

out to be, in many instances, slave labor from some of the poorest countries around the world. Many labels pulled out because they didn't want to be associated with those labor practices. They went off and had their clothes made in Indonesia or Mexico or the Caribbean or wherever. Others stayed and then things started getting worse. The final tier of the Multi-Fiber Agreement came along, and like so many other places in the Pacific, that's how that industry migrated to China, to Vietnam and elsewhere and left the CNMI.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Well, I appreciate the gentleman's giving some background on this, and I'm not going to refute that. However, it seems to me that the mere evidence of the remedy that we are proposing here is aimed at the minimum wage, which was passed in 2007, and the remedy addressing the minimum wage would certainly indicate to me that, at least in the real near term, the reason for this is the minimum wage, and so I stand by my remarks, but I know there's always more to it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Certainly, the delegate from the CNMI continues to support the increase in the minimum wage. We're just trying to time it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, I will just simply say that I find it remarkable that the remedy we are trying to pursue is prolonging an increase in the minimum wage.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. We could have gone the other way, maybe more in keeping with the Republican doctrine. We could have lowered the wages to 70 cents an hour and then they could have kept the jobs from going to Malaysia, but I don't think they could support themselves in these territories with that, especially with the construction going on in Guam.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, I don't recall during the debate that there was a discussion of any level of minimum wage as the gentleman was referring to, but as was pointed out by the gentleman from Iowa, it simply is a matter of supply and demand, and we need to be cognizant of that.

So, with that, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 3940.

With great fanfare, this Democratic majority increased the federally mandated minimum wage as one of its first acts. At the time, many of us warned that without adequate financial

relief or transition time, especially for small businesses, workers would be harmed by a proposal that was intended to help them.

We warned that teens seeking their first job and the chance to build work experience would have fewer opportunities. We warned that unskilled workers would be replaced by a smaller number of more highly skilled workers. And we warned that regions with comparatively low wages and living expenses would be especially hard hit because of the added cost to job-creators.

With nearly 15 million Americans searching for work, it's a terrible time to have to say we told you so.

In July 2007, when the first phase of the wage hike took effect, the national unemployment rate was 4.6 percent. For teenagers, the unemployment rate was 15.3 percent.

Today, while the overall unemployment rate stands at an unacceptably high 9.6 percent, the figure for teens is far worse: more than one-quarter of all teens are unemployed, a total of 26.3 percent.

Young African-American men perhaps bear the greatest burden from this irresponsible tinkering with the free marketplace. At the time Democrats passed their minimum wage hike, 31 percent of African-American teen males were unemployed; today, these same young men have a 50–50 chance of being unemployed.

No one would suggest federal wage mandates are the sole cause of this spike in unemployment. But the difference between the overall jobless rate and the number of teens who cannot find work is startling and should not be ignored.

Economists from the University of California, Irvine and the Federal Reserve reviewed more than 100 academic studies on the impact of the minimum wage around the time these increases began. They found overwhelming evidence that the least skilled and the young suffer a loss of employment when the minimum wage is increased.

Similarly hard hit by the wage requirement are the territories of American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. A major tuna cannery in American Samoa closed its doors last year, laying off some 2,000 workers—roughly 12 percent of the territory's workforce. The second cannery has already laid off hundreds of workers and its future remains in doubt.

In April of this year, the Government Accountability Office reported on the how the wage rate harms these territories:

In American Samoa . . . Many employers reported having taken cost-cutting actions, such as freezing hiring and cutting worker benefits, since the increases began. Employers also reported planning actions such as leaving American Samoa or closing by the end of 2010. More employers attributed their actions to the minimum wage increases than to other factors. . . . In discussion groups, workers generally said that their support for the wage increases had dwindled because of concerns about issues such as the cannery closure, job insecurity, and loss of benefits.

Today, the House is voting on a measure to temporarily suspend the destructive federal wage mandates. Another increase is scheduled to take effect tomorrow, which makes immediate action imperative.

But we can't pretend the negative consequences of the minimum wage hike wreaking havoc on businesses in American Samoa aren't equally damaging to businesses in Muncie, Indiana. Or Le Center, Minnesota. Or Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Or anywhere else a business is struggling to meet its payroll and provide opportunities for its workers.

I certainly support this small measure of relief for the territories. Congress should do everything it can to right any wrongs it imposes on the people we are here to serve. However, I hope we do not fail to learn the larger lesson: Federal laws that force one-size-fits-all mandates on vastly different workers, workplaces, and communities often do far more harm than good.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEINER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 3940.

