ozone Maintenance Area to Maintain the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2011-0455-201131(a); FRL-9621-8] received January 24, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4998. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans For Designated Facilities and Pollutants, State of West Virginia; Control of Emissions from Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerator Units, Plan Revision [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0848; FRL-9620-6] received January 24, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4999. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Protection Against Turbine Missiles, Regulatory Guide 1.115, Revision 2, received January 23, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5000. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 2011 annual report on the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program, pursuant to Public Law 106-309, section 304; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5001. A letter from the Co-Chief Privacy Officers, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's Privacy Act Report for fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5002. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the Authority's Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5003. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the report on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act covering the six months ending June 30, 2011, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 621; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. WEBSTER Committee on Rules. House Resolution 547. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3408) to set clear rules for the development of United States oil shale resources, to promote shale technology research and development, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3813) to amend title 5, United States Code, to secure the annuities of Federal civilian employees, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highway, public transportation, and highway and motor carrier safety programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-398). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 4016. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the proper tax treatment of personal service income earned in pass-thru entities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. DOLD, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 4017. A bill to promote efficient energy use in the Federal and private sectors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 4018. A bill to improve the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 4019. A bill to increase employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing Federal forest land, while also reducing the cost of managing such land, by providing such counties a dependable source of revenue from such land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on

Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California):

H.R. 4020. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to allow the construction and improvement of structures used for agricultural production in floodplains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FALCONE of Virginia:

H.R. 4021. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to waive certain requirements for naturalization for American Samoan United States nationals to become United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself, Ms. HOCHUL, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa):

H.R. 4022. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to protect the right of a claimant in a civil action before a Federal court to retain a structured settlement broker to negotiate the terms of payment of an award, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HOCHUL (for herself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 4023. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the use of teleconsultation, teleretinal imaging, telemedicine, and telehealth coordination services for the provision of health care to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 4024. A bill to suspend approval of liquefied natural gas export terminals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 4025. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior may accept bids on any new oil and gas leases of Federal lands (including submerged lands) only from bidders certifying that all natural gas produced pursuant to such leases shall be offered for sale only in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 4026. A bill to reauthorize the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal years 2013 through 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 4027. A bill to clarify authority granted under the Act entitled "An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. CARNAHAN):

H.R. 4028. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to improve transportation for seniors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JONES, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 4029. A bill to permit certain current loans that would otherwise be treated as

non-accrual loans as accrual loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4030. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to extend the post-employment restrictions on lobbying by Members of Congress and officers and employees of the legislative branch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 4031. A bill to provide that claims presented to an Indian Health Service contracting officer pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act on or before October 31, 2005, involving claims that accrued after October 1, 1995 and on or before September 30, 1999, shall be deemed timely presented; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.J. Res. 102. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUAYLE (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution recognizing February 14, 2012 as the centennial of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H. Res. 545. A resolution congratulating the World Affairs Council of Seattle on the occasion of its 61st anniversary and recognizing its contributions to the greater Seattle region and Washington State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H. Res. 546. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Department of State should raise the travel advisory for Egypt from the current level of "Travel Alert", in place since November 7, 2011, to "Travel Warning", the highest level of travel security advisory, until all 43 detained nongovernmental organization workers are given the freedom to leave Egypt; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 4016.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Sixteenth Amendment

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 4017.

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. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 4018.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 1; General Welfare Clause

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 4019.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3, clause 2

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 4020.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. FALCOMA:

H.R. 4021.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 4022.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution (Sec. 1, Sec. 5)

Commerce Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 3)

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 3).

By Ms. HOCHUL:

H.R. 4023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 4024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 4025.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 4026.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 4027.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 4028.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4031.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 clause 3.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.J. Res. 102.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 5 of the United States Constitution which states that, "The Congress, whenever

two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution . . ."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 140: Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 181: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 186: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 192: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 324: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 333: Mr. AMODEI, Ms. HAHN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 374: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 458: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 459: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 494: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 498: Mr. CAMP and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 587: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 769: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 780: Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 870: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HINCHY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 876: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 890: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 892: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 1004: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 1063: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1142: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1172: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1175: Mr. BURGESS and Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1179: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1206: Mr. LABRADOR and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1265: Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 1322: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1340: Mr. JONES, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1370: Mr. REED and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1417: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. CHU, and Mrs. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1511: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1639: Mr. CAMP and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1648: Mr. KEATING, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1718: Mr. KEATING, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1738: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1867: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1878: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1946: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 1960: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.

H.R. 2106: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 2152: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BACA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. LUTKEMEYER.

H.R. 2288: Mr. YODER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. REYES, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 2299: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 2370: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 2412: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2429: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 2485: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 2487: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2568: Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 2607: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2674: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 2679: Ms. DEGETTE.

- H.R. 2689: Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 2777: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 2827: Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 3001: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. CAMP.
 H.R. 3032: Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.R. 3057: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
 H.R. 3059: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 3086: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. BACA, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. DINGELL.
 H.R. 3185: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 3187: Mr. COOPER, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 3200: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 3236: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 3252: Mr. ROONEY.
 H.R. 3269: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 3300: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 3315: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
 H.R. 3401: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
 H.R. 3485: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3497: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 3510: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. AMODEI, and Ms. HAHN.
 H.R. 3515: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 3523: Mr. LANCE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 3526: Mr. ISRAEL and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 3542: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 3590: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 3596: Mr. MORAN, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. KUCINICH.
- H.R. 3606: Mr. RUSH, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. CANSECO.
 H.R. 3612: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 3615: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 3618: Ms. SEWELL.
 H.R. 3627: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3643: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. RIGELL.
 H.R. 3676: Mr. ROONEY.
 H.R. 3698: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 3760: Ms. HIRONO and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3767: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. BOREN.
 H.R. 3768: Mr. NUGENT and Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 3769: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 3786: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 3789: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 3803: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BERG, Mr. PETRI, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. CAMP.
 H.R. 3805: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 3811: Mr. FINCHER.
 H.R. 3828: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. PALAZZO.
 H.R. 3829: Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 3855: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 3856: Mr. MACK.
 H.R. 3859: Mr. LUJÁN.
 H.R. 3877: Mr. HERGER and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 3893: Mr. HANNA and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
 H.R. 3909: Mr. PIERLUISI.
 H.R. 3973: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 3981: Mr. GRIMM and Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 3982: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. AKIN.
- H.R. 3993: Mr. CLAY, Ms. SPEIER, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H.R. 3994: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 4000: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
 H.R. 4003: Mr. GRIMM.
 H.R. 4010: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REYES, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. CHU, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. VISLOSKEY.
 H.J. Res. 88: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H. Res. 111: Mr. CARTER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SABLAN.
 H. Res. 258: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
 H. Res. 282: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H. Res. 440: Mr. STARK.
 H. Res. 507: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative ISSA, or a designee, to H.R. 3813, the Securing Annuities for Federal Employees Act of 2012, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.