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. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, Republican Leader:

SEPTEMBER 28, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
H-232, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Pursuant to Section 214(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15344), I am pleased to reappoint Mr. Thomas A. Fuentes of Lake Forest, California to the Election Assistance Commission Board of Advisors.

Mr. Fuentes has expressed interest in continuing to serve in this capacity and I am pleased to fulfill his request.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Republican Leader.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL URBAN AIR TOXICS RESEARCH CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412), and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following member on the part of

the House to the board of directors of the National Urban Air Toxics Research Center:

Ms. Jane Luxton, McLean, Virginia.

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO
SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY
BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 703 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 903), and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, and upon the recommendation of the minority leader, the Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, effective October 9, 2010, of the following member on the part of the House to the Social Security Advisory Board for a term of 6 years:

Mrs. Dorcas R. Hardy, Spotsylvania, Virginia.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO
H.R. 3081, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1682 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1682

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3081) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendments. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

□ 2210

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1682.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 1682 provides for consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 3081, the Continuing Appropriations Act of 2011. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations, or his designee, that the House concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 3081. The rule provides 1 hour of debate on the motion, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion, except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. And finally, the rule provides the Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, we are here tonight to approve the continuing resolution to maintain a level and consistent funding stream for the government. It is an easy issue to demagogue, and it is my hope that everybody will work together now and quickly move this bill to passage and to the President's desk. The Senate voted earlier this evening on the same straightforward bill that keeps funding even for the fiscal year that begins on Friday. As you know, the CR before us will fund government agencies until December 3, and Congress will revisit the issue in November.

There are some on the other side who question why we are considering a CR. They want us to stay here in Washington instead of getting this done and heading back to our districts. If you ask me, we've been here long enough. It has been an historic, groundbreaking session of Congress that will improve the quality of life for millions of Americans and has exceeded all of our expectations.

Generations from now, history will show that Speaker PELOSI and our majority helped usher in far-reaching health care reform that had been tried for 100 years and put curbs on insurance companies, restructured Wall Street rules, reformed student aid, increased small business assistance, added new regulations on tobacco, curbed credit card abuses, and protected Social Security. It has been one of the most productive sessions of Congress that I have ever been associated with, and I am proud of all the work that we have behind us. But now it's time to approve the CR and go home.

No one should be surprised with the CR. With the exception of fiscal years 1989, 1995 and 1997, one continuing resolution at least has been enacted for each fiscal year since 1955. In the 12 years that Republicans controlled the House, CRs were enacted 84 separate times. As in previous years, we are extending funding with a CR but are making no changes in policy. And I

hope all of my colleagues would join me in voting "yes" on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, before we spend more time on conversations about budgets and currency, I want to pause to pay tribute to a very special person who is retiring from Congress in November. Katharine Hayford, known to the world as Sophie, is more than just a dedicated member of the Rules Committee staff. She is an icon in the House, a symbol of the best attributes of the dedicated staff that keeps this place humming. She is a deep and irreplaceable reservoir of institutional knowledge, and to say she will be missed is a critical understatement.

Sophie is one of those rare people in Congress who has always been content to work quietly and professionally in the background. She never sought or wanted attention. Her pride was in being prepared for any scenario that could unfold in the hearing room or on the House floor. And as someone with more than a little experience on the Rules Committee, I can vouch for that. Almost anything can and does happen here every day, and that is one of the things that makes the place so wonderful to work in.

It's common knowledge to those of us on Rules that the tiny cubby holes and shelves behind her desk have more yellowed and dog-eared records than the National Archives and more paper and reports than a Presidential library. Sophie saved everything. Whenever the members were on the floor to manage a rule, Sophie was ready and waiting with a massive, double-phonebook-sized binder filled with House precedents, statistics, talking points, and even items that she had culled from the many blogs and Web sites she devoured.

My first email from her every morning came between 5:35 and 6 a.m. But she is much more than a mini research factory. Sophie has a smile for everyone and went out of her way to provide cookies, raisins, almonds, crackers, chips, and even doughnuts on a regular basis to our hardworking staff. She did that on her own because she knew it was needed and appreciated. She bakes cakes, even vegan ones, out of deference to our staff that don't eat dairy. Her birthday celebrations are a familiar and comforting routine.

Before we had the privilege of working with Sophie, she worked in the personal office of Congressman Joe Moakley, who was a friend to all of us. Sophie spent 10 years on Congressman Moakley's staff before coming to the Rules Committee in 1986, the year that I was elected to Congress, and some of my staff had not yet been born. More recently, she has discovered the pleasures of France and is a frequent visitor to Paris, where she is learning the language and discovering sites.

And now, as she prepares to leave the Hill and spend more time with Brad,